

CANADA
CHRISTIAN WORKER
 Printed by Watson & McMillan, at the office
 of the *Meaford Monitor*, for the Publishers.
 Published Every Month by
 H. D. SHERMAN, Editor and Publisher.
MEAFORD, - - - ONTARIO.
 J. C. WHITEHEAD, Business Manager,
 Meaford, Ont.
 To whom all Business Letters should be Addressed
 SUBSCRIPTIONS 50 CENTS PER ANNUM.

HOW IS THIS.

David said, "Flora be Quick," and a Templeton started off on double Quick. The result as usual on such occasions, "At Rockport, Missouri, April 5th, at 8 p.m., D. A. Quick, to Miss F. E. Templeton." We acknowledge the receipt of an invitation to attend. May peace, happiness and prosperity attend you.—*Ed. Worker.*

OUR PLEA.

We plead for the restoration of the ordinances of the church to their proper place in the worship. The "breaking of bread" in remembrance of our Saviour's suffering, formed a conspicuous place in the worship in the assembly every Lord's Day, under the teaching of the apostles. The Lord's Table has been subject to many dishonoring changes at the hands of so called churches; each one claiming the right to fix the time for observing the ordinance, as well as to dictate who shall partake of it.

It is quite clear from reading Acts 2-42 that the Disciples attended to the "breaking of bread" as stated as they did to the teaching, fellowship and prayers. If there is an effort made to establish the fact that they only observed it once per month, we can establish upon the same basis that they only attended to the prayers once per month. This of course none will allow, yet the primitive Christians were as steadfast in one as in the other. There practice was to "come together on the first day of the week to break bread." (See Acts 20-7.) Their practice was given to them by the inspired apostles, hence right. Any other practice will be wrong. John Wesley, John Calvin, Martin Luther, Neander and John Mosheim and all eminent writers who have written on the subject, unite in saying that it was the practice of the primitive Christians to break bread in remembrance of our Lord's suffering, every Lord's Day. This is our practice. In this you will observe that we are closely following our plea for the restoration of the church of Christ in teaching and practice. Christ has not authorized man to change the ordinances, and there can be no excuse for doing so, unless it be the excuse offered by "his awful reverence" the Pope! "That he has a right to change the ordinances of the church." Perhaps the children and grandchildren recognize the right and power of their maternal ancestor, and practice accordingly. We do not presume to be judges of the Lord's servants, hence we do not examine them to see whether they may eat at the Lord's table or not. We recognize that it is the Lord's table, for the Lord's children, and that one child of God has as good a right to the table as another. Our Baptist neighbor will recognize you as a child of God, but will debar you from the table unless you are a member of the Baptist Church. This is assuming a responsibility that I would not assume for my right arm—to debar a child of God from the Lord's table unless he belonged to a society that is neither named or hinted at in the Bible!

OUR CREED—the Bible, says: "let a man examine himself and so let him eat." Baptist creed says—or at least the practice says, "let me examine you and if you are a good Baptist you may eat." If you are a child of God, you have a right to the Lord's table, and none has the right to debar you from it. There can be no union among God's children until we can all sit down to our Father's table together without having to subscribe to some human dogma.

Are we not right in this?

CHANGE OF HEART.

That the term "change of heart" means the change of affection, I suppose, will be admitted by all. That sinners must undergo this change, is conceded by all I am sure. That this change of heart is poorly understood by the people in general is a fact that must be conceded by all thinking people. Change of heart and conversion means one and the same thing, so far as it refers to the condition of the minds of men. As long as a man loves sin, he needs a change of affection so that he will hate sin, so long as he loves in, he cannot love God, for love for God and sin at the same time, cannot be in a man's heart, they cannot dwell together. Hence man needs a change of heart, so that he will love God and hate sin.

How is this change brought about? Here we approach a momentous question. There are many ways taught by men, by which this change is brought about. It is only necessary to present the right way and leave the wrong ways to take care of themselves.

In order that the affection for sin be removed, it will be necessary to reveal the exceeding sinfulness of sin, until it will appear hateful. As soon as this is done, the old love for it will disappear. This, Christ our Saviour, came to reveal to the world. 1st. Sin is displeasing to God; 2nd. Sin robs us of our respectability here; 3rd. It leads downward always, and finally brings eternal death; 4th. Sin has nothing to recommend itself to us, it is only a loathsome disease, that is always against us. Now, as soon as a man is convinced of these facts, he will hate sin, because he will see how hateful it is. He must believe in Christ before he can be convinced of this, for he is only convinced by the teaching of Christ that these things are so, as stated. So, then Faith in Christ as the Son of God, is the power that brings about this change of heart. Because Christ has showed him the fearful consequences of sin. Believing in Christ, he believes all Christ has said, he believes he is a sinner and lost on account of sin, so he hates the very sin he once loved, and asks how to be freed from it. He now listens to the story of God's love, with an interest that he has hitherto been a stranger to. He has faith in the statements of Christ concerning God's love, and realizes that God loves him, and has made provisions for his escape from sin and its consequences. He now loves God whom he before cared nothing for. He asks in deep earnest now, "What must I do?" As soon as he learns what the Lord requires of him, he gladly obeys. The evidences of a "change of heart," to the man himself, will be that he now hates the sin that he once loved, and love God whom he once hated. The evidence to the world, that he has experienced this "change of heart," is the change of his life. He obeys God's word, he swears no more, he loves God's people and is always found in the Lord's house, he is honest, he is truthful, and in fact the change of life is as apparent to the world, as the change of affection is apparent to himself. The Christian religion makes men happy within, and beautiful in character without. If our religion does not do this for us, we may know full well it is not the religion of Jesus Christ.

Toronto, March 23.—The West End congregation had their hearts warmed and cheered by 1 cockshon last Lord's day evening. The attendance at our meetings

is good, and attention excellent.—C. F. R.
 TORONTO, April, 1th 1882.
 DEAR BRO. SHERMAN.—Kindly give the enclosed clipping space in your paper. We are having excellent meetings, and feel very much encouraged. We will be able to send you a good report for your May issue. Two were added by relation (as you have explained the term) and two made the good confession on Sunday 2nd inst., and will be baptised on Thursday, God willing. We will report these and we hope others in time for the May number. We hope your call for help may be responded to, are sorry our hands are full of necessity beyond our ability.

Fraternally Yours
 C. C. POMEROY.

PHIL. 1st CHAP. 21, 22, 23, 24.

DEAR BROTHER,—Accept my thanks for your explanation of the above passage in *CHRISTIAN WORKER* of Jan. last. Allow me to take objections to your criticisms on the work I quoted from. You say the work is characterized with prejudice and that the marks are very distinct; so far as read by me, I fail to discover any prejudice, therefore my brother, according to your own words I must be an extraordinary reader, or one below the ordinary, whichever meaning the expression (any ordinary reader) is meant to convey, accept thanks. I do not aim at controversy; but if the word (analousi) in the sentence; having a desire to depart (Greek analousai) is the correct rendering in the passage, why is it not rendered the same in Luke 12, 36. Waiting for their master when he will (analousai) return from the nuptial feast? Diaglott. Who wait their master's return (analousai) from the wedding. Living Oracles by Campbell, Doddridge and McNight. That wait for their Lord when he will return from the wedding—Common version. "Jesus taught his disciples that he would come again or return, John 14, 3, 8. Also the angels said the same at His ascension, Acts 1, 11. Paul believed it as doctrine, and consequently taught it, Phil. 3, 20. Thus 1, 10, 4, 16, 17. This is doubtless the meaning the Apostle meant to convey to the Philippians Brothers, his desire was for the returning of the Lord and being with him as far as his own interest were concerned; but at the same time his presence was more needful for them." You also say that "it is clear that Griesbach has started out to prove the theory of soul sleeping; if he fails it is not because he has not made the effort," and that he is so wedded to a theory that it (his being wedded to this theory) destroys the usefulness of the work. Professor Milligan says: "For accuracy, sound judgement, good taste, and critical ability he excels all his predecessors." It surely would not exhibit sound judgement, or good taste, or accuracy to be prejudiced in favor of soul sleeping or wedded to this theory." Greater reliance can be placed on his references and extracts than on any that had before been given to the public." surely no reliance could be placed on any translator who was wedded to a theory, none, whatever, could be placed on his references or extracts if prejudiced in favour of soul sleeping. I shall not attempt to define soul sleeping, for that is not now under consideration. But will give a few more opinions of the public on the character of the work. If none can be found who lay the same charges against it, then the conclusion is evident that your decision is unsupported by testimony. "This is decidedly with us one of the most valuable works we have ever met with. The original language as used by the Lord and the holy apostles, and in the precise manner as recorded by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, is given, and underneath each word, is the plain English word expressive of the Greek word above it." (Christian Pioneer) 1868. We have between 20 and 30 translations and we consider this the most reliable one among them all so far as giving a faithful rendering is concerned." (Oris Boston) 1868. "We would not be without this for

any ordinary consideration." (A. C. Reuben Cincinnati) Judge Taber of Independence, Iowa, says: "It is the best that has come under his observation, for the student it is invaluable." Elder John R. Howard, Mo. says: "I regard it as the most valuable work of the kind ever issued from the press." Not one word of its being wedded to a theory; surely some of these individuals would have discovered it somewhere. Again you say the common version is the better translation. This can be taken in two or more meanings; one is that a better rendering of the passage under consideration; and the other as a better translation of a work: If we accept the first then we are liable to be charged with not being willing to receive any idea that conflicts with our own preconceived ideas, whether they are correct or not. If the latter is intended then we are forced to accept the rendering from only 8 manuscripts under examination; in place of the one that had 660 to refer to when translating his book in 1806 when Griesbach completed his labors. The received text from which the common version is compiled, is considered to be the worst Greek Text extant in a printed form. However my Brother "to err is human to forgive divine."

ENQUIRER.
 Owen Sound, March 1st, 1882.

REMARKS.

ENQUIRER is on the wrong trail. I offered no criticism on Griesbach as a Scholar, but on the *Emphatic Diaglott*, hence all his recommendations are gratuitous, as the authors scholarship is not, nor has not been questioned. Being a scholar does hinder a man from being prejudiced does it? your insertion of Griesbach's *foot note*, is perhaps the best reasoning that can be given, but since the Greek work (Analousi) is not the word used by Luke in 12, 36, the bottom falls out of the theory of Paul desiring the returning, and not departing. How ridiculous the position of Paul, if your rendering is correct. On his own account he would rather that Christ would return, but on the *Philippians account* he would rather *Ho* (Christ) would not come or return!! If Paul desired the returning of Christ, and that is what he meant, and Christ did return as he desired, would not Christ be with the Philippians as well as with Paul. Would you have us understand Paul to say, that it is better for me to be here with you alone, than to have Christ and me back with you? This conclusion is unavoidable, if you accept the *Diaglott's* rendering and reasoning. This of itself ought to condemn the rendering. This shall suffice now. The position is so unreasonable that it deserves no further consideration. By saying that the authorized version is the best translation, I mean that it is not misleading, and the *Diaglott* does mislead by this rendering.

ED. WORKER.

WAS PETER IN THE KINGDOM?

Editor *Christian Worker*.
 Allow me to ask your correspondent, the writer of the article "Who can enter the Kingdom of Heaven." Where was Peter—On the inside or outside, when he opened the Kingdom the day of Pentecost? If on the inside, how did he get in? If on the outside, *when* did he get in. If the Kingdom of Heaven was not opened on earth till the day of Pentecost; and if there can be but one way to enter, and according to your correspondent, the three thousand entered by that one way, namely, by faith, and obedience in the waters of baptism, conjoined, bringing the repentant believer into the state, designated "born of water and of the spirit," and therefore into the Kingdom of God. If it also be true, what your correspondent asserts, that "No authority in the universe can repeal a law, or an ordinance of God (not even to accommodate Peter). Then the question is easily answered. Neither Peter nor any of the Apostles, excepting Paul, ever got into the

Kingdom of God at all; because they were never "born of water and of the spirit," never saved by the "washing of regeneration." However, their case does not seem altogether hopeless, seeing the have John's baptism to fall back upon; which, although it could not introduce its subjects into the Kingdom. See Acts 16, 34, nevertheless, was immersion in water, and that always covers a multitude of sins. But what shall be said of the prospects of Luther, Baxter, Wesley, Whitefield and Finney, together with the multitudes, which no man can number, that they represent, who, not only, were not "born of water and of the spirit," but, according to your correspondent, had not even their sins remitted.

I am sorry that my article on "The Baptism of the Holy Ghost," was too lengthy for your paper, it might have thrown some light upon the above subject.

MARRIAGES.

On Friday evening March 17th, at the residence of the bride's parents "Sunny-side farm" in Derby, by D. Sterling, C. A. Fleming, of the Northern business College, Owen Sound, to Margaret E. eldest daughter of George Donald, of Derby. Chris.—the cake was not very good, but no matter now, we hope you may glide down the stream of time so smoothly that "not a wave of trouble may roll across your peaceful breast."—*Ed. Worker*

By the editor of the *WORKER*, at the editor's residence in Meaford, April 10th, John Boinstead, to Elizabeth Smallie, both of St. Vincent. May much happiness attend them in life.

On the 11th inst., at the residence of the bride's uncle, Mr. W. A. Stephens, Owen Sound, by Elder D. Sterling of Meaford, Thos. Edwin McGirr, of Flesherton, to Laura, youngest daughter of Mr. James Crispin.

DIED.

Sister Jane Falls—"fell asleep in Jesus," April 5th, at her home in Euphrasia, after a heroic fight for life for many months, of the "fall destroyer" consumption. In this community nothing need be said about Sister Falls. She was well known and universally loved by all. Her devotion to the Church and all its interests, was an index to her great Christian heart. We always mourn the loss of one so good, yet what a beautiful silver lining has the cloud of sorrow. "We sorrow not without hope." Bro. Falls and the children have the sympathy of all, in their bereavement.—*Ed.*

I have just received a letter from my old home in Indiana, announcing the death of Bro. R. A. Buchanan, in the 52nd year of his age. Bro. B. was one of the first preachers I associated with after I entered the ministry. He did more work for the church and got less for it than any preacher in my knowledge. He was universally loved by all for many years, but when misfortunes came upon him in business, many of his so-called friends, forsook him. He was slandered by those who had received his labor for years' gratuitously. His life has been above reproach through it all. Insinuations of dishonesty was all that stood against him. How earnestly have I heard him plead with sinners to turn to the Lord. He was one of the most industrious men I ever saw. During his financial trouble he worked night and day to make a living. He said to me once, "Bro. Sherman, you do not know what I suffer on account of my misfortune." No act of intentional dishonesty could be fastened on him. I knew him well. I believe him to be a good man. Now that he has gone where trials among "false brethren" are no more, I want to drop a tear of sympathy with the bereaved wife and of children, praying that god will be their comfort in their sore bereavement.

Rest secure the righteous man
 At his Redeemer's feet—
 Sure to emerge and rise again
 And mount above the wreck.
 Nothing hath the past to lose
 For worlds on worlds destroyed,
 Nor beneath his feet the ruins
 With smiles the flaming void

Editor.