

Desiring to show the Whole Truth, and Baring to Oppose any Error--Christ is my Judge. J. A. Gares, Editor.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1854.

NO. 6.

VOL. XI.

Our Pulpit.

Prayer.

As the Lord will call upon God, and the Lord shall answer him, morning and evening, I will pray and cry aloud, and he shall hear my voice.—Psalm 55: 16, 17.

The religion of the Bible is a religion of prayer. The people of God in all ages have been praying people, and those who have been most eminent as the saints of God—those who have been most honored for above their fellow men in the history of the world, have been men eminent for prayer. This was the case with Abraham the friend of God—with Isaac and with Jacob, the ancestors of God's ancient people. Their frequent prayers and their solemn worship of Almighty God are continually mentioned as though they were things of most familiar occurrence. Prayer was indeed the habit of their lives; and it was so of Moses. Num. 11: 2, 21; 7, Deut. 9, 20, 25, so it was also with Samuel, Elisha, Isaiah, Ezeiel, Jeremiah and Daniel. They were all as eminent for prayer as they were for their high standing and influence in the ancient church of God. Of Daniel especially, it is said that he did what David says in the text that he will do—he knelt on his knees three times a day and prayed and gave thanks to his God as he had aforetime. And David, that most eminent saint, who notwithstanding his faults and his most grievous fall, was a man after God's own heart, has filled his Psalms with prayer—he seems especially after his repentance for his great sin, to have breathed the very breath of prayer, and even to this day the voice of his prayers are echoed and repeated by millions of the people of God.

Nor is the duty and the privilege of prayer less frequently or forcibly exemplified in the New Testament, all its precepts and all the practice of Jesus and his disciples enforced and illustrated the fact that the Christian must be a man of prayer. There is no true religion where there is no prayer. The child of God is a praying person, and if we are or desire to be the children of God, we cannot but feel some interest in the teachings of the Word of God upon this subject—lend me your attention then, while we endeavor to bring to remembrance some of the most important thoughts which the Bible teaches in regard to it.

First, then, I remark that, *Prayer is an imperative duty.* If all good men are men of prayer, this follows as a thing of course. That we should all be good men we will doubt; and if good men must pray then we must pray. But we are not left to infer it—it is expressly taught.

First by *Precept*—Watch and pray, said our Saviour, that ye enter not into temptation. His spake a parable that men ought always to pray and not to faint. Pray without ceasing. I will therefore that men pray everywhere lifting up holy hands unto God. Pray to thy Father who seest in secret. The Bible is full of such precepts.

Second by *Example*—The saints of old were men of prayer, but none of Old or New Testament times were more eminent for prayer than he who last required prayer, Jesus is spoken of as a man of habitual prayer, he went out into a solitary place to pray, and on one occasion he continued all night in prayer to God. The early Christians continued with one accord in prayer to God, and indeed the whole history of the saints is a record of their prayers.

It is a most important duty—This is to be inferred from the frequency and earnestness with which it is inculcated; and its absolute necessity to Christian character. It is the food of religion—it is the breath of religion—it is the life and strength of religion.

Prayer is to be offered publicly.—The form of prayer which Christ taught his disciples, begins our Father, showing that it was to be used by more than one. God's House is called a house of prayer, but if prayers were not public they could have been offered anywhere.—The Jewish saints went up to the Temple to pray, and prayers were made in their synagogues; and by the early Christians in their churches.

In the family—Pour out thy fury, says the Psalmist, on the families that call not on thy name. If prayer is so essential to religion, there is a manifest propriety that it should be offered for and in the presence of our children; it shows them one of the duties of religion.

In private—It is private, secret prayer that is chiefly inculcated and most insisted on. The public worship of God may be kept up by a mere form; so may the solemn words of prayer be said in the family and some may not regard them; but prayer is the essence of religion—it is the secret communion of the soul with God—when thou prayest enter into thy closet, &c. Jesus went into a solitary place, he went into a mountain to pray. The soul that feels its necessities as it should will not wait for public opportunities or occasions—it will constantly go out to God—it will cry unto him night and day—it waits not for any set words, but groweth up in strong cries and tears and groanings that cannot be uttered.

Public, special prayer, is to be made on certain occasions, as Solomon prayed at the Dedication of the Temple, as Daniel prayed when he learned that the time was near to restore the Jews in times of great trouble, as when Peter was in danger and in prison, Acts 12: 5, 6. On undertaking any new work, as when they set sail, Barnabas and Saul.

Private, special prayer—When special mercies have been received, or are needed, or times of personal affliction, afflictions are desired for the church, or in times of temptation, or when some change is in our affairs—under such circumstances, &c.

The nature of prayer—It is the offering up of our desires to God—it is the referring of our case in reference to any particular matter to him. We are weak, helpless, dependent creatures; God gives us all things we have, the pious heart feels this, and acknowledges it, and God to supply his wants, he cannot but desire; the wicked have desires also, but the pious man desires to God. It is our desires—the will of the heart, offered to God.

God powerful—It recognizes God as able to grant it. God is stronger than we; the pious heart feels that he is infinitely above us; it comes to him as the God of all, and knows that he can do all things.

God a friend—The prayer of the true child of God is an expression of confidence—my Father, my God, my protector and my friend is the feeling which brings him to God—he is weak, he is needy, but he has a friend who is strong and can supply his wants—he comes to him and simply tells him what he needs and asks him to supply him.

God is wise—Prayer recognizes God as an all powerful friend and infinitely wise—he knows all things from the beginning to the end; he knows better than we can what will be the effect of his gifts, and whether they will be for our good. Prayer therefore trusts or submits to him the propriety of granting or withholding such things as it desires, as he shall in his infinite wisdom see they will be good or evil.

Here then we have the whole nature of prayer. It presents our desires to an Almighty Friend, who cares for us and knows better than we do the things that are good for us, with humble submission to his will. It says, Oh God, I desire such a thing, thou art able to grant it, thou carest for my good, and knowest best if it will be for my good and thy glory, if it be so, be pleased to grant it.

Some things we may pray for without reservation. These are such as God has promised, as daily bread, grace sufficient for trials. Pray to escape from temptation, final salvation, sanctification, pardon of sin, &c.

Some things we can only pray for conditionally, as wealth, prosperity, health, the life of friends, the conversion of particular individuals. Such things we may desire, but should not insist upon if God who is wiser than we are, sees they will be evil to us or his cause, which the true Christian values more than life.

God will answer prayer—The effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous man availeth much. God may withhold things if not asked for which would be contrary to his will; but for all this he says, will I be engaged of by the house of Israel. It is in answer to prayer he gives faith, penitence, hope, love, patience, sanctification. His spirit to them that ask him moreover. He often gives unpromised blessings in answer to prayer, when he does not see that they would be injurious.

Why is not prayer always answered? First, because it is not offered, words are said, but prayer is earnest desire, not words.

Second, because it is not with faith in God, or does not appreciate God as a friend and wise and mighty.

Third, because we do not look for an answer, expect, wait, watch for it.

Fourth, because we ask for contradictory things, to grow in grace and prosper in the world for instance, when God sees one will prevent the other.

Fifth, because we entertain sin in life or purpose.—If I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me, "ye ask and receive not because ye ask amiss, to consume it on your lusts."

Sixth, because we have not faith in Christ, and do not ask only for his sake—God will put honor on Christ, He gives his blessings through him—in my name, says Christ, hitherto have ye asked nothing—whatsoever ye shall ask in my name ye shall receive.

PULPIT ILLUSTRATIONS.

Original and Selected.—By THE EDITOR.

Give Him All.

An Indian, who heard a sermon in a Christian settlement, was much moved by the claim that he should give up all to God. The duty pressed upon his heart; he returned to his wigwam; he meditated much upon it; and at length solemnly resolved to do what God required. First, he took his rifle and set it apart for the Lord; then his fishing apparatus; then his scanty furniture; then his blanket—repeating as he set apart each article, "Here, Lord, take that." Finding himself utterly destitute, having given up all, he yet felt that he was forsaken of God, and was in great distress. The darkness of despair came over him. In this last extremity, he laid himself upon the altar, saying, "Here, Lord, take poor Indian." The offering was accepted; and there, alone, bereft of human help or hope, this poor despised savage was delivered from the power of sin, and made an heir of glory. He soon learned to read, and was supplied with a Bible, which he made his daily companion; and he was happy in solitude, or with Christian friends, to whom he often ministered, that when he gave himself to the Lord, the Lord gave him, "all things for the life that now is, and that which is to come."

When a man directs his thoughts to the works of creation—his number, their vastness, their immensity—he is overwhelmed and exclaims, "Herein is power." When he beholds the variety, the utility, the manifold beauties, and the harmony that pervade the works of God, he exclaims, "Herein is wisdom." When he sees the order and the beauty of the universe, he exclaims, "Herein is love." How much joy and comfort there is in looking forward to the glories of the Promised Land, he exclaims, "Herein is goodness." And lastly, if he could be carried to the borders of the world of woe, and behold its terrible sufferings, he would cry, "Herein is justice." But when the sinner, guilty and despairing, is led to Calvary, he exclaims, "Herein is love."

"We Are Saved by Hope."

"We are saved by hope." 1. It is a desire or expectation of obtaining some promised good. 2. It is a desire or expectation of obtaining some promised good. 3. That which gives confidence and expectation to the soul. 4. An opinion or belief amounting not to certainty, but grounded upon evidence.

According to the first definition, a desire of good is excited in the heart by a promise of good; according to the second, a confidence is inspired, by a belief that the good promised is ultimately attainable, based upon the probability and possibility of the fulfillment of the promise in connection with the third definition, bringing to view the Author of the promise, whose known character is an additional ground for the fulfillment of the promise; all more certainly secured by a well-grounded belief, (the fourth definition,) that we are in a state to enjoy the good promised. Man, with respect to God and all that is good, occupies a state, either of good or evil—we mean spiritually. In revelation, God is the author and promiser of all good. These promises beget in man a desire—God being the author, not only of all good, but also of the promise of good—inspires a confidence in man that that good is attainable. This is that natural hope which inspires mankind in their struggles for happiness—which causes the scholar to burn the midnight lamp—the warrior to brave danger and triumph on the battle-field—the merchant to pour over his ledger—the sailor to ride far away from home and friends upon the heaving treacherous billow—fills the patent office with new inventions and checkers the world with railroads. This is that natural hope which every one possesses to a greater or less degree, that encourages all men, of whatever industry, occupation or avocation, and which lies at the bottom of the brilliant efforts, and more brilliant attainments in art and science.

Without this hope, after a few ineffectual struggles, the world would become a awful calm—no industry, no energy, no enterprise, would mark the downward course of time; but like the great stagnant pool, would only catch up to its unfruitful bog, the poisonous miasma of highland effluvia exhaled from its lifeless waters. But "we are saved by hope." In revelation, we are taught that man's state by nature is evil. That man is only evil, and that continually—that man is dead in trespasses and in sins—that he is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be—that he "perceiveth not the things that be of the Spirit of God," &c.—that "the carnal mind is enmity," &c.—and that "whatsoever is born of the flesh is flesh." Whenever we have our eyes opened sufficiently to see our state by nature, the first thing we discover is our unworthiness and the impossibility of our enjoying the good God has promised, here or hereafter, unless a change in our state takes place—God has promised to work that change. The greatest Good God has promised is spiritual good. Man, to receive and enjoy that good, must become spiritual. He must be born of the Spirit, for "whatsoever is born of the spirit is spirit," and by parity of reasoning, whatsoever is born of water is water.

Now, the fact that the promise is of God, that good has been promised, that that good is attainable, that God has promised so to work in us as to fit us for receiving and enjoying that good when attained, all produce in man a well-grounded belief that this change of state has been wrought in us. "For His Spirit testifies with our Spirits that we are his." For example, God has promised us "eternal life." This is a Great Good; this promise has begotten a desire in all mankind to enjoy "eternal life," and for that God is the Author of this promise; all mankind believe "eternal life" is attainable. This "eternal life" is in his Son. But man must receive this eternal life through faith. He has sent his Son into the world that we might believe on him. But before we can receive this faith and appropriate to ourselves this eternal life, we must undergo a change of state—God has promised to work this change, and has said that, if we believe on him who raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, that this faith shall be imputed to us for righteousness, on account of which imputed righteousness, he will forgive us our sins. Where is boasting, then? Is it excluded? By what law? The law of works? Nay, but by the law of grace. For, by grace are we saved, through faith, and that not of ourselves—it is the gift of God. Now, because God has promised it, we believe it attainable, and we take him at his word, laying hold of Jesus Christ by faith. Because we have faith in his Son, we believe also that God has changed us, as justified us, and sanctified us, or qualified us for enjoying "eternal life." This latter belief is the Christian's hope. Because "faith" is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Man prived was pure and perfect—"good, good, good." But man disobeyed the commandment—the forbidden fruit—"sinned in the eye and brought death in the world and all our woe"—died morally, and became the subjects of temporal and eternal death. All along down the history of the world, with a ray of light and a rainbow promise, the important truth was made known to the world, that God had determined to save man from the dreadful consequences of disobedience and sin, and make a way possible and attainable from a state of stony mortality to a

happy immortality. It is also revealed to us that God will bestow these inestimable blessings only on and through His Son. We are required to repent, believe and be baptized. The sinner when he is brought to see his dreadful condition, the "receding sinfulness of sin," to feel that without some way of escape, he is irretrievably lost; and when the law only thunders denunciation and destruction, and he perceives that there is no light in an arm of man's strength, his eye is directed by the unerring Spirit of God to the cross, a cross which is seen upon the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

"A day" is ourschool-master to bring us to Christ. The Holy Spirit quickens, enlightens and draws the soul to Christ, prompts the exercise of faith, regenerates and gives us the "earnest of the Spirit" which earnest is hope, by which we know we have passed from death to life. Hence, "by grace are ye saved through faith," that it might not be of works, that "God might be all in all." The messengers of mercy go out into the world proclaiming that salvation is by Jesus Christ; they make known the promises of God in Christ, they point the mind to the eventful scenes of Calvary, the awful judgment day, the glories of Heaven, and the horrors of the "lake of fire and brimstone," whose smoke ascendeth up for ever and ever, which glories we shall enjoy, if we repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; which horrors we must suffer if we die impenitent—the law so pure, so perfect, and so holy, has condemned us already—the Holy Spirit makes us to see our danger, the soul begins to quake and fear; we fall upon our knees and implore Divine mercy—we agonize in the strait of the dreful alternative—the spirit pours in more light, deepens conviction; justice seems inexorable. Truth appears—with certain and sure hand she shows us "the way, the truth, and the life." We believe—a peace taketh hold of us which passeth knowledge—a joy fills the heart which is "unspeakable and full of glory;" a belief that we are pardoned, that our sins are forgiven, begets in us the "hope of immortal glory," which "hope is an anchor to the soul sure and steadfast, and reaches to that within the vail," and we are enabled to "rejoice in the hope of the glory of God."

TO BE CONTINUED.

The Place Where John Baptized.

The place which is marked out by tradition as the locality where John baptized the holy and blessed Saviour, who ever deemed it right to fulfill all righteousness. I was somewhat surprised to find the Jordan so much narrower than I had supposed; I had expected to see a broad stream, not unlike many of the rivers of less note in our country; but it is not so; between the steep and often high banks, where the river flows during most of the year, it appeared to me not to be more than sixty or seventy feet wide. It is but a guess, and judging by the eye—for I had no means of measurement with me, and, therefore, is not to be relied upon at all for accuracy—all that I would affirm positively is, that the Jordan is by no means a wide river, and is narrower between its banks than many of the creeks in our part of the world. The current is extremely rapid in this part of its course, running, I should think, from three to four miles an hour; and so strong is it, that very rarely can the most muscular swimmer make head against it; instances happen once in a while of persons being carried away and drowned in consequence of having braved it too far. I think myself a pretty good swimmer, and in ordinary cases would mind nothing of launching forth to reach a point a mile or more distant; but when I looked upon the Jordan for a while, and tried to estimate the force of that powerful current, I knew that it would not be safe for me to venture out beyond my depth; and I did not.

The color of the water is nearly that of gray slate, and the river appears to gather sediments in its course from the north; but I cannot express to you how sweet and delightful the water is. Notwithstanding its turbidness and mixture of earthy matter, coming from the Dead Sea only two hours before, the contrast was very striking; for that is nauseous and pungent to a degree inexpressible; this is delicious and refreshing to the taste. Almost as much so as the water of the Nile. Of course, I could not leave the Jordan without bathing in its most honored stream; my companion declined going in, fearing the chilliness of the water; so, all alone, in a woody and retired spot, protected by the shade of the sycamore, the flex and the willow, I disrobed and advanced into the river; the bank is very declivities, and in a few moments I was nearly out of my depth. I found it difficult to stand against the current which rushed by me with considerable force, and the water was decidedly cooler than that of the Dead Sea. You will believe me that the associations of the place and the time were not without effect upon my mind; from the depth of my soul I blessed God for the privileges of His covenant sealed to us by the holy sacrament of baptism; and I seemed to myself to be looking upon the solemn and touching scene of the Lord's baptism, by His messenger whom He sent to prepare the way before Him. Earnestly did I supplicate that God of His mercy would wash and purify my soul, body and spirit, by the blood of Christ, Jesus our Lord.

I lingered in this lovely and secluded spot as long as I dared. Penetrating into the dense thicket, I tried hard to find me a good stick for a pilgrim's staff; but met with very indifferent success. "Killing a bottle or two of the water, and re-mounting our horses, we bade adieu to this deeply interesting place. Dr. Wilson, giving the width of the Jordan at this place as exactly 40 yards; he estimates the current as at least 3 miles per hour.—(Leaves of the Bible, vol. II, p. 17.)

Controversy.

Methodism Explored.

For the Tennessee Baptist.

BROTHER GAVER:—In the Nashville Advocate of August 31st, we notice a publication headed, "A Debate on Baptism and Church Government," in which the writer has presented to us forth a concise history of the debate between Elder Frogge of the Methodist church South, and Elders A. Taylor and J. Taylor, of the United Baptist church, which, taking all things into consideration, seems at least to bear the impress of the marvelous. Now we always glory in the exercise of a string intelligence, and feel to respond our hearty amen to the faithful trumpeting of truth whenever it falls on our ears, but when men for sectarian purposes become so designedly zealous of their cause as to disqualify themselves for writing correct histories merely because such histories must relate in part to the strength of an opposing theory, it certainly becomes the duty of some nerve that has taken no part in shouting the praises of this sectarian Dianna to write a few things which he also has seen and heard. A more one-sided piece of vain boasting we have not noticed for many a day; indeed the writer seems to have taxed his ingenuity in giving possible feature to his picture that would exhibit the Baptist as having fallen before this mighty Goliath of Methodism. This he attempts to do by representing the whole Baptist church as being engaged in trying to confront the doctrines of Brother Frogge. Hear him: "Frogge's debate being with the church," &c. I wonder if our friend Listener of the Advocate wrote this upon the strength of his imagination, or did Brother Frogge tell him he had debated with the church? If so, we must throw back upon Mr. Listener Brother Frogge's anecdote of the little ox and locomotive, and say to him as the traveler did to the ox: we admire your courage but we pity your judgment.

It is true as our friend of the Advocate stated, there was a debate on baptism and church government, but this debate was entered into according to mutual agreement between the debaters, without the church having anything to do with it, either in saying what should be discussed or with whom discussions should be held. Every one regarded this as a voluntary act between the gentlemen friends' notions of agency here grew out of a remark of Brother Frogge who stated during the discussion that he was employed by the Elder to whip the Baptist. Now I suppose as Bro. F. considered it his province only to act in obedience to his superior (the Elder) that Bro. Taylor of course was under the restrictions and supervisions of his church even in this particular. But if our Methodist friends are so ignorant of Baptist liberties and Baptist republicanism, we would inform them that our preachers are amenable to our churches only for their conduct and doctrine. Bro. Taylor did not consult the church, neither did the church consult Bro. Taylor upon the subject of debate.

Again, says our Listener, (for we shall so denominate him), "The first proposition involved infant baptism, F. in the affirmative of course, and a more able defence of our views we have never heard." As to what the writer has heard, or what would be an able defence of infant baptism, we have no means of knowing. We have no means of knowing what would be an able defence of a system that carries to the cradle of unconscious infancy the shackles of creed and party, and imposes upon them a yoke which many of them in maturer years have wisely thrown off, a custom that is fast passing away before the light of Divine truth, and that must soon fall like Dagon before the Ark. Again, says our Listener: "Mr. F. was perfectly at home in the use of arguments from books, and had much that was new, all of which was presented in a manner both captivating and instructive." We have no doubt of friend F.'s being at home, but where his home was we will not stop to inquire; but we are sorry to say that it was not the dignified position of a Gospel minister contending for the faith once delivered to the Saints, as may be seen by presenting a few of those things called new—for instance, it was new to hear anecdotes presented as substitutes for arguments in a religious discussion. Of these we were favored with quite a number—such as Sally driving Richard under the bed with her broom-stick and could not get him out. This was new—it was new also to learn that Bro. F. regarded himself as Sally, calling Bro. Taylor "Richard." These things, with many others of a similar character, were all new to us, and according to our Listener were to many both captivating and instructive. If there were new arguments of any note, they have escaped the mind of the writer. We regard Bro. F.'s arguments as being simply those that have been used by pedo-baptists of past centuries, arguments that have a thousand times received their just deserts at the hands of the faithful exponent of Bible truth. Again, our Listener says: "It was not long until the people began to make tree use of a quaint remark of a shrewd lawyer who said, 'democracy there is no knowing which way a frog will jump.'" Delicacy would forbid our comparing Mr. F. to a frog, but if our Listener is disposed to do so, we make no issue; indeed we think his peculiar jumping from point to point, some times in one direction and some times in another, was a striking verification of all the lawyer may have said or thought about it. In these things Bro. F. may have possessed some advantages (if advantages they may be called) over Bro. Taylor, but surely a victory from such a source would hardly be claimed

by petty lawyers or designing politicians, much less a Christian debater. As to Mr. F. being more than Bro. Taylor's equal in some things, we admit he was, such as anecdotes that meant nothing, and sarcasms of which Bro. Taylor was incapable; but as to his being more than Bro. Taylor's equal in all that goes to make a good debater, we deny. But believing that Bro. Taylor needs no one to sound his fame, we will content ourselves by submitting these things to the public.

Again, says our Listener: "On the 21st morning, intelligence came that Bro. Taylor was sick." Right, Mr. Listener, he was very sick, and from what you say of Bro. Taylor being a man who has the confidence of his brethren, it was natural for them to regret his sickness. As for those "pale faces" of which you speak, we suppose they were seen through Methodist spectacles; and we cannot but think that if you thought as you should have done in your remark about Bro. Lamb, you would not have alluded to him as you did in the language of sacred prophecy.

Again: "Frogge let them know his debate was with the church, and that he could select another representative," &c. You are mistaken again, Mr. Listener, he did no such thing. Our arrangements were made in this particular before we had an interview with Bro. F. about who should supply the place of Bro. Taylor before we had appeared on the ground. We only wanted the sanction of Bro. F. in order to a renewal of the contest. Hence we say that your low whispers about what was to be done, was heard with ears that sympathized with your eye-sight. It is due Bro. Bennett to say that he entered the debate without a moment's preparation, and that he acquitted himself nobly in the discussion of both propositions, viz: "Baptism and Church Government."

Again, says our Listener: "Frogge led off again, Bro. Taylor having refused to affirm anything on the subject of baptism." True, Bro. Taylor led off, but not in consequence of Bro. Taylor refusing to affirm, as you say, anything upon the subject of baptism.

Our readers would infer from what Listener says that Bro. Taylor has become quite a Quaker at once, or that he had become panic-struck at the sight of this giant of Methodism, and was now ready to retreat from his ground. Worse and worse, Mr. Listener. Bro. Taylor proposed to affirm "that immersion in water is the action required in Gospel baptism." But Bro. Taylor of discipline. But Mr. Listener tells us that Bro. Frogge "smoothly glided into his subject and made a most beautiful speech." Well, Mr. Listener, if that is what you call smooth gliding, we have no disposition to enter your craft. Pray in what did its smoothness or beauty consist? In exhibiting the truths of the Bible in their simplicity? No; and that your soul very well knows. You well remember, sir, that Bro. Frogge spent quite a portion of this speech in ridiculing the Baptist as being allied with infidels, in opposition to the Bible—calling them the pretended friends of the Bible, &c., and made some quotations from Waller and Cone (not Cane, if you please), for the purpose of impressing his anti-Revision Methodist friends with the correctness of his assertions.

Again, says Listener: "Bro. Bennett soon convinced us that the character of the debate, hitherto remarkably pleasant, had to be changed." It is a great wonder, sir, that with powers so nicely discriminating as yours you did not make this discovery during the opening speech of your friend Frogge, unless you supposed that the Baptist would suffer themselves to be brow-beat and vilified without even making a proper resentment. Indeed, sir, it seems to be a part of your creed not to admit that anything coming from the lips of your worthy champion, could be too harsh to cram down the throats of Baptists. Speaking of Bro. Bennett's manner, you say: "I think no one ever displayed more uncouthness in a single speech." You had better go to your dictionary, Mr. Listener, and learn what uncouth means, and you will be better prepared to make the application. We notice, sir, a disposition on your part to give tone to your trumpeting by juggling in the gabble of by-standers, and it would seem that your attentive listening was more directed towards them than the subject in debate. Speaking of the sarcastic taunts of your orator, you say he told Bennett "if he persisted, &c." he "Frogge" would cut off ears," &c. A new way of boasting, reader. But Listener says, "A Doctor said: 'Gentlemen! he is healed right—he has already killed one chicken,' &c. As it is evident to all that this was the language of some Methodist chicken-fighter, we will let it pass, it carries its own coloring and will exhibit for itself. As an attentive listener, which you claim to be, we must say that your ears were miserably at fault, with memory equally treacherous, for we notice that every word uttered by Bro. Bennett of which the smallest advantage could be taken, including mistakes which often occur in the heat of debate, has undergone the ire of your scrutiny; for while you have taken particular pains to embellish with great glee the most buoyant sallies of your friend, you concluded that "Frogge's victory was, if possible, more triumphant than that of the former proposition." Thus having attacked your case in your own way, you reject your judgment seat, and like Harry Skyles, you dispose of the case according to your own wishes. Now, sir, I call you back to the tribunal of an intelligent public and require you to untidy that other ear that you have kept closed so carefully all this time, and I think your veracity will compel you to acknowledge that your worthy champion provoked many complaints from a disappointed congregation, who had become already disgusted at anecd-

otes so untruthful and so unbecoming an occasion as this. If we were to give the testimony of by-standers concerning this debate, as you have been wont to do, to our certain knowledge there are vast numbers who would say that Bro. Frogge, instead of regularly pursuing the point at issue, frequently made slight allusions to the arguments of Bro. Taylor, as if he intended to reply—these are some specimens about a great deal, as on a certain occasion, he said, "get up a Methodist laugh, and then turn to Bro. Bennett and tauntingly claim the victory. Among the many anecdotes presented by your friend F., the majority of which were evidently wanting in refinement, the following we have not yet forgotten: Bro. F., in disclaiming immersion, stated that he was by immersion like the old negro was once asked by a preacher, "Old boy, do you ever pray?" to which the old negro replied, "Lord bless your life massa, dis darky not guilty dat dark crime. Sir, this is the first time we heard a Gospel minister adopt the language of an infidel negro and say he was like him. Even your own brethren, who had been holding quite a jubilee over Mr. Bro. F.'s anecdotes, began to look as if they thought they had been laughing at the wrong time.—And yet they make up the gentlemanly debate, the triumphant victory! Well, take them with all their achievements, to such you are welcome. But as to our defence, we are proud to say, that like our cause, it did sustain as it ever has, that dignified, that firm and unshaken position that will ever sustain our bark amidst the storms of party contention. We are proud to say that in spite of all the sneers, taunts, vain boastings, or anecdotes from an illegitimate source, that Bro. Bennett could not be deceived from a position that well became him, in a religious discussion; and that he sustained himself to the entire satisfaction of all Methodists excepted. And thus ended the discussion of the second proposition with arguments on one side and incongruities on the other.

Third proposition: "That the form of church government as taught in the Discipline of the M. E. church South, is unscriptural and anti-republican." Bennett affirmed and Frogge denied. Mr. Listener in the Advocate has told us a great deal about the challenge of Bro. Frogge for some man to face the music, of "a certain unwillingness to engage, &c." The fact that these men, who are the people believed, are testimonials of more worth than columns of such boasting. But what says Mr. Listener in speaking of Bro. Frogge's effort upon this proposition: "O! he was weighty and powerful!" I wonder if he was. In what particular, Mr. Listener? In his abuse of the Baptist church, I suppose; it could have been in nothing else. Indeed the general impression with all (Methodists excepted) seems to be that if Bro. F. had been confined to the point at issue, policy would have dictated for him to have acted the part of Col. Crockett's Coon. The fact is, Bro. F.'s tottering bark did strand, a miserable wreck, on the craggy rocks of his own stormy shore, where he still lies, an object of pity to the public eye.

Again, Mr. Listener says: "Bro. Bennett had evidently studied our economy to poor profit." You are right, Mr. Listener. So far as Baptists are concerned they had as well study any other unscriptural invention, for all the profit that might arise from such a source. It is for your sakes, my Methodist brethren, that we have made your economy our study. In doing this, we have discovered your precarious position, we have heard the creaking of your crazy old ship as she totters in jeopardy on waves of republican revolutions. We invite you to come on board the old ship that has withstood the storms of persecution that raged in the days of your Protestant fathers; and as she rides in triumph, her banner shall be the breeze, waving the signals of "Union, Liberty, and Justice for all." In this was in perfect keeping with his entire effort. As to whether his brethren will endorse his buffoonery and parrot-like squeak the same, will of course depend upon their sense of delicacy. But we have too high an opinion of many of our Methodist brethren to believe they will do so, for many of them are far from endorsing Bro. Frogge's course in such things.

But Mr. Listener tell us that Bro. Frogge has written a book in reply to "Bro. Padgett's Three Reasons," that every one ought to read." So you think, no doubt, but perhaps the people think differently. How then? Well, we leave you and the people to decide this matter. But what next do we hear? Why, "Bro. Bennett displayed an amount of ignorance of our economy that I did not think any man in Kentucky had who possessed ordinary intelligence." It is well you drop you pen when you did, sir, for the self-deceiving tortures you seem to be making with increasing violence, incline us to think that most assassination was close at hand. Finally, Mr. L., to your language of economy, dedicated to the honor of Elder J. M. Taylor, we make no objections, we think he is worthy. Your language in regard to elder Austin seems to be somewhat infernal; but from the many mistakes you have made already, you had better cease.—Bro. Austin is of age and will speak for himself; if you do not believe it, you may just try him. With due respect and kind feelings for all, we subscribe ourselves, Yours truly, J. A. Gares, Editor.

P. S. The arguments of Bro. Bennett upon the last proposition, also the reply pronounced by him in his closing speech, will appear in a future publication.

Tennessee Baptist.
NASHVILLE, TENN.
SATURDAY, OCTO. 7, 1854.

NOTICE.
The Editor of the Tennessee Baptist, at Nashville, Tenn., is now receiving contributions for the year 1854, and is desirous of having them sent to him as early as possible.

"We must still ask indulgence from the part of correspondents, all will receive prompt attention when the Editor is again seated in his chair. He has stood to his post long and faithfully, and his absence, at this time, could not well have been avoided. We expect he will resume his pen again after our next issue, and hope the account he may render will be satisfactory to all."

"Journalism."

Under this head the editor of the "Gospel Banner," a Tennessee paper published at St. Louis, expatiates at great length, evidently in pursuit of his favorite idol, familiarity called noteworthiness, and in order to appear before the public with more than usual pomp he assumes the office of umpire between the editor of this paper and A. Campbell, and evidently takes great pleasure in seeing Mr. Campbell's "assurances" that he does not endorse Mr. Graves. The editor of the Banner puts in mind of a certain character described in a Main Tale, who received a severe flogging for presuming to wear a garment that did not belong to him. But we are not in the least surprised at our young aspirant, after witnessing his laughable efforts to exhibit himself in full costume while attending the Revision Association recently held in Nashville. We think that all who saw him at that time will be fully prepared to account for his present gigantic dimensions. We would advise the "young man" of the Banner to recall that very weighty advice he gave to the venerable Agent of the Revision Association, respecting the "dangerous and unspectacular practice of Baptists communing with Campbellites." It would be a catastrophe, if in his endeavor to save the Agent from the vortex of Campbellism, our "young man" should himself be swallowed up in the same whirlpool. His neighbor of the Presbyterian says "he is a young man and may learn much yet." That he is young is evident—that he will ever learn much is doubtful.

We presume the Agent above referred to would be not a little surprised to learn that the Campbellites are actively engaged in extending the circulation of the paper edited by his would be teacher. Now all these things may appear in their proper place when viewed through our "young man's" kaleidoscope, but to an unassisted vision they must look peculiarly doubtful. Probably on the editor's return he will call for the *per diem* of his efficient judge.

A Deed of Doubtful Morality.

"H," the Memphis editor of the Tennessee Baptist, in the last number of that paper has published two articles as from our pen, in full quotation marks and with our editorial signature—which we never wrote!! An intelligent brother, just now in our room, having written a letter to the Editor of the Tennessee Baptist, published such sentiments. We told him we had not. He examined them again and remarked, "Well perhaps 'H' intended only to be witty; but this looks very much like forgery; it is even worse than his plagiarism. Such proceedings will disgrace the ministry."—Western Recorder.

The Recorder seems to be in a bad way just now. From our very soul we pity him. It is painful to see a great mind wandering in darkness, unable to see the difference between truth and error, right and wrong. May the obscurity be but temporary. When he gets the beam out of his own eye, he will see clearly to take the mote out of his brother's eye. The Recorder before us contains several singular statements. We hardly know how to account for them; perhaps they are owing to inattention or to a poor memory. We will suppose so at least.

"The Memphis editor of the Tennessee Baptist" has published two articles as from our pen in full quotation marks, and with our editorial signature—which we never wrote. The Memphis editor did not do such thing. He wrote a parody on two articles of the Recorder, supposing that they might have been "written two thousand years ago," by some old editor, who was opposed to the doctrine of the first advent of Christ. True we used the language of the Recorder, with some alterations to adapt it to the supposed age. No intelligent reader could have misunderstood the import of the articles and supposed that we meant to ascribe them to the Recorder. Our introductory explanations were sufficient to prevent such a mistake. As to the quotation marks, we used them to show that the language was borrowed, and that the articles were taken from a supposed "old parchment." The editorial signature used by our ancient editor was intended, we suppose, to indicate the *starry brilliancy* of his production. We really regret that we should have nettled our worthy brother of the Recorder. We only intended to show that he was treading in the footsteps of his "illustrious predecessors," that his ponderous and unanswerable arguments were anticipated "a long time ago," on a kindred subject. We sincerely hope our brother will forgive our offense, and not charge us with "forgery." We meant no harm; indeed we did not.

As to the advice so gravely given, we shall be likely to appreciate it when the star editor either improves his memory, or learns to make statements in accordance with facts. We refer to the article headed, "The Plagiarism Confessed." There may be found alarming indications of spiritual morality, or we would rather say a very defective memory. "Charity thinketh no evil." But one thing is certain, allusion is made to a certain editorial as having been written before the occurrence of some painful events in our history. Not so. The editorial was written after the alleged time. The article in this paper that called out that scurrilous editorial of the Recorder, was not printed all the way through, and we were not able to call this with other statements, the deed of doubtful morality, but we will not. We would rather call it a mistake, or a forgery, or any thing rather than a willful deception.

The Design of Christ's Second Coming.

NUMBER NINE.

We have yet much to say on the Design of Christ's Second Coming, as revealed in the Scriptures, but for the sake of carrying conviction to the minds of our readers, and persuading them to heartily embrace these great Bible truths, we shall occupy the present number with what we conceive to be the Scriptural doctrine of the future judgment. The judgment day is often a theme of pulpit declamation. It is a favorite topic on great occasions, with brethren who are highly gifted with elocutionary powers, a vivid fancy, and a memory well stored with fragments of poetry. The awful scenes of the judgment, are frequently described with wonderful skill and power, and make indelible impressions on the minds of the hearers. Such discourses as we commonly hear contain much truth; but we fear that this truth is often encountered with much error, and falls infinitely below the whole truth as made known in God's word.

The general impression is, that the day of judgment is a literal day of twenty-four hours, or at the best a very short period; that all the dead and living shall simultaneously stand at the bar of God; that all shall be eternally divided into two classes; that one class shall be taken up to heaven, and the other class be driven into "outer darkness;" and that the "earthly history of man shall be closed forever by the configuration of the globe. We believe that this is a comprehensive and fair, though brief, outline of the common theory of the judgment, as advocated by most preachers and held by the generality of their hearers.

Millennarians, however, believe that the day of judgment is a period of dispensation running through centuries, in which Christ will exercise judicial, legislative, and executive authority; that this period will be ushered in by the visible, personal coming of Christ—that all who died in the Lord will be raised, and that the saints then living will be transformed and glorified, "in the twinkling of an eye," and will reign with Christ during the millennial or judgment period; that living apostate and anti-christian nations and churches, will be overwhelmed with terrible destruction; that the Jews, God's ancient covenant people, will be restored to their own land, and converted to their long rejected Messiah; and that through their instrumentality whole nations among the Gentiles will be converted, and form, with the Jews, the subjects of the kingdom of God, over whom Christ and his bride, i. e. the glorified saints, will reign in righteousness; that Satan will be imprisoned and denied access to the nations; and that at the close of the judgment period all the wicked dead will be raised and judged according to the deeds done in the body, and with Satan and his hosts shall receive their final doom; and then shall be ushered in that glorious and eternal state when the kingdom shall be delivered up to the Father, and God shall be all in all. This is a comprehensive outline of the day of dispensation of judgment, and is not designed to bring all the details into view.

By what means, it may be asked, are Millennarians led to take a view of the judgment that is so much more comprehensive than that which is given in the Scriptures? The instructions of the Bible are not confined to a few, isolated passages, but they are exceedingly numerous. Some passages refer to the judgment as a whole, some refer to separate facts or events, some refer to one circumstance and some to another; but when all are brought together, their details examined and compared, and every part takes its proper place, they raise the mind far above the common view, and produce the most thrilling impression of the vastness of God's purpose, the grandeur of the Messiah's kingdom, and the completeness and comprehensiveness of the economy of redemption. If our readers will take up a good reference Bible, and compare Scripture with Scripture on this subject—examine every passage in the Old and New Testaments that describes the events of "the day of the Lord," they will feel the force of what we say as they have never felt it before. We commend this exercise to all, but especially to our brethren in the ministry.

The attentive reader of the Bible will find that the judgment is called by different titles, as "that day," "the day of the Lord," "the day of judgment," "the great day of God," "the great day of wrath," "the day of vengeance," "the year of our redemption," and the like. The frequent use of the term "day," has led many to believe that a period of twenty-four hours, or a very short space of time is meant. By attending, however, to the *usage* of the prophets, and the specific character of their descriptions of the day of judgment, we find that they could not have meant a literal day, as many suppose. The word day is sometimes used prophetically, to mean a year, as by Daniel, Ezekiel, and others. It is sometimes used to denote an indefinite period of time—a series of years or ages possessing the same general characteristics.

Christ called the period of his personal ministry "a day," lamenting that the Jews had not known that their day the things which make for their peace. Luke 19: 42. The period of forty years, during which the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness, was called a day—"the day of temptation."—Heb. 3: 13, 15. And the Apostle Paul called the gospel dispensation a day, saying, "now is the accepted time, and to day is the day of salvation."—2 Cor. 6: 2.

The Old Testament Prophets, "use the emphatic phrases, 'In that day,' 'the day of the Lord,' to denote the judgment period, though not according to the commonly received opinion. They evidently regarded 'that day' as a season or dispensation during which the most wonderful events would occur." There are some exceptions to this use of the term, but attention to the subject or context will show to what period the sacred writer applied it. Our limits will not admit of many references, but we urge our readers to look for examples of the use of the term, in Zechariah 12: 14, Isaiah 24: 24, etc. We think a careful examination of the Scriptures will convince any one who is not hopelessly wedded to a preconceived opinion, that "the day of judgment," or "day of the Lord," is a long period or dispensation, the commencement of which is

signaled by the personal advent of the Son of God, the resurrection and transformation of his saints, and the close of which is signified by the resurrection and final doom of the wicked dead, whilst the intervening period is filled up with the most wonderful events of the Messiah's personal administration.

If this is a correct view of the day of judgment, we may well suppose, that "the Judge of all the earth" will exercise other functions than that of merely examining character, and deciding upon the destinies of the righteous and wicked. Hence we find in Scripture that the office of a judge is not merely to hold an assize, but to deliver the people, to take vengeance on their enemies, to rule and exercise all the functions of kingly authority. The attentive reader of the Bible will find that the words *to reign* and *to judge* are often used interchangeably. "Say among the heathen the Lord reigneth; he shall judge the people righteously." "He cometh, he cometh to judge the world with righteousness and the people with his truth." Ps. 96: 10, 13.

"The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; thou dost establish equity; thou executest judgment and righteousness in Jacob." Ps. 99: 1, 4. "O let the nations be glad and sing for joy; for thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon the earth." Ps. 98: 9. "Behold a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment upon the earth with righteousness and equity, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness." Jer. 23: 5. "For the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Law-giver, the Lord is our King; he will save us." Isaiah 33: 22. We give one more passage. "We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead that they should be judged," &c. Rev. 11: 17, 18. These are but specimens of the manner in which the words "reign" and "judge" are used. They show that the office of a judge in Scripture, is "to rule and govern—to protect and bless, as well as to adjudicate and punish." Keeping this in view, there can be no difficulty in understanding the many previsions that relate to the kingly and judicial authority of Jesus Christ. "He is our Judge, our Law-giver, our King." These offices all meet in our Messiah, and are exercised at the same time. And according to the prophetic Scriptures, they will be gloriously exercised during the judgment period; for "the Lord shall be King over all the earth;" he shall judge among the nations; and "out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Much light will be thrown upon this whole subject, by comparing the passages of the New Testament, that relate to the judgment with those of the Old Testament. The New Testament writers were thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Old Testament, and were in the habit of using its phraseology and imagery. If we would understand God's will and become familiar with his great purposes, we must read both Testaments; for they form but one revelation. Let this course be pursued on this intensely interesting and important question, which heretofore has cherished nothing but confused, vague, and uncertain notions of the whole subject. Will the reader open his Bible and compare John 5: 22, 27, with Jer. 23: 20; Matt. 24: 30, with Dan. 7: 13, 14; Rev. 1: 5, with Zechariah 12: 10-14? Compare Rev. 14: 14-20, with Isaiah 63: 1-6; Joel 3: 1, 2, 13; 14, Rev. 19: 11-21, with Eze. 38, 39, chaps. The examination of these Scriptures as advised, will show the inestimable advantage of this method of study. Not only so, it will show that "the day of the Lord" extends through centuries, during which our Messiah will manifest his glory in this guilt-stricken world, extirpate all evil, "destroy all the works of the devil," extend his sovereign rule over his recovered empire, decide the eternal destiny of all earth's vast population, and survey with infinite delight the finished work of redemption.

No wonder "the day of the Lord" was so dear to the hearts of God's people in former times; it was the object of their fondest hopes; the period not only of their glory, but the glory of their Redeemer; the appointed time for the establishment of his everlasting kingdom, the vindication of his claims, and the confusion and dismay of his enemies.

And if Christians now would embrace with all their hearts the Bible doctrine of a future judgment, they too would "love the appearing of Jesus Christ, and would pray, hope, look, watch and long for 'that day.'"

Preamble and Resolutions.

WHEREAS, Mr. Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Virginia, has in the August number of the "Millennial Harbinger," implicated many ministers of our denomination, and whereas, he has withheld their names, leaving us to conjecture who they may be, who are fraternalizing with him and condemning Brother J. R. Graves, therefore,

Resolved, That we deem the course thus alleged against some of our ministers, traitorous to our denomination and particularly to the cause of truth.

Resolved, That in our judgment, Mr. Campbell's writings are self-contradictory, and dangerous because erroneous.

Resolved, That we highly approve the course pursued by Brother J. R. Graves towards Mr. Campbell and his heresies.

Resolved, That we earnestly request Brother Graves to publish in pamphlet or book form, the series of letters or articles written on Campbellism when completed.

Resolved, That we do cordially endorse the "Tennessee Baptist" as an able and faithful exponent of Baptist principles.

Resolved, That the above preamble and resolutions be signed by the Moderator and Clerk and forwarded to the "Tennessee Baptist" for publication.

M. BALL, Moderator.

W. J. RIDDLE, Clerk.

Some men are called sagacious, merely on account of their avarice; whereas a child can catch its first moment it is born—

Thoughts on Christian Duty, No. 9.

GROWTH IN GRACE.

Growth in grace is a phrase which denotes the progress the Christian makes in the divine life. That the doctrine of growing in grace is taught in the Scriptures the following passages clearly indicate: "The righteous shall hold on their way, and he that hath clear hands shall grow stronger and stronger." "The path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." "All the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." We read in the apostolic epistles of faith growing exceedingly, of hope abounding, of love increasing, and of patience having its perfect work. Wherever this is the case there is growth in grace. It should be remembered that growth in grace implies a symmetrical development of christian character. None of the graces of the spirit are so strengthened as to enfeeble others; but here is proportional improvement in all. The thrifty plant or the vigorous tree grows in all its parts. The well-formed body exhibits harmonious proportions in all its various members. So in those who grow in grace the elements of christian character are mingled in beautiful proportion. While they make attainments in knowledge, their zeal becomes more ardent, their hope assumes new vigor, their humility is deepened, their patience is rendered more thorough, and they are richly adorned with all the virtues which constitute the ornament of saints. This is the divine arrangement, and it is an admirable one. For knowledge, disconnected from faith and love, would be merely speculative—it would "puff up," but could not edify. Faith without knowledge would degenerate into blind credulity. Love and zeal, undirected from their appropriate connections, would result in enthusiasm and fanaticism. Indeed, it may be said of every christian grace that if separated from its kindred graces, it would be divested of much of its beauty and loveliness.

I fear the doctrine of growth in grace is very imperfectly exemplified in most modern professors of religion. How many appear more devout at their entrance on the christian course than ever afterwards! How many run well for a time, and then move with so tardy a step as scarcely to advance at all! And others seem to be stationary, while others still make an apparent retrogradation. Reader, are you growing in grace? Say not this question would suit your neighbor. It is intended for you. Revolve it in your mind every day till you can give it an affirmative answer. If you are not growing in grace, what scriptural hope can you entertain of heavenly glory? Perhaps you would like to have some of the evidences of growth in grace pointed out. I will name the following:

1. *Increasing hatred of sin.* It is characteristic of all christians that they hate sin, but in their hatred are many degrees. The hatred of some is much more intense than that of others. Why is sin hateful to christians? Because the obliquities of their moral vision have been so corrected as to enable them to see things in some degree as they are. Sin is seen to it will be born again. There is no change in sin, but the change is in the subject of regenerating grace. There is a new moral taste, and there is a new moral vision, the taste resulting from the vision. If this be so, the more acute the vision the more acute the taste, and the more acute the taste the deeper the hatred of sin. There are degrees in the acuteness of moral vision. All christians see sin where other christians do not—not and God beholds it, where no angelic eye can discern its existence, because in him is exemplified an infinitely perfect moral vision. It follows then that the more acute our moral vision is, the more we are like God, and the more we are like God the more we hate sin. Hence an increasing hatred of sin is one of the best evidences of growth in grace. Our spiritual state may always be determined by the depth of our abhorrence of sin.

2. *Deadness to the world.* Christians cannot love the world supremely, but they may love it inordinately. There are many illustrations of this inordinate attachment. Now as the spirit of christianity and the spirit of the world are directly opposite, it is manifest that growth in grace implies an increasing indifference to, and contempt of the world. Paul was crucified to the world. Crucifixion was a lingering death. The point which the believer's crucifixion to the world has reached, is the point he has reached in his growth in grace. What say you, christian reader? Are you becoming dead to the world, to its honors, its riches and pleasures?

3. *A deep sense of personal unworthiness.* Job was growing in grace when an exhibition of the glory of the divine character caused him to say: "Behold I am vile: I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." Isaiah was advancing in the divine life, when a contrast of his imperfect character with the perfect character of God led him to exclaim: "Woe is me! for I am undone! I am a man of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of Hosts." Paul was rapidly ascending the summit of christian excellence when, with inimitable modesty he said: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given." Growth in grace promotes humility, and humility arises from a sense of personal unworthiness; and hence this sense of unworthiness is an evidence of growth in grace.

4. *Tenderness of conscience.* Many professed christians, I am sorry to say, do not exemplify this tenderness of conscience. They do not say many things from which the sensibilities of a tender conscience would revolt. And why? Because they are not christians! I do not so say. But because they are not growing in grace. Those who grow in grace, having tender consciences, are afraid of sin. They do not lay claim to perfection. They sometimes, yes, they often sin. Conscience condemns them in proportion to its tenderness, and they feel the deepest grief on account of their deviation from the path of holiness. Tenderness of conscience is an invaluable possession and indicates growth in grace.

5. *A disposition to forgive injuries and do good to enemies.* These are duties which to the unawakened professor are very unimportant of performance. They come directly into contact with the impulses of human nature. It is natural to retaliate injuries and to do evil to those that hate us. When divine grace enables us so to subdue the propensities of our nature as cheerfully to forgive those who trespass against us, and do good to those that hate us, we may know that we are growing in grace. We are becoming more like God who delights in the exercise of forgiving mercy, and makes his enemies the recipient of ten thousand blessings.

6. *An increasing love of communion with God in secret prayer.* We take delight in holding intercourse with those we love. The throne of grace is one of the places at which God permits his people to take communion with himself. The guilty backslider is ashamed and afraid to draw near to God—the warm-hearted christian comes into his presence with delight, and communes with him at the mercy-seat. Those who are growing in grace would not for all the wealth of the world be deprived of the privilege of secret prayer. Such deprivation they would consider a most grievous calamity. If their access to the throne of grace was cut off they would be wretched indeed. Reader, do you love to

promote the cause and the glory of God, by a mortifying truth that christians sometimes become indifferent to the interests of the cause of God. They can see Zion languish without any special sorrow—they can see her prosper without any special joy. They are at ease—in a state of guilty apathy. They are not zealous for the divine glory. They can see God dishonored and their hearts are not broken by the sight. They can see his glory tarnished and their spirits are not stirred within them. I need not say that the doctrine of growth in grace is not illustrated in such christians. Those who are advancing in the divine life ardently love the cause of God, and desire above all things the promotion of his glory. The honor of God is dearer to them than all other objects. Hence they evince a cheerful readiness to do any thing they can do to promote the cause and the glory of God. Verbal expressions of attachment to this cause do not satisfy them. They must do something, and will do something to subserve its advancement. They do not think it sufficient to say in words that they desire the divine glory—they prove their sincerity by acting with a view to its promotion. In short those who are growing in grace regard religion not as a nominal thing, but as a reality of transcendent importance. They have in their souls the power of godliness and they are a peculiar people.

Reader, in view of these evidences of growth in grace, are you growing in grace? Is your path like that of the just, shining brighter and brighter? Are you forgetting the things that are behind—reaching to those before—and thus pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus? I pray you examine the matter. Be not satisfied with "a name that you live" while you are comparatively dead. Bow down before God, and ask him that you may grow in grace until the day comes when grace shall fill us up.

AMERICAN BIBLE UNION, 350 BROOME ST., New York, Sept. 20, 1854.

MY DEAR BROTHER:—The following letter has this day been received by me from our beloved Brother OKEN:

HAMBURG, 1st Sept. 1854.

MY DEAR BROTHER:—After a prosperous and pleasant passage across the Atlantic and German Ocean, I arrived here most recruited in my health on the 25th of August. The joy experienced in meeting, after so long an absence from my beloved family, and the dear people of my charge, words cannot describe; I am lost in wonder, love and praise, in reviewing all the way which the Lord has led me, during my long, hazardous and laborious journey.

Oh, to grace how great a debtor,
Daily I'm constrained to be!
Let thy grace, Lord, like a fetter
Bind my wandering heart to thee!

I trust the Lord's goodness will not be lost upon me and mine, but that it will tend to lead me to walk more humbly with my God, and to devote myself more unreservedly to his cause.

The field is widening before us on every hand, and we shall require all the aid you can render us through the medium of the American Bible Union. The first edition of the School Bible, published at the expense of the Bible Union, is so far circulated that not an unbound copy is left at the depot. A second edition is under the press, and to-day or tomorrow I shall be under the necessity of drawing on Dea. Colgate, at least for a part of the two thousand five hundred dollars promised on the 1st of October. But of our wants, &c. I will (the Lord willing) write more fully after our Triennial Conference, which commences on the 12th inst. In the mean time, you will know that we want all the aid the friends of the Bible Union can render us.

I love you, my dear Brother, and feel under lasting obligations for the great kindness you have shown me. I could fain wish to continue. But, for the present, farewell! With affectionate regard,

Yours, in the best of bonds,

J. G. OKEN.

The Board of the Bible Union, having paid to him on the 1st of June, \$2,500 of the \$10,000 promised, has pledged a second payment of \$2,500 by the 1st of October. A considerable part of the latter sum is still to be collected, and as the Board has imposed upon me the duty to complete the amount, I hereby earnestly and affectionately request you, and the church with which you are connected, to aid us in this glorious work. As I cannot call upon you in person, please to take the business in hand yourself, and remit whatever funds you can raise, to Wm. H. WYCKOFF, the Corresponding Secretary of the American Bible Union.

Wm. H. WYCKOFF, Agent.

True glory consists in doing what deserves to be written in writing what deserves to be read, and in so living as to make the world happier and better for our living in it.

New Albany, Miss., Sept. 2, 1854.

BROTHER GRAVES:—The church at this place some time since invited Brother Sledge, of Oxford, in this state, to visit them and preach a few days here; he made it convenient to do so, and was here four days, commencing on Saturday last. When written to, he was supposed to him, that it might perhaps be well to preach one discourse on revision. It was, however, noised abroad that Brother Sledge was going to preach a series of sermons on Revision and Baptism. Mr. Ford, the circuit-elder, and preacher "in charge," it seems wrote to his Brother H. F. Morrison, who is a "legal" preacher, to be present on an occasion, for the purpose of taking notes and replying to Mr. Sledge, who did accordingly make his appearance.

Bro. Sledge was, on his arrival, informed that a Methodist minister had been sent for, and was here to answer him. So, after he had preached his first sermon, which was on Saturday, from "By grace are ye saved," &c., which was, indeed, quite an able effort, he stated what he had been informed, and that if it was the case, that any person present desired to answer him, that he would be happy to meet him; and if so, he preferred making with him some definite arrangements. Mr. Morrison went to Bro. Sledge and told him that he had been written to, and was here for that purpose. That evening they met, and agreed to discuss Monday or seven questions, to commence on at that time deferring the other two days only, questions till Tuesday after the third day of the month; at this time to occupy but two days—then, five. Moderators were chosen, and on Monday morning, in the presence of a large audience, the first question was read, about as follows:

"The common (King James') version of the Scriptures in the English language, is a revision, and the modern revision enterprise is competent to effect said revision." Bro. Sledge affirmed, Mr. Morrison denied.

Bro. Sledge's opening speech was the first effort made in this neighborhood in behalf of this noble enterprise; and previous to his visit among us, many had thought but little upon the subject, while others had been under, and influenced by, incompetent counselors; so his friends were scarce, but now greatly on the increase; and it is most truly the case, as was remarked by an "anti" brother, that the visit to this place by Brother Sledge, has caused every body to think and talk about revision.

It is out of my power to give even a synopsis of the discussion, that would be very interesting, because I could do neither of the gentlemen full justice.

Bro. Sledge took the ground that our present version is a good one, compared to all its predecessors, but not so good as it can be made. He reviewed the history of the English Bible, commencing with the labors of Tyndale, and how he suffered death for what he had done, &c., showing conclusively that revision had been practiced from Tyndale's day to this. He read from Buck, Dr. Clarke, Doddridge, and other learned men, showing that a revision of our present copy, was desired by them in their day. King James' Bible, he asserted, is not the Bible that God gave to men—it is the word of God, said he, so far as it is a faithful translation, and no farther. Our Pedobaptist friends have found, and corrected, as they tell us, twenty-four thousand errors. Many are alarmed at the idea of a revision of the Scriptures, not calling to mind that revision has been the order of the day, from the time of Tyndale till now. Others fear it will be a sectarian work. Why, my friends, said he, if the proposed revision is made, by seven or eight different denominations engaged in it, is subject to that objection, what may be said of King James' Bible? Were not those who gave it to us all Pedobaptists, and all Episcopalians, without a single exception?

Then, if you are to oppose the present movement because its work will be sectarian, why upon the same principle you should oppose the version we now use, eight times over. My friends, God intended his truth to be given to men, yes, his whole truth; and he has intrusted his servants to write his words "verbal and literal." But they have not all been so written. A portion of his truth is covered up in the original—never has been translated, and he adopted the language of CARSON, that "it is right to withhold one part of the Bible, it is right to withhold all."

Why, friends, said he, on the day of Pentecost, Peter translated the word into many languages; thus, we have divine precedent for it. God has never authorized his word to be written but very plainly. He then showed many grammatical errors, and in several instances where the truth was perverted. Read from a copy which made Christ a malefactor with those crucified with him.

Mr. Morrison appeared on the stand. He would not defend the Bible which made Christ a malefactor. Bro. Sledge having remarked, that Tyndale was a Baptist, and his translation a good one for his day, and the many adverse circumstances surrounding him. Mr. Morrison hoped his friend would stick to Tyndale, and attempted to argue, that if we had a good translation, we should be satisfied. If we had a good Bible then, I would, said he, be in favor of a translation. Those dissenting voices noticed by Mr. Sledge, said he, are met with by Greek scholars. We only want an English Bible, and we have it here, (slapping the book,) on the stand.

My friend has often preached from it. If it is so the pure word of God, why did he do it? God knows better than any man, or set of men, whether or not it is his word. He has blessed it, which he would not have done had it not been. The word of God is pure, said he, and cannot be contaminated. Our learned men tell us, our present version is clean upon all points essential to salvation. It is not every man who professes to be a Greek scholar that can translate. We have no critics who are able to do such a piece of work as the revisors are promising the people. The word before the present version, continued Mr. Morrison, was "spurious," consequently revision was called for. God has worked under this book. He knows whether or not it is his word. He would not own and bless it, if it is not so. He says we have precedents for revision; yes, and so we have precedents for all the crimes that have been committed. It would be, said Mr. M., a poor plea indeed, for a criminal to set up at the bar, that he had been

precedent to for murder, and therefore he was guiltless, &c. &c. I say no man can understand all the Bible. If it were so, the infidel would say it is nothing more than a cunningly devised fable. My friend says that there has been discovered and corrected by the American and Foreign Bible Society 24,000 errors. If so, there cannot be much left undone; but in what did they consist? Why, in dots and marks and italics. Could you not, my friends, continued Mr. M., understand a word as well in italics as in Roman letters? When we get, my friends, a new Bible, it will be human work, and the infidel will use it against the word of God.

I want you to have the true word of God. I am not going to oppose that. Mr. Morrison introduced the letter from Amity Street Church, New York, written by Mr. Williams, to prove that no revision should take place. He read a sentence at a time, and commented on it, and enforced its objection. Here his time expired.

I shall not attempt to follow the speakers through the remainder of the discussion upon this proposition. Suffice it to say, that Bro. Sledge's reply was completely triumphant. All that had been said by his opponent seemed to be as chaff before a mighty wind.

The next day, Tuesday, was taken up in discussing the following proposition: "The Scriptures teach, that Baptism is a prerequisite to communion in the Lord's Supper." Bro. Sledge affirmed.

I shall not attempt a synopsis of their arguments, in order that I may bring this communication to a close. I am satisfied that all intelligent and unprejudiced auditors could discover enough but quite a negative side of the proposition.

It so happened, that on Tuesday Mr. Morrison's class-lecture was present, and we were somewhat amused at a remark we understood he should have made at recess. I have, said he, listened to Bro. Morrison one hour, in reply to Mr. Sledge, and he has done what few others would have done. He has not, in my opinion, said he, answered the first argument of his opponent.

In answer to the question, whether or not this debate met with the approbation of his people, the class-leader replied that it did not; that, if they desired a debate, Bro. Morrison was not the man to conduct it; that they were not willing to regard him as an exponent of the doctrines of the Methodist Church.

After the debate closed in the evening, Bro. Sledge remarked, that, if this debate was to be continued, as at first contemplated, that he and others should regard his opponent as an exponent of the doctrines and practices of the Methodist E. Church South; and if Mr. Morrison's friends refused to regard him as such, that he (Sledge) could not further prosecute the debate with him, which brought to the floor the class-leader above referred to, who made substantially the same statements as above given. After which, the question, whether the debate should be continued or not, was put to the audience, and decided it should not be continued.

We suppose this conclusion was caused by the contrast in the abilities of the disputants. That that was the cause why some desired it come to a close, there is no doubt. When we listen to a discussion, it is for the purpose not only that the truth may be vindicated and set clearly before the people, but that we may be edified also; and when one of the parties fails to support himself from want of ability, why it weakens, in some considerable degree, the interest that would otherwise be felt. Such was the case in this debate.

Yours, truly, X. Y.

Eighth Annual Report of the Southern Board.

MARION, ALA., Sept. 2, 1854.

DEAR BROTHER GRAVES:—This interesting Report from April 1853 to April 1854, I have just read, and with great pleasure. Much is doing by the Baptists in aiding weak and destitute portions of our Southern field in giving the preached word to our own people; and much, much more is to be done.

Our cities and towns must be aided—brethren of the country churches must aid in strengthening our towns

Thrilling Incident.

At a few days since, Mr. Davenport of Shelbyville, Tenn., went down into a well which he was engaged in digging, and the negro who remained at the mouth of the well became alarmed at his groans and ran to the street crying out that a man was dying in the well. A young gentleman happened to be passing at the moment and instantly ran to the well, pulled off his coat and climbed down by the curbing till within about ten feet of the bottom, when he encountered the stream of poisonous air which had broken into the well, and finding he was likely to fall, jumped to the ground. He found Mr. D. apparently dead, and immediately made a rope of chain fast around the lifeless body which was drawn up by people who had assembled at the well. Scarcely had he done this, however, when he became unconscious and sank to the ground. Those about the mouth of the well finding that the body drawn up though seemingly dead, showed some faint signs of remaining vitality, were busily engaged in endeavoring to restore the suspended animation, forgetting for the time that some one had gone into the well, and it was not till Physicians had been sent for and several had arrived with a crowd of the citizens, and the first object of their anxiety had begun to breathe again that they were reminded (probably by the negro) that a young man, a stranger, had gone down to rescue this man and was now, doubtless, a corpse in the bottom of the well. What could be done? Who was there brave enough now that the danger was fully known to venture into the very jaws of death? They let down a light, but it was instantly extinguished. They threw down burning shavings, but they only filled the pit with suffocating smoke. Meantime the question was asked again and again who was it that went down? No one could answer till a lady present, exercising her woman's wit, caught up his coat and pulled some papers from the pocket. They were notes of a sermon. The young man was the newly chosen Baptist preacher, Mr. Faulkner, a man who has in a few weeks won the hearts of his people in a most remarkable degree, and whose promise of future usefulness has seldom been equaled. When this was known there was a silent pause. No one would venture into the well; but among the Physicians who had gathered at the first alarm was Dr. Barksdale, a Deacon in the Baptist church, of which Mr. Faulkner is pastor, and at whose hospitable mansion the young man made his home. He instantly stripped and prepared to enter. In answer to the remonstrances of friends who felt that he was descending to almost certain death, he said, "This young man is a stranger—he is residing under my roof—I am in a degree responsible for his life. I will at least try to save him though I die in the attempt. They let him down, but the suffocating vapor mixed with the smoke, compelled him to desist for a time. He was drawn up, got some fresh air, waited till the smoke had subsided a little and then went down again. He passed a chain round the body but could not fasten it for want of a little stick to pass through a link to lock it. They threw down stick after stick, but the poison had taken hold on his brain—his head reeled, his breath failed and he could not find them; he could only call out that he was dying. They drew him up and laid him apparently dead beside the other. He soon revived, however, and explained in what condition he had left the young man. Mr. Griffith, a strong minded and strong bodied mechanic and most worthy citizen, volunteered to go down, carrying with him a suitable stick to fasten the chain around the body. The work was quickly done and he was drawn back without having suffered any very great inconvenience. When Mr. Faulkner was drawn up, after he had been in the well more than an hour, he was apparently gone past all hope, but the anxious and persevering efforts of his friends, aided by the best medical skill, were blessed at length to his recovery. Life came slowly back and he is now, though still feeble, able to walk about. In a few days he will probably be as well as ever. The others are also all doing well.

Bro. Ford, junior editor of the Western Review, was present, and preached a most excellent discourse on Saturday night, which was highly praised by the brethren who heard it.

Bro. J. M. Bennett, in the introductory sermon, which he preached by previous appointment, took a strong and decided stand in favor of what would call "Baptist Exclusiveness." His discourse was the occasion of a good deal of remark, and we hope may elicit further thought and earnest action. It is time for Baptists to awake to a full sense of their responsibility, not only as Christians, but as Baptists. Baptists have a great and peculiar work to do, which can only be done by Baptists, and which none can do so well as American Baptists. Let us be prudent; let us be kind; let us be genuine and loving like our Saviour, but as he was so let us be uncompromising and fearless advocates of the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as we find it in the Book. But I forget myself. I set out to tell what Bethel Association, or rather the brethren connected with that Association, (for it is as individuals and as church members that we expect them to act,) are likely to do for the Bible, and I was near getting into a disquisition (suggested by Bro. Bennett's sermon) on the duties of Baptists generally. May we not expect that when the other Associations of Kentucky have paid the obligations which they have already assumed to the Northern Bible Societies, they will feel the propriety and yield themselves to the privilege of contributing the funds which they can give for Bible purposes through their natural and proper organs, the Board of the Southern Convention?

We hope in the course of the coming year to be able to visit that noble State again. We were delighted with this brief visit to Kentucky.

O. D. DAYTON.

Brother Graves:—The Liberty Association has just closed one of the most harmonious sessions I have ever witnessed in any body. The general amount of business was transacted, as you will see when our minutes appear. There was a resolution offered and passed without a dissenting voice, expressive of the sentiments of the delegation in reference to your course in the vindication of truth against Reformers (so called), and especially as it regards the present controversy now going on between you and A. Campbell. One thing I think is certain, i. e., there is not a minister in the Liberty Association that has one particle of sympathy for the Rev. gentleman from Virginia. When you see our minutes you will see our general proceedings.

I have resigned the care of the church in this place, and my future destination is yet undetermined. I will in future give directions for the Baptist.

Your brother, etc.,

D. B. HALL.

The Bible Cause and the Bethel Association.

This large and efficient body of Baptists met at Russellville, Kentucky, on the Saturday before the fourth Sabbath in September. The attendance of delegates was tolerably full, and the meeting one of great interest. The hospitality of the citizens was largely taxed in consequence of the meeting of the Louisville Methodist Conference occurring at the same time and place; but, notwithstanding this and the withering drouth, which had destroyed the products of the gardens, there was a most abundant and generous provision for the comfort of all.

On Saturday, pending the adoption of the report of the committee on the Bible Cause, the Corresponding Secretary of the Southern Bible Board, who was present, was cordially invited to address the Association. The brethren seemed deeply interested in our condition and our plans, and many of them showed not only willingness, but an earnest and heartfelt determination to aid us to the extent of their ability.

The Bible funds of this Association have been heretofore divided between the Bible Union or Revision Society, the American and Foreign Bible Society, and the Bible Board of the Southern Convention. Many of the brethren have become life-members to one or the other of the former Associations, others are bound by pledges of annual payments, but the claims of our Board are evidently becoming paramount to all others, and there is a general and strong desire to see the Bible contributions of Southern Baptists paid to the Southern Board. As in the other Associations which I have visited, most of the Missionary brethren agreed to present our claims to their churches at their next monthly meeting, or so soon thereafter as might be thought best for the cause, and take up collections for the supply of Bibles to the Chinese in California, and in China, as well as for our home destitution. Bro. J. R. Graves, the President of the Bible Board, preached a soul-thrilling and heart-opening sermon on the Sabbath, after which a liberal collection was taken up, half for the Bible cause, and half for Indian Missions. We expect great things from the churches of Bethel Association. There is among them a vast amount of wealth—God has blessed them most abundantly, and we cannot but hope they will contribute of their abundance most liberally.

Bro. Ford, junior editor of the Western Review, was present, and preached a most excellent discourse on Saturday night, which was highly praised by the brethren who heard it.

Bro. J. M. Bennett, in the introductory sermon, which he preached by previous appointment, took a strong and decided stand in favor of what would call "Baptist Exclusiveness." His discourse was the occasion of a good deal of remark, and we hope may elicit further thought and earnest action. It is time for Baptists to awake to a full sense of their responsibility, not only as Christians, but as Baptists. Baptists have a great and peculiar work to do, which can only be done by Baptists, and which none can do so well as American Baptists. Let us be prudent; let us be kind; let us be genuine and loving like our Saviour, but as he was so let us be uncompromising and fearless advocates of the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as we find it in the Book. But I forget myself. I set out to tell what Bethel Association, or rather the brethren connected with that Association, (for it is as individuals and as church members that we expect them to act,) are likely to do for the Bible, and I was near getting into a disquisition (suggested by Bro. Bennett's sermon) on the duties of Baptists generally. May we not expect that when the other Associations of Kentucky have paid the obligations which they have already assumed to the Northern Bible Societies, they will feel the propriety and yield themselves to the privilege of contributing the funds which they can give for Bible purposes through their natural and proper organs, the Board of the Southern Convention?

We hope in the course of the coming year to be able to visit that noble State again. We were delighted with this brief visit to Kentucky.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Revival—Intelligence.

Thrilling Incident.

At a few days since, Mr. Davenport of Shelbyville, Tenn., went down into a well which he was engaged in digging, and the negro who remained at the mouth of the well became alarmed at his groans and ran to the street crying out that a man was dying in the well. A young gentleman happened to be passing at the moment and instantly ran to the well, pulled off his coat and climbed down by the curbing till within about ten feet of the bottom, when he encountered the stream of poisonous air which had broken into the well, and finding he was likely to fall, jumped to the ground. He found Mr. D. apparently dead, and immediately made a rope of chain fast around the lifeless body which was drawn up by people who had assembled at the well. Scarcely had he done this, however, when he became unconscious and sank to the ground. Those about the mouth of the well finding that the body drawn up though seemingly dead, showed some faint signs of remaining vitality, were busily engaged in endeavoring to restore the suspended animation, forgetting for the time that some one had gone into the well, and it was not till Physicians had been sent for and several had arrived with a crowd of the citizens, and the first object of their anxiety had begun to breathe again that they were reminded (probably by the negro) that a young man, a stranger, had gone down to rescue this man and was now, doubtless, a corpse in the bottom of the well. What could be done? Who was there brave enough now that the danger was fully known to venture into the very jaws of death? They let down a light, but it was instantly extinguished. They threw down burning shavings, but they only filled the pit with suffocating smoke. Meantime the question was asked again and again who was it that went down? No one could answer till a lady present, exercising her woman's wit, caught up his coat and pulled some papers from the pocket. They were notes of a sermon. The young man was the newly chosen Baptist preacher, Mr. Faulkner, a man who has in a few weeks won the hearts of his people in a most remarkable degree, and whose promise of future usefulness has seldom been equaled. When this was known there was a silent pause. No one would venture into the well; but among the Physicians who had gathered at the first alarm was Dr. Barksdale, a Deacon in the Baptist church, of which Mr. Faulkner is pastor, and at whose hospitable mansion the young man made his home. He instantly stripped and prepared to enter. In answer to the remonstrances of friends who felt that he was descending to almost certain death, he said, "This young man is a stranger—he is residing under my roof—I am in a degree responsible for his life. I will at least try to save him though I die in the attempt. They let him down, but the suffocating vapor mixed with the smoke, compelled him to desist for a time. He was drawn up, got some fresh air, waited till the smoke had subsided a little and then went down again. He passed a chain round the body but could not fasten it for want of a little stick to pass through a link to lock it. They threw down stick after stick, but the poison had taken hold on his brain—his head reeled, his breath failed and he could not find them; he could only call out that he was dying. They drew him up and laid him apparently dead beside the other. He soon revived, however, and explained in what condition he had left the young man. Mr. Griffith, a strong minded and strong bodied mechanic and most worthy citizen, volunteered to go down, carrying with him a suitable stick to fasten the chain around the body. The work was quickly done and he was drawn back without having suffered any very great inconvenience. When Mr. Faulkner was drawn up, after he had been in the well more than an hour, he was apparently gone past all hope, but the anxious and persevering efforts of his friends, aided by the best medical skill, were blessed at length to his recovery. Life came slowly back and he is now, though still feeble, able to walk about. In a few days he will probably be as well as ever. The others are also all doing well.

Bro. Ford, junior editor of the Western Review, was present, and preached a most excellent discourse on Saturday night, which was highly praised by the brethren who heard it.

Bro. J. M. Bennett, in the introductory sermon, which he preached by previous appointment, took a strong and decided stand in favor of what would call "Baptist Exclusiveness." His discourse was the occasion of a good deal of remark, and we hope may elicit further thought and earnest action. It is time for Baptists to awake to a full sense of their responsibility, not only as Christians, but as Baptists. Baptists have a great and peculiar work to do, which can only be done by Baptists, and which none can do so well as American Baptists. Let us be prudent; let us be kind; let us be genuine and loving like our Saviour, but as he was so let us be uncompromising and fearless advocates of the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as we find it in the Book. But I forget myself. I set out to tell what Bethel Association, or rather the brethren connected with that Association, (for it is as individuals and as church members that we expect them to act,) are likely to do for the Bible, and I was near getting into a disquisition (suggested by Bro. Bennett's sermon) on the duties of Baptists generally. May we not expect that when the other Associations of Kentucky have paid the obligations which they have already assumed to the Northern Bible Societies, they will feel the propriety and yield themselves to the privilege of contributing the funds which they can give for Bible purposes through their natural and proper organs, the Board of the Southern Convention?

We hope in the course of the coming year to be able to visit that noble State again. We were delighted with this brief visit to Kentucky.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Revival—Intelligence.

Thrilling Incident.

At a few days since, Mr. Davenport of Shelbyville, Tenn., went down into a well which he was engaged in digging, and the negro who remained at the mouth of the well became alarmed at his groans and ran to the street crying out that a man was dying in the well. A young gentleman happened to be passing at the moment and instantly ran to the well, pulled off his coat and climbed down by the curbing till within about ten feet of the bottom, when he encountered the stream of poisonous air which had broken into the well, and finding he was likely to fall, jumped to the ground. He found Mr. D. apparently dead, and immediately made a rope of chain fast around the lifeless body which was drawn up by people who had assembled at the well. Scarcely had he done this, however, when he became unconscious and sank to the ground. Those about the mouth of the well finding that the body drawn up though seemingly dead, showed some faint signs of remaining vitality, were busily engaged in endeavoring to restore the suspended animation, forgetting for the time that some one had gone into the well, and it was not till Physicians had been sent for and several had arrived with a crowd of the citizens, and the first object of their anxiety had begun to breathe again that they were reminded (probably by the negro) that a young man, a stranger, had gone down to rescue this man and was now, doubtless, a corpse in the bottom of the well. What could be done? Who was there brave enough now that the danger was fully known to venture into the very jaws of death? They let down a light, but it was instantly extinguished. They threw down burning shavings, but they only filled the pit with suffocating smoke. Meantime the question was asked again and again who was it that went down? No one could answer till a lady present, exercising her woman's wit, caught up his coat and pulled some papers from the pocket. They were notes of a sermon. The young man was the newly chosen Baptist preacher, Mr. Faulkner, a man who has in a few weeks won the hearts of his people in a most remarkable degree, and whose promise of future usefulness has seldom been equaled. When this was known there was a silent pause. No one would venture into the well; but among the Physicians who had gathered at the first alarm was Dr. Barksdale, a Deacon in the Baptist church, of which Mr. Faulkner is pastor, and at whose hospitable mansion the young man made his home. He instantly stripped and prepared to enter. In answer to the remonstrances of friends who felt that he was descending to almost certain death, he said, "This young man is a stranger—he is residing under my roof—I am in a degree responsible for his life. I will at least try to save him though I die in the attempt. They let him down, but the suffocating vapor mixed with the smoke, compelled him to desist for a time. He was drawn up, got some fresh air, waited till the smoke had subsided a little and then went down again. He passed a chain round the body but could not fasten it for want of a little stick to pass through a link to lock it. They threw down stick after stick, but the poison had taken hold on his brain—his head reeled, his breath failed and he could not find them; he could only call out that he was dying. They drew him up and laid him apparently dead beside the other. He soon revived, however, and explained in what condition he had left the young man. Mr. Griffith, a strong minded and strong bodied mechanic and most worthy citizen, volunteered to go down, carrying with him a suitable stick to fasten the chain around the body. The work was quickly done and he was drawn back without having suffered any very great inconvenience. When Mr. Faulkner was drawn up, after he had been in the well more than an hour, he was apparently gone past all hope, but the anxious and persevering efforts of his friends, aided by the best medical skill, were blessed at length to his recovery. Life came slowly back and he is now, though still feeble, able to walk about. In a few days he will probably be as well as ever. The others are also all doing well.

Bro. Ford, junior editor of the Western Review, was present, and preached a most excellent discourse on Saturday night, which was highly praised by the brethren who heard it.

Bro. J. M. Bennett, in the introductory sermon, which he preached by previous appointment, took a strong and decided stand in favor of what would call "Baptist Exclusiveness." His discourse was the occasion of a good deal of remark, and we hope may elicit further thought and earnest action. It is time for Baptists to awake to a full sense of their responsibility, not only as Christians, but as Baptists. Baptists have a great and peculiar work to do, which can only be done by Baptists, and which none can do so well as American Baptists. Let us be prudent; let us be kind; let us be genuine and loving like our Saviour, but as he was so let us be uncompromising and fearless advocates of the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as we find it in the Book. But I forget myself. I set out to tell what Bethel Association, or rather the brethren connected with that Association, (for it is as individuals and as church members that we expect them to act,) are likely to do for the Bible, and I was near getting into a disquisition (suggested by Bro. Bennett's sermon) on the duties of Baptists generally. May we not expect that when the other Associations of Kentucky have paid the obligations which they have already assumed to the Northern Bible Societies, they will feel the propriety and yield themselves to the privilege of contributing the funds which they can give for Bible purposes through their natural and proper organs, the Board of the Southern Convention?

We hope in the course of the coming year to be able to visit that noble State again. We were delighted with this brief visit to Kentucky.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Revival—Intelligence.

Thrilling Incident.

At a few days since, Mr. Davenport of Shelbyville, Tenn., went down into a well which he was engaged in digging, and the negro who remained at the mouth of the well became alarmed at his groans and ran to the street crying out that a man was dying in the well. A young gentleman happened to be passing at the moment and instantly ran to the well, pulled off his coat and climbed down by the curbing till within about ten feet of the bottom, when he encountered the stream of poisonous air which had broken into the well, and finding he was likely to fall, jumped to the ground. He found Mr. D. apparently dead, and immediately made a rope of chain fast around the lifeless body which was drawn up by people who had assembled at the well. Scarcely had he done this, however, when he became unconscious and sank to the ground. Those about the mouth of the well finding that the body drawn up though seemingly dead, showed some faint signs of remaining vitality, were busily engaged in endeavoring to restore the suspended animation, forgetting for the time that some one had gone into the well, and it was not till Physicians had been sent for and several had arrived with a crowd of the citizens, and the first object of their anxiety had begun to breathe again that they were reminded (probably by the negro) that a young man, a stranger, had gone down to rescue this man and was now, doubtless, a corpse in the bottom of the well. What could be done? Who was there brave enough now that the danger was fully known to venture into the very jaws of death? They let down a light, but it was instantly extinguished. They threw down burning shavings, but they only filled the pit with suffocating smoke. Meantime the question was asked again and again who was it that went down? No one could answer till a lady present, exercising her woman's wit, caught up his coat and pulled some papers from the pocket. They were notes of a sermon. The young man was the newly chosen Baptist preacher, Mr. Faulkner, a man who has in a few weeks won the hearts of his people in a most remarkable degree, and whose promise of future usefulness has seldom been equaled. When this was known there was a silent pause. No one would venture into the well; but among the Physicians who had gathered at the first alarm was Dr. Barksdale, a Deacon in the Baptist church, of which Mr. Faulkner is pastor, and at whose hospitable mansion the young man made his home. He instantly stripped and prepared to enter. In answer to the remonstrances of friends who felt that he was descending to almost certain death, he said, "This young man is a stranger—he is residing under my roof—I am in a degree responsible for his life. I will at least try to save him though I die in the attempt. They let him down, but the suffocating vapor mixed with the smoke, compelled him to desist for a time. He was drawn up, got some fresh air, waited till the smoke had subsided a little and then went down again. He passed a chain round the body but could not fasten it for want of a little stick to pass through a link to lock it. They threw down stick after stick, but the poison had taken hold on his brain—his head reeled, his breath failed and he could not find them; he could only call out that he was dying. They drew him up and laid him apparently dead beside the other. He soon revived, however, and explained in what condition he had left the young man. Mr. Griffith, a strong minded and strong bodied mechanic and most worthy citizen, volunteered to go down, carrying with him a suitable stick to fasten the chain around the body. The work was quickly done and he was drawn back without having suffered any very great inconvenience. When Mr. Faulkner was drawn up, after he had been in the well more than an hour, he was apparently gone past all hope, but the anxious and persevering efforts of his friends, aided by the best medical skill, were blessed at length to his recovery. Life came slowly back and he is now, though still feeble, able to walk about. In a few days he will probably be as well as ever. The others are also all doing well.

Bro. Ford, junior editor of the Western Review, was present, and preached a most excellent discourse on Saturday night, which was highly praised by the brethren who heard it.

Bro. J. M. Bennett, in the introductory sermon, which he preached by previous appointment, took a strong and decided stand in favor of what would call "Baptist Exclusiveness." His discourse was the occasion of a good deal of remark, and we hope may elicit further thought and earnest action. It is time for Baptists to awake to a full sense of their responsibility, not only as Christians, but as Baptists. Baptists have a great and peculiar work to do, which can only be done by Baptists, and which none can do so well as American Baptists. Let us be prudent; let us be kind; let us be genuine and loving like our Saviour, but as he was so let us be uncompromising and fearless advocates of the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, as we find it in the Book. But I forget myself. I set out to tell what Bethel Association, or rather the brethren connected with that Association, (for it is as individuals and as church members that we expect them to act,) are likely to do for the Bible, and I was near getting into a disquisition (suggested by Bro. Bennett's sermon) on the duties of Baptists generally. May we not expect that when the other Associations of Kentucky have paid the obligations which they have already assumed to the Northern Bible Societies, they will feel the propriety and yield themselves to the privilege of contributing the funds which they can give for Bible purposes through their natural and proper organs, the Board of the Southern Convention?

We hope in the course of the coming year to be able to visit that noble State again. We were delighted with this brief visit to Kentucky.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

O. D. DAYTON.

Suppose where a majority in a church, as this is sometimes the case, should depart from the constitution, doctrine, or discipline—should become Campbellites, and you should be called on to decide the matter, would you say that the majority in that case have a right to rule, or would you say the few, the minority, adhering to the constitution, &c., were the church, and have a right to rule, and to the church, book and other property? What says the law in the case? It takes more than simply a majority to constitute a true republic; a democratic form of government; it requires the adoption and adherence to a constitution of equal rights.

To say that a majority adhering to such a compact should not rule, would be anti-republican; nor would it be less so to affirm that they have a right to rule in violation of such a compact or constitution. To assert that a majority have a right to rule in such cases of violation, is to affirm that there is such a thing as an anti-democratic republic; which is a contradiction in itself, in my view.

These thoughts are submitted to your disposal. Yours, in Christian love, C. N.

Ass. The majority or the minority must rule. Both cannot. Let N. C. himself decide which ought. If the majority depart from the faith, let the minority withdraw and organize a new church, or re-organize upon the old organization.

