

THE BAPTIST.

VOL. V.] NASHVILLE, JANUARY 1839. [NO. 1.

GREETING.

With the commencement of the new year, we lay before you, respected patrons, the first number of the fifth volume of *The Baptist*, and offer to you the compliments of the season. During this year, may the Father of all our mercies, "keep your eyes from tears, your feet from falling, and your souls from death;" bestow upon you "every good and perfect gift;" and make you more pious, happy, and useful, than in any former period of your life.

With the new year, brethren, let us arouse ourselves, in the strength of Almighty God, to renewed diligence, and zeal, in the cause of Christ. But that our prayers, and efforts, may be rightly directed, and produce the results which we desire, we must have correct information, and be guided by a right spirit. How often have the best exertions failed, entirely, of their end, because the actors were unapprised of the real state of things in the field of their labours, and did not, therefore, properly adapt them. And as certainly, will the best adapted efforts fail, if they are not prosecuted with the spirit of devotion, and love, inculcated in the word of God, and by the example of Jesus Christ. Wherefore, laying aside all malice, and all guile and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speaking, as new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby; if so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious—To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed, indeed, of men, but chosen of God, and precious.—Ye, also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet 2:1—6.)

We recommended, to you all, renewed diligence, and prayerfulness, in the study of the Bible, and increased ear-

nestness at the throne of grace. Cultivate, among yourselves, "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," and that benevolence towards all others which so prominently characterised the great Shepherd, and Bishop, of souls.—"Let this mind be in you, which was, also, in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found, in fashion, as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him—Do all things without murmurings, and disputings, that ye may be blameless, and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked, and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world; holding forth the word of life." (Phil. 2: 5—9, 10, 11, 12.) Seek, industriously, the spirit of consecration. Remember that you belong to Christ, and profess to live for God. Discard, therefore, the spirit of the world, its fashions, and maxims, and realise your obligations to employ for his honour, and the advancement of his kingdom, and glory, in the world, your soul, body, and substance. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet, for your sakes, he became poor, that ye, through his poverty, might be rich." (2 Cor 8:9.) Be not so careful to lay up for yourselves treasures upon earth, as in heaven. When, brethren, we have succeeded, extensively, in all these acquisitions, we may, and not before, expect to see the whole Tennessee Church, united, prosperous, and happy.

To our brethren in the ministry, we would seize this auspicious occasion to say—Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Seek to feel the worth of souls, and the necessity of the Gospel, in its purity, and full power upon your hearts, for their happiness here and their salvation hereafter. Study the nature, and objects, of the Church of Jesus Christ. Preach; with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, the word, the whole word, and nothing but the word of God, giving to every class of men, and department of the Church, their portion in due season. Remember that without the presence and blessing of God all your labours will be in vain. Live, therefore, daily, at the throne of grace. Seek the mind that was in Christ. Ponder his

blessed promises. Believe his word; and trust in him for the fulfilment of all your hopes. Give yourselves, to the utmost of your ability, wholly, to this work. Then you will always come before your congregations in the fullness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ—And the desert and the solitary places shall be glad, for you, and the wilderness rejoice, and blossom as the rose.

We desire all our readers to consider us as an humble coadjutor in the field of the Gospel, and as zealously cooperating, as well in your efforts to acquire a true knowledge of the divine will, and a higher standard of christian holiness, as in all your works of faith, and labours of love. May the Lord, in infinite mercy, render the present year, one of eminent success to his cause, and prosperity, and happiness, to his people.

QUERY

Shall the publication of The Baptist cease with the present, or next number?

We imagine that, on casting their eyes upon this enquiry, our friends, in astonishment, ask—Why, what do you mean? Do you intend to insinuate that, upon certain contingences, The Baptist will be wholly discontinued and we be left without any paper in Tennessee? Yes, brethren, this is, exactly, what we mean; and it lies with you to decide the matter. You can, by the necessary movement, preserve this paper alive, or you can blot it out of being, by permitting its affairs to remain as they now are. This business will be decided soon.

To let our friends see, exactly, the ground of our conclusions, we will lay before you an exhibit of the concerns of the office. We had, ourselves, until two days ago, no idea of the case. The truth is we have not time to attend to every thing, and especially to the books of the office. We entrust these, and all the other interests, except the editorial department, to the printer. But we resolved, last week, to look over the books, and we found them to present the following posture of affairs. We have about *eighteen hundred* names on our list, from which, if we deduct those of exchanges, agents, &c, who are not expected to pay, about *seven-teen hundred* will remain, these are, or should be, paying subscribers. The actual expense for publishing The Baptist—

4
for paper, setting up type, press work, folding &c, clerking, post office bills, &c, &c, is, say, in round numbers, one thousand three hundred dollars. Now, to pay this one thousand three hundred dollars, how much do you think we have received from subscribers since January 1838. Precisely eight hundred and fifty two dollars, and sixty two and a half cents, every cent told! This leaves us in debt to the workman four hundred and forty seven dollars, and thirty seven and a half cents! Now we ask you, brethren, whether it is our duty to pay, out of our own pocket, even if we had the means to do it, which we have not, \$447. 37½ a year, for the privilege of editing, without compensation, a religious news paper? Consider what it would amount to in a few years. No. This state of things must be changed, instantly, or we shall drop the paper. The workmen are poor. They cannot afford to lose their work, and we cannot pay it. We must stop the concern, unless a remedy can be provided.

But a friend enquires—Will not these nine hundred delinquent subscribers pay? And, if they do, the whole amount will be made up, and something over. Ah—"If they do"—We do not know whether they will, or not. We only know they have not—And as the whole amount is scattered over several States, in single dollar subscriptions, we, of course, never can collect it. If they choose to pay, very well; if they do not, we cannot get it, and the paper dies. We would, respectfully, suggest, to those who know they have not paid, the inquiry, whether it would not be better for them to pay the dollar, or two, which they owe us, than for this medium of communication, and usefulness, to be lost to the Baptist denomination in the South West? We have been frequently told that the anties constantly represent to their congregations that we are making an immense fortune by The Baptist. Perhaps this may be the reason why we have not been paid. If so, we hope this article will dissolve the charm, and send us the needful, which may always be transmitted through the Post Office at our risk.

All will, however, readily see that we cannot rely upon the probability that delinquents will pay, and, upon this ground, go still further into debt. We, therefore, make a double proposition—*First*—That every subscriber of this paper, immediately, on the reception of this, make an effort for it, and send us as many additional subscribers as he, or

5
she, can possibly obtain. And—*Secondly*—That every name be, if practicable, accompanied by one dollar. Referring to the Ladies reminds us to appeal also to them. If Ladies, you will take up this matter, which we earnestly entreat you to do, not for oursake, but for the sake of the good cause, the thing will be accomplished. We shall rely upon your aid.

With these expositions, and remarks, we again submit the inquiry—Shall The Baptist live or die? Brethren, and Sisters, what you do, do quickly.

OPEN COMMUNION.

Happening, the other day, to call, with a gentleman, at the office of the Nashville Whig, in Deaderick Street, our friend B. R. McKennie Esqr, of the Steam Press, presented us a handsomely executed pamphlet, of thirty large octavo pages, dated at Maclemoresville, Tennessee, September 10th 1838, and entitled:—"Thoughts on christian communion at the Lord's Table; Water Baptism; & Election, and Reprobation; by J. M. Hurt, a lay member of the Baptist Church." We have, with the writer, personally, no acquaintance, and can, therefore, say nothing with regard to him. He is, it will be observed, a member of the Baptist Church. We have examined the contents of his pamphlet, and have concluded, that, as the only public journalist of the Baptist Church in Tennessee, and, as we trust, a sincere friend to the prevalence of right principles, and practice, it is our duty to review the work before us.

This we shall do with all possible kindness of feeling, and as much brevity as the nature of the case will admit.

The title-page, already quoted, indicates that this book discusses three subjects. The first:—"Thoughts on christian communion at the Lord's Table"—occupies the work to the middle of the seventeenth page, the grand object of which is to maintain, and defend, *open*, or *free* communion. The second, is:—A concise view of christian baptism." This is discussed through nine pages—to the close of the twenty sixth. To this part of the book we do not design to offer any objections. The third:—"Election, and Reprobation," extends from the bottom of the twenty sixth page, to the end of the pamphlet. It is due, perhaps, both to ourselves, and the cause, to make a remark, *en passant*, on this last subject, and, we think, no more than this is required.

Brother Hurt sets out with this observation:—"That election, and predestination, is a scripture doctrine, none should deny." As to the truth of this proposition, we agree with him, and it is almost the only one, on this subject, contained in his book, from which we do not feel it our duty to record our entire dissent. The doctrines advanced are decidedly too Pelagian for us. We regret, too, that he has thought proper, throughout the whole pamphlet, to deal, so largely, in round assertions, and the hackneyed slang which so abundantly characterise the more self important, but really illiterate of the clergy of our day. For example, we protest against such passages as these: "If election, and reprobation be (are?) true, the rich man in hell, with the reality of these things upon him, misunderstood those terms. And, moreover, good old Father Abraham was also disposed to carry on this deception &c." p 29. "But, says one, dont God foreknow all things that will come to pass? I cannot answer this question. I cant comprehend Deity &c" p 29. "Who dares to preach this doctrine as he believes it? Do not all men, who believe this doctrine preach it deceitfully? This doctrine, undisguised, would disgust the very votaries of it themselves" p 30. We may discuss these points, at some future period, and possibly, convince, even brother Hurt, that he is wrong. We promised some friends, last year, to give the subject an investigation, in this paper, at our first leisure, and we intend to do so. Our present object, however, is an examination, more at large, of the first topic in the pamphlet before us—the *lawfulness*, and *policy*, of open communion.

We regret to find that brother Hurt, except an occasional, and hastily, news-paper article, has never read anything on either side of this controversy. His examinations of the New Testament, also, seem to have been superficial, or, if otherwise, they have failed to conduct him to the true principles by which christians are governed in relation to communion at the Lord's-Table. He might have examined Bunyan, Hall, and others, in favour of free communion, and Kinghorn, Boothe, Judd, Fuller, the elder, and the younger, and many more writers, against it, and we are sorry he did not, at least before he wrote upon the subject. What a man attempts to teach others, he certainly ought himself to understand.

Before entering upon the discussion, we will remark that brother Hurt lays down some rules, and makes some assertions, which we think strangely wild, and singularly rash, for an intelligent man. One of his rules, for instance, is this:—"We are bound to decide every matter according to the weight of testimony, and choose the least of evils." p 4. This, for any thing we know to the contrary, may answer well enough to govern a voter in giving his suffrage to this, or that, political aspirant; and from that source, we apprehend, it was derived. But it will not do in Theology.—Why, in matters regarding obedience to the divine law, choose any evils of any kind? Why not be governed by God's word wholly, and in relation to the sacraments especially "make all things according to the pattern shown in the mount"? One of his opinions is this:—"I am of the opinion that there is no such thing among us as a legitimate ceremonial Church"! No legitimate (lawful) ceremonial (visible) Church! Why, brother Hurt, what do you mean? He explains:—"We are informed that there was a space of, at least, one hundred and fifty years, when the Pope held universal dominion &c." If this were true how could it blot out, forever after, the existence of the lawful (as to form, legitimate) Church. Is not all ecclesiastical authority under Christ, in the Church? Or is the Church, like a race of animals, which once having become extinct, can never be renewed, but by a new creation by God himself. But it is not true that, for a hundred and fifty years, or for one year, the true Church (ceremonially) has been extinct. God has never yet left himself without a witness.

The truth is, we suspect, that brother Hurt is, in this matter, a little tinctured with Popery, or Episcopacy, and is thinking of a regular apostolical succession. In this opinion we are confirmed by other parts of his book. He says: "Suppose I were to inquire, who is a proper administrator, to baptize the followers of our Lord Jesus Christ in the present day—you would tell me it must be a regularly ordained preacher of the Baptist Church. I would then extend the inquiry:—Who are authorised to ordain? Such only as have been baptized, and ordained, by the laying on of hands &c. So then, if any besides such pretended to baptize, since the days of the Apostles, all his ceremonial descendants must be deficient &c. &c." "We are, many of

us, the ceremonial descendants of Roger Williams, he being an unbaptized man &c. &c." p 5. So after all, according to brother Hurt, we have no lawful Church, as to form, and it is extremely doubtful whether any of us are legally baptized, or ordained! After this, we are not surprised that he came out an open communionist. But time, and space, do not admit of discussion here. We come, now, to the subject in hand.

Brother Hurt argues, that close communion is inconsistent because it can be maintained only on the ground that the Baptist Church is the only Church on earth, which, as there are, confessedly, out of our Church, true christians, is clearly an absurdity.

He says:—"I was sadly disappointed, and mortified, that he (Bro. Meredith, in an article in the Biblical Recorder &c, of Raleigh N. C.) should assume for granted, that which all the christian world, but our denomination, deny, that is, that the Baptist Church is the only Church of Christ in the world." p 4—"It is contended that ours is the only Church of Christ, and therefore those who are not in our Church are of the world, and, of course, we must not admit them to the Lord's-Table" p 5. "Now let me ask my brother Baptist for evidence to sustain the high ground taken by our denomination: (*i e*) that we are the only Church of Christ in the world" p 13. Other passages, to the same effect, might be quoted, but it is unnecessary.

What some individuals about Maclemoresville, may believe, or maintain, we, of course, cannot determine, nor is it of much consequence, inasmuch as, whatever may be true as to the effects of their opinions, and discussions, upon the sentiments of brother Hurt, the doctrine of the Church remains the same that it was before Maclemoresville existed, and precisely what it will be when Maclemoresville shall have been numbered with the cities that were. We deny, wholly, and entirely, that Baptists believe, or affirm, that they are the only true people of God, or that the settlement of the inquiry who are, or who are not, really christians, decides the question as to who are entitled to participate in the sacrament of the Lord's Table. This will be fully explained, and prominently apparent, presently, in the general argument. At this point, although, as we shall soon see, notwithstanding what he had previously said about le-

gitimacy of ceremonials, he agrees with us, in the opinion, that the Baptist Church is the only Church on earth that really "keeps the ordinances as they were delivered." Bro. Hurt makes a mistake that drives him entirely away from the scriptural "view" of the subject of communion.

2. The writer before us repudiates, wholly, the idea that baptism is a prerequisite to communion; and here, again, he is labouring under an egregious misconception. We will quote a few passages:—

"But I am told that *baptism* is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper." p 14 "It is argued that *baptism* is a prerequisite to the sacrament" p 15—He denies it in the following language:—"It is not merely for want of baptism that those who are in pedobaptist Churches are excluded from the Lord's Table, but it is, in fact, because they cannot subscribe these unscriptural creeds of faith." pp 14. 15. He adds:—

"I find nothing, in the word of God, to justify me to reject a brother, but immorality, or heresy." p 5—"Baptism is just as much a pre requisite to salvation as it is to the supper." p 16.

We confess ourselves greatly astonished to find these sentiments expressed by any intelligent christian, and much more to see them uttered by a professed Baptist! He is sustained in them neither by the Bible, by reason, by Baptist doctrines, nor by pedobaptists doctrines. Let us pause, and demonstrate these facts.

1. Brother Hurt is not sustained in the sentiments just quoted by the Bible.

If the ordinances of baptism, and the Lord's supper, are to be observed at all, and that they are, is fully admitted, there, of course, must be some relative order in the observance. This order is prescribed in the apostolic commission (Mat. 28: 19. 20 Mark 16: 15. 16) and confirmed, and enforced by apostolic example, as well as by the nature, and design, of the two institutions. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized &c"—"By the law (says Judd. Review of Stewart, pp. 121. 122) we are required, in the first place, to teach, or preach the Gospel; secondly, to baptize them that believe; and, thirdly, to instruct such baptized believers to observe all things, whatsoever Christ has commanded; and the order in which these several duties are here stated

is as imperative as the duties themselves. It is just as obvious that we are restricted in the administration of baptism to a certain class of subjects, as that we are authorised to baptise at all; for, on no rational principle of interpretation, can the commission be supposed to warrant the baptism of any but a disciple, or such as profess to believe the Gospel." "But, if the commission authorises us to require faith (regeneration-conversion) as an indispensable prerequisite to baptism, it is equally clear that it authorises us to require baptism as an indispensable prerequisite to communion at the Lord's Table." "The two positions must stand, or fall together." This is so obvious that it needs not another word of argument to sustain it. But brother Hurt adopts the former, and rejects the latter! So did not the Apostles. Look into the history of their proceedings—on the day of Pentecost, in the cases of the Phillippian Jailor, Lydia, Cornelius, and in every other instance of their practice upon record, and it will be found that they, *invariably*, follow the order of the commission. They first taught, then baptized, and afterwards administered the Lord's Supper." Then they, that gladly received the word, were—what? Admitted to the holy Table? No. They were baptized. And they that were baptized, "continued, stedfastly, in the Apostle's doctrine &c, and in breaking of bread." We now see, without further argument, that the word of God, unequivocally, contradicts the conclusion of brother Hurt, and positively requires, in every case, the baptism of the individual, as an essential prerequisite to his admission to the Lord's Table.

2 It is equally evident that the pamphlet before us is not sustained by enlightened reason.

That baptism was an ordinance of Christ; that submission to it was required; and that it was administered to multitudes, before the sacred supper was instituted, or heard of, will not, we presume, be denied. Perhaps a *pedobaptist* may object, and say—Ah that was John's baptism, which was not legitimately christian—But brother Hurt rebukes him for his timidity, and says to him:—"Why do pedobaptists deny John's baptism as a precedent? There is but one reason, and that is, that John immersed; for if he had not, it would not affect their argument, for the worse, to admit John's baptism as a precedent; and thus by the rejection of

the precedency of John's baptism, they make a full, and fair, admission that immersion was the apostolic mode; for surely no man, making any pretensions to the exercise of good sound sense, will attempt to draw any distinction as to the manner, or mode, of John's baptism, and that of Phillip and the Eunuch p 20." In confirmation of this opinion we remark, that John's baptism was administered by the command of Christ, by the authority of Christ, in the name of Christ, upon a profession of faith in Christ, within the period of the christian dispensation, and to the same subjects, and in the same mode, with those baptized by Peter, and Paul, and none of them ever again received the ordinance, all of which is capable of the clearest proof, and if all this does not constitute christian baptism, we should like to know what does? But John's baptism out of the question—Christ's, disciples, after the martyrdom of the Precursor, baptised many, who certainly received a valid christian baptism, and the concession will be made, on all hands, that baptism was instituted previous to the Sacred Supper. If so, we ask, does not enlightened reason claim its administration to the candidate for ordiances previous to his admission to the Lord's Table?

Again. Baptism, as brother Hurt, not only admits, but fully, and handsomely proves, (pp 22-23) is an emblem of our union with Christ, our great representative, and substitute, in his death, burial, and resurrection, and by which we are pledged to live no more to ourselves, but to him who died for us, and rose again. Now, as in baptism we profess that we have received spiritual life, so, in the Lord's Supper, we have the emblems of the spiritual food by which that life is maintained, and perpetuated. Which does reason teach us should be received first, the life, or the food?

Once more, on this head. As we are born of God but once, so we are baptized but once. But as spiritual life is maintained by the continued agency of divine grace and the comforts of it, enjoyed by the habitual exercise of faith in the dying Redeemer, so it is our duty, and privilege, frequently to receive the Lord's Supper. Baptism being the emblem of the reception of life, and the eucharist of the progress of life, we are again led to ask which enlightened reason teaches should be received first? The reader can

be at no loss for an answer.

The christian Church, in the earliest times, required that those who communicated at the Lord's Table, should previously have been baptized. Thus, again, brother Hurt finds himself at war with his brethren of primitive antiquity. This is matter of history, and will require our attention but a moment.

Justin Martyr lived, as is supposed, a short time, at least, contemporary with the Apostle John, as this Apostle lived until about A. D. 100, and this Father wrote, say, A. D. 150. *Justin*, on the subject before us, says (2d Apology, p. 162, apud Suicer)—“This food is called by us the Eucharist, of which it is not lawful for any one to partake but such as believe the things that are taught by us to be true, and have been baptized.” Let it be remembered that *Justin Martyr* was writing to the Roman Emperor, and presenting to him an Apology for all christians, and as he spoke in their name, doubtless, expressed the faith, and practice of the whole christian Church.

Jerom, another of the early christian Fathers, says:—(In cap. 7. Ep. 2. ad Cor.) “Catechumens cannot communicate at the Lord's Table, being unbaptized.”

Austin (Epist. ad Bonifacium) says;—“Of which (the Lord's Supper) they (Catechumens) certainly cannot partake, unless they be baptized.”

We could quote fifty other passages of the same kind, from the early Fathers, to prove, as a well known historical truth, that, in the primitive Church, none were admitted to the Lord's Table but such as had been baptized; but these are sufficient.—

3 But we also stated that brother Hurt is unsustained even by pedobaptists, whose cause it appears to be his object to favour, in his doctrines on the subject of communion.—This statement we will instantly prove by unquestionable testimony.

The Episcopalians will not admit to the Lord's Table an individual, however pious, who is, in their opinion, unbaptized. *Dr. Wall*, their most celebrated historian shall bear testimony for them—We could produce twenty witnesses from every one of the prevailing sects of pedobaptist, but we will, for the sake of brevity, satisfy ourselves with one only—*Dr. Wall* says (Hist. Inf. bap. part 2. ch. 9.) “No

Church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before he was baptized”.

The Methodists will allow only those who, in their judgment, have been baptised, to approach the Sacred Supper. *John Wesley* shall speak for them. (*Coke and Moore's* life p 97 apud *Bogue and Bennet's Hist. of diss.* 2d Lond. Ed. Vol 2. p 7):—“He refused (while in Georgia) to admit *one of the holiest men in the province* to the Lord's Supper, though he desired it, unless he would submit to be baptized.” Some, it is true, of the more illiterate, and fanatical, of this sect had occasionally departed from this principle. But the very last session of the General Conference of the Methodist Church censured the practice as heretical, and required all their Ministers, and others, to desist from such unscriptural proceedings.

For the Congregationalists, Independents &c, *Dr. Dodridge* shall speak. He says—(Lectures p. 511.) “It is certain that christians, in general, have always been spoken of, by the most ancient Fathers, as baptized persons; and it is also certain that, so far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity extends, no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper.

Dr. Dwight, the late distinguished, and learned, President of Yale College, will speak for Presbyterians of all classes. He says: (Sys. Theol. Serm. 160.) “It is an indispensable qualification for this ordinance (the Lord's Supper) that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible church in full standing. By this I intend that he should be a person of piety; that he should have made a public profession of religion; and that he should have been baptized.”

All the confessions of faith, and Catechisms, of all the pedobatist denominations speak, in substance, the same language. The question with them, as with us, is, not whether a man is a christian only; he may be the holiest of men; but also whether he has been baptized; if he has not been baptized, he cannot, lawfully, be admitted to the Lord's Table. There is no difference in sentiment, respecting the doctrine of communion, between Baptists, and pedobaptists. Our opinions are identically the same. The only thing that

separates us is the answer given to the question. What is baptism? Here we separate *toto coelo*; and how brother Hurt can believe with us, and practice with them, is a matter, the consistency of which we leave him to settle according to his own views of propriety.

What think you now, brother Hurt—Is baptism a prerequisite to communion? Be careful as to the answer you give to this inquiry, lest while you plead for communion with pedobaptists they exclude you from their table as a heretic, on account of the principles you adopt, upon which to defend your practice. Remember that you yourself maintain that heresy ought to exclude a man from the Lord's Supper:—Your language, in the pamphlet before us, is this:—"I find nothing, in the word of God, to justify me to reject a brother *but immorality, or heresy.*" Let the pedos adopt this rule, and you are excluded from *their* communion, for you see, by what has been proved, that, in the estimation of them all, you are a heretic, in the matter under consideration; and if they depart from their own established principles, to encourage and caress you, for the present, as they have in some other instances of open communion Baptists, you ought to suspect that it is not because they believe your doctrine, but because, by this means, they can, the more easily, distract, harrass, divide, and retard the progress of the Baptist Church.

The question, again we say, is not, are pedobaptists really christians. We fully believe they are; and we evince our sincerity (not our *inconsistency*, as brother Hurt imagines, p. 5. &c.) by joining with them, as ministers, and people, in every way we conscientiously can, in doing good, and thus both declare our sincere desire for their success, so far as they are engaged with us in the same common cause; and testify that we are *not*, solely, influenced, as this pamphlet more than intimates (p. 13) by the distinguishing tenet of baptism, to the exclusion of faith, and morals. Nor is the question legitimate *whether they sincerely believe themselves baptized.* Their *belief* may govern their actions, if they choose to make it superior to God's word; but we are to be directed, *not by their sincere belief*, but by our own conscientious understanding of the duties inculcated in the Bible. The question is, do they come according to the law of Christ? In other words—are these pedobaptist christians baptized?

If they are, unless prevented by "immorality, or heresy," we are bound to commune with them. If they are not, in our opinion, baptized, we *dare* not join them at the *Lord's Table*. Remember, it is the *Lord's Table*, and his laws must govern its dispensations. Were it our Table, we might make laws for it, or be ruled by our sympathies, or views of policy; but as it is the *Lord's* this cannot be permitted—"To the law, and to the testimony."

Are these pedobaptists baptized? Brother Hurt answers *no*—they are not. He says:—(p. 14)—"I have nothing to do with these people when they go to sprinkle. I get clean out of sight, and hearing, and should be glad that I could never think of it. I tell them that it is an institution of man, and not of God." Again he says;—(p. 21 &c.) "It is very strange, to me, how any one could conceive that any thing else is baptism but immersion." Here, we fully agree with brother Hurt, having, long since, adopted, as unquestionably true, the sentiment expressed by Tertullian, a celebrated Carthaginian Elder of the third century, [De baptismo, chap. 5, p. 230.] "Those who are not rightly baptized, are, doubtless; not baptized at all." Well, then, as pedobaptists are not baptized *at all*, and, therefore, do not come to the Holy Table according to the law of Christ, if we commune with them, we shall, by so doing, violate the law of God, and act, otherwise, in conflict with the deliberate convictions as to the claims of truth, and righteousness, as held by the best, and most intelligent, men, of all ages, and of all denominations.

It is of no avail to maintain that pedobaptists are willing to commune with us, and as *we* believe they are christians, and *they* sincerely believe they are baptized, we ought to commune with them. A good Quaker all believe to be a christian. He, having, as he supposes, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, has complied with that baptism which alone is now authorised in the New Testament. The pedobaptist refuses to commune with the Quaker. Why? Not because the Quaker is not, *in his own opinion* baptized; but because the pedobaptist does not believe him to be. All believe Baptists to be baptized. They can, therefore, commune with us. But we do not believe the pedobaptist has been baptized, and we refuse him, on the same ground that he repels the Quaker.

We have only time to say further, in conclusion of this part of the subject, that, in the worship of God, of which the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a most interesting and important part, "there cannot be (to use the language of the venerable Boothe) either obedience, or faith, unless we regard the divine appointment. There can be no *obedience*; because that supposes a precept, or what is equivalent. There can be no *faith*; because that requires a promise, or some divine declaration. If, then, we act without a command, we have reason to apprehend that God will say to us, as he did to Israel:—"Who hath required this at your hand?" And, on the contrary, when our divine Sovereign enjoins the performance of any duty, to deliberate is disloyalty, and to dispute is rebellion."

But we promised to discuss the *policy*, as well as the *lawfulness* of open communion, and we feel disposed to do so, even at the risk of extending this article greatly beyond the usual limits of an editorial. We have proved that open communion is unlawful; we now consider the question, does good policy recommend the practice? We assume, in the outset, that it does not, and shall proceed to establish the correctness of our opinion.

It might, with some, be a sufficient demonstration to announce, simply, the plain argument, which, for the sake of convenience, we will throw into the form of a syllogism, as follows:—That course of conduct which, for the advancement of the Church, requires a violation of the law of God, cannot be good policy. But open communion is a violation of the law of God; therefore, the practice of open communion cannot be good policy. But our brethren might not be satisfied with this scholastic method. Many of them, with whom, in intelligence, and piety, we, perhaps, ought not to claim, even, an equality, both in Europe, and America, have, at different times, from the pulpit, and the press, strongly reprobated the *policy* of close communion so universally acted upon by the Baptist denomination. In this number we may rank our brother Hurt. He says:—(p. 15.)

"Let me ask my close communion bretheren what mighty mischief may be expected from open communion? And where will these evils operate on the cause in general, or on the Baptists as a denomination? It is admitted by the "Recorder," and clearly established by common experience;

that the Baptist cause suffers on account of this restriction." (p. 17.) "The Lord prayed [John 17: 20, 21,] that his people might be one, and he gives the reason—that the world may believe. This is the great evidence that shall convince the world, and prostrate every objection to the christian religion. It is evident that the *confused and distracted state of the Church of Christ*" (on account of close communion) "is the cause of thousands of our fellow creatures going to endless destruction &c. &c."

With these opinions the writings of others, on that side of the controversy, generally, agree. The impolicy of close communion is maintained by them on the ground that it hinders the salvation of souls, and retards the progress of the Baptist cause. To each of these assumptions we will devote a moment's reflection, and close this article.

1. Does close communion hinder the salvation of souls?

If it does, which may, we think, justly be held in doubt, the Baptists are neither accessory, nor responsible, in any degree, for the evil. We would prevent it, if we could without relinquishing an ordinance which God has commanded us to observe. But as close communion, which is supposed to be productive of such mischief, has been brought into being, not by us, but by them, whatever may be the results, we are guiltless of the crime of producing them. Ah! Says an objector—You surprise me! I know of no close communionists but the Baptists. All the other denominations hold, and practice, open communion, and, therefore, for whatever fault, or evil, there is connected with it, the Baptists are wholly responsible. No Sir; it is not so—We deny both the facts, and the conclusions drawn from them. As respects the principles upon which we proceed in communion, they are precisely the same with all other evangelical christian denominations. They will not commune with a man who, in *their* judgment, has not been baptized, and we will not commune with a man who, in, *our* judgment, has not been baptized. So that we are the same in principle. In practice we are much more open in our communion than any other denomination. Are you astonished to hear us make such an assertion, and do you ask for the proof of its truth? You shall have it, instantly. Baptists commune, cheerfully, with all those (if neither heretical nor immoral) they believe to be baptized. Are

pedobaptists as liberal? No. They profess a willingness to commune with all those they believe are baptized, but, in practice, they refuse to do so. Hundreds, and thousands, of their little children, who are neither heretics, nor immoral, and if they have a right to one ordinance—baptism, certainly have the same right to the other—the Lord's Supper, although they say they firmly believe they are baptized, they refuse to admit them to the Lord's Table. Therefore we are, really, and truly, more free, or open, in our communion, than they are in theirs.

But Baptists refuse to commune with pedobaptists. Very well. This is not the fault of the Baptists. We did not set up the barriers to free communion. It is not our business, or duty, therefore, to take them down, even if we could do so without violating sacred principles. The pedobaptists set up the barriers, and keep them up, and are, therefore, exclusively responsible for all the consequences, whatever they may be. This fact is capable of the clearest proof, to which, for a moment, we beg you to attend.

All denominations, or to say the least, all who have any existence in the South West, do, as we have seen, firmly hold baptism to be an essential prerequisite to communion at the Lord's Table. We, as Baptists, admit no other standard of religion, or its ordinances, but the Bible. Who, we now ask, are we, according to the Bible, to regard and receive, as entitled to baptism? We answer, confidently, believers only. Even a solemn immersion, in the name of the holy Trinity, by a regularly authorised administrator, of an adult, who is not a believer, is not baptism, because such a person is not legally capable of being baptized; and much more is not the sprinkling of an unconscious, and unoffending babe, baptism. The best, and most learned, pedobaptist writers, although influenced, by motives of worldly policy, to practice differently, admit, in their moments of cool reflection, that we are right. They confess that no precept, or example, for infant baptism, can be found in the Bible, nor during the first, and purest, ages of the Church. This, we know, is a strong declaration, but the proof is at hand, some part of which we will lay before you.

Dr. Wall (Hist. Inf. bap. Introduction) says:—"Among all the persons recorded as baptized by the Apostles, there is no express mention of any infant."

Martin Luther, the great reformer (vide Pengilly on bap) says:—"It cannot be proved, by the sacred Scriptures, that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the Apostles."

Bishop Burnett (Expos 39. articles on art 28) says:—"There is no express precept, or rule, given in the New Testament for the Baptism of infants."

It is, therefore, conceded that there is no command of God, or inspired precedent, to baptize infants! What, then, shall we do?—

GOD ALMIGHTY says (Deut. 12:32.) "What things soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it."

Now if what these great men say is true—and we could add a hundred other similar concessions, by pedobaptists of equal reputation—and what God says has any authority, infant baptism is unlawful, not to say a crime. But they have foisted it into the Church, and, against our perpetual remonstrances, have thus set up one of the barriers. It only remained, after this, to change, what they call the mode—a dopt, sprinkling, or pouring, which is, in reality, to dispense with baptism altogether, and the gulf between them and us was completely fixed. And this it was not long before they completed. Thus they abolished all the prerequisites to the Lord's Supper, and still insist upon it that we shall admit them to communion, or else confess that we unchristianise them, and bear the odium, besides, of getting up schisms, and divisions. But no, we will neither do, nor admit, any such thing.

The Bible allows of no such thing as sprinkling, or pouring, for baptism, nor does the early Church; and, strange as it may seem, when we consider their contrary practice, these facts are fully acknowledged by the truly learned, and candid, divines among the pedobaptists themselves. We have space only for three or four eminent instances.

Martin Luther, [on Acts 8: 3.] says:—"They ought [in baptism] to be wholly immersed."

Storr, an eminent German writer, [Bib. Theol.] says:—"The ancient immersion ought not to have been changed."

John Calvin [Inst. of Rel. art. Bap.] says:—"It is certain immersion was the practice of the early Church."

Bishop Stillingfleet says:—"Rites, and customs, apostol-

ical are altered, as [for example] dipping in baptism."

If all this is true, and brother Hurt fully agrees with us in the belief that it is, and God's word, rather than our whims, and conjectures, requires obedience, and the latter cannot be, legitimately, substituted for the former, then it is unlawful to recognise a sprinkling, or a pouring, as a baptism, and consequently where these only have been received, the prerequisites to the Lord's Supper, according to the acknowledged law of Christ, have not been complied with. If we admit them, under these circumstances, we, confessedly, stand before God as guilty of profaning his holy ordinances.

We have now seen that the actual prerequisites to communion at the Lord's Table have been changed, and by whom? Not by us. We stand, in this matter, precisely, where the Apostles did. We have not made the slightest alteration in any particular. They have made the change. They have introduced, and set up the barriers. They, therefore, and they alone, are responsible for all the consequences, be they what they may. When, therefore, our pedobaptist friends prove that the crime of schism, or any other crime, is involved in close communion, and, as is often the case, grow warm, and eloquently indignant, they do but publish their own guilt, and grace with the charms of rhetoric the sentence of their own condemnation.

If it is desirable for all true christians to commune together, and we all agree that such a state of things is devoutly to be sought for; if the pedobaptists have introduced and, so far, kept up the barriers that separate us; and if they alone are responsible for the consequences; it requires no great skill in casuistry to determine whose duty it is to remove the impediments. They set them up; let them now take them down. This they can easily do without the sacrifice of a single principle. When they find their interest promoted by it, they can, and do, as we have documents in our possession to prove, dispense with baby-sprinkling. Let them discard this unauthorised practice altogether. They can, to save a good member, although he has been sprinkled in infancy, baptize [immerse] him, when he becomes a believer. Instances of this kind are numerous, and need not be recited. Let them, then, adhere to the acknowledged apostolic practice. A believer as the subject, and immer-

sion as baptism, are what, alone, ever will be acknowledged by us; we can, conscientiously, admit no others, nor can millions of citizens of our country. Now let the pedobaptists take down the barriers they have raised, and the results will be glorious. If they are as anxious as they pretend to be for unrestricted communion, as it requires them to sacrifice no principle, they will do it; and if they will not, let them "forever hereafter hold their peace." Let no Baptist, because the sprinklers will not return to the truth, strive to carry off the Church to join them in their errors. This remedy would be infinitely worse than the disease—it would be to drown the world with a deluge for the sake of extinguishing a volcano. Let us, brethren, on the contrary, adhere, with all possible tenacity to all the truth we possess, and labour, with unmitigated industry, to bring as many as possible into the paths of righteousness. But if pedobaptists will not obey Christ in baptism, let them not expect to enjoy, without it, the privileges to which it introduces the obedient at the Lord's Table.

2. Does close communion retard the progress of the Baptist cause?

Brother Hurt maintains that it does. He says:—"It is clearly established, by common experience, that the Baptist cause suffers on account of this restriction." That he and others, if there are any, on his side of the question, really believe what he has stated to be true, we have no doubt. But is it a fact? And would the Church be more prosperous, and happy, if she would practice open communion?

We assume the negative, and will now proceed to establish our position by competent testimony.

Assuming the Bible as the word of God; that the immersion of a believer is the only baptism; and, as admitted by all pedobaptists, that baptism is an indispensable prerequisite to communion; and reasoning from these premises we never should, by any legitimate argument, arrive at the conclusion that close communion retards the progress of the Baptist cause, or that the Church would be more prosperous and happy were she to practice open communion. God will not prosper the open violation of his laws, by those who know, as Baptists certainly do, what they teach. Pedobaptists have, generally, been kept in the dark on this sub-

ject, and their prosperity, in some places, is proof that God still acts upon the principles which he avowed, when in reference to another subject it was said of him by an inspired speaker:—"The times of this ignorance God winked at." But will God never vindicate his truth? If Baptists, habitually, practice the infraction of his laws can they hope to prosper? If so (we speak it with reverence) God must soon discover that his laws are unwise, and unsuited to the condition of religious society, and, especially, injurious to the union of the Churches; because "it is established by common experience" that to obey his requirements is injurious to the prosperity of the Church, and that to disregard them, is promotive of our prosperity, and happiness. If this is good reasoning, and it, certainly, is that adopted by brother Hurt, then we ought to throw away our present Bibles, and govern ourselves by the superior dictates of our own wisdom, until God shall please to give us a new revelation, more in accordance with wisdom, and benevolence, and brotherly love, and obedience to which will not inflict so great an injury upon the Church of Jesus Christ!

But we are not left to be guided by the doubtful light of reason alone. Unfortunately, for open communionists, we can settle the question whether this very liberal practice is favourable to the prosperity of the Church, by actual experiments, and facts. There is, in England, and has been ever since the days of John Bunyan, a considerable number of free communion Baptists. Have they prospered, or declined? The answer to this question will solve the problem. It is well known to those familiar with Baptist History, that, notwithstanding all the advantages of popular prejudice in their favour, and the advocacy of the most learned, and eloquent, ministers the world ever saw, as Hall, Foster and others, their Churches, since they adopted the practice, have regularly, and constantly, dwindled, and have now become almost extinct. We will be allowed to prove the truth of this remark by several examples, which may be seen at large in Ivimy's History of the English Baptists, and works on communion, in reply to Robert Hall, and others, by Kinghorn, and the younger Fuller.

The Father of open Communion was, as we have already intimated, the justly celebrated John Bunyan, author of the Pilgrim's Progress, and numerous other reputable works,

Paster of the Baptist Church in Bedford, England. This venerable Church languished for years. Pedobaptists, as they were allowed all the other privileges, could not be denied membership, or, what was the same thing, the right of voting in their Church Meetings; for it would be preposterous habitually to commune with a man, and then not permit him to vote in ordinary matters. The Bedford Church was not so illiberal. But the consequences were, that the pedobaptists soon became the most numerous; they immediately routed the Baptists; took possession of the Meeting House; called a pedobaptist Pastor; and have, generally, held possession ever since. Here is one practical illustration of the advantages of open communion. We will give you another.

Rev. James Foster D. D. the Essayist, one of the most thorough scholars, and most elegant writers of this, or any other, age, was Pastor of the Baptist Church in Barbicon Place, London. Under the influence of the mania for open communion produced by the eloquence and zeal of Robert Hall of Bristol, they adopted the practice. With this event their happiness and prosperity terminated. The Church receded continually. Foster, at last, resigned the Pastorship, and it is now dragging out a miserable, and useless existence.

The Churches in Bristol, and, afterwards, in Birmingham, of which Robert Hall, who wrote the most elaborate works extant, in favour of free communion, was Pastor, notwithstanding his unrivalled eloquence, amazing learning, unaffected piety, and unprecedented popularity, under the influence of this very liberal practice, sunk down to almost nothing, and so remain to the present day, as monuments of the benefits of open communion.

Rev. Mr Hinton, the Father of John Howard—author of—"The work of the Holy Spirit—The Active Christian—Revivals—History of America &c. &c."—adopted the practice of open communion in his Church at Oxford. The Church was, soon, in so deplorable a condition that he gave it up in despair, and retired from the Pastorship. His son, J. H. Hinton, wrote a biography of him after his death, in which he published a letter of his to a friend, giving his reasons for resigning the Oxford Church, in which (Fuller on com. p. 240.) he says:—"I cannot be free in my ministry

without giving offence. The congregation is of so mingled a nature that I find it impossible to escape censure either from Baptists, or pedobaptists."

Do these facts, and their number might be greatly increased, favour the conclusion that "the Baptist cause suffers by the restriction" of close communion? Do they not, on the contrary, prove that open communion, wherever it prevails, is the destruction of the Church, and, therefore, is demonstrated to be not only wrong in principle, but also as a matter of policy absolutely ruinous?

Some of our brethren have been deceived into the belief that there are many persons who, but for our close communion, would cordially unite with our Churches, and who, on that account join other denominations. Says a friend:—I like your Church Government, your piety, zeal, and your principles generally, but your *close communion*,—I cannot stand that—Oh, it is revolting! I would join you but for that.—Well, perhaps he thinks he would; but we do not believe it. The persons who talk thus, if they would look into their hearts, would find that they have other reasons for not joining us, and what they say is either what they have heard from others a mere *pretence* to make a show of liberality, or a device to cover their real sentiments. But some good hearted Baptist brother listens to the "*blurney*," feels sorry to lose such a good member, and is, like brother Hurt, strongly moved to regard our practice as an injury to the Baptist cause." But, like the Mirage of the Desert, it is all show, and nothing else. Not an individual, probably, would join us as *open* communionists, who would not, or does not, as *close* communionists. The experiment has been fully tested and the truth of the opinion we have now expressed has been demonstrated. Take, if you please, two or three examples, by way of father proof, if it is needed, of the injurious tendency of the *policy* in question.

Mr. Giles, in his very interesting letters to Mr. Hall (pp. 63-65. apud Fuller on communion p. 250) remarks:—"The following cases have come under my own observation."

"In a town, in the south of our Island, (England) a most serious division took place in an Independent congregation. Sixty or more, of its members separated from their brethren, attended the Baptist meeting house. and expressed their desire to join in communion with the Church. The Baptists

from a wish to evince their brotherly affection, and from a confident persuasion that such an act of liberality would not fail to be followed with conviction, at least, among some of these mistaken brethren, agreed to alter their terms of communion, and receive them. Some of their members, and some of their neighboring ministers, and brethren, remonstrated with them, and assured them that the result would prove to be the opposite of what they expected.—But these remonstrances were disregarded, and the *liberal* plan adopted, with a confident persuasion of its success.—This mixed fellowship continued for, I believe, a year and a half, or more, but *not one of the pedobaptists could see baptism to be of sufficient importance to submit to it.* At last some Independent minister, from the kindest motives, no doubt, attempted, and actually effected, a reconciliation between the remaining members of the Church, and the brethren who had seceded; the result of which was that *every one of them returned to his old fold, leaving the Baptists without the accession of a single member from them.*"

"I am, (says brother Giles, *ut supra*.) acquainted with another Church at——. This Church, for the purpose of receiving a few unbaptized persons, altered its constitution. The consequence was, that as soon as the alteration was made, as many baptized brethren withdrew, as unbaptized persons joined." The Church was soon made sensible of the evil, and resolved they would never again do such an act.

Here again we see the *evil* (will you admit it to be such, bro. Hurt?) of open communion, and such it ever has been, and ever will be, in all ages, and all countries. One more example, of a character the opposite of those we have recited, shall close this demonstration.

"At——(in Eng. Giles, *ut supra*.) an unhappy division took place in an Independent congregation, which resulted in the ultimate removal of its pastor. Many of this congregation united in worship with the Baptists. The Baptists retained their accustomed terms of strict communion; and several of the pedobaptists have joined the Church, and now rank among its most pious, active, and useful, members."

These experiments prove, as we said, that all the talk of individuals, solicited to join us, about close communion, is de-

signed merely as a cloak to hide what they really feel, but are unwilling to express. In view of these facts we again submit the inquiry, whether it is true, as stated in the pamphlet before us, that "It is clearly established, by common experience, that the Baptist cause suffers on account of this restriction"—All the clamour of our pedobaptist brethren on the subject, is, in truth, a mere *coup de main*—a stroke of policy—to drive us from our principles. The artillery professedly levelled against communion, is, in fact, directed against our mode, and subjects, of baptism, the plain propriety, and scriptural character, of which, is a perpetual rebuke, which they constantly feel, and of which they are anxious to be delivered. Their objections to communion, when translated into plain English, would be about this:—You, Baptists, are beyond measure, stubborn, and unaccommodating. Do acknowledge our baby sprinkling to be a valid baptism, and allow that whenever you baptize a person who has been sprinkled in infancy you rebaptized him—That is—Do give up your principles as Baptists, and then we shall all have communion together. Or, if you please, let us blot out the Baptist Church, and then there will be no bar to universal christian love, and communion, and we, pedobaptists, shall have no more Mordecais to disturb our repose, annoy our consciences, or rob us of our honours.

We have now done with the review. We beg pardon for having written so long an article, but we could not, conveniently, have said less. The subject is an important one, and we are anxious that all our readers shall fully understand it. We have proved that open communion is unscriptural, and wrong, in principle, and that, as a matter of policy, it is absolutely ruinous to all the interests of religion, and if carried out would totally destroy the Baptist Church. We trust that nothing we have said has been offensive to any of the parties concerned. "If we have extenuated nothing, we have set down nought in malice." Our consistency must be apparent to all, and, therefore, if even our pedobaptist friends are not won, we hope they will cease to upbraid us as unreasonable, and bigots. But however this may be, we earnestly entreat all our Baptist Churches to stand firm in the principles of their primitive Fathers. Be not, by any means, driven from your obedience to the law of Christ. It is God who speaks to us from Heaven, and says:

"Thou shalt not add to the word which I command you, neither shalt thou diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."

Be assured, dear brethren, that to serve God otherwise than as he has commanded us, is not only, not acceptable to him, but it is a revolting mockery. To do that which we are not commanded, is a greater sin than not to do that which we are commanded to do. The latter is a sin of omission, but the former is a sin of sacrilege and contempt. In the latter we charge the law with difficulty, but in the former with folly. In this we discover our weakness, or disinclination, to do his will; but, in that we declare our impudence, and arrogance, to control the wisdom of God. Brethren, as Baptists, let our standard ever bear, written in legible characters upon its ample folds:—"To the law, and to the testimony."

BOOKS.

The Comprehensive Commentary, Baptist Edition, edited by Eld. J. A. Warne; and the Encyclopaedia of Religious knowledge, Edited by Elder J. Newton Brown; are the best works of the kind now extant. Fessenden's edition of the Polyglott Bible, with prefaces &c. by brother Warne, is very good. Our friend Deacon Smith is now engaged in obtaining subscriptions for these works in Tennessee. Three brethren Holt, are obtaining subscriptions for Murrays Encyclopædia of Geography, an excellent work. We take the liberty of recommending them to our friends. Be careful to see that the commentary has on the back "Baptist Edition"—otherwise it will prove to be such a book as our friends do not want.

REV. JOHN M. CHAUDION.

This brother, who now live in this vicinity, was baptized thirty four years ago by Elder S. Woodfin and joined the church under his charge, at Muddy Creek, Powhatan co. Va. He was then in the 19th year of his age. He subsequently moved to Adair county Ky. commenced preaching, and was ordained, by Elders J. Hill, and J. Jones. In 1812, in the excitements, on doctrinal subjects, which resulted in a division of the Churches in that quarter, in which, brethren

rea Chandler, Chilton &c. were prominent, brother Chaudion adhered to them, and was dropped from the General Union. He remained separate until April 1838. He then made application to the Church at Cedar Spring, Edmonson Co. Kentucky, under the Pastorship of Elder Frederick Meredith, and was received as a member. Bro Chaudion is now a minister of the United Baptist Church in full fellowship.

A WEEKLY.

Bro. Owen, of Somerville, proposes to become responsible for fifty subscribers to The Baptist, provided it is changed into a weekly, and Bro. Bethel, of Eaton, for twenty five. This is the idea brethren. This looks like doing the business. Who will follow their example? A few such pledges will make the change. Who says fifty or twenty five more?

NASHVILLE BAPTIST CHURCH.

We find the following editorial article in the Daily Republican Banner, of the 9th inst, a commercial and political paper of this city, conducted, with great ability, by S Nye, and A. A. Hall, which we, with great pleasure transfer to our columns.

THE NEW BAPTIST CHURCH.

It may not be amiss to give some description of the neat and tastefully constructed house of worship, belonging to this Church, of which the Rev. R. B. C. HOWELL, A. M., is Pastor.

It is situated on Summer, between Spring and Cedar Streets—a very central position. The structure is purely Gothic in its architecture. All the exposed portions are of stone, and the other parts stuccoed, so that when finished, it will have the appearance of a granite building, throughout. The edifice has five buttresses on each side, and is finished with parapet walls above, ornamented with scrolls. On the outside it is about seventy feet long by fifty five wide. In the front are two octagonal towers, eight feet in diameter, and upwards of seventy high, finished at their summits with carved stone work. The door way is perhaps, the most elegant specimen of stone work of the kind, to be found any

where in the Mississippi valley. It is a triple, interwolved, gothic arch, twenty-seven feet high, resting on three octagonal stone columns, eighteen feet high, with Corinthian capitals. When finished, the edifice will present an extremely imposing appearance, and will be an ornament to the city, of which our citizens may justly be proud.

The house is, on the East side, twenty-five feet from the street, which allows ample space for a beautiful yard which is to be enclosed with an iron fence with gates, and ornamented with trees and shrubbery.

The basement story of the Church contains five apartments, two eighteen feet square, with fire places, for wardrobes, connected with the baptistery, one for a store room under the baptistery, and one for fuel, under the vestibule. The principal room is the Lecture Hall, which is forty by fifty feet, and will accommodate about four hundred people. This Hall is approached from the street by descending a flight of stone steps, at the south-west corner of the Church, and entered by two large double doors. It is neatly finished, with a modest pulpit, filled with settees, is remarkable for comfort and convenience, and is occupied for the present, until the upper part is finished, by the church and congregation.

We have often observed this very tasteful house of worship, in the course of its erection, and have been desirous to see so creditable an ornament to our fair city completed. We therefore bespeak the liberality of our citizens to aid in its completion in a style worthy of its design. CHARLES C. TRABUE, Esq. is Chairman of the Building Committee, thro' whose instrumentality, together with that of Messrs. JOHN MCINTOSH, JOSEPH H. MARSHALL, JAMES THOMAS, and a few other active and influential friends, the enterprise has been carried to its present advanced position. The stone work was done at the Penitentiary, the wood work by Mr. Vannoy, and the brick work by Mr. Watkins.

OBITUARY.

Died, at Alton, Benton county Ten., at the residence of her step-father, T B Altom, Esq. Thursday the 22 November, 1838, Mrs. Juliet M. Brown, wife of Jesse A. Brown of Paris, after a lingering illness of some months, aged twenty years, leaving a husband, an infant of three months old,

a mother, father, brothers, sisters, and numerous friends, to lament her premature departure.

Mrs. Brown professed religion, and joined the Baptist Church, in Paris, in her sixteenth year, which she adorned until her death. She was a most devoted christain, and did much, during her short sojourn, for the cause both by her money, and her example. Her whole soul was set upon doing good. Her step-father, in a letter to the Editor says:—

“When on her death bed, and two weeks before her death, she was, one evening, suddenly taken worse, and we all thought her to be dying. After being speechless for, some time, she recovered, a little, so she could talk. I asked her if she was reconciled to die. She replied—Yes, papa; the Lord is good, and will not take me away from you all unless it is best. Do you think the good Lord will take you to heaven, I asked. She replied yes, my dear father, the Lord has heard and answered your prayers for me, and has this night given me an assurance of Heaven which I never can doubt. At this time, she grew so weak, I thought proper to cease talking to her, for the present. She never uttered a groan or a sigh afterwards, and finally, when she was seized by the cold hand of death, after being speechless for some time, she came to her speech again, and, first, thanked her parents for raising her up under the influence of religion, and told us we ought to be encouraged to pray for our children, and desired our prayers for her dear husband; gave us directions, very deliberately, about her child; and said—“My good God will take care of my child. I leave it with my mother, and my father in heaven, and with them I know it is safe.” She called all the family around her, and told them all, she should soon be in Heaven, and directed them how to obtain the same glorious end. She was perfectly in her senses, and seemed to be entirely easy. Thus she lay for about three hours, occasionally praising the Lord for his great goodness, till, finally, as she closed her eyes, she said, very distinctly, “sweet Jesus, come, and come quickly”—and fell asleep, as though she had dozed off, to wake no more, till the morning of the resurrection. Thus died the christian. It is enough. I feel that the Lord deserves all the glory of saving his creatures,

and unceasing praises for the evidences that are left by the dying christian, that Christ is precious.

OBITUARY.

Communicated.

Died, on the 25th, day of November last, near Dixon's Spring, Smith County, of that most fearful destroyer, the Consumption, Mrs. Mary J. Bradley, consort of Mr. William Bradley, daughter of Garland Mc. Allister Esq. and grand daughter of Rev. William Flowers, in the 21th, year of her age, leaving behind a bereaved husband and two sweet little daughters to mourn her early departure, with many friends,

Much might be said in praise of this lovely young wife and mother; but we deem it not only unnecessary, but superfluous to say much, in enumeration of those charms, and manifest virtues which adorned her person and character, and in their conspicuousness, made themselves so perceptible to all by whom she was known. We merely take it as our privilege to notice her death as one eminently calculated to show forth the powerful efficacy of the religion of Jesus Christ, to make “a dying bed feel soft a downy pillows are”—to sweeten the last sad, hours of human existence, and brighten the fading flickerings of earth's departing twilight.

Mrs. Bradley embraced religion when young, at Good Hope Camp Ground, Wilson County; and, subsequently joined the Baptist Church, of which she was an exemplary member until her death. She had many sorrows and afflictions to endure, during her short life, all of which she sustained with the firmness becoming a christian. Among others was the death of her sweet little daughter, Martha Donoho, who died in April last, at the age of 18 months, and went up to the home of the blest. Through her life, after this bereavment, her afflictions increased rapidly, bearing the usual characteristics of the disease, until a few weeks before her departure, when it became apparent to all that she must die. When this truth forced itself home upon her mind, she met it with composure, reclining, with beautiful meekness and tranquility, upon the Almighty arm of him in whom she had trusted. During this happy state of mind, many were her soul touching allusions to her glorious prospects beyond the grave, where, was her language, she soon would be, walking the golden streets of the city of her God, in

sweet and undisturbed companionship with her sainted sisters, and her dear little angel babe.

Ecstasies, inexpressible, often possessed her soul, during which her language was of that burning and unearthly kind which might fall from the lips of one already on the purlieus of the christian's final home. In the midst of one of these absorbing ecstasies, with hands raised towards heaven, with eyes strained and glowing with the last glimpses of human delight, and with her countenance irradiated with smiles already caught from the better world, she died the blissful death of the righteous.

Then sleep, departed, in thy early tomb,
 Though dark and narrow be thy clay cold bed;
 Gay memory's flowers shall unwithering bloom,
 All fresh and softly o'er thy lowly head.
 Thy husband's tears shall often damp the stone
 That marks the spot where rests thy youthful head;
 And thy sweet girls, in sorrow, and alone,
 Around the sacred mound shall often tread.—
 And those thou lov'dst beside, shall nurture there
 Fond recollection's bright unfading flowers,
 And in their hearts, thy cherished image bear,
 More freshly clad, as fade away the hours.
 But all alike to thee may pass away
 Our sorrow's tears—Our memory's richest bloom;
 Not all the world can wake thy moulding clay,
 Or rouse thy senses from the lowly tomb.
 Thy spirit bless'd shall no more sorrow know;
 Far, far above this world of grief and pain,
 Where lov's untrammell'd stream doth ever flow,
 Thou art engaged in heavens most glorious strain,
 Farewell, bright spirit, safely lodged thou art
 In the pure world where endless pleasures dwell;
 We'll meet again, nor ever more shall part,
 But live, and ever love—till then, farewell—

B. H.

DIED at the house of her Father, Edward York, Esq. in Elkton, Giles Co. Tenn. on the 26th, Nov. 1838, after a lingering illness, aged 18 years, Miss Sarah York,—a niece of the Editor of this paper.