

have been duly REGISTERED, entered, and enrolled, by Thomas Huband Gregg, D. D., and M D, the Primate of the said Church, according to the provisions of the Act 5 and 6, Victoria, cap 45, and all other Acts of Parliament protecting the rights and copyright thereof.

Whereupon 'Bishop' Sugden formerly of the 'Free Church,' has something to say to Dr. Gregg in an advertisement:—

"REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.—COMMUNICATIONS relating to this Church should hereafter be ADDRESSED to the Right Rev. Bishop Sugden, Teddington; the Rev. Alfred S. Richardson, Malvern; or the Rev. Phillip Norton, Littlehampton, Sussex, N. R.—The new scheme, recently set forth by Bishop Gregg, of Southend, has no sanction from the Reformed Episcopal Church, as now existing in the United States, Canada, Bermuda, and Great Britain."

This looks as if the Lawyers would have something to do before long. At present there are three candidates in the field. "The Primate's Church," "The Free Church" and "Mr. Sugden's Church." And this is the haven of rest to which Churchmen were invited. May we all learn a lesson from such spectacles as this, and hold our principles firmly, but in a loving and charitable spirit, cultivating the grace of humility—and from the sin of Schism, which inevitably tends to many evils spiritually, may the good Lord deliver us.

A SHORT BAPTIST SERMON.

AND Abraham circumcised his son Isaac being eight days old—Gen. xxi: 4.

Circumcision was the ancient mode, divinely appointed, whereby persons were admitted into the church of God. Upon this point there can be no doubt in the mind

of any intelligent reader of the scriptures. All must admit the fact.

Hence, (but now we speak as a Baptist divine, and are looking at things through Baptist spectacles) we are forced to conclude that Abraham was guilty of a great crime when he administered the sacrament of circumcision to that little eight day old baby Isaac. His conduct—to our Baptist mind—was monstrous, wicked and absurd. His sacrilegious course—in our Baptist opinion—will be punished of God and work incalculable harm to the babe himself. And all this we (that is, we who are versed in Baptist logic,) can prove by the most unanswerable arguments.

In the first place, circumcision is described (Rom. 4, 11) as a sign, "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being uncircumcised." Faith, as you will thus perceive, is a condition precedent to circumcision. But then this eight day old babe could not exercise faith. Therefore he ought not to have been circumcised. It was very wrong in Abraham. He went directly against the teachings of scriptures which demand faith first, and circumcision afterwards.

But again, what good could it do little Isaac? The babe was only eight days old. He had no intelligent appreciation of the rite. He did not understand the sacramental service through which he was passing. He cried and whimpered, and was tortured, all the while conscious alone of the pain which he was suffering. Could anything be more irrational, absurd and ridiculous? It could do the unconscious recipient no good. It was an unmeaning service wrought upon