

THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST,

AND

General Intelligence.

WILLIAM HENRY BRISBANE, EDITOR.

Vol. II.]

CHALESTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1835.

[No. 10.]

THEOLOGY.

The admission of unbaptised persons to the Lord's Supper inconsistent with the New Testament: A letter to a friend (in 1814.)

Dear Sir,—The long and intimate friendship that I have lived in, and hope to die in, with several who are differently minded from me on this subject, may acquit me of any other motive in what I write than a desire to vindicate what appears to me to be the mind of Christ.

So far have I been from indulging sectarian or party spirit; that my desire for communion with all who were friendly to the Saviour has, in one instance, led me practically to deviate from my general sentiments on the subject: the reflection on which, however having afforded me no satisfaction, I do not intend to repeat it.

You request me to state the grounds of my objections to the practice in a letter, and I will endeavor to do so. I need not prove to you that it is not for want of esteem towards my paedobaptist brethren, many of whom are dear to me. If I have any thing like Christian love in me, I feel it towards all those in whom I perceive the image of Christ, whether they be baptists or pedo-baptists; and my refusing to commune with them at the Lord's table is not because I consider them as improper subjects, but as attending to it in an improper manner. Many from Ephraim and Manasse, Issachar and Zebulon, who partook of Hezekiah's passover, are supposed by that pious prince to have "prepared their hearts to seek the Lord God of their fathers;" but, having eaten "otherwise than it was written," he prayed the Lord to "pardon every one of them," and therefore could not intend that the disorder should be repeated.—2 Chron. xxx. 17—19.

I have been used to think that our conduct on such questions should not be governed by affection any more than by disaffection, but by a regard to the revealed will of Christ.

A brother who practises mixed communion, lately acknowledged to me that "he did not think it was a question of candor or charity, but simply this, *Whether there was or was not an instituted connection in the New Testament between baptism and the Lord's Supper.* If there was, we ought not, under a pretence of charity, to divide them: for surely Jesus Christ may be allowed to have had as much charity and candor as we! Yet we hear a great outcry, not only from paedobaptists but baptists, against our want of candor, liberality, &c.; all which, if concession be just, is mere declamation.

To what purpose is it, too, that such characters as *Owen, Watts, Doddridge, Edwards, &c.*, are brought forward in this dispute, unless it be to kindle prejudice! If it were a question of feeling, the names would doubtless have weight; but, if it relate to the revealed will of Christ, they weigh nothing. Is there, or is

there not, an instituted connection between baptism and the Lord's supper, as much as between faith and baptism? If there be; we might as well be asked, how we can refuse to baptize the children of such excellent men, as how we can refuse to admit them to the Lord's supper. If a man call me a bigot, I might in reply call him by some other name; but we should neither of us prove any thing except it were our want of something better to allege. The question respects not men but things. It has been painful for me to "withdraw from a brother who has walked disorderly;" nevertheless I have felt it to be my duty to do so. I was not long since assured by a paedobaptist friend, that, "If I could think free communion to be right, I should be much happier than I was;" and it is possible that in some respects I might. If I could think well of the conduct of a brother whom I at present consider as walking disorderly, or if I could pass it by without being partaker of it, I doubt not but I should be the happier: but if that in which he walks be disorder, and I cannot pass it by, without being a partaker of it, I had better be without such happiness than possess it.

The question of free communion as maintained by baptists is very different from that which is ordinarily maintained by paedobaptists. There are very few of the latter who deny baptism to be a term of communion, or who would admit any man to the Lord's supper whom they consider as un-baptized. Some few, I allow, have professed a willingness to receive any person whom they consider as a believer in Christ, whether he be baptised or not. But this is probably the effect of the practice, so prevalent of late among paedobaptists, of decrying the importance of the subject. I have never known a paedobaptist of any note, who conscientiously adheres to what he thinks the mind of Christ relative to this ordinance, who would thus lightly dispense with it. The ordinary ground on which a paedobaptist would persuade us to practice free communion is that their baptism, whether we can allow it to be quite so primitive as ours or not, is nevertheless valid, and that we should allow it to be so, and consequently should treat them as baptized persons by admitting them to the Lord's table. It is on this ground that *Mr. Worcester* in his *Friendly Letter to Mr. Baldwin*, pleads for open communion.—He allows that if *Mr. Baldwin* could demonstrate that baptism is to be administered only in one mode and to one kind of subject, and that immersion is not a mere circumstance or mode of baptism, but essential to the ordinance so that he that is not immersed is not baptized, his sentiment of close communion "would be sufficiently established."—pp. 8, 9. To the same purpose is the drift of the Reviewer of *Mr. Booth's Apology* in the Evangelical Magazine. But to admit the validity of paedobaptism would not overthrow strict communion only, but baptism itself as performed upon persons who have been previously baptized in their infancy. If infant baptism be valid, it ought not to be repeated; and he that repeats it is, what his opponents have been used

to call him, an *anabaptist*. The ground of argument, therefore, does not belong to the subject at issue. Its language is, Do acknowledge our baptism to be valid, and allow that whenever you baptize a person who has been sprinkled in his infancy you re-baptize him;—that is, Do give up your principles as a baptist, in order that we may have communion together at the Lord's table!!!

Very different from this are the grounds on which our baptist brethren plead for free communion. As far as I am acquainted with them, they may be reduced to two questions. 1. Has baptism any such instituted connection with the Lord's supper as to be a pre-requisite to it? 2. Supposing it has, yet, if the candidate consider himself as having been baptized, ought not this to suffice for his being treated by a Christian church as a baptized person; and does not an error concerning the mode or subjects of Christian baptism come within the precepts of the New Testament which enjoin forbearance, and allow every man to be "fully persuaded in his own mind?"

Let us calmly examine these questions in the order in which they are stated:—

First. *Has baptism any such instituted connection with the Lord's supper as to be a pre-requisite to it?* No baptist will deny it to be a duty incumbent on believers, but he may consider it as having no more connection with the Lord's supper than other duties, and the omission of it, where it arises from error, as resembling other omissions of duty, which are allowed to be objects of forbearance.

If there be no instituted connection between them, it must go far towards establishing the position of Mr. Bunyan, that "Nonbaptism (at least where it arises from error) is no bar to communion." If Mr. Bunyan's position be tenable, however, it is rather singular that it should have been so long undiscovered; for it does not appear that such a notion was ever advanced till he or his contemporaries advanced it. Whatever difference of opinion had subsisted among Christians concerning the mode and subjects of baptism, I have seen no evidence that baptism was considered by any one as unconnected with or unnecessary to the supper. "It is certain," says Dr. Doddridge, "that as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity reaches, no unbaptized person received the Lord's supper."—Lectures, p. 511. See Mr. Booth's Apology, sect. 1. The practice of Christians having been uniformly against us, I acknowledge, does not prove us to be in the wrong; but an opinion so circumstanced certainly requires to be well established from the Scriptures.

To ascertain whether there be any instituted connection between the two Ordinances, it will be proper to observe the manner in which such connections are ordinarily expressed in the New Testament. It is not unusual for persons engaged in argument to require that the principle which they oppose should, if true, have been so expressed in the scriptures as to place it beyond dispute. This, however, is not the ordinary way in which any thing is there expressed. Nor is it for us to prescribe to the Holy Spirit in what manner he shall enjoin his will, but to enquire in what manner he has enjoined it. A Pædo-Baptist might say, if teaching be indispensably necessary to precede baptizing, why did not Christ expressly say so, and forbid his disciples to baptize any who were not previously taught? A Roman Catholic also, who separates the bread from the wine, might insist on your proving from the New Testament that Christ ex-

pressly connected them together, and required the one before and in order to the other.

To the former of these objections you would answer, Let us read the commission: "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Is it not plainly the order of things as stated by our Lord Jesus Christ, you would add, that we are first to teach men, by imparting to them the Gospel; then, on their believing it, to baptize them; and then to go on to instruct them in all the ordinances and commandments which are left by Christ for our direction? Thus also to the Roman Catholic you would answer: Let us read the institution as repeated by the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, 'Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.'" You would add: How dare you put asunder the wine and the bread which Christ hath thus manifestly joined together? The former of these answers must, I think, be approved by every Baptist, and the latter by every Protestant. But the reasoning in both cases proceeds on the supposition that the ordinary way in which the mind of Christ is enjoined in the New Testament is by simply stating things in the order in which they were appointed and are to be practised; and that this is no less binding on us than if the connection had been more fully expressed. It is as clear in the first case as if it had been said, Go, first teach them the Gospel; and, when they have received it, baptize them; and, after this, lead them on in a course of evangelical obedience. And in the last case, it is no less clear than if it had been said, First take the bread, then the cup, and never partake of the one without the other.

But if this be just reasoning with a Pædo-Baptist and a Roman Catholic, why should it not be so in the present case? If the above be the ordinary mode of divine injunction, we can be at no loss to know what is enjoined respecting the duties in question. All the recorded facts in the New Testament place baptism before the celebration of the Lord's supper.

The first company who joined together at the Lord's table were all baptized. That Christ was so himself we are expressly informed; and of the disciples we are told that they baptized others (John iv. 2;) which would not have been permitted had they, like the pharisees and lawyers, refused to be baptized themselves.

The next mention of the celebration of the supper is in the second chapter of the Acts. The account given is, that every one of them was exhorted to "repent and be baptized," and that they who gladly received the word "were baptized;" after which they were "added to the church," and "continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."

The question put by the Apostle Paul to certain disciples at Ephesus, who said they had not heard whether there were any Holy Ghost, "unto what then were ye baptized?" clearly intimates that there were

no Christians in those times who continued unbaptized. He does not ask whether they had been baptized, taking this for granted, but merely to *what* they had been baptized.

The nature and design of baptism, as given us in the New Testament, shows it to have been the *initiation* ordinance of Christianity. It was not, indeed, an initiation into a particular church, seeing it was instituted prior to the formation of churches, and administered in some cases, as that of the Ethiopian eunuch, in which there was no opportunity for joining to any one of them: but it was an initiation into the body of professing Christians. And, if so, it must be necessary to an admission into a particular church, inasmuch as what is particular presupposes what is general. No man could with propriety occupy a place in the army without having first avowed his loyalty, or taken the oath of allegiance. The oath of allegiance does not, indeed, initiate a person into the army, as one may take that oath who is no soldier; but it is a prerequisite to being a soldier. Though all who take the oath are not soldiers, yet all soldiers take the oath. Now baptism is that divine ordinance by which we are said to *put on Christ*, as the king's livery is put on by those who enter his service: and, by universal consent throughout the Christian world, is considered as the badge of a Christian. To admit a person into a Christian church without it were equal to admitting one into a regiment who scrupled to wear the soldier's uniform, or to take the oath of allegiance.

There are instances in the New Testament in which the word baptism does not mean the baptism by water, but yet manifestly alludes to it, and to the Lord's supper as connected with it; e. g. 1 Cor. x. 1-5. "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness." The Corinthians had many amongst them who had polluted themselves with idolatrous practices, and yet presumed on being saved by Christ. The design of the Apostle was to warn them, from the examples of the Jewish fathers, not to rely upon their having been partakers of the Christian privileges of baptism and the Lord's supper while they indulged in sin. The manner in which these allusions are introduced clearly shows the connection between the two ordinances in the practice of the primitive churches.

Thus also in 1 Cor. xii. 13, we are said "by one spirit" to be "all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free, and all made to drink into one spirit." The design may be to illustrate the spiritual union of all true believers in one invisible body, as originating in the washing of regeneration, and as being continued by the renewing of the Holy Spirit: but the allusion is, I conceive, to the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper; by the former of which they were initiated into the body of professing Christians, and by the other had communion in it. See Poole, Henry and Scott on the passage.

From these instances, we have equal evidence that the two ordinances were connected in the practice of the first churches as we have of faith being connected with baptism, or of the bread being connected with

the wine in the supper. The only difference between these cases is, that the one requires a part and the other the whole of a divine institution to be dispensed with. Is it for us to make light of the precepts of Christ, under the notion of profiting and edifying his people? If we have any ground to expect his presence and blessing, it is in "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he has commanded" us.

But let us proceed to the second question, *Whether, if the candidate consider himself as having been baptized, this ought not to suffice for his being treated by a Christian church as a baptized person; and whether an error concerning the mode or subjects of baptism be not a subject of Christian forbearance, in which every one may be allowed to be fully persuaded in his own mind.*

That there are cases to which this principle will apply is certain. Concerning eating or not eating meats, and observing or not observing days, the Apostle teaches that every man should "be fully persuaded in his own mind." "Who art thou?" he asks, "that judgest another man's servant! To his own master he standeth or falleth. Why dost thou judge thy brother; or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. Every one shall give account of himself to God. Hast thou faith! have it to thyself."—Rom. xiv.

These passages have often been alleged in favor of free communion between Baptists and Pedo-Baptists; and if the principle laid down by the Apostle applies to that subject, though originally he had no reference to it, the reasoning of our brethren is just and right.

The case, I conceive, must have referred to the prohibition of certain meats, and the observance of certain days, under the Jewish law; which being no longer binding on Christians, some would avail themselves of the liberty, and disregard them; others, not having sufficient light, would regard them. Had it referred to any customs of heathen origin, or which had never been, nor been understood to be, of divine appointment, it is not conceivable that those who regarded them should "regard them to the Lord." In this case, every man was allowed to judge and act for himself, and required to forbear with his brethren who might be otherwise minded.

That we are to apply this principle without restriction, few will maintain. Should the first principles of the Gospel, for example, be rejected by a candidate for communion, few who pretend to serious Christianity would think of receiving him. Yet he might allege the same arguments, and ask, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant! To his own master he standeth or falleth. Why dost thou judge thy brother; or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. Every one of us shall give account of himself to God. Hast thou faith! have it to thyself." In this case, we should answer, that the language of the Apostle was misapplied; and that it was not his design to affirm that Christians in a state of religious society had no right to judge of each other's avowed principles: for if so, he would not have desired some to have been cut off who troubled the Galatians.—Gal. v. 12. Nor would the church of Pergamos have been censured for having those amongst them that held pernicious doctrines.—Rev. ii. 14, 15. Private judgment is every man's birthright, considered as an individual; but, as a candidate for admission into a voluntary society, it is essential that there be an agreement, at least, in first principles: for "how can two walk together except they be agreed?"

And, as we are not so to apply this forbearing principle in matters of *doctrine* as to raze the foundations of divine truth, neither shall we be justified in applying it to the dispensing with any of the *commandments* of Christ. The meats and days of which the Apostle speaks, are represented as not affecting the kingdom of God: "The kingdom of God," he says, "is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."—Ver. 17. But, if they had required a positive commandment of Christ to be dispensed with, they *would* have affected the kingdom of God, and the Apostle would not have written concerning them as he did. In short, it is not just to argue from Jewish customs, which though once binding had ceased to be so, to Christian ordinances which continue in full force. The tone which the Apostle holds in respect of those Jewish rites which ceased to be obligatory is very different from that which respects commandments still in force: "Circumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God."—1 Cor. vii. 19. "I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you."—1 Cor. xi. 2.

If to be baptized be a qualification requisite to Christian communion (which under this second question I have a right to assume) it is absurd to suppose that it belongs to the candidate exclusively to judge of it. It is contrary to the first principles of all society for a candidate to be the judge of his own qualifications. Apply it to any other qualification, as faith in Christ, for instance, or a consistency of character, and you will instantly perceive its absurdity. We must return to the first question: Is baptism prerequisite to the Lord's supper? If it be so, it must belong to the church to judge whether the candidate has been baptized or not. But the principle on which the Apostle enforces forbearance is often alleged as applicable to this question. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye,—for God hath received him." It is doubtful whether *receiving* here means admission to communion. Mr. Booth has shown that this is not the ordinary meaning of the term: but allowing this to be the meaning, and that God's having received a person furnishes the ground and rule of our receiving him, still there is nothing in our practice inconsistent with it. If receiving a brother here denote receiving him into Christian fellowship, the meaning is, receive him to the ordinances, and not to one of them without the other. We are willing to receive all who appear to have been received of God to the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper: if we object, it is because they wish to be received to the one *without the other*, of which there was no example in the first churches. Let it also be particularly noticed, that our brethren who plead for receiving Christians as Christians receive them to the ordinances as understood and practised by them, and this we do. If the prejudices of a pious Catholic would permit him to request to join with them at the Lord's supper, they would, as we have often been told, receive him; but to *what*? Would they provide a wafer for him, and excuse him from drinking of the cup? No, they would say, we are willing to receive you to the Lord's supper, in the way we understand and practise it; but we cannot divide the wine from the bread, without dispensing with an essential part of the institution. Such is our answer to a pious Pedo-Baptist. We are willing to receive you to the ordinances of Christ, as we understand and practise them; but we cannot divide the one from the other without dispensing with an institution of Christ.

Objections.

It has been said that "we all practise a worse mixed communion than that with Pedo-Baptists; that we have *covetous* and other *bad characters* amongst us," &c. If we "bear them that are evil" in things of a moral nature, this is our sin, and we ought to repent of it, and not to argue that because we do wrong in one instance we ought to do so in another. If we omit to admonish and exclude manifestly wicked characters, it is of but little account that we are strict in regard to baptism; but, in reproving us, our Lord would not complain of our not being alike lax in things positive as we are in things moral, but of our not being alike strict in both. "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

There is, however, a wide difference between bearing with individuals, even in things which are evil, where that evil lies so much in the *motive* as to be very difficult of detection, and making it a *rule* to tolerate men in such vices. It was no reproach to Christ and his Apostles to have had a Judas amongst them, though he was a "thief," so long as his theft was not manifested: but, had there been a *rule* laid down that covetousness and even theft should be *no bar to communion*, the reproach had been indelible.

It has been said, "If our practice of strict communion be right, it ought to be to us as an act of *self-denial*, and not of pleasure, inasmuch as charity would be unable to take pleasure in excluding those from communion whom we consider as Christians." And this so far as it relates to men is true, but it is no less true of many other duties, in which we may be called to act differently from our brethren, and to reprove them.

"But in thus denying ourselves," it has been further said, "we deny some of the best feelings of the human heart." This I cannot admit. The best feelings of the human heart are those of love and obedience to God: and if I deny myself of the pleasure which fellowship with a Christian brother would afford me, for the sake of acting up the mind of Christ, or according to primitive example, I do not deny the best feelings of the human heart, but, on the contrary, forego the less for the greater. It is a greater pleasure to obey the will of God than to associate with creatures in a way deviating from it.

We may act in this matter from temper or from prejudice, rather than from a conscientious regard to the mind of Christ; and they who oppose us may act from worldly policy, or a desire to court applause as candid and liberal men; but neither of these cases proves any thing. The question is, whether, in admitting unbaptized persons to the Lord's table, we do not deviate from the mind of Christ.

I am willing to allow that open communion may be practised from a conscientious persuasion of its being the mind of Christ; and they ought to allow the same of strict communion: and thus, instead of reproaching one another with bigotry on the one hand, or carnal policy on the other, we should confine our enquiries to the precepts and examples of the New Testament.

I am affectionately yours,

ANDREW FULLER.

Look backwards, and time was when souls were not; look forward, and our souls will be when shall not. Who will not deny himself for a time, that he may enjoy himself forever.

Christ did not die for sin, that we might live in sin.

MISSIONS.

From the American Baptist Magazine.

Burmah.

AVA.

Journal of Mr. Kincaid.

The Burmans are fatalists. They attribute the good or ill they experience, to the influence of former deeds, that is, deeds done in a former state. They have no idea of the pardon of sin. They acknowledge the depravity of the heart, but consider it a misfortune rather than a crime. If a person dies by disease, it is his *Kou* (fate.) If one is a murderer, or decapitated, it is his *Kou*. Of a holy, perfect, and unchangeable Being they are entirely ignorant, and of course ignorant of the divine law.

Sept. 29. Gave away 150 tracts. Inquiry is on the increase. The call for books is greater than at any time before, since I have been in Ava. We feel greatly encouraged from what we see and hear around us. The God of grace is looking down upon these sons of darkness; the vale of death is visited by the day-spring from on high, and a melting is heard, as if dry bones were shaken by a mighty wind.

Oct. 1. This has been a great day among the Burmans. It is the day appropriated to the worship of a celebrated *pagoda*, a little distance from the city. Immense numbers of people come from the surrounding country, not for devotion, but trade. Thousands of tents are erected, in which all kinds of merchandise, particularly articles of fancy, are offered for sale. Gave away 800 tracts, and many asked who did not receive. If the demand for books continues, I shall soon be without a tract to give a poor perishing idolator, who is beginning to inquire, "What shall I do to be saved?" and according to the rate I have been able to get things as heretofore, it will be four or five months before I shall get a supply from Maulmein.

2. Two of our inquirers spent all the forenoon at the house. For 6 months they have been reading the New Testament, and often attending worship on Lord's day. I have long felt certain that truth was making an impression on their minds, and hoped ere long it would prove a savor of life unto life to their souls; but unexpectedly they declared themselves on the Lord's side, and said their hope, their only hope was in Christ, the Author of eternal salvation. We cannot doubt their sincerity. Such evidence of the operations of the Holy spirit on the proud and haughty people of Ava, is truly encouraging. Gave away 140 tracts.

4. Had preaching and disputing the whole day, mostly with priests. During this month, great numbers, particularly priests, come in from neighboring towns, it being a time of festivals. One man was as insulting and violent in his language, as any man I have before met with in Burmah. He said I might as well teach them to worship trees and plants, as an invisible Being, and the absurdity of such a doctrine made it evident, that my only object was to disaffect the people towards their own religion, and involve them in endless disputes among themselves. He said if I would go among wild uncivilized tribes, and teach religion and science, it would be a favor; but to come among the Burmans, whose religion was at least equal to any in the world, was idle, and I deserved nothing but ridicule. I told him I expected nothing but ridicule from men blindly attached to their traditions, but there were many sober-minded men among them who reasoned on the subject; and all who reasoned a little,

were convinced that there was one living and eternal God, and therefore to worship idols which cannot see or hear or speak was absurd, degrading and ruinous to the soul.

The longer I continue among the heathen, the more I am convinced that the Gospel conveyed by the living voice, is the means appointed for the conversion of men. Reading of books enlightens, and induces a spirit of inquiry; but the full and overflowing heart reaches the conscience, and awakens the finer feelings of the soul. Hence the necessity of preaching the word, of being instant in season and out of season. Could we but feel as we ought, we should know how to estimate the claims of these millions, on whom not one gleam of moral light has dawned for ages. It is not enough that we pray for them; it is not enough that we give them books; we must preach Jesus Christ, and not be discouraged amidst reproaches and insults.

27. Yesterday Moug Kai was called to the house of one of the *Ateen woon*s, where he is well acquainted. He found about 30 discussing the subject of religion; some for, and some against Buddhism. The *Ateen Woon's* lady had read most of our books, and she wished Moug Kai to explain the doctrines of the Christian religion. He did, and a long discussion took place, in which the lady joined in defending the religion of Christ. Such facts are interesting to us; for we see in them the dawning of a better day.

Ko Guca, the good old man who was baptized, together with his wife last April, tells me he has cheering evidence of the conversion of a son, who has been for some years very dissipated, but has left off his bad habits since he began to read the Scriptures, and for about five months has led another life altogether.

Arrangement of Mr. Kincaid.

Nov. 6. This morning at an early hour, I was summoned to the palace. The manner in which I was called, indicated that a fearful storm was gathering, and in this I was not deceived. On reaching the Royal Court, where the *Woon-gees* and others transact business, a *Scara-dougee* was ordered to bring forward the black book, and read. I listened to several chapters, in which they had drawn out circumstantially many charges against me, the substance of which was, "The American teacher is stirring up divisions among the people, teaching them to despise the religion of their country, and to follow a religion which the king, the princes, and noblemen do not approve. He is not contented to live in the Golden City quietly, as other foreigners do, but in the city and all places round, is giving books and preaching a foreign religion, and his object is to bring into contempt and destroy the religion which has been revered for ages." This and much more to the same purport I listened to without uttering a word, but at length they accused me of a crime, which had no foundation in truth, and I could remain silent no longer.

The charge was this: "About seven months ago, the American teacher promised to give no more books, but regardless of that promise, he has given books and preached ever since." I said, I had never heard of such a promise before, but that I had promised to withhold the Investigator, and this promise had never been broken, and the *Woon-gees* had given me permission to preach, and give the sacred Scriptures. The *Mea-wa-de Woon-gee* pretended to be in a great rage, said he knew nothing about one book, and that I had promised to give no more books. A *Woon-douk* followed up the subject, said I had no right to speak of

one book, that they were determined to stop my giving books and preaching too. I remonstrated with them on taking such a violent course, and then said, "You allow Papists and Mussulmans to follow their religion unmolested, and converts from among the Burmans are not disturbed." They cried out most violently, "No Burmans enter the Papist and Mussulman religions, and those people do not give books or preach." I said, "Do you intend driving me out of the country?" A *Woon-gee* replied, "No, but you must promise to give no more books, and not go about preaching." "I cannot make such a promise." *Woon-gee*. "You must promise." "I fear God more than earthly kings and cannot promise: if you cut off my arms, and then my head, I dare not promise." They then said I was not fit to live in the empire, and must be sent off. They got into a great rage, threatened the old man who had rented me the house; (he was near by, on his face, nearly frightened out of his senses, and begging for his life,) and said, they would put him in the *see loang tik*, that is burn him alive. (These are not often vaunting threats, for many a poor wretch is burned, strangled, or cut in pieces with axes.) I felt indignant at such brutal language, and though the old fellow is a violent enemy of the Christian religion, and has constantly done his best to injure me, yet I took his part, and told the ministers that they had no reason to be offended with him, for by their permission he had rented me the house. I then begged the prince (the queen's brother) who is actually the reigning monarch, to give me a patient hearing. He did, but appeared to take little interest in my story, as he only remarked that the owner of the house must pay me the money he had received. This is the substance of the conversation, which took place between the ministers and myself. Besides the retinues which belong to these noblemen, many spectators were present listening to all that was said, and I fear a general alarm will be spread among the people, so that all open inquiry will cease, at least for some time to come. One remark occurs to me, which I will mention here. While endeavouring to convince the prince that I taught the people nothing but what was calculated to make them better, wiser, and happier, a proud, haughty *Woon-douk* exclaimed, "If we do not oppose you we shall go to hell." I replied, "My only object is to teach all men the divine law, so that they may become holy, and enjoy the favor of God forever." The *Woon-douk* again exclaimed, "We are afraid of hell, and dare not listen to you." I understood this well; they wished to have the people think their opposition was dictated by the purest motives; for, despotic and tyrannical as they are, they wish to have the good will of the people. If I can judge from the temper and language of this morning, the government is determined to proceed to extremities. But yesterday, and not a cloud darkened our prospects. We looked over the immense field, whitening for this harvest, and rejoiced in the glorious prospect spread out before us. We fondly imagined the sun of prosperity would never set, but now our hopes are crushed; and yet we cannot but hope that this threatening storm will pass, and the sun of prosperity again shine upon our path. I feel distressed for this little flock, gathered from among the heathen. Precious souls, they have entered a kingdom against which the world has waged an unceasing war, but if they are faithful to the end, the boon of eternal life is theirs. O God, restrain the wrath of the heathen. Save thine own heritage, and have mercy on this great city.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

From the Religious Herald.

Catholic Controversy--No. 3.

DAGGER'S SPRINGS, July 10th, 1835.

Brother Taylor--

In our last number on this subject, we gave a brief sketch of the state of the Christian world at the era of the Reformation, showing the necessity and expediency of the work undertaken by Luther and his coadjutors, to restore the doctrine and practice of the gospel to their primitive simplicity, and to remove the rubbish under which it had been so long buried, and its brightness obscured.

That the portrait we exhibited was not an exaggerated one, is abundantly proved by contemporary history. The elegant and erudite historian Robertson, in his history of Charles V., has presented many humiliating details of the scandalous excesses and corrupt practices of this Popish hierarchy. Bellarmine, one of their most esteemed writers, says, in reference to this period, "there was no restraint in morals, no acquaintance with sacred literature, no respect paid to holy things, in a word, hardly any religion." Father Paul, the historian of the Council of Trent, bears a similar testimony. Another writer observes: "The state of morals and religion in Europe, at the commencement of the sixteenth century, was truly deplorable. In the general depravation of manners that prevailed, the ecclesiastics, even of the highest order, largely participated. The murmurs and complaints of all christendom, frequently and unequivocally expressed, verify this fact beyond the possibility of contradiction. It is also confirmed by the reluctant admissions of the parties themselves.

"History bears ample testimony to the truth of these remarks. The writers of the period above mentioned, agree in confessing that gross immorality and cruel oppression distinguished the priesthood, and justly exposed it to the contempt and hatred of the community. A volume might be compiled from the statements of unexceptionable witnesses, who possessed personal knowledge of the facts which they relate. From such sources we learn the following facts:—that the forced celibacy of the priests produced among them unbridled and shameless licentiousness, concubinage being generally practised—that they had contrived to obtain possession of so much wealth, that in Germany more than one-half of the national property was in their hands—that by their fees and exactions, often wrung from the people by vile imposture, they impoverished every Christian country, while they refused to share the burden of taxation—that they claimed exemption from the jurisdiction of the laity, and could therefore commit crime with comparative impunity; in which they were further indulged by the easy terms on which pardon or dispensation could be procured at Rome, that the vanality of the pontifical court was so notorious that the sale of offices was open and public—that the detestable traffic in indulgences gave rise to the most scandalous impositions, and legalized every species of avarice and fraud—that by reservations, appeals, expectative graces, annates, &c. the popes had subdued to their will the whole hierarchy, leaving to the bishops little more than the shadow of power, and exalting above them the monastic orders, their sworn and faithful vassals—and that these same pontiffs, so far from being examples of virtue and reli-

gion, were generally destitute of both, and too frequently patterns of the most horrible vices.

"It must not be forgotten that with these abuses were connected the most awful corruptions in doctrine and worship. Human merit was substituted for justification by faith. Fasting, penances, idle ceremonies, and the *opus operatum* of the sacraments, were instead of sanctification by the influences of the Holy Spirit. The Virgin Mary and the saints had, in a great measure, supplanted Jesus Christ, and robbed him of his honors. The scriptures were studiously withheld from the people, and little studied by the priests, many of whom were, in fact, totally ignorant of the word of God. Worship was performed in Latin, which scarcely any understood. Incense perfumed the air—gold, and jewels, and magnificent pageantry dazzled the eyes—melodious sounds of music fell upon the ear, but the mind was unenlightened, and the heart unimpressed. Faith had to do with little else than the "lying wonders" by which a system of impudent trickery was upheld—hope rested on the intercession of saints, the power of priestly absolution, and the efficacy of prayers for the dead—charity was reserved for those, and those only, who bowed the knee before the "man of sin."

Such is the picture left of that period. If the general features were so revolting, the private history of the great mass of the Romish priesthood was still more hideous and deformed. The scenes disclosed at the suppression of the monasteries and convents, were disgusting spectacles of fraud, obscenity and licentiousness. Error in doctrine, produced its usual concomitant error in practice. This Luther perceived at an early stage, in his resistance to papal usurpations. His first efforts were only directed to obtain the reform of certain abuses which had crept into the Popish church, and not to overthrow or subvert the system. But he was soon led to see that the whole superstructure was radically defective—that the papal system was founded on a wrong foundation—that it was not built on Jesus Christ, and him crucified—but on frivolous ceremonies and idle traditions. Hence he directed his whole force against the corrupt doctrine of the Romish church, in the firm persuasion that purity of doctrine would be followed by holiness of life. He proved conclusively, that by their system of human merits, good works and indulgences, the whole tenor of the gospel was changed, and that it had emphatically become another gospel. Whilst the scriptures declare that we are justified freely by grace—that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness; the Popish system had substituted another and quite different source of justification—by their doctrine laying another foundation than the death, merits, and sufferings of the Redeemer.

This is, then, the true ground of controversy between the Papal and Protestant systems. We do not charge it solely with corrupting christianity with vain traditions, unmeaning pomp and idle ceremonies, or with desecrating the word by adding to the ordinances of the gospel, or imposing restrictions on their adherents in despite of its express prohibitions, as forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats! We do not criminate it only for withholding the scriptures from the laity, or for celebrating its services in a language unknown to the great body of its members—nor for the immoral lives of its clergy, or the blasphemous titles and prerogatives assumed by its head. We charge it in addition with dethroning the Son of God from his place and dignity as the

Redeemer of his people—with substituting another foundation than his finished redemption—with giving his office and glory to another. With ascribing to human merit, relics, the saints, and the Virgin Mary, part of the glory of a work which is due to him alone.

That the Saviour is thus defrauded of the honor due to his name, and displaced from his office as the Mediator of the New Covenant, we think can be fully proved from the doctrines held by the Romish church, as exhibited in their avowed creeds. For this purpose, we shall take a brief survey of them, as laid down by the Council of Trent; as the standard of faith then agreed on, is now of acknowledged authority in the Romish church.

This Council assembled at Trent, in German Austria, in 1545. It was called at the request of the Emperor Charles V. and the Diet of the German Empire, to endeavor to settle the controversy between the Papiets and the Protestants, and with a view to reform the acknowledged corruption and licentiousness of the Romish church. Luther had appealed from the decision of the Pope to a General Council, and as early as the year 1522, the Germanic Diet, had urged the convocation of such an assembly. The Popes, always adverse to reform, had contrived by various pretexts, to delay its assemblage, from year to year, until at length the public indignation was so far aroused, that it could not any longer be prudently deferred. The Council was composed of bishops and delegates from the various monastic orders. Their deliberations were aided by the counsel of their most eminent theologians and divines. Three legates presided over the Council on behalf of his holiness of Rome, and every thing transacted in the assembly was forwarded to him for his approval and sanction.

The object of the Council was two-fold—to establish a correct system of doctrinal articles, and to reform the great abuses which had crept into the church, and to restrain the licentiousness of the clergy. Little was done towards accomplishing the latter object, from the continued opposition of the Pope, who had no wish to restrain the great abuses and corruptions which he was compelled to acknowledge existed, from the fear of lessening his gains, or decreasing his authority. Our object at present is to ascertain the former.

After reciting the Nicene creed as the ground of their faith, the Council could not agree on the definition or description of the true church. We shall endeavor from other sources to supply this omission.

The church, according to the Papal writers, "consists principally of two parts, the one called the church triumphant, the other the church militant. In the former are comprised the blessed spirits in heaven, in the latter all the faithful still dwelling on earth." The church militant is described as "a body of men united in the profession of the same Christian faith, and communion of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors, and particularly of the Roman Pontiff, Christ's only vicar on earth." It is "composed of two classes of persons, the good and the bad, both professing the same faith, and partaking of the same sacraments, yet differing in their manner of life and morality;" but "the condition of both is very different: the wicked are contained in the church as the chaff is mingled with the grain in the threshing floor, or, as dead members sometimes remained attached to the living body."

This true church has four marks to distinguish it from others: 1. *Unity* in faith and worship, under one

ruler and governor—the invisible one Christ, whom the eternal Father “hath made head over all things for the church which is his body;” the visible one, the Pope, who as legitimate successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, fills the apostolic chair. 2. *Holiness*; “because she is consecrated and dedicated to God, as other things, such as vessels, vestments, altars, when appropriated and dedicated to the worship of God, although material are called holy,” and “as the body, she is united to her head, Christ Jesus, the fountain of all holiness;” and because she “alone has the legitimate worship of sacrifices, and the salutary use of the sacraments, by which, as the efficacious instruments of divine grace, God establishes us in true holiness, so that to possess true holiness, we must belong to this church.” 3. *Catholicity*.—“Unlike republics or empires of human institution, or the conventicles of heretics, she is not confined within the limits of any one kingdom, the members of any one society of men.” “She is also called universal, because all who desire eternal salvation, must cling to and embrace her, like those who entered into the Ark, to escape perishing in the flood.” 4. *Apostolicity*.—“Her doctrines are neither novel, nor of recent origin, but were delivered, of old, by the apostles, and disseminated throughout the world.” “The Holy Ghost who presides over the church, governs her by no other than apostolic men, and this spirit, first imparted to the apostles, has, by the infinite goodness of God, always continued in the church.”

In contrasting the rituals and worship of the Romish, with that of the primitive church, our readers can determine for themselves the correctness of the claim to apostolicity. From these assumptions, *infallibility* is necessarily claimed for the Papal church, and also for the Papal See, though several Popes, by the testimony of infallible councils, have erred from the true Romish faith, and some of these infallible councils, by the decisions of other infallible councils, have also wandered from the right way. Those who reject the authority of this infallible church, have committed mortal sin, and if they die in that state they “go to hell for all eternity.”

The next subject brought before the Council, was the Rule of Faith. This produced long and acrimonious debates. Whether scripture and tradition should be deemed of equal authority was one point of controversy; the right of private interpretation, and what version should be the standard, the Latin Vulgate, or the Hebrew and Greek originals, were points of long and bitter dispute; but, as might have been expected, the decision was adverse to the right of private interpretation, or the use by the laity of the scriptures, and in favor of the Latin Vulgate, in deciding disputed passages, over the original Greek and Hebrew. One argument adduced in favor of the Vulgate, was rather novel and amusing. It was urged that as the Jews had the Hebrew original, and the Greeks a Greek original, it was fair to presume that the Latin church enjoyed a similar favor, and that the Spirit of God presided over and directed the Vulgate translation. Yet it appears by the subjoined note,*

* After the termination of the council, Pius IV. employed many learned men in preparing a correct edition of the Vulgate. His successor, Pius V., continued the undertaking. The book was published by Sixtus V. in 1590. “This active and resolute pontiff not only assembled around him a number of the most learned and acute linguists and critics, but ardently and personally engaged in the examination of the work himself.” He read the whole before it was committed to the press, read it over

it abounded with grievous errors. The decree on the Rule of Faith was divided into two heads. 1. Of the canonical scriptures; and, 2. of the edition and use of the books. The consideration of these we must defer to a succeeding number.

CHARLESTON, S. C.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 4, 1835.

From the Editor.

The acting editor of the Christian Secretary, upon whom we called for “evidence that slavery is contrary to the word of God:” says he willingly dispenses with the labor, since he has not “leisure to do it justice.” We have no doubt he will find it tedious whenever he undertakes it; and we would not be surprised, should he give himself time to search the “word of God” thoroughly in reference to this question, if he should arrive at the conclusion, that it would be more facile to him to take our side of the argument, notwithstanding he now recommends us to the Bible with as much confidence as though it were altogether on his side of the controversy. Ah! brother Secretary, we most affectionately solicit your particular attention to that good Book for guidance in this matter, and we are not without hopes but you will soon cease your anti-slavery efforts. But the Secretary, lest the “word of God” should prove inadequate to our conviction, recommends uninspired writings to our attention, and especially what he calls the *conclusion* treatise in Wayland’s Moral Philosophy. To this we have only to remark, that though we have perused Wayland on Personal Liberty not less than seven times, and in doing so have endeavored to lay aside all prejudice, and not to allow our personal interest to warp our judgment, yet our candid opinion is that Wayland is *inconclusive*. The argument is a splendid effort of a great mind, well calculated to excite apprehension and doubt, but it finally fails to convince. Decorated as it is with the ornaments of philosophy, it dazzles the mind and warps the understanding; but when its novelty ceases, the argument is discovered to be sophism, not logic, and the *philosophy*, to be “*falsely so called*.”

But the Secretary opines that there are some \$14,000, on our Bible, through which it is very difficult for us to discover an anti-slavery text. This uncharitable suggestion is sufficiently refuted by a fact stated in our paper of the 7th August, and to which we refer the Editor of the Secretary. We have placed ourselves in a condition to examine this subject dispassionately, and if we know any thing of our own heart, we desire earnestly to find out the will of God; but as yet we have seen *nothing* to satisfy our minds that slavery ought to be abandoned by South-Carolina. It is our settled conviction that under existing circumstances, our State is fully justifiable in continuing the present system of slavery. When we can afford to reinstate the

again as it passed through the press, and when it was all printed off re-examined it, and corrected it anew. This edition was accompanied by a bull, enjoining its universal reception, and forbidding the slightest alterations, under pain of the most dreadful anathemas. But it was scarcely published before it was discovered to abound in errors, and was quickly called in. A more correct edition was issued by Clement VII. in 1592, accompanied by a similar bull. An edition still further improved left the press in 1593. The differences between these editions is very considerable. “Dr. James, in his ‘Bellum Papale,’ notices 2000 variations, some of whole verses, and many others clearly and decidedly contradictory to each other. Yet both editions were respectively declared to be authentic by the same plenitude of knowledge and power, and both guarded against the least alteration by the same tremendous excommunication.” —Townley’s Illustrations of Biblical Literature, vol. ii. 487-495.

African race in their own country, it will then be time enough to enquire whether it would be expedient or proper to abandon slavery. In the mean time, we are surprised that they at the North who are conscientious in their opposition to slavery, do not perceive that it devolves on them as the descendants and heirs of those who introduced slavery into this country (for the North and not the South carried on the slave trade) to return to us the money thus acquired, and to send back the slaves to the country whence their fathers forced them. Surely if their fathers imposed on us unlawful property, it is the duty of their heirs to make restitution. Let therefore our Northern would-be philanthropists remember that if slavery is a sin, it is their crime and not ours. They have inherited the profits of the criminal commerce; and to them it belongs to return to us the money we paid for our slaves, if they are to be restored to their own country.

The Editor of the Biblical Recorder has expressed his opinion that the proposal of a special meeting of the Baptist State Convention of South-Carolina is premature, and has suggested to us the propriety of deferring any measures for the re-establishment of our Theological Institution that North-Carolina might have an opportunity to unite with us in a Southern Institution. We are pleased with the prospect thus held out, and hope our Convention will readily concur in brother Meredith's proposal. We would remark, for the satisfaction of our North-Carolina brethren, that the more particular object of the Convention in having a special meeting, is not the re-organization of our *Theological Institution*, but the establishment of a *Manual Labor School* for boys. We can easily defer action on the account of the Theological Department, but it is important to adopt measures for instituting our *Manual Labor School* at once.

We have been requested to give our opinion on this question, viz: "What is the duty of a church when a member applies for a letter of dismission to join a church more distant, without a removal of residence?" The Baptist Summary of Discipline answers this, in the following language, viz: "That it is the duty of a believer to give himself a member of an orderly church nearest to his place of residence, or which he can most conveniently attend to, appears plain from the following considerations; (1) by the neglect of this duty he will deprive himself of the edification, comfort, loving instruction, watchful care, and faithful admonition of his fellow members; (2) it would give room to suspect he was impatient of that restraint, which every humble member deems his mercy; (3) it would seem as if he aimed at screening himself from necessary contributions, or church discipline; (4) such a neglect casts a manifest contempt on the church and ministry, near which he resides; (5) was this conduct to be allowed, and become general, it would cause great confusion among the churches; and as such a practice can suit none but careless and disorderly persons, the church they belong to ought to admonish them, and if they still persist, censure them. The same reasons hold good, against those who require a dismission from the church they belong to, unto one more remote. If one member may be dismissed, another may, even officers of the church as well as others. To dismiss a member to the world at large, would be yet more preposterous, and ought never to be done any other way than by excommunication. The usual plea for such an unreasonable request is either that they cannot profit under such a ministry, or that the concerns of the church are not properly managed; but the truth is pride is generally at the bottom of such desires; for unbecomable Christians will esteem others better than himself, bear with the authority

of the weak, and pray and hope to find a blessing where Providence casts his lot."

We have introduced the above quotation at length, not only because it clearly expresses our own opinion, but because we hold in the highest respect the little book from which it is extracted. That there should be some uniformity of action among our churches we think highly important, and hence our attachment to the Confession of Faith and the Summary of Church Discipline adopted by the Charleston and other Associations in this State and many other sections of the United States. We are perfectly aware that many persons object to adopting as their guide any other book than the Bible, and regard all Confessions of Faith as a contempt of the sacred volume. That Confessions of Faith and Rules of Discipline are not to be regarded as in themselves authoritative we readily admit; but that they should be adopted as convenient for reference, as an index to the scriptures, and as expressive of those principles which as a denomination we hold in common; we think it would be fastidiousness to deny. We believe that most persons who object to our Confession of Faith and Summary of Discipline, have never read the book, and enter their protest against it in consequence of what they hear from other denominations respecting it. But if Baptists generally would give it an attentive perusal, and compare it with the scriptures, we doubt not but we would soon have a greater uniformity of action and sentiment among our churches, and that the spirit of brotherly love would be in much greater exercise. Without some uniform standard of discipline, we must be subject to constant variations of conduct and the most inconsistent and often contradictory course of action; and without a common Confession of Faith we must acquire the character as a denomination of great fickleness and instability of opinion. The design of our Confession of Faith is to state those common principles and fundamental doctrines which are essential to our harmony and communion as one people, the Summary of Discipline is calculated so to regulate the practice of the Churches as to perpetuate our communion. Now unless what is contained in this book can be shown to be inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Gospel, our churches are in duty bound to be regulated by it for the general peace and harmony of the denomination. If therefore that book requires that a member should not be dismissed to join a church more remote, they ought not to dismiss him until it can be shown that his case forms an exception to the common rule, and that the example thus set will not be regarded as a precedent or will not be evil in its general consequences. A member who persists in despite of the deliberate judgment of the church, in his determination to withdraw, must certainly be, except under extraordinary circumstances, in the exercise of feelings which render him unfit for communion any where; and a church that would receive him under such circumstances, ought not to be countenanced by sister churches.

We hope these observations will not be regarded as designed to bear personally on any one in particular, as we are unacquainted with the merits of any specific case where they would appropriately apply. But as the question has been proposed to us, we express our opinion upon it candidly and honestly.

Liberal Donations.

We have been favored with a view of the transfers of the Stock in the South-Carolina Columbia Bridge Company, made by Mr. David Ewart to the different religious denominations, to be employed in the promotion of religion. The transfers are as follows, viz:

To the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South-Carolina and Georgia, one hundred shares, for the endowment and perpetual establish-

ment of the Professorship of Biblical Literature in the Seminary.

To the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Lutheran Synod, located in Lexington, six shares to assist in the permanent endowment of a Professor in said Seminary.

To the Society of the South-Carolina Conference for the relief of the children of its members, six shares to aid and assist in the education of pious young men designed for the Gospel Ministry within the bounds of the South-Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

To the Convention of the Baptist denomination in South-Carolina, six shares to assist in the payment of Professors or Teachers in the Theological Seminary, located in Sumter District. The original cost of the shares was \$100 each.—*Columbia Times & Gaz.*

B. Manly hereby acknowledges the receipt from the liberal donor, of the papers necessary to entitle the State Convention of the Baptist denomination in South-Carolina to their part of the significant donations mentioned in the above extract.

The Preamble of the Trust Deed is so just and wise that it is deemed appropriate to give the following extract from that document.—

"Know all men by these presents, that I, David Ewart, under the solemn impression that the dissemination of genuine Christianity in these United States is the only efficient means by which their civil and religious privileges can be maintained and secured; and that this glorious work cannot be accomplished fully and perfectly, without the instrumentality of ministers of the Gospel, not only pious men, but men well instructed; have granted, assigned, and transferred," &c.

After much reflection we have concluded to publish the following from our friend and correspondent "J. D.," since it is defensive on his part, and has no personal reflection except upon the editor himself. The public will judge for themselves whether the editor said more in the remarks objected to by "J. D." than sheer justice to a well tried and worthy officer of the Convention demanded from us. The editor makes his absence from the city his apology to "J. D." for not attending to his communication sooner.

Dear Brother Brisbane:

I have observed your editorial remarks in the 23d Number of the Southern Baptist, in reply to my queries and suggestions relative to the Furman Institution; and considering your interpretations and strictures rather calculated to make unjust and unfavorable impressions upon the public mind against me in the discussion referred to, hope you will consider a rejoinder due me, and give the subjoined a place in your columns, without abridgment.

You assert in the first place, that "you were extremely reluctant to publish my communication on account of its personalities," &c.; that "it would certainly have been more in keeping with that character for prudence and judgment, and Christian benevolence for which we know 'J. D.' to be distinguished, to have made his observations rather in the way of suggestions and enquiries than in the severe terms in which the Board and their President have been publicly censured by him." Now, brother Brisbane, I take it if you re-examine my first communication, you may easily perceive that its scope and tendency consisted in queries and suggestions, and that every cen-

sure therein was only a presumption upon the answer to the queries. Moreover, I imagine you may as easily infer that my purpose was to draw, from the officers of the Convention, explanations of the causes of the *interregnum*, to satisfy the public mind at a time when the prejudices of many, unfriendly to the Institution, were making false constructions, disrespectful to the Institution in general, and especially to its worthy Professors who had resigned. The friends of the Institution, particularly in the middle and upper parts of the State, were perfectly at a loss to give explanations. Above all, the admission was pretty general, that *something* was wrong *somewhere*. The Institution was denominational property. Every member of the denomination, or at least supporter of the Institution had, and still has, not only a common right of investigation, but a right to censure the acts of its officers or agents; and sheer justice requires, where there is blame, that the proper persons should not shrink from their relative proportions of it, and where personalities (if errors in office can be so called) can be fixed, they should be fixed in every such case, in Conventions of Church or State. If I should be charged, therefore, with want of prudence, judgment, and Christian forbearance, in endeavoring to fix such personalities connected with the Institution, however it may be considered by others, I view it as a conscientious discharge of duty. Besides, let me remind you, brother Brisbane, if I have censured the Board and President in such severe terms, you have blamed me for the very same act which you have reacted in your answer. I did, and do yet, blame the Board for the appointment of a coequal presidency, as inconsistent with moral as well as natural government. For this, the President censures me with making a very "grave charge against the judgment and understanding of the Convention." You vindicate the President, blame me, turn around and make the same *grave charge* yourself, in saying, "we most sincerely regret this error of the head" (the coequal presidency) and "we trust past experience will guard us in future." I ask you now, brother Brisbane, did I go any further, in this *grave charge*, than yourself? Did I say, or *insinuate*, that it was an error of the heart? So far from it, in my reply to the President, I expressed my conviction "of his being influenced but by the best designs and anxieties for the prosperity of the Institution." Hence, brother Brisbane, if I have not acted in "keeping with that character for prudence, judgment, and Christian benevolence," of which you speak, you have done the same; and "*with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*" However, I think on this point neither of us has much reason to fear our keeping in the bounds of prudence and judgment, although one of us need to fear that he may not have preserved a *keeping* of consistency.

Further: brother B., you charge me with misconception of the President's remarks, in saying that "his remarks were strictly apologetical or explanatory and not discussory," and that "they ought to have been so considered by 'J. D.'" But, brother B., I trust I may be permitted to construe and consider a man's meaning according to the plain and simple interpretation of his language, and the general drift of his arguments. Well, I have re-considered the President's language and arguments, and if he meant what his language undoubtedly means, and what his arguments mean, you must have a very different rule of interpreting language from me, not to give his

remarks strictly a *discussory* and defensive construction. It is known, the President remarked that I had made a *grave charge against the judgment and understanding of the Convention*: if he deemed it an error of the head, as you have done, why did he contend that the Convention had numerous examples of other Institutions which had proved successful under similar circumstances? Why did he quote apostolical example as authority for their justification? Did the Apostles institute rules of discipline from an error of the head, or by Divine inspiration? If perhaps I had possessed the previous knowledge you professed to have, "that the President, from the origin of the coequal presidency, was opposed to the whole scheme," I might have strained inferences so far, as to have arrived at your conclusions, or at such far-fetched, apologetic, constructions; but having no other land-mark by which to be governed than his remarks, I do not see how you could expect me to draw any conclusion different from that expressed in my reply. I am truly sorry I have been constrained to say so much upon this subject, and should not have sent even a second communication, had the honest confession of "an error of the head" been made at the outset, instead of censure for a *grave charge, severe terms of censure, &c.*

And now, it is to be hoped, the President, Convention, and Editor, will not construe any thing I have written, in this controversy, designed to cast the most distant reflection upon the purity of their motives and intentions; and, before they charge me again with severe censures, will remember I have no delight in any style of writing, unless one that is undisguised, straight forward, and downright to the point: albeit, some may construe such a style into "harshness," "severity," "personalities," &c. At the same time, I hope they will remember, that in a country like ours, their public acts are public property, subject to public inspection and scrutiny, and that we, as Baptists, rejoice in this privilege as a denomination. This right I claim, allowing reciprocal freedom to be corrected when found in error or sin, without offence on my part, (the grace of God sustaining me.) But when I am censured with *grave charges, not keeping my prudence in bounds, and considering things in the way I ought not to do*, I insist on, and must have proof, before submission to any *ipse dixit*, however I may esteem the author for wisdom and prudence, to the contrary notwithstanding. That our discussions in all things pertaining to the kingdom of Christ, may for the future be directed by wisdom from above, and the Convention never hereafter be led away, from the true path, by another "error of the head," is my most fervent prayer.

J. D.

FOR THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST.

The internal evidence of historical truth is a subject too copious to be comprised in a short essay. The more enlarged are our views and the more accurate our researches, the more fully does the evidence appear. It was remarked by Hume, that historians have been generally the friends of virtue. This may be accounted for in two ways: 1st. By believing that it is a love of truth which engages a person to investigate and record interesting facts. 2d. That a familiarity with truth, in observing the influence of virtue and vice on human affairs, confirms the virtuous principle, where it already exists. We may therefore expect in a historian who is worthy of the name, a sound mind, and a consistent narrative—a conformity

to the principles of common sense, and those maxims of economy which the experience of ages has sanctioned for domestic, civil and political welfare. While it may be impossible to assign infallible criteria of truth, we may well suppose that the following circumstances united are and should be satisfactory: When the author is known, and is known to have possessed means of correct information on the subject of which he treats, is of good repute for truth, and under no strong temptation to pervert it; when there is no absurdity or impossibility in what he relates, however different from common observation; when he delineates genuine characters, and his narrative is consistent with itself, with well known contemporary facts, with the manners of the age, and the state of arts, civilization and science.

The authenticity of a work is a primary consideration, materially affecting its truth; for if a writer deceives in one important particular, we have no security for his general veracity. But such an imposition cannot easily escape detection; and it is so presumable that he who professes to be the author of a book, is so in reality; that unless there is some discrediting circumstance, the claim is generally admitted. Without internal evidence to the contrary, general assent may be considered as settling the point. Cesar's Commentaries and Franklin's Life, have never, as far as we know, had their authenticity questioned. At their respective times of publication many were living who had known the writers, were well acquainted with their characters, and familiar with particulars of their history, who accordingly could readily confirm or disprove doubtful assertions, and detect any palpable deviations from truth. The authors were men of acknowledged veracity, with characters too high to be hazarded in quest of unmerited honors. The subject of each is distinct and appropriate. Cesar recounts in a plain and concise but dignified manner his military operations, describes persons and places as they come into notice, in a cursory but particular manner, so far as they relate to his purpose—shows a quick discernment of character, a ready invention of expedients, comprehensive foresight, energy of conduct, self-respect and self-command. He candidly states the objection, defences and criminations of his adversaries, and incidentally but covertly alludes to a faction at Rome opposed to his views and jealous of his influence. His conference with Divitiacus and with Ariovistus, his descent upon Britain, his constructing of a bridge over the Danube, as well as other scenes, are described with the liveliness and precision of a witness and an agent. His geographical notices and his remarks on manners and the state of society are exact and instructive. These things comporting fully with the character of Cesar, and with well known facts in which his agency was conspicuous, leave no doubt of the authenticity of the Commentaries. Franklin details the early efforts of an active inquisitive mind, describes his parentage with simplicity, in accordance with apparent truth, with English history and his own circumstances; he records his youthful follies as well as uncommon application to learning and sedulous attention to business; the expedients of a self-directed genius for personal and social literary cultivation; characteristic traits of his contemporaries, whether printers or governors, with incidental allusions to public affairs, and the state of arts, manners and government. These, with his early travels, the incidents of which, though not remarkably important, yet from the manner in which

they are related, and the interest which novelty confers, are very engaging, are related in a manner so natural and characteristic as to leave no doubt respecting the real author.

But a work may be authentic, or a genuine production, and yet be wanting in strict historical truth. There is a remarkable difference in this respect between two distinguished works of the adorned Greek historian Xenophon—his *Cyropædia* or the Institution of Cyrus, and his *Anabasis* or the Expedition of the Greeks,* commonly called the Retreat of the Ten Thousand. The first is evidently designed to teach maxims of government as well as general ethics. The narrative probably contains some authentic anecdotes of the elder Cyrus, skilfully interwoven with imaginary ones, and set off by just sentiments and elegant description. But it wants the particularity and liveliness of the latter, which is evidently the work of an eye witness. In the *Anabasis* motives of conduct are distinctly displayed, characters clearly marked, times and places particularly noted, remarkable objects and peculiar customs in the countries through which they marched, are accurately described. The commanding genius of Cyrus, his artful management to induce the Greeks to accompany him beyond their expected destination, the devotion of the Persian grandees who attended him, the animosity of the brothers, the perplexity of the Greeks after a partial victory to find that Cyrus was killed in battle, their perseverance in their retreat notwithstanding continual annoyance from their enemies by insidious artifices and direct hostilities, the alarming sickness produced by the honey dew, and their shout of transport on discovering the sea, are related in a manner inimitable by one who recites only the reports of others. In the *Cyropædia*, the author is evidently recommending what he describes. In the *Anabasis* he exhibits facts in the manner and order of their occurrences. The scene of the former is in distant countries imperfectly known, and a number of the facts not distinctly recognized in general history. The events of the latter are essentially connected with authentic records of the historians, and the countries mostly those with which the Greeks had constant intercourse. As the *Anabasis* harmonizes with the Grecian general history, so do the histories of Sallust, concerning Jugurtha and Cataline, with the Roman. Their authenticity and general truth are unquestionable.

That criterion of truth which consists in agreement with an author's known character and sentiments, and with circumstances, is exemplified in Milton's Latin Treaties, lately published. He was understood to have written a work on the principles of the Christian Faith, but for more than a century and a half it was supposed to have been lost. Connected with its discovery among State papers, and with the known fact that he had been a Secretary of State for Latin Correspondence, internal evidence of style and sentiment soon convinced the public that it was a genuine work of the great English bard. In like manner, a work purporting to be a posthumous production of Franklin, Burke or Robt. Hall, would soon be brought to the test of strict examination, and have its claims disposed of by internal evidence. On such ground the third part of *Pilgrim's Progress* is rejected as being spurious; and a *View of Heaven and Hell*, published with Bunyan's name, is liable to such a suspi-

*To assist the younger Cyrus against his brother Artaxerxes king of Persia.

cion. A new work claiming to be Bunyan's, under circumstances similar to those of Milton's Treaties, would not long have its claim undecided.

A species of moral evidence of an author's truth may be found in the suitableness of the conduct and speeches of individuals to their circumstances and character. Such is the answer of Leonidas to the Persians demanding the Spartan arms: "Come and take them;" that of Themistocles to the Spartan Admiral, who in a reply to a remonstrance of the former, raised a staff as if about to strike him, "Strike, but listen;" that of the American patriot Reed in rejecting the offer of royal bounty, as an inducement to desert the cause of his country, "I am not worth purchasing, but if I were, George III. is not rich enough to do it;" that of John Rutledge when advocating the grant of free powers to the delegates from South-Carolina to the old Congress, himself being of the number. To one who objected that they might abuse their powers—and what then? "Hang them," he replied. Such originality and fitness of thought and expression give credibility to the narrative.

The era of events is often indicated by incidental unconstrained allusion to circumstances. We may instance money, measures, civil and military offices, and arrangements, and common utensils, which varied with the country and the state of society. In the first notice that we have of silver used as medium of traffic, it appears to have been more in masses, the value of which was ascertained by weight, as in Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah. In the sale of Joseph it would appear to have been reduced to uniformity of size, if not of impression. It afterwards received particular designations as coined into portions of a certain form and value. The coin of different countries was distinguished by its "image and superscription." Xenophon mentions Cyrus' payment of the Greek soldiers in *daricks*, which derived their name from the Persian king Darius. The *denarius* or "penny" of scripture had the impress of Cæsar; as in modern times we have *Carolus*, *Louis*, and *Napoleon's*. The payment of a debt in the latter coin must of course be dated subsequent to the beginning of the present century, as eagles, dimes, and cents mark a period commencing with the ten last years of the past. As the denominations of money peculiar to one country incorporated into the language of another indicate a period of special intercourse, so a similar transfer of civil and military terms is consequent on invasion and conquest. Tetrarch, proconsul or "deputy publican, centurion, legion, cohort or "band," prætorium or "judgment hall," &c., found in a foreign language, indicate the era of extended Roman conquests. These words would not come into current use without special intercourse with the conquering nation. The same is probable of the measures, fathom, furlong, firkin, bushel, occurring in the N. Testament. The English traveller, Clarke, witnessed in Palestine a trace of the French invasion in the imitative military manœuvres of the younger Bedouins and their giving the French word of command. The introduction of such terms into the language of England, and especially into legal use, marks the era of the Norman conquest, and our intercourse with India is testified by the transfer and use of numerous native words of that country; shasta, pagoda, brahmin, biraggee, pundit, sahib, rajah, sepoy, rupoe, para, jungle, compound, bazar, zayat, verandah, &c. Names of rivers and places in our own country have a reference to its aboriginal or colonial history. Of the

former class are Santee, Peedee, Enorec, Combahee, Coosawhatchie, Cheraw, Eutaw, Winyaw, &c.; Charleston, Georgetown, Camden, Granby, Ashley, Cooper, Craven, Clarendon, &c., of the latter.

From the cursory view of historical evidence now taken, it appears that when an author writes good sense, is consistent with himself, with general history, with the manners and customs of his age; when he is incidentally confirmed by, or confirms, other credible writers, and has the external corroboration of monuments, relics, institutions, &c., he is, without positive proof of imposition, entitled to belief.

We propose in a future number to examine the Acts of the Apostles as a historical document.

STOA.*

* In the last number, page 121, second paragraph, for "make not only," read mark, &c.

FOR THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST.
PLEASANT HILL, Lancaster District, S. C., }
August 10, 1835. }

Dear Brother Brisbane:

Believing that there is nothing better calculated to refresh the souls of God's dear children than accounts of a gracious work upon the hearts of poor sinners, I have thought it might be the means of encouraging the dear ministers of Christ in their arduous labors, and of building up the saints of the Most High God, to give you an account of what I have seen and enjoyed of late.

I attended a Protracted Meeting at Cedar Creek, near Wadesborough, N. C., and I witnessed a glorious out-pouring of the Holy Spirit. The meeting continued thirteen days and nights in succession, and fifty-two persons were added to the church.

As soon as I returned home, I commenced a meeting at New Hope, one of the churches I have the care of, which continued nine days. About twenty-one persons were added to this church. Nine other persons have been united since to the Broad and Fork Hill churches, making in all thirty persons that have joined these churches in less than two weeks.

In view of these things, I feel to thank God and take courage.

Affectionately your brother in Christ,
S. S. B.

SUMMARY.

There were 14 deaths in this city from the 23d to the 30th August—8 whites and 6 blacks and colored.

First load of new Cotton.—Eight bales of new Cotton were, a few days since, brought to town by wagon from the plantation of Mr. Wm. Sinkler, at Eutaw. It was consigned to Mr. C. D. Deas, and was put up in very neat packages, and said to be of good quality.

Carroll, alias Wood, was on the 29th ult. put on board the line brig Courier, Capt. Hull, for New-York.

The Baptists in Georgia are endeavoring to erect and sustain a College. The location will be Washington. \$15,000 have been subscribed.

From a statement of the affairs of the Bank of the United States up to the 6th of July last, it appears that after allowing six millions of dollars for bad debts, that institution has still a clear surplus of seventeen per cent to divide amongst its stockholders.

Unparalleled Impudence.—An English ship, the John May

Delany, arrived in the lower harbor last evening from Dublin; and in the course of the night landed in her boats at the wharves in the city, about 300 Irish passengers, and then made sail. The revenue cutter was dispatched this morning to apprehend the author of this daring villany. If the vessel cannot be captured and brought back, it is to be hoped our government will adopt other prompt and vigorous measures to cause exemplary punishment to be inflicted for this high handed violation of our laws.—*Boston Mer. Jour.*

An incendiary has been taken up and put under arrest at Chesteron, Md., for tampering with the negroes.

Trade of New-Orleans.—The Bulletin of the 12th inst. presents the following estimate or calculation of the value of a few leading items embraced in the commerce of New-Orleans, for the past year:

Cotton,	\$37,000,000
Sugar and Molasses,	9,000,000
Tobacco,	3,250,000
Lard, Pork, and Bacon,	3,500,000
Flour and Corn,	1,750,000
Lead,	1,000,000
Bagging and Rope,	1,300,000
Whiskey,	290,000—57,305,000
Other articles received from the interior, probably	12,700,000
	\$70,000,000

It was supposed by the estimate that the trade coastwise from abroad, including the goods that pass through the city, would amount to an equal sum.

The New-Orleans Commercial Bulletin of the 11th ult. says: "We are happy to announce the arrival in this city of Colonel Stephen F. Austin, of Texas. He came passenger in the brig Wanderer, 11 days from Vera Cruz.

Longevity in America.—The Natchez (Miss.) Courier asserts, that no people on earth have fewer diseases, or live to a greater age, than the native Mississippian; and that such calumnious phrases in use, as the "sickly South," &c. ought rather to be changed to the "sickly North." The tables of longevity are said to present a greater number of persons over 100 in the West and South than in the North. This is observed chiefly in the slave States, for it is found the negro lives generally to a greater age than the white.

The American squadron left Naples previous to June 30, with 80,000 ducats, the annual instalment of the indemnity which Naples has agreed to pay the United States for the confiscation of the property of her citizens.

A letter from Vicksburg, Miss. says, "There is not a gambler now to be seen in this place. Grand Gulf and Natches have rid themselves too of these useless, insolent, and dangerous men. Owing to their expulsion, and the closing of numerous grog-shops, the town presents more the aspect of Sabbath than I have ever seen it wear.

The Blind.—The first stone of a magnificent building, about to be erected for the accommodation of these unfortunates, at Philadelphia, was laid on Monday. Several gentlemen of distinction took part in the ceremony.

The affairs of the Queen of Spain look somewhat better. The Queen issued a decree on the 4th, by which the order of Jesuits is suppressed, and their property ordered to be sold. This is described as being a very wise and popular act. The Jesuits are not favorites with the Spanish populace, though the Mendicant Friars are beloved.

At Galway, Ireland, 1800 families were in a state bordering on starvation.

GENERAL MISCELLANY.

Metamorphosis of Rags.

Curiosity led us the other day, being at Brattleboro', to visit the works of Messrs. Fessenden & Co. Their paper-mill and printing office are in contiguous buildings. The paper-mill is worked with the advantages of the latest improvements; that is, the cylinder mould by which a continuous sheet is drawn out, and the steam-drying cylinder by which the paper is dried, fit for printing, as soon as made. The printing-office contains as many as seven or eight power presses, each performing double the work, in the same time that hand-presses perform. In the same building is the room for drying the sheets when printed, and for pressing the sheets when dried, by a hydrostatic press of enormous power. In another building still is the bindery, on a scale commensurate with the plan of the other departments.

Here then is a metamorphosis as sudden and as surprising, could we not trace the process, as the changes of the professor of legerdemain. What enters the mill at one end as rags, comes out at the other as books; first the rags are seen circuiting the engine, next the cylindrical mould receiving its thin layer of pulp, which, being dismissed by the unceasing revolution of the mould, is sent to pass over the heated cylinders. Having passed over these, a knife falling at regular intervals, cuts the endless sheet into pieces of requisite length. Forthwith it is transferred to the printing office, and then with still greater rapidity, by means of power presses and stereotype plates, covered with letters, words and sentences. From thence it passes to its last stage, where with the art and mystery of the binder, it is folded, cut, and stitched, encased in back and covers, and labelled "Comprehensive Commentary," "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," "Holy Bible," &c. What yesterday was vile rags, having grown old in the service of warming and ornamenting the body, to-day becomes the material of enlightening and adorning the immortal mind.

This, thought we, is better than making gin. What a dreadful metamorphosis is that! good rye, and maize, and potatoes, which might feed many a poor family with wholesome nourishment, turned into a poison which has no affinity for stomach, brain or blood, and cannot feed nor clothe, nor benefit anything!

But we do not intend to write a lecture upon the manufacture and traffic of ardent spirits. We will therefore close by saying, that it is not the least interesting consideration connected with the establishment of Messrs. Fessenden & Co. that all their labor is performed without the aid of ardent spirits.—*Wind-sor Vt. Chronicle.*

We understand that such is the perfection of works in the above named establishment that rags have been taken in the morning, formed into paper and printed before night! We are informed that one of the publications of Messrs. Fessenden & Co. "The Comprehensive Commentary," when an equal number of all the volumes shall have been completed, with those which have been already printed of the first, will have consumed Fifteen Thousand Reams of Paper, and in the binding nearly sixty thousand sheep and calf skins.

Temperance Stick.

At a small town, not ten miles from Keighley, an individual keeps a school; the income arising from which not being sufficient to maintain him, the wits

of the master are further exerted to obtain "that food which nourisheth the body;" he has therefore opened a shop, where he exposes for sale various articles of toy ware, and being a strong advocate of "Temperance Societies," he enjoins all his immediate neighborhood to follow his precepts and example. On most of the goods he offers for sale, are painted some emblematical design of "Temperance;" even walking sticks cannot evade the "determined foe to strong drink." On some of them he has engraved the word "Te-to-tal," and on the others "Moderation." One of the scholars, a ruddy faced urchin, having called forth the displeasure of his preceptor, he had recourse to his bundle of sticks; the boy seeing punishment awaiting him, significantly exclaimed,

"Sir, is that stick 'Te-to-tal,' or 'Moderation!'"

"Why," replied the master.

"Because," said the boy, "if it is 'Te-to-tal,' you mount strike at all; if 'Moderation,' use it easy."

Shaving in Spain.

An Irish gentleman travelling thro' Spain, went in to a barber's shop to get shaved. The man of foam with great obsequiousness, placed his customer on the chair, and commenced by spitting on the soap and rubbing it over the gentleman's face. "What!" said the Irishman, "is that the way you shave a gentleman?" at the same time preparing in his wrath to overturn the wig minister. "It is the way we shave a gentleman, senior." "Then how do you shave a poor man?" "We spit on his face, and rub the soap over that!" was the Spaniard's reply. "Oh, then, if I remember nothin' else but the one thing, it'll be the Spanish Barber's distinction;" and so saying, he rose, paid the demand, and departed.

Anecdote.

A young minister, considerably spiced with vanity, once being asked to preach by an elderly clergyman, objected by saying "that he preached so badly, that he always wished to avoid preaching when he could." The old minister knowing that his object was to elicit praise, very gravely replied, "You are known to be a young man of moderate talents, and the people here are prepared to make allowances for you."—*Western Luminary.*

The effects of Aquafortis.

A Chinese silversmith, to whom the Europeans at Canton have given the name of Tom Work, brought home some silver spoons, as he called them, to a captain of a ship who had ordered them. The gentleman suspecting that his friend Tom had played him a trick common in China, of putting no small quantity of *tutenague* to the usual proportion of alloy, taxed him with the cheat, which he denied with the strongest asseverations of his innocence. The captain then told him that he had bro't with him a famous water, called *lie water*, which being placed on the tongue of a person suspected of telling an untruth, if the case were so, burnt a hole in it; if otherwise, the party escaped with honor and unhurt. Tom having no faith in the water, readily consented to the experiment; upon which, with much form, a single drop of *aquafortis* was put upon his tongue. He instantly jumped about the room in violent pain, crying out "Very true, half *tutenague*, half *tutenague*," in hopes that confessing the fact might put a stop to the operations of the *lie water*, which, from the pain he felt, he had some reason to think pos-

essed the quality ascribed to it. Several Europeans who were present, and who had bought different pieces of plate from him, now put similar questions to him, and he confessed that it had been his uniform and constant practice to add a very large proportion of tutenagus to every article made at his shop, for which, during the continuance of the pain, he promised ample restitution.

The Three Runaways.

Lord Camelford, when once dining with Burdett and Tooke, lamented that his education had been greatly neglected, adding, that "he regretted exceedingly that he had run away from the Charter House." On this Sir Francis observed, with a sigh, that he had also to lament that "he had run away from Westminster." Mr. Horne Tooke, however, consoled them both by observing that "he too had run away from Eton."

The London Lancet mentions a curious case, in which a Secretary of a public institution was twice attacked with a very violent fit of salivation, so as to render medical aid indispensable, from having wafered five hundred circulars, which he had wetted in his mouth.

Consolation.

While Gen. Greene of Rhode Island was independent of all parties, he had a capital knack of soothing the disappointment of beaten candidates, and on such occasions used to tell a favorite story, in a style of inimitable humor, which reconciled every body to the loss of office. We can give nothing of its spirit—merely the outline. A field slave in the South, to whom meat was a rare blessing, one day found in his tray a plump rabbit. He took him out alive, held him under his arm, patted him, and began to speculate on his qualities. "O how fat! the fattest I eber did see! Let see how I cook him. I roast him. No, he so fat lose all he grease. I fry him. Ah, yes, he so berry fat he fry himself; golly! how fat he be! No, I won't fry him I stew him." The thought of the savory stew made the negro forget himself, and in spreading out the feast in his imagination, his arm relaxed when off hopped the rabbit, and squatting at a goodly distance, he eyed his late owner with great composure. The negro knew there was an end to the matter, and summoning all his philosophy he thus addressed the rabbit, shaking his fist at him at the time, "You long eared, white whiskered, red eyed —, you no so berry fat arter all noder!"—*Boston Free Press.*

Running on the Bank.

"There, mister," said a man from the back woods, throwing on the counter of the bank in this place some of its bills—"there, I want the hard stuff for them are papers." "Very well," replied the cashier, "we'll try and accommodate you." The cash was accordingly counted out in silver and foreign gold coins, and the notes were about being stowed away, when the fellow, who had been turning the gold over with an inquiring eye, as much as to say, "Rot ye, I'd like to know what ye are!" cried out, "Stop, stranger! if it's not too much trouble, I'll take them are bills back agin." "Very well," again replied the cashier, handing over the bills to the fellow, who, thrusting them into his breeches pocket, observed that "he wouldn't

toat such yellow stuff about him, no way you could fix it."—*Indiana Palladium.*

In the days of the revolution there was an old lady who occasionally "entertained man and beast" remarkable for her unfeeling covetousness. One day a weary and famished soldier called at her house and asked for refreshment—his appearance indicated extreme poverty—the old lady thought his means not adequate to remunerate her for a simple repast, so she placed before him a dish of bones, which looked as though they had been pretty faithfully picked before, and left her son to settle with the soldier, when he had finished their second examination. The boy, pitying the traveller, and willing to give his parent reproof for her parsimony, told his guest, upon rising from the table, that he was welcome to what he had eaten, and made him a present into the bargain. In a short time the mother returned, when her son inquired—"Mother, how much was it worth to pick those old bones?" "A shilling, my dear," said she, expecting to receive the money. "I thought so," replied the boy, "and I gave the old soldier a shilling for doing it."

A Good Hint.

"The Scotch and New England mode (says the Philadelphian) of letting out paupers to farmers, is the best cure for pauperism." We add, our slaves population would be paupers, if they were not let out to farmers, and we are glad to see the plan for their support and for the relief of community at large, from a crowd of paupers, is approved at the North.

Notice.

✽ The Twentieth Anniversary of the Moriah Baptist Association will convene by appointment on the Saturday previous to the third Lord's day in September, with the Lower Fork of Lynch's Creek Church, in Darlington District, ten miles from Tiller's Bridge. S. S. BURDETT, Clerk.
Sept 4

Protracted Meeting.

✽ In accordance with a resolution of the Willow Swamp Church, Orangeburg District, a Protracted Meeting will be held at that Church, to commence on Friday Evening, the 2d of October next, and we affectionately invite all our brethren generally, and our ministering brethren particularly, to attend.
July 3 ELISHA TYLER, Sen.

Protracted Meeting.

✽ The Church at Phillippi, in Edgesfield District, about ten miles South East of the Court House, have resolved to commence a Protracted Meeting at their Meeting House, on the Saturday before the third Lord's day in September. A cordial invitation is hereby extended to the Ministers of Christ to attend this meeting.
Aug 21

The Comprehensive Commentary,

ON the Holy Bible, containing the text according to the authorized version; Scott's marginal references; Matthew Henry's Commentary, condensed, but retaining every useful thought; the practical Observations of Rev. Theo. Scott, D. D. with extensive explanatory, critical and philological notes, selected from Scott, Doddridge, Gill, Clarke, Patrick, Poole, Lowth, Burder, Harmer, Calmet, Rosenmuller, Bloomfield, &c. the whole designed to be a digest and combination of the advantages of the best Bible Commentaries—edited by Wm. Jenks, D. D. Boston. Also an Edition by Rev. Joseph A. Warme, adapted to the views of the Baptist Denomination. For delivery to Subscribers, or for sale at this office.

Plain binding \$3; Calf \$3 75; Gilt Calf \$4 50.
June 19

CHARLESTON PRICES CURRENT, AUGUST 28, 1835.

ARTICLES			ARTICLES			ARTICLES		
	¢	q		¢	q		¢	q
BAGGING, Hemp, 42 in. yd.	26	a	American Cotton, yd.	35	a	OIL, Tanner's, bbl.	11	a
Tow and Flax	22	a	FISH, Herrings, bbl.	75	a	OSNABT RGS, yd.	8	a
BALE ROPE, lb.	11	a	Mackerel, No. 1	750	a	PORK, Mess, bbl.	18	00
BACON, Hams	00	a	No. 2	700	a	Prime	15	00
Shoulders and Sides	84	a	No. 3	600	a	Cargo	8	50
BEEF, New-York, bbl.	00	a	Dry Cod, cwt.	75	a	Mess, Boston	14	50
Prime	8	a	FLOUR, Bal. ILS. sup. bbl.	675	a	No. 1. do.		
Cargo	41	a	Philadelphia and Virginia	650	a	PEPPER, black, lb.		81
Mess, Boston	00	a	New-Orleans	000	a	PIPER, No. 1	9	a
No. 1	00	a	GRAIN, Corn, bush.	1	a	RAISINS, Malaga, bun. box	3	00
No. 2	8	a	Oats	36	a	Muscadel	3	00
BREAD, Navy, cwt.		a	Peas	18	a	Bloom	2	75
Pils	4	a	GLASS, Window, 100ft.	41	a	RICE, 100lb.	31	a
Crackers	7	a	GUNPOWDER, krg.	5	a	SUGAR, Muscovado, lb.	71	a
BUTTER, Goshen, prime, lb.	25	a	HAY, Prime Northern, 100lb.	1311	a	Porto Rico and St. Croix	71	a
Inferior	20	a	IRON, Pig		a	Havana white	11	a
CANDLES, Spermacedi.	32	a	Swedes, assorted	1	a	Do. brown	71	a
Charleston made	16	a	Russia, bar	4	a	New-Orleans	6	a
Northern	12	a	Hoop, lb.	61	a	Loaf	14	a
CHEESE, Northern	8	a	Sheet	8	a	Lump	14	a
COFFEE, inf. to fair	11	a	Nail Rods	7	a	SALT, Liv. cas. sack, 1 bu.	1431	a
Good fair to prime	13	a	LARD	9	a	In bulk, bush	35	a
Choice	141	a	LEAD, Pig and Bar, 100lb.		a	Turks Island	31	a
Porto Rico	131	a	Sheet	61	a	SOAP, Am. yellow, lb.	5	a
COTTON, Uplands, inf.	16	a	LIME, Stone, bbl.	150	a	SHOT, all sizes	71	a
Ordinary to fair	161	a	LEMBER, Pitch Pine, rfs, Mh.	7	a	SEGARS, Spanish, M.	14	a
Good fair to good	171	a	Shingles, M.	3	a	American	185	a
Prime to choice	19	a	Staves, Red Oak	14	a	TALLOW, American, lb.	9	a
Santee and Maine	32	a	New-Orleans	25	a	TOBACCO, Georgia	31	a
Sea Island, fine	32	a	Sugar House Trunks	30	a	Kentucky	5	a
CORDAGE, Tanned	9	a	NAILS, Cut, 4d. to 20d. lb.	61	a	Manufactured	8	a
Do. Manila, cwt.	11	a	NAVY STORES		a	Cavendish	24	a
DOMESTIC GOODS		a	Tar, Wilmington, bbl.	1621	a	TEAR, Bohem	18	a
Shirtings, brown, yd.	61	a	Turpentine, soft	250	a	Saucong	30	a
Bleached	8	a	Do. Georgetown	1	a	Gunpowder	75	a
Shabbing, brown	8	a	Pitch	175	a	Hyson	50	a
Bleached	101	a	Rosin	1371	a	Young Hyson	65	a
Calicoes	9	a	Spirits Turpentine, gal.	45	a	TWINE, Seine	26	a
Stripes, indigo blue	81	a	Varnish	25	a	Sewing	26	a
Checks	7	a	OHIA, Sp. winter strained	105	a	WINES, Madeira, gal.	2	a
Flails	84	a	Fall strained	90	a	Teniffe, L. P.	1	a
Fustians	12	a	Summer strained		a	Malaga	45	a
Bad Tick	13	a	Lined	1	a	Claret Bordeaux, emk.	29	a
DUCK, Russian, bolt	15	a			a	Champaign, doz.	8	a

BANK SHARES, STOCKS, &c.

NAMES.	Original Cost.	Present Price.	Dividend.
United States Bank Shares	100	109 00	3.50
South-Carolina do.	45	61	1.75
State do.	100	120 00	3.00
Union do.	80	55	1.50
Planters & Mechanics do.	25	371	1.00
Charleston do.	25	50 00	
Union Insurance do.	60	78	2.00
Fire and Marine do.	66	00	4.00
Rail Road do.	100	115	3.00
Santee Canal do.	870	00	20.00
State 6 per cent Stock	100	103	
State 5 per cent do.	100	102	
City 6 per cent do.	100	102	
City 5 per cent do.	100	00	

EXCHANGE.

Bills on England, 9 a 91 per cent. prem.
 France, 5f. 23 a 5 25 per dollar.
 New-York } 60 days, 1 per cent. discount and int.
 Boston and } 30 days, 1 per cent. discount and int.
 Philadelphia } 10 days, 1 per cent. discount and int.
 Branch Bank rates of Exchange—Bills on New-Orleans, and Mobile, 1 and int.; Western Offices 1 per cent. and int.; North 4 per cent and int.; Savannah 1 per cent. and int.; Checks on the North, par. do. South and West, 1 prem.
 Savannah and Augusta Bank Bills, 1 per cent. discount.
 All other Georgia Bank Bills, 1 per cent. discount.
 North-Carolina Money, 1 per cent. discount.
 Spanish Doubloons, 151.
 Mexican and Colombian do. 151.
 Heavy Guinea, 95, and Sovereigns, 441 a 4 7-8

Charleston Market.

COTTON.—The only sale that we have heard of this week is 25 bales of Uplands at 19 cents. We have received 13 bales of the new crop. 19 cents have been offered, but refused. At present we have no vessel loading for any part of Europe, and the shipment making to the Northern ports are on owners' account.

RICE.—The few sales made since our last was at 64, our stock has increased, and the demand is limited.

Terms of the Southern Baptist.

There will be two volumes of the Southern Baptist in the year. The first from the 1st of January to the 1st of July, and the second from the 1st of July to the 1st of January. The last Number in December will contain an Index for the two volumes.

Payments always in advance. Annual subscription, Three Dollars. The paper will not be sent to new subscribers, unless payment in advance be made. The names of old subscribers will be erased from our list, if after a suitable time payment should not be made; and ten cents will be required for every number received up to that time.

Persons may order the paper any other time than July or January, provided they will take all the back Numbers from the commencement of the semi-annual volume.

Postage must be paid on all letters to the Editor, or attendants to them must not be expected.

Baptist Ministers and Postmasters are requested to act as Agents.

PRINTING,

Neatly and expeditiously executed by

JAMES S. BURGESS.

PRINTED FOR THE EDITOR,
 BY JAS. S. BURGESS, 18 BROAD-ST. CHARLESTON.