

difference between the two parties already too wide. Your Correspondents own communications, (for his style is as patent as his handwriting or face) are often far from being free from the fault complained of, and his last one especially, over the new signature "Modesty" furnishes a most melancholy "specimen." For what earthly or heavenly purpose, such a communication was penned and printed, it would be difficult to devise. But 'twere easy to suggest one with a qualifying epithet formed from the name of the "other place;" while, to quote a striking passage from his sermon in the vestry last evening, the agents of that dark region "grin with fiendish delight," over all such exhibitions of human nature. Do, dear brethren, shun profane and vain babblings, for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And, "speak the truth in love."—"Study the things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another."

Allow me to offer a brief remark or two on your editorial note appended to my last, and it shall go for my final reply to Dr. Tupper, and to "Bertha," and all else. It is no comfort to differ in a matter of that kind from esteemed and valued friends. I may be mistaken; very likely I am, in my views. But if so, I cannot be set right by such arguments as they and you have used; and I must give you all credit for doing about the best of any I have yet had to meet.—It seems to me you reason in the case marvellously like the Pedobaptists when they attempt to prove infant baptism to be correct. And you do seem flatly to contradict the inspired apostle. Just look at your teachings placed side by side with his:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>PAUL,
1. "Let your women keep silence in the churches."
2. "For it is not permitted unto them to speak."
3. For it is a SHAME for women to speak in the church."</p> | <p>YOU,
1. "Let your women not keep silence in the churches."
2. "For it is permitted unto them to speak."
3. "For it is NOT a shame, but an HONOR, for women to speak in the churches!"</p> |
|---|--|

There is the matter in a nut-shell. You gravely tell me, my "construction" of the passage would preclude women from making a personal profession of religion, and leave "the singing of praises in the sanctuary to the men." But I put no "construction" on the words of Paul. No language can be more plain and expressive. The trouble is all on the other side. The sentiments placed opposite, and which I and you do hear continually inculcated, in our "conference and prayer meetings" are those that need the "construction" to be put upon them, in order to accomplish the hopeless task of reconciling them with the other side.

And then you are again mistaken. The most rigid construction of Paul's words, cannot "preclude women from making a personal profession of religion and confessing Christ before men."—Simply since she can do all this without uttering a single word. I have seen it so done, and in a very impressive manner. I dare say you have, I confess I think the words of Paul might be so construed as to preclude women from either singing in the churches or "reading the responses." And it strikes me that "you" and my Episcopalian friends are bound to show where and how the Scriptures make these exercises cases of exception to the general rule, or else give in that you do not follow the Bible in all things.

Having now disposed, I hope finally, of the two first points enumerated in the heading to this article, I proceed to the third. This is an examination of a short article from the pen of my friend Rev. Mr. Sommerville, which appeared in the last *Witness*, in which he attempts to prove that Paul could not have been immersed when he was baptized. I will not ask you to quote the whole article. It is based upon an examination of the Gospel of Matthew, as issued in its corrected form, by the Bible Union.

"The amended translation," he says "of Mat. ii, 3, is, 'Herod the king, hearing, was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.' The authorized translation, 'When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled.'"

*** The criticism [of the Bible Union] goes to show that in such a construction the action or subjective state expressed by the verb, coincides in point of time with that which is expressed by the preceding participle, and that Herod was troubled, not after he had heard, but when he was hearing the wise men."

As I have not the work of the Bible Union at hand, I have not the means of examining their critical note. Taking it for granted that it has been correctly presented, and that Mr. S. approves of it, I would remark in passing that it does not strike me as either forcible or correct. Whatever the Greek expression may be supposed to convey, the shades of idea represented by such different expressions in English as the

following:—Herod, hearing the news, was troubled: Herod having heard the news, was troubled: When Herod had heard the news, he was troubled,—is slight indeed. For pray, how could the intelligence brought by the wise men, have troubled him until it came to his ears? until he knew what it was? until he had heard it?

Mr. S. proceeds: "There is a sentence in Acts ix. 18, in which we meet with precisely the same construction, and where also our translators have failed to bring out the correct idea.—'He (Saul) received sight forthwith, and he arose and was baptised.'" Here we have as in the former case the Aorist participle (anastas) translated *he arose* followed by the Indicative of that tense, (*ebaptisthe*) translated, *he was baptised*. The common Version excludes the idea that Paul was baptised while *standing-up*; the original does not. The participial construction of the Greek therefore ought to be retained in the translation as giving the true sense more exactly. The verse then will read, "He received sight forthwith, and standing up was baptised." I am not aware that any objection to this translation except that it unequivocally exhibits Paul as baptised in an erect posture, and is inconsistent with the doctrine of baptismal immersion."

This is the gist of the criticism. Before proceeding to examine it, I think I may fairly congratulate the friends of "Revision" in being able to enumerate on their side the Rev. Mr. Sommerville. And he, I trust, will not be hereafter too severe upon the Baptists, for mending a few passages so as to make them "bring out more fully" their own views.

But to Mr. S's criticism there are grave objections. 1st. It confounds two distinct Greek terms, and confuses two distinct meanings of an English term. "Standing up," in English, may mean either the act of rising up, from a sitting or recumbent posture, to an erect position; or the state of standing after having arisen. In Mr. Sommerville's reasoning he uses the term in one sense in his premises, and in the other in his deduction. I need not remind him that this is "bad logic."

2d. Secondly, the Greek word expresses simply the act of rising up, and does not express the idea that he stood at all. It is from *anistemi*, *anastas*, not from *istemi*. To answer Mr. S's purpose it should have been *istas*, *standing*, not *anastas*, *rising up*. If his criticism be sound, Paul was not baptised in a *standing*, but a *rising* posture.

3d. This act of rising up is so far from being incompatible with "baptismal immersion," that it invariably forms an essential and an expressive part of the interesting rite.

4th. Though Mr. Sommerville does not, we always do require the candidate to stand up in order to be baptised. He could not very well receive the rite at our hands, either lying on his couch, or sitting in his chair.

5th. If Saul had to be immersed, he would have to "rise up," and "stand up," and possibly in the mean time to walk or be carried a short distance. If he had merely to be "sprinkled" there was no conceivable necessity, for either rising, walking or standing.

Mr. S. does not believe that baptism can be scripturally administered by immersion. His Presbyterian friends of the *Witness*, will be therefore sorry to learn that he has joined the ranks of the "Anabaptists." For certainly if I am to be considered an Anabaptist, because I immerse those who have been sprinkled, he must be deemed one also, since he sprinkles those who have been immersed. In my humble opinion, however, the term as applied to either of us, is erroneous, wrong, and unchristian.

Mr. Sommerville intimates in the article referred to that "immersion" is *sinful*. Some Baptists think the same of sprinkling. So we are even again. Happily in this case the province of judging is, and may be safely left, in "good hands."

But dear, Sir, [to Mr. Sommerville,] you have in your "Remarks on Impudence" strongly reprobated the idea of considering the "Great Reformers," as men very likely to make mistakes. Turn you then to that precious old volume of Calvin, in your study, and see what he says on the subject. He deemed it proper to administer a *trine* immersion, and gives his testimony as a historian and as a man of learning, that the original mode was immersion, and that the Greek term means to immerse.

Yours truly,
Monday, July 22. S. T. RAND.

[We presume that our worthy friend Rev. S. T. Rand, will not trouble any body much by his having assumed the position of Censor-general of "the Presbyterian Witness, the Christian Messenger and their correspondents," seeing that he is himself included in the latter term. Perhaps he

feels that he himself needs a little reproof for his mode of treating "small points of difference" with others. His remarks on this may possibly be the result of some slight feeling of compunction he is experiencing, and he has therefore undertaken to confess, on his own behalf, and for the sake of being in good company, embraces other "correspondents" in his vote of censure. We more readily perceive in others the infirmities of which we are ourselves the subjects, and as they are more prominent in us, our condemnation of them is often the more severe. This may be the case with Brother Rand, and he fancies that he discovers in others the mote of a "widening of the difference between the two parties;" whereas it is but the beam in his own visual organ, which to him appears so large, and requires removing from that of his brethren.

We have no desire of reproving Brother R. for displaying his idiosyncracies,—uniformity would be as undesirable in newspapers as in human countenances, or in landscape scenery. Even "bitterness" may be needed occasionally by way of medicine. Mr. R. is quite capable of occasionally preparing a mixture of this nature; some may think his present communication not entirely free from that flavor. Possibly he thinks it contains no ingredient which should render it ought but wholesome and agreeable to the most fastidious.

Mr. R's remarks in reference to the writer of the article signed "Modesty" shew that he is altogether mistaken in his guess as to its author. For his information and satisfaction we may state that it was written by no person in Kings or Hants counties. He may therefore feel quite safe in taking the full benefit of "the striking passage" of the sermon he heard in the vestry, without supposing he has discovered the "style, hand-writing, or face" of the writer.

In the contrast between "Paul" and "you," Mr. Rand has taken the liberty of putting words into our mouth and then founding a charge upon them; this we think not quite fair and honorable. Without further discussing the subject as to what extent women are allowed to speak when they confess Christ before men, on which perhaps there has been too much said already, we may state that we believe there is greater danger, in the present day, of their being misled by bald and bold statements of the prohibition referred to, than of their taking an enlightened view of Scripture examples and precepts, and endeavouring before the church and the world, to carry them out, in the fear of God, for the benefit of all.—See Rom. x. 9. 10; Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8, &c.—Ed. C. M.]

For the Christian Messenger.

Obituary Notices.

MRS. ELLEN LESLEY.

Died at North Sydney, on the 11th of last February, Ellen, widow of the late Captain Lesley, in the 63rd year of her age. Mrs. Lesley obtained a hope in Christ, was baptized and united with the church under the pastoral care of the Rev. G. Richardson, in 1843. In the order of Providence it was allotted to sister Lesley to suffer much bodily indisposition. During her last illness she manifested resignation to the will of God, and a confident reliance on the atonement of Christ for salvation.

MISS ELIZA CAMPBELL.

The eldest daughter of Brother Alex. Campbell, of North West Arm, Sydney, died on the 8th inst., in her 24th year. During a revival of religion in 1856, Miss C. obtained a hope in Christ, was baptized, and united with the church at North Sydney, then under the pastoral care of Elder A. Shields. By the mysterious arrangement of Providence, this amiable young sister was removed after a few days illness, expressing reliance on the Saviour, and submission to the will of God. She was a favourite with her acquaintances, and her sudden removal from friends has produced a solemn effect upon their minds, which we hope may not be effaced.—Com. by Rev. H. Ross.

American and Foreign News.

Latest from the States!

United States papers are filled with the various accounts of the late battle. The report given in our telegrams last week, of the number killed is said to be greatly exaggerated. The estimate however, differs greatly as made by different parties; the probability seems to be that between 1,000 and 500 were killed. So many are said to have been disbanded and wandering in the woods that it was not likely that the number of killed could soon be accurately given. No list of names has of course been published, but it is promised soon as possible by the government.

As we intimated last week, it appears that the Southern troops by clever maneuvering led on the Federalist forces, and after what they thought a series of successful movements in advance, they were fallen upon with most terrible effect and fled. It is said by some that the am-

munition of the Federal artillery had been expended in the previous contest, it was ordered to the rear to replenish, and as caissons were rushing at full speed to the rear for this purpose, the movement was construed by the teamsters and civilians there into a retreat. That panic among them occurred, and they ran for their horses, without waiting to ascertain the facts, cut the traces of the waggon horses, and commenced a precipitate retreat. The consternation thus created was communicated to the soldiery in the rear of the column at the very moment when a charge of fresh cavalry from Manassas Junction was made upon them. They were jaded. They had had a fatiguing march, had fought desperately for many hours, without food, rest, or refreshments. The panic in the rear spread from regiment to regiment, and in the very hour of a glorious victory all the advantages so hardly and so gallantly gained by a day's hard fighting were lost. The whole column was stamped. It was nothing more nor less than a stampede.—The enemy were themselves not aware of it.

Gen. McDowell was in the rear of the retreat, exerting himself to rally the men, but with only partial effect. The latter part of the army is said to have made their retreat in good order.—General McDowell was completely exhausted, having slept but little for three nights. His orders on the field did not at all times reach those for whom they were intended. It is supposed that the force sent against the Northern troops consisted, according to a prisoner's statement, of about 30,000, including a large number of cavalry. He further says, that owing to reinforcements from Richmond, Strasburg, and other points, the enemy's effective force was 90,000 men.

According to the statement of two Fire Zouaves they have only about 200 men left from the slaughter, while the 69th and other regiments frightfully suffered in killed and wounded. Sherman's, Carlisle's, Griffin's and the West Point batteries were taken by the enemy, and the eight siege 32 rifled cannon, the latter being too cumbersome to remove fell into their hands.—They were two miles the other side of Centreville. Such of the wounded as were brought to the Centreville hospital were left there, after having their wounds properly dressed.

Some regiment's waggons were overturned by accident, or the wheels came off, and they had to be abandoned. Large droves of cattle were saved by being driven back in advance of the retreat.

On Monday morning the roads were strewn with stragglers. Washington city was of course in the most intense state of excitement. Groups every where gathered enquiring the latest news. The dead and wounded continually arriving in waggons. Soldiers relating the events as they occurred on the previous day in their presence. The Steamboats and telegraphs were not allowed to be used by the public. The ladies at Washington were in the greatest state of alarm.

It was reported that the Black Horse cavalry of the enemy made an attack on the rear of the retreating column, when the latter turned and fired, killing all but six of the assaulting party.

The following regiments were engaged in the fight. The 1st, 2d, and 3d Connecticut; 2d Maine, on regiment of regulars, composed of the 2d, 3d and 8th companies and 250 marines, 8th and 14th N. Y. militia, 1st and 2d R. I., 71st N. Y., 2d N. H., 5th Mass., 1st Minnesota, 1st Michigan, 11th and 38th N. Y., 2d, 4th and 5th Maine and the 2d Vermont, besides the several batteries.

In many instances the teamsters unhitched the horses and abandoned the waggons when there was not the slightest necessity. The rebel cavalry was the terror of the volunteers, who were compelled to keep in the woods to avoid being charged by them.

The corps d'armee at Washington is to be instantly reorganized and increased. The orders have already been given. Officers of regiments already raised and being made will be accepted with such rapidity as to insure that this will be accomplished.

Large reinforcements from various districts are already on their way thither, orders for them having been telegraphed yesterday while the battle was progressing.

The government entertains no apprehension for the safety of the capital.

Preparations not only for defensive, but for the renewal of offensive operations, are going on vigorously.

General McDowell has returned to his headquarters at Arlington Heights. The regiments comprising his army will resume their position. Most of them have already done so.

A Zouave who was taken prisoner with six others, and who subsequently effected an escape, reports that the Zouaves were treated with Indian barbarity by the rebels, many being pinioned to trees and tormented with bayonets thrust at them.

It was confidently asserted at Winchester that Johnston and Col. Hunter were both killed at Manassas. It is rumored that General Jackson was also killed. There had been great sickness and numerous deaths at Winchester.

There is an awful state of anarchy in Missouri.—Both sides are committing atrocities, and men are murdered in cold blood without the least compunction. A Dr. Palmer was shot dead, his head being perforated with bullets. At another town a father and his two sons were killed, and so on. In some places the order is "take no prisoners."

Taylor's recent mission to Washington was to propose an exchange of the prisoners taken on the privateer Savannah, and to inform Mr. Lincoln that the confederate leaders are determined to check all barbarities on prisoners of war by such retaliations as will effectually put an end to such practices. Mr. Lincoln's promised reply has not yet been received by the rebels.