

worshipping assembly of Christians, and is the appropriated designation by which such assemblies are usually designated, will appear from the following passages: "Greet Priscilla and Acquila, likewise the Church that is in their house." "The churches of Asia salute you." "Salute the brethren who are in Laodicea and Nymphas, and the Church which is in his house." Who can read these texts, and feel any doubt respecting the proper and literal import of the title in question as it here occurs? Is there any thing equivocal in the matter? Whether can it mean in these places, *one* congregation in each house, or a *number* of congregations in Presbytery or Conference assembled? Let the man of common sense decide.

2d. Again I remark, that not only does the apostle Paul and the other sacred writers uniformly use the title, *Church*, in the singular number to mean but one worshipping assembly, but when they come to speak of a greater number they never use the singular, but always without exception, the plural,—never *Church*, but always *Churches*. In proof of this, among a multitude, let a few passages suffice:—"Then had the *Churches* rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria." Had some of our modern Presbyterians, Methodists or Episcopalians been narrating this fact, instead of saying the *Churches* had rest, they would have informed us "that those *branches* of the *Church* in Judea, &c. had rest, for they are always dreaming of a united and consolidated hierarchy, placed under their *own* management and control, not being satisfied that Jesus Christ *alone* should regulate the concerns of his entire Kingdom.

3d. That no combinations, or Church judicatories, existed in primitive times, will appear from the fact that the Seven Churches in Asia are called upon to reform their own abuses. Also, when Diotrephes abused his power and tyrannized over the disciples, the Church was *not* ordered to lodge an appeal to any Superior Court, in order to rectify the evils of his improper conduct. John simply declares that when he came he would remember his deeds. Having no such Court to refer to, he was obliged to leave them for the present, to set matters to rights *themselves*. But had some of our moderns been there, they would have found no difficulty in the case at all. They would have summoned a few of their brethren even from the distance of 40 or 50 miles perhaps, to examine and pass judgement and after having found means to blindfold the unreflecting multitude they would have exonerated the accused from the charge and reinstated him as pastor, sometimes even in the face of all evidence. But, Mr. Editor, what has the History of Church courts been but the History of tyranny often in favor of wealth against the lowly and the down trodden. They seldom "take the part" of the poor and the oppressed. Their master evinced a different spirit.

1st. In the Sacred oracles, it is more than to be inferred, the only classes of officers required in a *Church* are Elders, or Bishops, and deacons—and such officers as, Archbishops, Rectors, curates, Ruling elders, and presiding Elders, are mere human inventions, and alike destitute of Scriptural authority. And in order to establish the position from the Bible that but *two* officers continue to be