# The Tennessee Baptist.

WM. C. BUCK, C. B. HENDRICKSON, } Corresponding Editors.

DEVOTED TO THE ADVOCACY AND DEFENCE OF BAPTIST PRINCIPLES, AND DESIGNED TO BE A MEDIUM OF RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE FOR THE GREAT WEST.

Publishers and Proprietors. { J. R. GRAVES. W. P. MAKES.

Desiring to Know the Whole Truth, and Daring to Oppose any Error---Christ is my Judge. J. R. Graves, Editor.

VOL. XI. NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1855. NO. 30


## Our Pulpit.

### Questions to the Impenitent.—No. II.

CAN YOU, AS SINNERS, GO TO HEAVEN?

When the eventful life of Jesus was drawing to a close he told his disciples that he was about to return to his Father. Their hearts were filled with sorrow. He, to console them, gave them the assurance that they too should ultimately go to heaven and be with him forever. But to the unbelieving Jews he said, "Ye shall die in your sins: whither I go ye cannot come." Who would not go where Jesus is? The place of his abode is infinitely attractive. It is the select locality of the universe, invested with glories which shed their luster no where else. And yet it is certain that all will not go to heaven. The mansions of bliss will not be peopled by the whole race of Adam. "Heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people."

Impenitent sinners, however, indulge hope of heaven. They "lay the flattering unction" to their souls that when the scenes of mortal life are past they shall dwell at God's right hand. Vain hope! Delusive expectation! Destined to bitter disappointment!

My object now is to show that sinners, *as sinners*, cannot go to heaven. Why?

1. *They have no title to heaven.* They are in a state of condemnation. Having violated God's holy law they are under its curse. The wrath of God abides on them. They are "children of wrath" and heirs of perdition. This results necessarily from the fact that they are sinners, unpardoned sinners. What title can they have to heaven? What claim to the "inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading?" Do they base their claim on the supposition that sin is their misfortune rather than their fault? This is only a supposition—not a truth. They are *as guilty as unfortunate*. Their condition is *as culpable as pitiable*. They deserve blame as much as commiseration. And the whole genius of the gospel economy shows that while God pities them, he holds them justly chargeable with guilt. The justice of their condemnation is as evident as the graciousness of the deliverance from it which is freely offered to them. It follows then that they cannot claim admittance into heaven on the ground that sin is their misfortune; for it is their crime as well.

Will they claim heaven in consideration of their morality? Morality is a term often used and very imperfectly understood. Strictly speaking morality involves a compliance with the moral law of God. The first commandment of this law is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," and the second is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "On these too," said Christ, "hang all the law and the prophets." No sinner has complied with either of these requisitions. How vain then to talk of morality as originating and sustaining a title to heaven!

"Talk they of morals? O thou bleeding Son!
The great morality of love is Thee."

Sinners have no title to heaven because they reject Jesus Christ through whom alone title is conferred. To all who are saved Christ "is made wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption." He is the "end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." "By him all that believe are justified from all things." "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid which is Jesus Christ." Paul's great desire was to "win Christ and be found *in him*." What hope is there for those who are not in Christ? There is no rational hope—no hope which the gospel for a moment tolerates. All who go from earth to heaven go through the merits of Christ. There is put one way from God's footstool to his throne. That way is consecrated through the veil, that is to say the flesh" of the crucified One. Indeed Jesus is emphatically declared to be the WAY as well as the truth and the life. Those who have reached the bright mansion of glory sing the song of redemption through the blood of the cross. They sing no other song. Their impulses as redeemed souls can prompt them to sing no other. If all the ransomed in heaven have gone thither through Christ, in what other way is ascent to the skies practicable? If justification through the Redeemer gives a title to eternal life, by what other method can a title be secured? There is no other way—no other method. God will not deviate from his established plan to accommodate one sinner, or any number of sinners. Such deviation would be a reflection on the wisdom that devised the plan, and would imply that the stupendous transactions of Calvary were not strictly necessary to man's salvation. I insist, impenitent sinners, that you cannot go to heaven because you have no title to the celestial mansions. You reject Jesus Christ through whom alone title can be obtained.

2. *Sinners have not the moral preparation to enjoy heaven.* Even if they had the title to which I have referred, and in virtue of it be admitted into heaven, they could not enjoy its bliss. They are depraved. They are the subjects of a vitiated taste. They love sin and find all their pleasure in sinful objects. Before there can be happiness in any place there must be adaptation to that place. Before there can be happiness in any kind of society there must be adaptation to that society. Are sinners prepared for heaven? Would they be happy there? In what does the happiness of heaven consist? In a contemplation of the character of the God—in being with Christ—in being in a holy place—in enjoying holy society—in being forever free from sin, &c. &c. But sinners do not love God. They see no glory in his moral perfections. How then could a contemplation of his character render them happy. It would make them miserable. There is no pleasure in contemplating what we do not love. This is true on earth and it would be true in heaven—true in all places in God's dominions. Nor would the transition of a sinner from earth to heaven, could there be such a transition, effect any change in the affections of the heart. Those who do not love God on earth would not love him in heaven.

Sinners would not be happy in being with Christ. He is indeed "the chief among ten thousand and altogether lovely," but sinners do not recognize his claims. They see "no beauty in him that they should desire him." They would have no happiness, therefore, in being in the immediate presence of Christ. No, they would be miserable where Jesus is.

Nor would they be happy in a holy place, in the midst of holy society. If made free from sin they would not be happy unless they hated sin. They would be troubled with desire for that they loved. There can be no happiness in a holy place unless holiness is an object of love. There can be no happiness in holy society unless holiness creates a love of such society.

Impenitent sinners! Do you not see that you cannot go to heaven? You have no title to secure your admittance, and if you were admitted, you are morally disqualified to enjoy its bliss. Justification through the merits of Jesus Christ and regeneration by the Holy Spirit are indispensable to your entrance into the Paradise of God. Seek without delay these blessings of the "new and better covenant."

J. M. P.

### Legislation, Patriotism and Religion.

These are the means of prescriving our national institutions and prosperity, as presented in a Sermon by Dr. Murray of Elizabethtown, N. J. We give this portion of the sermon, believing that its reading will prove as interesting and profitable to our readers as listening to it did to ourself.—Ed.

1. *Is to legislation.* Our laws must be wise and just, not merely when measured by a constitutional standard, but by the divine standard of wisdom and justice. We can afford to go higher than the factitious standard of men, even up to "the higher law"—the law of God. So extended is our country, so varying are the interests, agricultural, commercial, and industrial, of different portions of it, as naturally to give rise to efforts to legislate for sections, parties, and peculiar interests. All our interests should be protected, as far as the public good demands; and our government should maintain the relation, to all our states and interests, that an intelligent and kind father does to a numerous family of children. But in order to legislation like this, the people must select men capable of framing, and of enacting such laws; men of intelligence, and substance, and known integrity, whose honor is dearer to them than popular favor, or eight dollars a day. Let any person compare with the picture of the Declaration of Independence, or the First Prayer in Congress, any faithful picture that for the last twenty years might have been drawn of our House of Representatives, and they will see at a glance the vast change for the worse in the character of our legislators. There has been such a letting down of the elective franchise, that none can be elected save those who can stoop to the arts of carrying the masses; and thus our legislators are often the representatives of the passions and excitements of the least intelligent of the people. On this subject the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the North and the South; have an equal interest. Laws founded in justice will execute themselves. They are as mountain pillars beneath our institutions, to sustain them; and as walls of brass around our property, to defend it. Thus far in our history we owe our quiet, in the midst of national convulsions—our freedom, in the midst of enslaved nations—the security of our property—the peace of our streets—the happiness of our homes, to the wisdom and justice of our laws.

2. *Patriotism.* Patriotism is love of country.—So that to be a patriot, a man must have a country. A patriot in England, Austria, or Russia, is one who sustains the institutions of those countries with zeal and energy. A patriot with us is one who sustains our institutions with zeal and energy. Each country has its own peculiar institutions; and he is a true patriot who sustains all that is good and who would seek, in all right ways, to rectify all that is evil in them, because of the love he bears his country.

There has been manifested in this land a patriotism which has astonished the world. The fathers of our government sacrificed everything but honor to found it: and wisdom was given them from above to inaugurate it as a constitutional government.—And patriotism calls upon their sons, and upon all who would seek here a home either from the poverty or the opposition of other lands, to maintain our institutions as they have been transmitted to us, and to entrust their management only to those who are acquainted with them. And upon this topic the signs of the times should induce all sober men to think, and to act. When we see our streets crowded by military companies of foreign name and birth—when we see and hear our most sacred institutions, even to the Sabbath and the Bible, denounced in public assemblages, by men unable to speak our language—when foreigners are mustered to the polls to defeat the election of an American citizen, because of his regard for law and order—when emigrants from other lands surround the polls, and murder peaceable citizens when going to the ballot-box—when those just escaped from the ignorance and degradation of other lands, burn our Bibles, and would turn them out of our schools, and would thus, in obedience to the altar dictation of imported priests, trample in the dust all that has made, and all that sustains us, as a free people, it is time for the American spirit to rise, and wisely to adjust its action to circumstances. Let the foreigner have no vote until he has had abundant time to learn our language, and the genius of our institutions; and, then, let him be content with the protection of our laws, and with all the rights and immunities of a citizen. This is alike due to the best interest of the foreigner, and of the country: it would take the stranger out of the hands of our base politicians, who mislead them, and degrade them by strong drink to secure their vote, and then desert them: and it would save the country from the political influence of the swarming multitudes who are seeking here a home from other lands, and among whom the most wicked, and unscrupulous, and the sworn enemies of our religious freedom, wield nearly all the power. Foreigners coming here for a home, owe it to themselves, and to their children, and to the country, to drop as soon as possible their peculiarities, and to become in the broadest sense, Americans. And hence, I would have no Scotch, or Dutch, or German, or Irish, or English churches;—nor would I have any such military companies, or political parties. I would put the broad American stamp upon all churches, creeds, associations, and parties; and to those who would not receive it, I would say, the road back to the old country is no longer than when you came. We may entertain all right affection for the country of our birth: but the country that feeds, clothes, protects us—that secures to us our liberty and privileges—that receives us as children, though aliens—that opens up to us every avenue of business, as to her own children, and which we desire to make the home of our descendants—that, should be the country of our love.

There is yet another point on which our patriotism will soon be tested. Our constitution and laws forbid us to ostracise any man for his religious opinions, be he Turk, Jew, Pagan, Protestant, or Papist: but they forbid us to raise any to office who are bound by a superior allegiance to any other government than to our own. Now, the Pope of Rome, as the vicegerent of God, claims a universal supremacy in things spiritual and temporal. He has never withdrawn his claim to the power he wielded, when he dethroned kings and princes, and absolved subjects from their allegiance to their sovereigns. And there is an oath upon the soul of every archbishop, bishop, priest, ecclesiastic, "to preserve, defend, increase, advance the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the lord, the Pope: that they will help to defend the royalties of St. Peter against all men." This sworn allegiance to the Pope they never change, save with their office, or on their conversion." The Pope receives obedience from the bishops, from the priests, and the priests from the people. And the people that will not obey the priest, the priests that will not obey the bishop, the bishops that will not obey the Pope, are cursed, and excommunicated, and go on over to hell and the devil. When the interests of this country come in conflict with the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the Pope, there is not a bishop, priest or Papist in the land, that is not bound by oath and principle, to go against our country and for the Pope. So that a man can no more be a Papist and a true and royal American citizen than he can serve two masters. He must be either a bad patriot or Papist. Is this so? If so, then a Papist is prevented *by his faith* from being a loyal citizen, *and because he cannot in obedience to his faith, be a loyal citizen, he never should hold office under this, or any Protestant government.* Unless the country comes to this, a few years will see our polls surrounded by imported bullies, set on by exhortations of imported priests from papal altars, prepared to shed the blood of American citizens, in order to preserve, increase, defend and advance the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the lord, the Pope."

May the patriotism of the fathers of our country be ever possessed by their descendants to preserve, defend and advance its free and sacred institution.

### He is a Christian.

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is a man of truth. Upon his word you may implicitly rely. His promises are faithfully fulfilled. His representations he believes to be scrupulously exact. He would not hazard his veracity upon a contingency. "He that speaketh truth showeth forth righteousness." "He sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is an honest man. He had rather wrong himself than wrong his neighbor. In whatever business he may be engaged, you may be sure that his dealings will be honorable and upright. Provide things honest in the sight of all men. "The way of the just is uprightness."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is an humble man. He thinks of his sins and humbly acknowledges his dependence upon God, and regards the wealthiest and poorest of his brethren as men, objects of his Redeemer's unerring love, and worthy of his attention and care. "God gives grace to the humble." "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is a kind man. He feels interested for his neighbors, and has ever a pleasant word for those he meets. He strives to promote the welfare and happiness of those with whom he is associated. His generous heart delights in diffusing enjoyment. The law of kindness is in his tongue. To godliness add brotherly kindness."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is a humble. He is prompt to attribute right motives rather than wrong to others wherever it is possible. Knowing his own liability to err, he will regard with a charitable heart the failures of others, and will be more ready to reclaim and restore than to censure them. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." "Charity suffereth long and is kind."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! To one who asks, he will give. He does not rankle in his heart, treating for a trespass. The forgiving word is ever upon his lip for he has most implacable enemy. "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive your trespasses." "Even as I have forgiven you, so also do ye."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is benevolent. He feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, administers to the sick. Human distresses touch his heart and open his hand. The spiritual maladies of mankind excite his commiseration and to relieve and remove them his influence and property will be cheerfully contributed. "Freely ye have received, freely give." "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then he is a man of prayer. He lives in communion with God, for thus only can the life of Christianity be derived or preserved in the soul. "In every thing, by prayer and thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet."

HE IS A CHRISTIAN! Then will he cherish and cultivate in his relations to God, and in his intercourse with men, "whatsoever things are true, honest, just, lovely, of good report."

But suppose a professor of religion does not exhibit or strive to cultivate these lovely characteristics. Then he is no Christian!—*Ed.*

### What is meant by Following Jesus.

*Following* Jesus, resembles *coming to Jesus*, just as a long journey resembles the first stage of it.—The two are similar, for every act of following is a fresh coming. They also co-exist, for all who truly come, follow. Yet they can be distinguished in our minds, just as following a guide can be thought of as something more than first applying to him. When the tract of country through which we travel is difficult, dangerous and unknown, it is essential that we secure the services of a competent person to show us the road and assist us in it. We put confidence in him, and act on his instructions. We keep our eye on him, watch his steps, and tread where he treads. We do not venture from the path he takes, nor lag behind so as to lose sight of him; but we do our best to keep near him, and willingly rid ourselves of any unnecessary luggage rather than be left behind.

We have lost our way in a world of sin. There is a road through it to a world of perfect holiness and joy. But we cannot find this road, nor keep it when found, without a guide. God himself undertakes to be our leader. In the Bible, loving and obeying him is spoken of as *following*. Caleb and Joshua are commended because they "wholly followed the Lord." We are told that David "followed God with all his heart," and Elijah appealed to the Israelites, saying, "If the Lord be God, *follow* him!" When Jesus called his chosen disciples, he said, "Follow me;" and the sons of Zebedee left their nets, and Matthew rose up from the receipt of custom. They not only went to him, but remained with him. Their conduct while he was visibly on the earth, was an emblem of what the disciple of Christ should do always after a spiritual manner. As the sinner earnestly seeking salvation is said to "come to Jesus," in like manner the after life of those who are truly converted, is spoken of as "following Jesus." The disciples grateful for the benefits they had received, delighted in his company, and conscious of their continued need of his help, followed him bodily, journeyed when he journeyed, rested when he rested, listened to his teachings, and rendered him any service he might require. Just so they who have come to him for salvation, continue to trust in him, and out of love to him, keep near to him in their thoughts, study his word, imitate his example, and obey his commands. This is what is meant by the exhortation, "Follow Jesus." Numbers 32: 12. Matt. 4: 18—32.

## Revision.

From the Methodist Protestant.

### The Revision Question.

MR. EDITOR:—In reference to a late communication of your correspondent "Menno," it may be proper for me to make an observation or two.

I know not who was your "good authority," nor who was Mr. Williamses's authority, but you were both correct. Until within a few weeks I have refused to have any sort of connection with the Bible Union and its proceedings.

But affinity with the Bible Union, and a desire to see our noble English Bible expurgated of all known defects, are very different things. Your correspondent "does not believe" what is affirmed as to these defects. His unbelief will vanish if he will examine the subject. Nor would his discovery of inaccuracies lead him to "burn his Bible, and study only natural religion," nor to take "the Talmud or Koran," &c. This would be as if a man, because he detects imperfections in an only and beloved and beautiful child, should adopt a monkey. I presume both "Menno" and myself would cherish our child and seek to correct these blemishes.

But are there inaccuracies in our received version? Let the following distinguished men, not Baptists testify:

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Commentary upon the twelfth chapter of the second book of Samuel, says: "Though I believe our translation to be by far the best in any language, ancient or modern, yet I am satisfied it stands much in need of revision. Most of the advantages which our unbelievers have over certain passages of Scripture, have arisen from an inaccurate or false translation of the terms in the original, and an appeal to this has generally silenced the gainsayers. But in the time in which our translation was made, biblical criticism was in its infancy, if indeed it did exist: and we may rather wonder that we find things so well, than be surprised that they are no better."

Bishop Lowth, a man high in honor among scholars, testifies in these words: "To confirm and illustrate the Holy Scriptures, to evince their truth, to show their consistency, to explain their meaning, to make them more generally known and studied, more easily and perfectly understood by all: to remove the difficulties that discourage the honest endeavors of the unlearned, and provoke the malicious cavils of the half-learned: this is the most worthy subject that can engage our attention, the most important end to which our labors in the search of truth can be directed. And here I cannot but mention that nothing would more effectually conduce to this end, than the exhibition of the Holy Scriptures themselves to the people in a more advantageous and yet light, by an accurate revised of our vulgar translation, by public authority."

Dr. Doddridge says, in the preface to his Family Expositor, that "the Old Testament has suffered more than the New in our translation."

Professor Stuart, D. D., whom Dr. Newcome translates "one of real judgment and taste," published a work in 1759 on the Expediency of Revising the present English version, in which he says: "Who our examines a version in present use, will find that it is ambiguous and incorrect even in matters of the highest importance."

Anthony Blackwall, A. M., author of a celebrated work on "The Sacred Classics Defended and Illustrated," speaking of King James' version, makes the following remark: "Innumerable instances might be given of faulty translations of the divine original. An accurate translation, proved and supported by sacred criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavillers."

Daniel Waterland, D. D., a distinguished minister and scholar of the last century, says: "Our last English version is undoubtedly capable of very great improvements."

Archbishop Newcome, D. D., in his "Historical Views of the present English Biblical Translations, and Expediency of revising by authority our present Translation, and the means of executing such a revision," a work published at Dublin in a judicious and able manner, in one place, after speaking of the change which our language has undergone since 1611, the date of King James' version, the numerous faults of that version, and of the additional light which has been shed on the sources of sacred learning, and the science of biblical criticism, he says: "With such an accession of helps, with light poured in from every part of the literary world, with such important principles, and with the advancement of critical skill to supply them, it is natural to conclude that many mistakes and obscurities may be removed from the present version, and that the precision, beauty and emphasis of the original may be communicated to it in various places." p. 240.

Archdeacon Hare, than whom no one is at present more distinguished in the Church of England, says: (see Mission of the Comforter, p. 224.) "When our Church has the courage to undertage the task of revising the authorized version of the Bible, the account of the work of the Comforter, given in the thirteenth verse of our chapter, will be corrected, along with a number of other inaccuracies arising from inattention to the force of the Greek article. The neglect of this force is one among the many proofs that our version of the New Testament is too dependent on a Latin Translation, probably that of Erasmus."?

Now, if such inaccuracies exist, why should not all christians unite in correcting them? God who gave the Scriptures yet guards and preserves them, and in spite of erroneous translations here and there, we still have His Holy Word. But if a single mistranslation is admitted; it will prejudice the cause of the Bible by casting "ominous conjecture" on the whole.

In conversation, not long since, with one of our most esteemed and prominent citizens, our attention was directed to Acts 12: 4. Here all admit a false and prejudiced translation. The original is *Pascha* (Passover;) the translation is "Easter!" Even Dr. Scott says, (see Commentary,) "it is therefore surprising that the venerable translators of the Bible should have used that word instead of the Passover in this connection." When this was shown, the gentleman remarked, "How can I be sure that there are no other errors, and why are they not removed?" This fear will insinuate itself wherever a single error is acknowledged.

Our Society is organized to aid any competent body—Baptists or Pedobaptists—in purging any errors from the version we have; but not to supplant this version which is most dear to us. As no other body is engaged in this work we are willing to try the "Bible Union." We are assured that they have enlisted at great expense, able men of six evangelical denominations to perform the task, to work under no sort of restriction; but faithfully to give the mind of the Holy Spirit. Their emendation we, and all men, can examine for ourselves; for they give in notes the reasons of any changes. And now, I ask, why should any one object to this?

Your correspondent wrongs me, when he affirms that "Dr. Fuller (by his own authority) took the chair." Mr. Kelly made a motion, and the body voted, and the chair was taken in obedience to the call. This, however, is a small matter. The other objection of your correspondent is not a small matter. It is, that so many Baptists are officers. I have regretted this, and wish now that some Pedobaptist Pastor would take the Presidency. But as none such were present, what could have been done? Must we defer this discharge of duty because others will not co-operate?

R. FULLER.

From the Same.

### Ought Baptists to Recognize Pedobaptist Preachers as Gospel Ministers?

We answer the above interrogatory in the negative, and for the following reasons.

1. The ministry is *in the church*, the gift of God to *the church*.

The great commission of our ascending Saviour "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," was given to his apostles, who were members of the Christian church, in full fellowship. And the great Apostle Paul was a regularly immersed believer and a member of the *visible* church of Christ, before he was ever recognized as a gospel minister. And in his epistle to the *visible* church of Christ at Corinth, he uses the following forcible language: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some *in the church*, first Apostles,' &c.—See I Cor. 12. 27. 28. Again he says: "And he gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the *work of the ministry*, for the edifying of *the body of Christ*," &c. Indeed, it appears so plain from the reading of the Scriptures, that no person was ever recognized as a gospel minister until he first became a member of the visible church, that it appears to us unnecessary to enlarge upon it. This principle, we presume, will be denied by very few, and it seems to us should not be denied by any. It is the very principle upon which Pedobaptists have so long and so justly charged us with inconsistency. It is the very principle upon which they proceed.

I ask, in all good conscience, would our Methodist friends recognize *any man* as a gospel minister, whom they believed was not a member of the visible church of Christ? or to use the language of Pedobaptists, of some branch of the Christian church. Take up the book of discipline and we find that a man cannot act as a steward or a leader, or even as a class-leader, unless he is first a member of their society in full fellowship. And I ask, Would our Presbyterian friends recognize any man as a gospel minister, unless in their connection he was a member of the visible church of Christ? Let us go to their views of the visible church for a moment. The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel dispensation, is composed of those who are under the laws, ordinances of all those through out the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." (The italics are ours.) Thus, unless they would recognize any man as a gospel minister, who is out of the visible church, and consequently according to their doctrine in a state in which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation, it would be absurd in the extreme. But if a lingering doubt should remain upon the mind of any one as to their views upon this subject, let us follow them a little further. They say: "Into this catholic church church *Christ hath given the ministry, oracles*, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints," &c. See Confession of Faith pages 134-5-6.

Thus we see that it is a scriptural truth acknowledged not only by us as Baptists, but also by all the prevailing denominations in our country, that out of the visible church of Christ we should recognize *no man* as a gospel minister. And where do we find *visible* churches of Christ? It is acknowledged by all denominations so far as I know, (Quakers only excepted) that Baptism is the initiatory rite unto the Christian church, that where is no baptism there are no *visible* churches of Christ. If we as Baptists are correct in reference to the ordinance of baptism, (and I believe with all my heart, soul, mind and strength, that we are,) then Pedobaptists have *no baptism, absolutely none*, (for their infant or adult *sprinklings, wettings, mastenings*, are the most unlike the ordinances instituted by Christ of any thing that can be conceived.) And consequently their societies are not visible churches of Christ, but mere human institutions. Holding therefore, as we do, that believers are the *only* Scriptural subjects of Christian baptism, and that immersion is *the* action commanded by Christ, and practiced by the Apostles, we cannot invite Pedobaptist preachers into our pulpits, and hold with them ministerial fellowship, who, according to our views, are unbaptized and out of the visible church of Christ, without manifest inconsistency.

2. Not only is the ministry in the *church*, the gift of God to the church, but it is the highest official station *in the church*. As in philosophy the greater includes the less, so in theology. When we ordain a man to preach the gospel, we authorize him to perform all the minor duties of the ministry, such as administering the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper. Paul says: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." 1 Cor. 7: 17. Not that he was unthorized to baptize, for he acknowleges in the context, that he "baptized Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanus."—But he designs to convey the idea, that preaching the gospel was the *principal* part of his ministry.—Now, where, we would respectfully ask, is our consistency, when we invite Pedobaptists into our pulpits to preach the gospel to us, and perform the highest functions of the ministry, occupy the highest official stations in the church, and at the same time deny that they have any right to administer the ordinances of the gospel, or to sit down at the Lord's table; yea, deny that they are even members of the *visible* church of Christ!

3. Pedobaptist preachers teach doctrines, and practice ceremonies, for which we would exclude a minister of our own denomination.

If a Baptist minister should so depart from the "faith once delivered to the saints," as to become the bold advocate of infant sprinkling, and exhort parents to bring their unconscious babes to receive the *sealing* ordinances, and then lay his wet fingers on their little foreheads, or sprinkle a little water upon them, and then raise his hands towards heaven and say, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost—Amen;" and should call this Christian baptism, where is the *sound Baptist* minister who would invite such a man into his pulpit? Where is the *sound Baptist* church that would recognize such a man as a gospel minister? If the question should be asked, What should be done with him? would not the voice of the whole denomination be heard at once, *exclude him, exclude him*, not only from the pulpit but exclude him from the *communion of the church*, for advocating *pernicious* heresy? But every Pedobaptist preacher in the land is doing those very things, and we exclude the one from our fellowship, as an incorrigible heretic, and invite the other into our pulpits and hold with him ministerial fellowship, at the same time. No, never.

For the sake of illustration, let us suppose that S. is the pastor of the Baptist church in R., and that H. is an ordained minister and a member of the church in R. H. becomes the bold advocate of infant sprinkling, but desires to retain his connection with the Baptist church, on account of her republican form of government. He is arraigned before the church for heresy.

On the day of trial, C., the Pedobaptist minister in R., attends to witness the trial. He is invited into the pulpit by brother S., the pastor, to preach the gospel to the congregation. At the close of the sermon Conference sits—the case of H. is called up—he remains obstinate—is excluded from the fellowship of the church. On the following day H. steps across the street, and is received into the Pedobaptist society, in full fellowship; and is by the society duly recognized as a gospel minister, and in that capacity he again visits the Baptist church, and S. should, in conformity to the *false* charity of some, invite him into the *same* pulpit to preach the gospel to the *same* church, from whose fellowship he had been righteously excluded for heresy, every one would cry out, O' consistency! Verily, thou art a jewel!

But an objector may say that H. was righteously dealt with by the Baptist church, because it is a *manifest inconsistency* for a man to advocate the doctrine of infant sprinkling, and at the same time desire to retain his connection with the Baptist church. But that C., (the Pedobaptist minister,) should be regarded innocent, because it is in perfect keeping with his whole system, for him to advocate and practice the objectionable ceremony. Let us remember that the charge against H. was not for inconsistency but for *the heresy itself*. But thus the objection proceeds upon the principle that errors are innocent provided a man will embrace enough of the rest to be consistent, and erring be among with another.

### Anecdote,—Close Communion.

The late Rev. Elisha Andrews, as well know in some part of this State and in New Hampshire, was a man learned and a theologian of the first order was always ready for an encounter. When religious controversy was upon him he never failed to accept it.

A few miles distant and in a neighboring town there resided a Pedobaptist minister of the same name—Elisha Andrews. Elder A. had long intended to form an acquaintance with his namesake, but never had an opportunity to do it until just after the publication of Robert Hall's celebrated work on communion, in which he severely and justly rebuked the bigotry and abuse of New England Pedobaptists, and then, though in the place where Andrews was, he had no leisure for making the visit. He was at the door by the Rev. Mr. Andrews, who was by instinct knew himself as the Rev. Mr. Andrews. He was received with great and cordial warmth, for which his name was sufficient introduction. On taking his hat, and observing a white neckcloth, Mr. Andrews—written in letters following dialogue ensued:

*Congregationalist Clergyman.*—I believe you have the whole of my name; I believe I have heard of you, you are a Baptist clergyman, I believe.

*Baptist Minister.*—I am a Baptist, and try in my feeble way to preach.

*Cong. A.*—I am happy to see you and form an acquaintance. Are you one of the liberal sort of Baptists? or, are you one of the rigid, close communion, high-church sort?

*Bap. A.*—I make no pretensions to liberality. I endeavor to follow the precepts of my Lord and Saviour, and the examples of His apostles and disciples. I am a restricted comunion Baptist.

*Cong. A.*—I am sorry. I wish you would read Robert Hall's book, and read it, and believe it, and practice it.

*Bap. A.*—Indeed: well, it must be a good book to be worthy to be read, believed, and practiced. What is there in the book? What does it teach, Bro. Andrews?

*Cong. A.*—Why, as to that matter, Mr. Hall does not believe that there is any other mode of baptism but immersion.

*Bap. A.*—Ah! does he teach that? Well in that matter, I should agree with him. Do you agree with him on that point?

*Cong. A.*—Why, no; no—I don't exactly agree with him there.

*Bap. A.*—Well, what else does this book teach?

*Cong. A.*—Well, Mr. Hall does not believe that there is any other Scripture subject of baptism but believers; he doesn't hold to infant baptism.

*Bap. A.*—I begin to be quite interested in the work. I agree with Mr. Hall. I don't believe in infant baptism. Do you agree with Mr. Hall here, friend Andrews?

*Cong. A.*—Why, no; I don't agree with him in these respects exactly, for if I did I should be a Baptist myself.

*Bap. A.*—Well go on, what else does Mr. Hall believe? Let us hear the whole.

*Cong. A.*—Mr. Hall believes that baptism is not a necessary pre-requisite to communion.

*Bap. A.*—Do you agree with Mr. Hall in this matter, friend Andrews?

*Cong. A.*—No, I confess I rather think baptism is to be regarded as a necessary pre-requisite to the other ordinance.

*Bap. A.*—Well, the case seems to be just here. I agree with Mr. Hall in two of the propositions, and with you in one of them, while you agree with him in neither.

You are a pretty fellow; you want me to read, believe, and practice a book that you don't believe a word of.

Suffice it to say, that the subject was dropped here; and, though the acquaintance was an amicable one through life, was never again resumed.—*Christian Era.*

UNCLE RASTUS.

WHO WOULD BE WITHOUT A NEWSPAPER?—A man eats up a pound of sugar, and the pleasure he has enjoyed is ended; but the information he gets from a newspaper is treasured up in the mind, to be used whenever occasion or inclination calls for it. A newspaper is not the wisdom of a man or two men; it is the wisdom of the age—of past ages too.

A family without a newspaper is always half an age behind the times in general information; besides they never think much, nor find much to think about. And there are the little ones growing up in ignorance without a taste for reading.

Besides all these evils, the wife, who, when her work is done, has to sit down with her hands in her lap, and nothing to amuse her mind from the toils and cares of the domestic circle. Who would be without a newspaper.

## Child's Department.

Articles from the Children's Book, for February and March.

### Learn to Pray.

Wake, little child, the morn is gay.
The air is fresh and cool,
But pause awhile, and kneel to pray,
Before you go to merry play.
Before you go to school.

Kneel down and speak the holy words:
God loves your simple prayer
Above the sweet songs of the birds,
The bleating of the gentle herds,
The towers that scent the air.

And when the quiet evening comes,
And dew-drops wet the sod,
When bats and owls begin to roam,
And flocks and herds are driven home,
Then kneel in prayer to God.

Remember you need him daily and hourly
To shield you with his arm,
To help you always to do rightly,
To feed your soul and give it light,
And keep you from harm.

THE BOY AND THE BRICKS.—A boy attending his father saw. Twas a noble one that would not work be always. And if father approves this rule I will test it in my play.

So setting up a row of brick edges on four inches apart, he tipped over the first which striking the second caused it to fall on the third and so on through the whole course until all the bricks lay prostrate.

Well, said the boy, as a brick has knocked down his neighbor which stood next to him, I only tipped one. Now I and raise one and see if he will raise his neighbor. I will see if seeing one will raise all the bricks. He begins to raise one and see them rise.

"Here father," said the boy, "is a pure rule, if it will not work both ways. They are all each other down, but will not raise each other up.

So, son, said the father, "bricks and mankind are alike, made of clay, active in knocking each other down, but not disposed to help each other up."

"Father," said the boy, "does the first brick represent the first Adam?"

The father replied with the following:

MORAL.—When men fall they lose company, but when they rise they love to stand alone, like render brick, and see others prostrate and below them."

From the Child's Paper.

### Young America.

More than two millions of boys in the United States are now attending the various schools and institutions of learning in this country. This is a great multitude and it may be safely said that the future political state of the nation, and the future interests of the church, much depend upon the principles which they are now taught and among them. These boys will soon be voters and share the heavy responsibilities of our elections; many of them will be church-members, to be the Pauls, the Peters, or the Judases of the American church. It may not be amiss to watch "the signs of the times," and ask under what influences and agencies the young Americans are growing up to manhood. What is the tone of morals among them? What the standard of religious character? What the prevailing tastes and popular pleasures? What books do they read? What kind of literature is most sought after? These are questions of deep import. Are parents and heads of families, and instructors and preachers and lecturers, and Sabbath-school teachers, and editors and book-makers fully alive to them? Are we teaching, both by *example* and precept, *Bible principles*, noble aims, and generous ideas, and manly purposes, and integrity, and justice, and the charity which suffereth long and is kind? for "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." "Happy is that people whose God is the Lord."

From the Child's Paper.

### "My Mother Knows Best."

A party of little girls stood talking beneath my window. Some nice plan was on foot; they were going into the woods, and they meant to make oak-leaf trimming and pick berries, and carry lunch-cons. Oh, it was a fine time they meant to have. "Now," said they to one of the number, "Ellen, you run home and ask your mother if you may go. Tell her we are all going, and you must." Ellen with her green cape bonnet, skipped across the way and went into the house opposite. She was gone some time. The little girls kept looking up to the windows very impatiently. At length the door opened, and Ellen came down the steps. She did not seem to be in a hurry to join her companions, and they cried out, "You got leave! You are going are you?" Ellen shook her head and said that her mother could not let her go. "Oh," cried the children, "it is *too bad!* Not go! it is really unkind in your mother." "Why, I would *make* her let you." "Oh, oh." "I *would* go, whether or no." "*My mother knows best*," was Ellen's answer, and it was a beautiful one. Her lips quivered a very little, for I suppose she wanted to go, and was much disappointed not to get leave, but she did not look angry or pouting, and her voice was very gentle but very firm when she said, "*My mother knows best.*"

There are a great many occasions when mothers do not see fit to give their children leave to go and do where and what they wish to, and how often are they rebellious and pouting in consequence of it. But this is not the true way, for it is not pleasing to God. The true way is a *cheerful acquiescence* in your mother's decision. Trust her, and smooth down your ruffled feelings by the sweet and dutiful thought, "My mother knows best." It will save you many tears and much sorrow. It is the gratitude you owe her, who has done and suffered so much for you.

# The Tennessee Baptist.

NASHVILLE, TENN.
SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1855.


☞ VERY SPECIAL NOTICE. ☜

Whenever Subscribers, or Agents, or Postmasters, write to us, stating new subscribers, or changing the post-office address of an old one, or to discontinue the paper, Be sure to state the Post-office at which it is being taken, so that the name can be found on our books.

☞ Communications must be accompanied with the real names of their authors. Who is Dudley, and C. O. W.?

☞ Use your paper. Look over the outside of this issue, and exhort your impenitent child or friend to read those solemn appeals to the unconverted.

☞ In the Baptist Memorial for March, there is reported the addition of 2,850 by baptism to Baptist Churches, twenty-two ministers ordained, three ministers received from Pedobaptists, and nine new meeting houses built.

Brother Burrows would astonish his readers and surprise even Baptists themselves to report the number of Pedobaptist members received in the course of six months.

☞ Brother Baylis, Pastor of the first Church in this city, delivered the most able and conclusive discourse last Sabbath, upon that article of the Baptist Church, entitled the Perseverance of the Saints, that we have listened to for many years.—We have requested, and hope he will consent to its publication in this paper. Brother B. is not only an able minister, but he is proving himself an efficient Pastor. The gloom and discouragement that have long rested upon the first Church are beginning to give way to faith and hope under his ministrations. May his hands be strengthened and the desires of his heart be given him.

☞ Will fathers and mothers look over the reading for children on the first page! Those are extracts from "The Children's Book" for February and March, which we are delaying to issue in order that we may hear from you, and receive the name of your child as a subscriber.

We have sent our 15,000 copies as a specimen number, and we are now waiting to hear from Southern parents, to learn whether they will encourage and support such a work in the South. Do you not want it for your child—your children! Only $1 00 will bring it into your family a whole year. Send to this office. None but subscribers will receive the second number.

### Have you Read This

Brother M. Green writes us from Summerville, while I have ordered for others, quite a number of other papers to be stopped, since the pressure in money matters at this office, not a copy of the "Tennessee Baptist." I am happy to state, has been ordered discontinued through me. This is a good index, indeed. And we are still more happy to state, that while several are stopping their papers, on account of the *hard times*, and when we looked for our list to diminish greatly, it is *even increasing*. And who can say that it will not reach the goal set for it, twelve thousand this year! Each give it a little push, and it will roll on rapidly. But there is one thing we do feel sensibly, our receipts are running below our expenses. Old subscribers are waiting until money is plenty before they remit their dues. How then shall we be able to pay the large amounts falling due for type and ink and paper. We *must positively* raise five thousand dollars over and above our weekly expenses to meet our paper for the present quarter, and where is the christian Brother who will be offended at us, or grumble and growl if we send him his bill, and as politely as we know how ask him to help us *a little* if it is only to a part of what he owes. He is no man to do it, and we do not want to have anything to do with such a patron. It may be it is hard times with him, but he must know it is hard times with his editor too, and suppose no one pays, what then! We say this because we are sending out bills to all, and that because we are *compelled to do so*. So far as we can learn they are answered promptly, and not a man has complained, except of his own remissness. If they are sent to any who are entitled to anything for services rendered, let them credit themselves the full amount in the bill and send the balance. Help us turn this hard quarter of a year kind friends, and our regard and love for you will be increased manifold. No paper ever had better patrons or warmer friends—or foes.

### The Way we Expected it would Work.

Mr. Fulton of the Gospel Banner, St. Louis, after fully endorsing the orthodoxy of Alexander Campbell's Reformed Christianity, and consequently current Campbellism finds himself (not to his surprise) in the receipt of cheering letters from Campbellites in Tennessee and Missouri, and he exhibits them from week to week with evident delight, because by taking them under his "Banner" works money into his pocket. He says:

"How it Works."

"LIBERTY, Mo., January 30, 1855.

*Bro. Fulton—Dear Sir:*—To-day, about twelve o'clock, was shown me a *Circular*, addressed to the patrons of the Gospel Banner, by *Mr. Coons*, of your city, in which sundry charges are very gravely preferred against yourself, and the Banner, on grounds then and there appearing, *repudiated*. These charges all resolve themselves, to my mind, into one—*that you have spoken courteously of my brethren, and, when truth demanded it, added a word or two in their defence*. Fear not to be deserted by such precarious friends. In lieu of every one such, five, more steadfast, will rise up. Sir, you have reached that period which will try your nerves. You may expect to be sifted. Speak *the truth*. Defend the innocent. Fear not what man can do.

Enclosed you have a small material token of the injury which this Circular has done you in a few hours in Liberty.

In your perils count on a friend in
Fraternally and truly yours,
M. E. LARD."

And "it works" another way—thus:

From the Gospel Banner.

"*Brother Fulton:*—In your 17th number (September 14) I find (*editorial*, it is presumed,) highly interesting reflections, under the head of "Journalism." I was, however, towards the close of the communication, not more surprised than mortified to see a position taken which, to me seems to look to, if not to *desire*, *affiliation* with the self-styled Reformers, or Campbellites. I regret, greatly, their participation in "Revision," with the consent, not to say at the *invitation*, of Baptists. Already, to my mind, has it proved, and it will *continue* to prove, the greatest incubus upon the "Revision" effort. In the omnipotence of truth, and its ultimate prevalence against and over men and devils, I am an unshaken believer. But why unnecessarily admit, or *call in*, those with whom we *cannot* affiliate, without renouncing distinctive principles, held by us to be Scriptural?

That it is wicked in Elder Graves to refute error, and to show it, in the manner [illegible] Neither *am I* [illegible] Baptists (as I know them,) your views (as expressed) of Mr. Campbell. "*Nullius addictus in verba jurare magistri.*" Yours in the truth,

*November* 14. A BROTHER."

Which is preferable, the praises of Campbellites and their apologists, or the great condemnation of true Baptists!

### The Discussion at Canton, Mississippi.

We have, since our last notice of this discussion, received a letter from the committee which we thought have received a month ago, and from it we learn that the propositions for the debate have been definitely agreed upon, leaving the time only to be fixed by us. The propositions are as follows:

"I. Immersed believers are the only scriptural subjects for baptism. Mr. Graves affirms. Methodists and Presbyterians, by their representative, deny.

"II. Affusion is the only scriptural mode of baptism. Methodists and Presbyterians affirm. Mr. Graves denies.

"III. The Methodist Episcopal Church Government and organization is Republican and Scriptural. Methodists affirm. Mr. Graves denies."—*Tennessee Baptist.*

"We can but express surprise, that any Pedobaptist should have consented to discuss the second of the above propositions.

"No Pedobaptist church in existence holds the doctrine it sets forth; and if Mr. Graves triumphs in its discussion, he will only have gained a victory over a few individuals, and not over any Pedobaptist church. We are therefore surprised, that Baptists themselves should accept the proposition.

"The first proposition is as it should be. The last will be apt to make some *music* in the course of its debate."—*Banner of Peace.*

We are astonished at Dr. Langdon's forgetfulness, or lack of familiarity with the fathers and eminent and endorsed writers of his own church, and as well as of the action of some of its Presbyteries. It is our impression that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is not far from holding that affusion only is baptism.

Finis Ewing was, we believe, one of the original founders of the C. P. Church. In his Lectures on Divinity, *printed* 1827 *by the C. P. Synod*, on page 211, will Dr. L. please read:

"Then when NEITHER SCRIPTURE NOR REASON supports immersion, why will men be so tenacious of it as even to tear asunder Christ's mystical body—his Church? I do conscientiously believe that, taking God's word and reason for their guide, Pedobaptists would have greater cause to exclude the Baptists *for omitting their duty* in baptism, from their communion, than the Baptists have to exclude them on the same principle."

This looks like Mr. Ewing and a whole C. P. Synod in Tennessee did once regard immersion no scriptural baptism. Does it not, *Dr. Langdon?*

Then there is the distinguished Doctor of Divinity and Professor of Theology in Bethel College, West Tennessee, R. Burrow, D. D., in a work on Christian Baptism, &c., on page 89, says:

"Having seen that there is not only *no evidence in favor of immersion*, BUT THAT THE SACRED SCRIPTURES GO EMPHATICALLY TO DISCOURAGE IT," &c.

We refer our cotemporary to this work—we must be excused from quoting its language—in which Baptists are charged with slaying *tens of thousands* immortal souls, when Infidelity slays only its thousands!! In other words, that the influence of Baptists upon the world is ten-fold worse than that of Infidels!! Now this book has been extensively circulated by Cumberland Presbyterians, and it received the commendation of the Banner of Peace, and even that of so good and catholic a man as Dr. Cossitt. We know the positions of this book to have been endorsed by several C. P. Churches in Tennessee. Has Dr. L. never seen it?

Finally, did not the Doctor publish, in his own paper, under date of October 26, 1854, a resolution something like the following, which passed the Charlotte C. P. Presbytery?

"*Resolved*, That the ministers of this Presbytery *will not longer administer* immersion for baptism, but adhere strictly to the formula of the C. P. Confession of Faith, *both the letter* and practice *pouring* and *sprinkling only*."

We are so informed—see last Tennessee Baptist. Are it is our impression that the Hopewell Presbytery has passed a similar resolution. What about these facts, Doctor? That Old School Presbyterians practically teach that affusion alone is baptism, we appeal to their invariable practice of sprinkling.

We could easily cite our worthy cotemporary to the writings and sermons of Old School ministers to show the grounds they occupy.

See Sermon by A. A. Campbell, pastor of Old School Church, Jackson, Tennessee, p. 7:

"The fact is clearly and unequivocally settled, that *immersion is no part of Christian baptism*, otherwise THE APOSTLES WERE BAD MEN, AND NOT ENTITLED TO OUR CONFIDENCE!

See p. 12: "If Christ was *baptized* by John in any other way than by sprinkling, he could neither have fulfilled the law, nor been ceremonially clean; *and the Jews could with propriety have scourged him, and been preiscriptorily in sodoming*," &c.

See p. 20: "And for a Christian minister to practice immersion, is to hedge up the way, and to prevent the fulfillment of prophesy in the return of the Jews; they are, therefore, clearly opposing, in this particular, the plan of God; and also, so far as their influence goes, will prevent the coming of that blessed day which Christ has taught us to pray for."

Poor Baptists, if left to the mercy of these men!

That Methodists have now taken the position that affusion alone is baptism, we appeal to the late works issued by their Book Concern, and their Conference papers, as well as to this proposition. The Methodist and Presbyterian Societies in Canton very well know what they were about when they fixed that proposition. By their publications they have been gradually preparing the membership to table it for public discussions.

We would be very happy to hear the editor of the Banner of Peace say whether he endorses the sentiments and positions of Dr. Burrows' book.

### Times are Hard, Continue my Paper.

I want, in these hard times, all the comfort that I can possibly secure. My Bible is the foundation, the source of spiritual comfort; and my minister elaborates and illustrates the teachings of the Sacred Oracles: in all this I rejoice and am greatly profited, but my newspaper is not the less necessary to my happiness. While I would not elevate it above the ministry, I must admit, what is certainly evident to all, that it gives a greater amount of religious intelligence, covers a wider range of subjects, and makes me more frequent visits than my minister.

I want it in my family as a preventive of extravagance and folly. The spiritual knowledge and pure examples, which are faithfully, yet attractively presented through my paper, are great helps to point out the dangers of improvidence.

If times get harder, I shall be constrained to read my Bible more frequently, pray more, solicit more frequent visits from my pastor, and take another religious newspaper. I have a great many reasons, of a purely religious character, why I must have the weekly visits of my paper, but cannot now consider them.

Times are hard, then do not fail to continue my paper! I cannot afford to do without it. It would be a sacrifice too great for me under existing circumstances. When times get good, I may dispense with it. No! let me recall that sentence, for then I shall need it as a check to pride and selfishness.

I have thought it would be an admirable arrangement, to make a permanent investment (when I am able) to supply my children, grand-children, and great-grand-children with a copy of the paper, *Times are hard, continue the "True Union."*

J. H. P.

We love that man, for he is a *man*, a whole man, and a *christian*. We will confess too, that we know nothing of human nature, if that man does not *pay* for his paper, in advance. Yes, sir, he pays for it, if the times are hard. He is not the man to think his editor may get through them the best he can—he will pay him for his paper when it is altogether convenient to himself if it is only once in three, four, or seven years.

His paper does him some good, too, because he pays for it. A subscriber who will take a paper for five or ten years without paying, although importuned and begged repeatedly, feels too mean for his paper to benefit him. He throws it down, and is ashamed to look it steady in the face.

For the Tennessee Baptist.

### Reply to Rev. J. M. Pendleton.

MR. EDITOR: In a postscript appended to my article on *The Interpretation of the Scriptures*, which you did me the favor to publish in the Tennessee Baptist of the 17th and 24th of Feb. last, I said I would probably have no reply to make, if any one should notice my remarks fairly and without misconstruction. The Rev. J. M. Pendleton, author of "The Old Landmark," has honored that communication with a notice in your paper of March 3d: I do not say unfairly—for he is not the man to do such things, but if I say with some misconstruction, the charitable conclusion must be, that the wise and good may err. I presume, Mr. Editor, you will see the propriety and justice of publishing this rejoinder in your next issue, while the points of difference are fresh in the memory of your readers. My object is to present subjects for reflection to my Baptist brethren generally, as I did before, but more particularly to my esteemed friend, the Rev. J. M. Pendleton.

DEAR SIR: I read your reply with interest, as I do the many excellent articles from your pen, which appear weekly in the Baptist, and I can scarcely make you sensible of the joy which filled my heart, when I found you so fully and unequivocally subscribing to every important point in my argument, in these words: "To six out of the eight numerical divisions of his argument I heartily subscribe." Knowing that my first six propositions contained my whole argument, designed to show that the universal Christian right of interpretation must if acknowledged, clearly demolish the proselyting sentiment; and that the seventh and eighth only made an application of the foregoing argument, by referring to the evil nature and tendencies of that untenable sentiment, could I come to any other conclusion than the one which would forcibly strike every attentive logical reader, namely That a talented minister had become convinced of his error and had the Christian independence to abandon his unjust and unseemly opinions? How I ask, could any person capable of reading and appreciating my argument in my first six propositions to which you so "heartily subscribed," that you thought—these may all be regarded as truisms"—come to any other conclusion?

Please reconsider the real gist and scope of my argument in the first six divisions, whose self-evidence at first struck your logical mind with such force, that you "almost wondered" why I "should dwell upon and amplify them." Here is a brief summary of the argument which may revive in your mind the main points of the original, though, as must be the case with all abridgements, it can not retain its innate cogency. Here it is.

Since all ought to read the Scriptures; since no human expounders are infallible; since there are acknowledged mysteries in them; since Pedobaptists differ about modes and images which both acknowledge not to be essential to salvation; since it is the right and duty of every Christian, each for himself and not for another, to interpret the Scriptures according to the light and grace which God may vouchsafe to his prayers and investigations. I come to the conclusion under the sixth division, that the right and duty of interpretation may be abused, and inasmuch as the Scriptures are to be the rule by which every Christian is to regulate his own faith and practice and not to judge the faith and practice of other Christians, if any one should presume to set on his own interpretation as the standard by which to judge and condemn another, as pure in heart and as holy in life as himself, he would abuse the right of interpretation, become a busybody in other men's matters, exact for himself what he will not allow to others, and violate the law of charity.

My argument assumes simply to the Baptists and Pedobaptists of churches, and more particularly to those with whom I do the very pleasant work and subjects of Christian baptism, if they are equally honest, prayerful, faithful and persevering as both profess to be, their difference in sentiment arises solely from the conscientious conclusions at which they arrive by interpreting the Scriptures or the conclusions which the Father of light may vouchsafe to their prayers and investigations. Now if either of the parties should conceive themselves so inevitably right, and the other so inevitably wrong in their respective conclusions, that the former must necessarily exclude from Christian privileges or repudiate the latter from the ministry and church of Christ, is there not a want of Christian humility, an over-weening self-confidence, which would lord it over men's consciences—of which God alone is the Judge—and condemn Christ's previous ones to the frightful penalty of repudiation, for the imaginary fault of interpreting the Scriptures conscientiously for themselves?

It seems to me you cannot avoid seeing this, and as you have admitted my premises, every intelligent reader will see how impossible it is for you to escape the fair and legitimate conclusion. But you can escape from the sentiment of repudiation. Allow me to say, it is my fervent prayer and full belief that you will abandon a sentiment so unworthy of you. My hope and confidence are based in part on these, your own words:

"To much—I believe I may say to most—of what Dr. C. says I have no objection. To six out of the eight numerical divisions of his argument I heartily subscribe. I certainly believe with him in the following points:

"1. *All ought to read the Scriptures.* 2. *No human expounders can be relied upon as infallible.* 3. *There are acknowledged mysteries in the Scriptures.* 4. *Pedobaptists and Baptists entertain different sentiments.* 5. *It is the right as well as the duty of all Christians to search and interpret the Scriptures, according to the light and grace which God may vouchsafe to their prayers and investigations.* 6. *The right and duty of interpretation may be abused.* These may all be regarded as truisms. I almost wonder that Dr. C. thought it necessary to dwell upon, and amplify them." he might have spared himself the labor." These are your own candid admissions.

When I examine your article further, I find after all, you have your misgivings. And I really fear that I am not to be the humble but happy instrument of winning you from the only peculiarity I ever knew, or heard, or thought concerning you, except whatsoever is lovely and of good report. But I will not despair at the success of others.

Do I seem to you to conflict with myself in the former and latter parts of my article? A refusal to show courtesy, by inviting a minister into the pulpit is very different from publishing to the world that he is no minister at all, nor a member of the Church of Christ.

And because Episcopalians do not invite other ministers; and Presbyterians and Methodists do not consider them as persecutors, you think my philosophy at fault. The refusal of Episcopalians and of Baptists would be alike a want of Christian courtesy: self-respect would forbid complaint. But the objection lies in the supercilious reasons and arrogant assumptions, avowed by the former for so unamiable conduct. Have not all evangelical denominations in the old world regarded these reasons and assumptions, as persecutions? And if you would know the evils to which they have led in Britain, and how many thousands of her brightest ornaments have been driven from that church by them, you have only to consult Strype, Whitlock, Bearsly, Clarendon, Burnet and nearly every writer from the reign of Henry VIII to the present time. And then surely you would pause long, before you would present a temptation, so corrupting in its tendency to the humble, honest-hearted Baptists. I verily believe the repudiating sentiment, if it should prevail, would drive most of the piety and intelligence from the church. You think you may repudiate other evangelical churches, as the Episcopalians do all churches, except the Papal, without persecution. I cannot answer you very well, because I do not wish to speak disparingly of any church.

More than one of my ancestors were Episcopal clergymen. My family and my own early training were in that church. I studied divinity in an Episcopal Theological Institution. And whatever partialities I may entertain for that people, you, I trust will not censure me for my favorable sentiments of the Baptists. The latter have always been the advocates of salvation, by grace, through faith. They have been counted on, as laboring for the world's evangelization. I have often assisted their ministers in conducting revivals, and they, as often, have assisted me in mine. About a year ago I assisted a Baptist pastor in conducting a revival in his church, laboring days and nights, and more than sixty persons professed joy and peace in believing. Where is the inconsistency forsooth?

I am somewhat surprised my dear sir, at the argument you have built on this phrase: *the right of private judgment in matters of religious belief.* You find it in my caption, but no where else in my whole article; and most certainly the laws of honorable discussion require you to use it in the only authorized sense—the one in which I intend it. Otherwise it would be easy to prove any thing that necessity might require—even "a stupendous inconsistency." In wielding it against my argument, every critical reader must see that you use it in a very extended sense—whereas the whole tenor of my reasoning will show, that I use it in a limited sense, as exactly equivalent to *the right of interpretation*, &c. I will now here logically analyze the argument you have made upon the phrase, supposing it happened through a little advertency; but will rather refer you to Hedge's Logic, chapter fourth, on Sophisms, article 194. But this is not all; your first inadvertency has clearly led you into another, as follows: "The judgment of Pedobaptists decides that they ought to be recognized as churches. &c. The judgment of Baptists decides the reverse." Certainly a little reflection will convince you that you have begg the whole question, and strictly arrive at a fallacy. I hope you will forgive me for putting out your mistakes, as I forgive you for having inadvertently made them.

Truly, I have said that Baptists and Pedobaptists agree that baptism is a duty, but not essential to salvation; and they differ only about the subjects and the mode. You seem very positive that baptism ought to come into a discussion on the repudiating sentiment. Why then do Drs. Lynd, Everts, and Ford, who agree with you on the baptismal question, differ so widely from you with regard to repudiation?

You say, "Dr. C's reference to the disputation between Paul and Barnabas does not avail him any thing." It avails me this much, and no more, they differ about a matter which I intimated to be of less importance than interpretation, and so widely that they separated but to report one another to the ministry and the church.

But what thought you of the controversy between Paul and Peter? Was their difference not anything affecting the organic structure of the church of Christ? Will you see what one of the wisest and best writers of this century has said of it? In early times in the city of Antioch, an attempt was made to subject the faithful to forms and ceremonies contrary to the gospel of Christ. And though even an apostle, Peter himself, was among those who attempted to bring the Christians under an unlawful yoke—they, with Paul, at their head, withstood him to the face. Yet there was no repudiation from the apostleship nor the church. This example denoted shows your repudiating sentiments and THE OLD LANDMARK.

[illegible] familiar with close communion in its origin, progress and ramifications, to point out whatever good or evil it may have done in the Christian world. This would be taking a road hitherto untrodden, for if Robert Hall has not touched the real merits of the question no one else has. But few Baptists or Pedobaptists would be competent to the justness of the subject—it would require one who prefers or thinks he prefers Bible truth to any other system and the conversion of the world to the precedence of any sect.

What you say about the ignorant and wicked seeing the consistency of repudiation, was doubtless intended to be amusing rather than argumentative. They might see the consistency just as the murderers of Stephen did, or as the Jewish multitude did when they cried, "Crucify him! Crucify him!"

And now, in conclusion, I can assure you, I am fully satisfied you did not intend to wound my feelings, nor have you done so in the slightest degree. As usual, you have been courteous and kind. I hope I have not failed in the due reciprocity. I have no interest in the subject of our discussion, except truth and its benign influences. My former article was sent for publication, before Christmas, and before I had learned that any of your old and distinguished brethren would give attention to what I regarded as injurious to piety; otherwise I would probably have been silent. I now believe the ark to be safe. And knowing those who uphold it can do it more to the satisfaction of the Baptist brethren than I can, I hereby assure you of my continued esteem and friendship, and bid you adieu.

F. R. COSSITT.

### Reply to the Foregoing.

DR. COSSITT—*My Dear Sir:*—I have read with due attention your reply to my communication of March 3d. You are certainly very happy in exemplifying the spirit of controversial courtesy and suavity. I know of no one who excels you in this particular.

It seems that in reading the first part of my communication you were almost satisfied that you had made me a convert to your views. You express yourself so artlessly and so earnestly that it is difficult for me to withhold from you my sympathy in your disappointment. I am so constituted as to share in the disappointments of my friends. Still you are disappointed, and are likely to remain so.

You are gratified at my acquiescence in your first six propositions, and seem a little surprised that it was given. The wonder would have been greater if it had been withheld: for the six propositions are indisputably true. The fourth proposition—that "Pedobaptists and Baptists differ"—is as clear as the sun in the heaven, and yet it is no clearer than the other five.

The conclusion of your reasoning on the six points is that "inasmuch as the Scriptures are to be the rule by which every christian is to regulate *his own* faith and practice, and not to judge the faith and practice of *other christians*: if any one should presume to set up his own interpretation, as the standard by which to judge and condemn another, as pure in heart and as holy in life as himself, he would abuse the right of interpretation, become a busybody in other men's matters, exact for himself what he will not allow to others, and violate the law of charity."

I respectfully submit that if the Scriptures are the rule by which you regulate your faith and practice, they must necessarily be the rule by which you judge of the faith and practice of other christians. Your faith and practice you consider as corresponding with the Bible. But there are "other christians" whose faith and practice do not correspond with yours. In regulating your own faith and practice by the Scriptures you are obliged to censure the faith and practice at variance with your own. For example: You believe in what is termed the "final perseverance of the saints." Methodists believe in "falling from grace." Now if the Bible regulates your faith in regard to the perseverance of the saints, it irresistibly leads you to judge that "falling from grace" is an unscriptural doctrine. Again, in judging from the Bible that the Presbyterian form of church government is right, you, of necessity, conclude that the Methodist form of government is wrong. I really cannot see how you can, by the Bible, regulate your own faith and practice without virtually deciding on the faith and practice differing from your own. In judging that you are right you judge that those who differ from you are wrong. Is it not so? Will you say this is an abuse of "the right of interpretation?" If it is, I can only say that it is unavoidable. Our moral organization is such that we are obliged to approve what we consider right, and to condemn what we consider wrong. And I courteously suggest that one may do this without becoming a busybody in other men's matters. If you determine that it is your duty to serve God in a particular way, do you become a busybody" in the matters" of those who choose to serve God in a different way? I insist you do not. If the opposite view is taken I see no consistent stopping-place till we reach the point that a man, to avoid the charge of being a busybody in other men's matters, must agree with all other men in their views and practices. And he who could do this would be unworthy to be called a man. Will you say that he who entertains such sentiments as these "even as for himself what he will not allow to others?" I must be allowed to demur. Some look on me as the incarnation of selfishness and bigotry; yet I claim nothing for myself that I do not cheerfully concede to others. I want them to be guided by the word of God—I ask no other guide. If they claim the right of interpretation I grant it, and claim it too. And I must be permitted to say that it is sometimes a matter of wonder with me that I seem to be considered a sinner above all the men that ever dwelt at Jerusalem."

You speak of violating "the law of charity." Ah, my Dear Sir, charity is a beautiful word. It is often used and often abused. It sometimes serves the purpose of a cloak to cover the language of Webster in regard to a righteous tariff. "A man," exclaims an indignant orator, "may cry Chaos every form in over the river Styx." It is enough for me to know that charity rejoiceth in the truth." She is the daughter of the God of truth, the offspring of celestial; she and truth have sworn an eternal friendship. From the creation of the world till now she has never consented you to do any thing at variance with truth, and she is now at your side when she consents. For an example, in the old Republic there were those who believed that people or white people were less intelligent for subordinate than any other people in the character made man. There is no charity in the proscription of the term worm, there is no love of the truth, and a love of truth must be shown by becoming what God has said and doing what he has commanded.

You say of the [illegible] which Baptists and Pedobaptists agree in regard to the simple sprinkling and pouring of water for baptism, and then that "the parties severally [illegible] in the mode." It appears to me you [illegible] plain CONSCIENTIOUS CONCLUSIONS. Most Baptists set in my school to their conscience "is something." It has sometimes appeared to me that Pedobaptists were [illegible] on the common question. If I correctly conclude that Pedobaptist Societies are not christian societies, not being organized according to the gospel—and that therefore their ministers are not to be recognized as gospel ministers—can I, my conscientious friend, be expected to act, or am I to be forced to act in opposition to my conscientious conclusions? This would be [illegible] you might [illegible]

[illegible] may Dear Sir, do not [illegible] Scripture as a gospel church, [illegible] they have repudiated both the ordinances of Christ. Your conscientious conclusions are that these Societies ought not to be recognized as churches of Christ. Have you not the right to adhere to these conclusions? Is it not your duty to do so? Would it not be persecution to require you to do otherwise? What then is to be done? You must act out your conscientious conclusions" and the Quakers must act out theirs. This is the best that can be done. And so I say of Baptists and Pedobaptists. They differ materially, and to proclaim to the world, by uniting together, that there is no material difference would be the proclamation of a falsehood. It cannot be right to be guilty of falsehood by word or deed.

You say, "I am somewhat surprised, my Dear Sir, at the argument you have built on this phrase *the right of private judgment in matters of religious belief.* You find it in my caption, but no where else in my whole article, and most certainly the laws of honorable discussion require you to use it in the only authorized sense, the one in which I intend it." Pardon me for smiling at this. I honestly thought you intended your article to illustrate the sentiment of your caption. I hope I have not violated the laws of honorable discussion." You say you employed the phrase, "*the right of private judgment in matters of religious belief*," in a limited sense, as exactly equivalent to *the right of interpretation*." Very well. So I understand you, and I would as willingly base an argument on the latter phrase as the former. It could be done just as effectually. I have turned to Hedge's Logic. I do not see the applicability of what he says to the present case. I do not think I wandered from the precise subject of discussion, nor that I endeavored to gain an advantage by altering the question." If I felt unable to meet an opponent I would think it honorable to acknowledge it, but very dishonorable to alter the question.

I quote again as follows: "You seem very positive that baptism ought to come into a discussion on the repudiating sentiment. Why then do Drs. Lynd, Everts, Ford, &c., who agree with you on the baptismal question, differ so widely from you with regard to repudiation?"

I answer that Dr. Lynd, so far as I know, has written nothing on the question discussed in the "Old Landmark." As to Dr. Everts I have to say that he differs from me because he differs from Baptists and Pedobaptists. He believes there may be churches of Christ where there is no baptism. He repudiates what he is pleased to call Dr. Griffin's fallacy—namely, "Where there is no baptism there are no visible churches." Dr. Everts believes of Pedobaptists what they do not believe of themselves. Leaving their "baptized children" out altogether, he considers their organizations churches of Christ. He says, however, that immersion is the only baptismal act. In addition to this he says that preaching is not exclusively an official act—that all christians have the right to preach, &c.—He is, therefore, in favor of a recognition of Pedobaptist preachers, not because he considers them baptized, but because he thinks unbaptized men have the right to preach, and that even the wicked, when they hear, should say, "come."

You refer to the fact that Paul withstood Peter to the face at Antioch because he was to be blamed: and you are pleased to say: "This example demolishes your repudiating sentiment and THE OLD LANDMARK."

Let us see: Peter was a Jew, and made a distinction between meats until the miraculous "sheet" descended from heaven. He was taught to call no man common or unclean. From this time Peter seems to have had no scruples in living as the Gentiles. When, however, certain brethren—Jews no doubt—went from Jerusalem to Antioch Peter "withdrew and separated himself fearing them who were of the circumcision." This was like Peter—timid, irresolute, cowardly. Paul blamed him—he was blamable. But Peter was not repudiated from the apostleship and the church. Very true. But suppose Peter had given such a practical interpretation of the great commission as had assailed the organic structure of the churches of Christ, would Paul then have recognized him as an apostle? I believe he would not. For he would have confronted an angel and challenged his authority had an angel preached a different gospel. I really think, my Dear Sir, that the Old Landmark is not yet demolished.

You are pleased to refer again to [illegible] on. Between us I suppose there is no difference as to communion. We both say baptism is a prerequisite to it. The difference [illegible] is about baptism. What Robert Hall has written on communion is specious sophistry. Had the same sentiments been published with no [illegible] of a great name, and with all the brilliancy of a magnificent rhetoric, they would have been laughed at by some and treated with contempt by others who now loudly panegyrize Robert Hall. This great man puts the web of his sophistry to the assertion that the New Testament does not teach the priority of baptism to communion. Every intelligent Sunday School scholar knows that this assumption. The whole tenor of the New Testament indicates the very opposite of what Hall contended for. Alas that his mighty powers were not employed to better purpose!

And now, my Dear Sir, will you allow me to say that in spite of our apparent antagonism we are really together on the Old Landmark position. I will make the appeal. Your [illegible] of Faith says: Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the enlargement of the party, but for the edification of the whole church. Are

You prepared, then, of course, that baptism is a prerequisite to church membership. Suppose I. Want together on this point. But Form of Government "chapter XIV, it is said: It is proper and prerequisite that candidates applying to the pastor to be formed to preach the gospel, publicly and satisfactorily in proofs of their good moral character, and of their being regular members of some particular church." Here we are again agreed as to the necessity of church membership in order to preach. You believe to be such church. The question [illegible] is required to answer to [illegible] question affirmatively, then you [illegible] and after the [illegible] of [illegible] church [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Baptists who could [illegible] the world [illegible] of the Lord [illegible] baptism and [illegible] world [illegible] good. Much [illegible] Baptists [illegible] by an angel [illegible] who do not understand [illegible]

But my Dear Sir, whence does [illegible] We [illegible] a man who [illegible] We [illegible] ing and immersion are and by [illegible] of faith as a sine qua non in your diagnosis to perform his order in church membership and other denominations profess authority to preach the gospel. Now suppose you believed sprinkling and pouring water [illegible] you could not consider them as [illegible] poured, or who are immersed, [illegible] members and eligible to the [illegible] of God. This is plain. Believing as I do, that it is absolutely impossible to be baptized [illegible] God, how can I regard Pedobaptists as [illegible] pel churches, or ordained ministers of the gospel?—How can I consider these societies as having the scriptural right to confer authority to preach the gospel? I can not. I do not. I want Pedobaptist preachers to do all the good they can. But I deny that any Baptist who reverences the Word of God can consistently recognize them as ministers of Christ, set apart, according to the gospel to preach. You will perhaps say, "How I regret this!" How deeply is it to be deplored!" &c. Your regret when simplified, your lamentation, confined to its legitimate sphere, can amount only to this: "How I am troubled that the author of the Old Landmark does not believe that something else as well as immersion is baptism!" Would not this be the substance of the most eloquent complainings you could put forth? The question, my Dear Sir as Dr. Griffin has shown is really this: Are sprinkling and pouring valid baptism? You anticipate from me a negative answer. Some things I cannot believe. I cannot believe in Transubstantiation, nor in Purgatory, nor in the immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, nor that Christ was an Impostor, nor that the Apostles were lunatics. All these things I put in the category of incredibilities, and sprinkling and pouring for baptism I place by their side.

But it is time to close this letter which I have made long, considering it the close of our correspondence. You regret my position. I advocate it because I love Jesus Christ. I must do what he commands. I must please him. It is an awful thing to disobey God, even in an apparently trivial matter. Moses ascertained this when instead of *speaking* to the rock in the desert, he *smote* it.—There is, I know, a maxim, like this, recognized in our Courts of Justice: "The law does not regard minor matters." There is no such maxim in the Bible. Jesus says, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these LEAST commandments, and SHALL TEACH MEN SO, he shall be called the LEAST in the kingdom of heaven, but whosoever SHALL DO AND TEACH THEM, the same shall be called GREAT in the kingdom of heaven."

Your kind heart, my Dear Sir, troubles you that I am rendering myself unpopular.

"O popular applause! What heart of man
Is proof against thy sweet seducing charms!"

I would be troubled too if my love to Christ had not crucified my love of popularity. There is but little popularity resulting from fidelity in the service of God. This is the only popularity worthy of a thought, and it is so rare a thing I have no expectation of enjoying it. As to worldly popularity it is not for me. I am destined to live unpopular—to die unpopular—and, if I am remembered after I am dead, to be unpopular then. I care not for it on my own account. Sometimes a momentary sadness comes over me in thinking that my children may, when I am no more, encounter inconveniences and mortifications for my sake: and then,

"Some natural tears I drop, but wipe them soon."

Ah, my Dear Sir, let the world frown—let Pedobaptist denominations denounce me—let my own brethren utter words of reproach—it will infinitely compensate for all this if Jesus at last says, "Well done, good and faithful servant." The voice that speaks this commendation will surely be sweeter than the music of an angel's harp.

I am, my Dear Sir, with profound respect,
Yours, very truly,
J. M. PENDLETON.

☞ Putman's Monthly for March, has been laid upon our table by Messrs. Toon & Nelson.

### The Texas Baptist

We have seen several numbers of this young weekly since our return. It is very creditable in appearance. We congratulate our brethren upon so favorable a commencement. And Brethren Baines and Sutler will allow us to welcome them most cordially into the editorial fraternity. In Brother B. we recognize an old friend, as the friend of a pure version were called at the Nashville Convention. We hope neither his zeal nor his love has cooled.

Our attention has been [illegible] appeared in one paper [illegible] signature of G. G. F. [illegible] the Texas Baptist. We have the utmost integrity of the [illegible] Board, not have we [illegible] in Texas save them.

[illegible] West or wanderings of the Board [illegible] tually allowed to be [illegible] both sides. Less we [illegible] to lose it, we [illegible] tion. Every honorable [illegible] sustain us in our [illegible] paper. So adverse [illegible] West. We hope the [illegible] derstanding, and love [illegible] only in that way [illegible] Baptists are spending [illegible] other the enemy will [illegible] to away into captivity.

[illegible]

### To Brother Everts

We lay before [illegible] from Brother Baines [illegible] Pedobaptism, Brother [illegible] also it [illegible] discuss the matter [illegible]

[illegible]

### The Western Recorder.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Baptist [illegible] Publication Society [illegible] which has the most [illegible] seen from his [illegible] dictate terms [illegible] ground. He [illegible] unmanageable [illegible]

First, he proposes [illegible] question to [illegible]

Second, he [illegible] discussion within [illegible] of doing [illegible] the personality [illegible] It would require [illegible] fully [illegible] discussion [illegible]

[illegible]

Third, I will engage [illegible] the discussion on any terms that may be deemed fair and equitable by *three disinterested persons*—you and Bro. Everts each to choose one of the three, and the two thus selected to choose the third person. The proposition or propositions to be discussed to be fairly stated, and to embrace the main points of difference. The referees to be judges of the fairness &c., of the *propositions* as well as of the *time*, unless you and Bro. Everts agree on the propositions.

I here by authorize you, Brother Graves, to act for me in submitting or receiving propositions, and making any stipulations or arrangements that may be deemed necessary—and if such arrangements are made I shall go on with my series. I have a little more *rubbish* to remove, which I hope to be able to effect by one more article. I shall then proceed to build up.

Yours sincerely,
J. S. BAKER.

Desiring a full, candid and christianlike discussion of this important question, we offer on behalf of Bro. B. the following proposition.

It is consistent for Baptists to recognize Pedobaptists preachers as authorized Gospel Ministers, so far as to invite them to our pulpits or to seats in our Associations and Conventions, or to take part in the ordination of our Ministers. Bro. Everts to affirm. Bro. B. to deny.

The discussion not to exceed twenty-two columns, on each side, forty-four in all, in the Tennessee Baptist. The Western Recorder and Tennessee Baptist publish the whole discussion. That neither the editors nor correspondents of either paper shall comment upon the discussion until it is closed.

Bro. Everts to open and Bro. B. to close the same. Hod

# The Tennessee Baptist.

NASHVILLE, TENN.
SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1855.

SPECIAL CONTRIBUTORS.
Elder J. M. Pendleton, Bowling Green, Ky.
Elder T. G. Keen, Mobile, Alabama.
Elder T. W. Tomy, Yanceyville, North Carolina.
Dr. J. S. Waseler, Murfreesboro, North Carolina.
Elder R. Jones, Helena, Arkansas.
Ivey F. Thompson, Esq., Greensburg, La.
Elder D. King, Sacramento, California.
Matt. Hillsman, Knoxville, Tennessee.
J. M. Hart, Mclemoresville, Tennessee.
Dr. J. S. Baker, Albany, Georgia.

HISTORICAL CORRESPONDENTS.
Elder S. Adlam, Newport, Rhode Island.
Elder W. B. Cooper, Monticello, Florida.

☞ An active boy, of steady habits, from thirteen to fifteen years of age, can have an opportunity of learning the printing business and receiving an education, by applying at this office immediately. One from the country preferred.

☞ Elder J. P. May writes encouragingly from Belmarte, Alabama. Elder P. G. Edmonds received from the Campbellites and ordained to preach the faith he once labored to destroy.

☞ We call attention to the new song book published by the Southern Baptist Publication Society. The Casket is pre-eminently the best book of music *for all occasions* we have examined.

☞ The third Gallery of Portraits, drawn by the master hand of Gilliland, will undoubtedly be hailed with delight by a large class of our readers. We are preparing a fuller notice of the work.

THE SOUTHERN HOME GAZETTE.—This paper has assumed the folio form to suit the popular taste. It is ably edited and is far superior to any paper published in Philadelphia, or New York, and why should it not receive the support of the South, instead of those trashy periodicals. It is published at Augusta, Georgia. $2.00 per annum.

THE TENNESSEE BAPTIST is out in an entire suit of handsome new type. This paper seems destined and determined to take the lead in the South-West. *Mem. Messenger, Va.*

Thank you, Brother Messenger. We labor and pray, expend and sacrifice to make our paper worthy of the Baptist denomination, and useful to the cause of our dear Redeemer. Would that all Baptist papers were better than ours.

☞ We take pleasure in calling the attention of teachers of schools, public and private, to the new series of Normal School Books, advertised in our columns. They are, in our opinion, and we have used school books some, as far in advance of the old systems used in most of our schools as a Rail Road express train is ahead of a common stage wagon, in point of speed. They are money and time saving books—parents should demand their use in the schools they patronize. They are being introduced into the schools in this city.

THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIBLE REVISION ASSOCIATION, will meet in St. Louis April 7. The following distinguished speakers are announced:

Elder E. S. Dulin of Missouri.
Dr. T. S. Bell, of Kentucky.
Hon. B. M. Crenshaw, of Kentucky.
Elder S. W. Lynd, of Kentucky.
J. T. Johnson, Kentucky.
Dr. C. K. Winston, Tennessee.
Professor E. Adkins, Illinois.
Dr. W. H. Hopson, Missouri.
Elder A. P. Williams, Missouri.

These names are a guarantee of a rich intellectual feast. The friends in St. Louis invite the West and South generally to come. Theirs is a large city, and theirs large hearts.

### "A Consistent "High-Churchman."

A MORMON CHAPLAIN.—The California Legislature invited, among others, a Mormon minister to officiate at the daily opening sessions. Rev. J. Lewis Shuck, the Baptist minister at Sacramento, wrote a short note to that body, declining the invitation, and administering a deserved rebuke. We see not how a proper sentiment of self-respect could have allowed him to do less. He says:

"I am now precluded from accepting the invitation you have extended, from the fact of the Assembly having, by a large vote of yesterday, acknowledged the Christianity of that daring imposture of systematized licentiousness, called Mormonism. With it or its "Elders" I can have no religious affinity, sympathy, fraternity, or intercourse. I claim for myself individually, no superiority in righteousness over other men; but as a Christian minister I do claim for Christianity a superiority over every other religious system on the face of this whole earth; and as to Mormonism itself, I regard it as a dishonor to the one living and true God—a libel upon Christianity—a disgrace to the philosophy of human progress, and a bold insult to the intelligence of the nineteenth century."

Well said, and like a Baptist. Every man except our extremely charitable and liberal brethren, and perhaps even they themselves will approve of the rebuke.

Bro. S. may have had no objection to the man personally; he may have been a pious, though sadly mistaken man, as are thousands of Pedobaptists. He had no objection to his prayer as a man, or praying with him as a *man*, but he would not associate with him in the pulpit—place of the Legislature, as a minister, since he would thereby recognize him as his equal in the ministerial office.

What say our "low churchmen" to this? Does it not solve the question at issue between the Western Recorder and Tennessee Baptist? What says Bro. Ford.

SPONGES IN BAPTISM.—An instructive and amusing book could be compiled from the writings of Pedobaptists, showing that nearly every position and argument uttered by the advocates of Infant Baptism, had been denied and confuted by the advocates of the same creed. The proofs on which it is defended by the different sects which profess it, are so various and so contradictory, that a Baptist need only to set his opponents to fighting each other and calmly stand on, and see how the victory is made to whom it may concern. One champion of the Lutheran Church, for example, speaks as follows of sponges, who are considered so indispensable to a sound church in the Episcopal Church.—*True Church.*

"The use of sponges however laudable the original design, however necessary in some cases, however faithfully their duties may at first have been performed, has deteriorated into an unmeaning and thoughtless and even sinful habit. Solemn engagements are made which are rarely, if ever fulfilled, nay, scarcely afterwards thought of, and which indeed those who make them have neither intention nor opportunity to discharge. Several of our Synods have accordingly publicly expressed their disapprobation of this practice in ordinary cases, and we think it ought, except in a few rare cases, to be discouraged and abolished as quickly as possible."

*A brother, the best qualified man in the South, is now engaged upon just such a work, and he writes us to furnish him all the Pedobaptist books and tracts published and circulated in the South West. Who will aid us in this? Send in your old copies of such works. Chapman's books that contradict all preceding Methodist standard authors, and Barrow's book that contradicts itself, and we will forward them to this author, and hope within the year to announce the book prepared for the Tennessee Publication Society.

*A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. Published under the auspices of the Board of the Society for the diffusion of useful knowledge. Vol. 1. London: Baldwin and Cradock, Paternoster-row. MDCCCXXXI.

AMENDE HONORABLE.—The following will speak for itself, and it speaks well in behalf of the American Tract Society:

NEW YORK, Nov. 9, 1854.

RESPECTED AND DEAR BROTHER:—I noticed some time since, a suggestion in your paper, that the text "He that believeth," &c., was quoted in our Tract, No. 399, "Dialogue between the Bible and the sinner," without the words "and is baptized." As soon as the suggestion came to the knowledge of the committee, they at once concurred in their insertion, and they have been inserted, both in page two and page four of that Tract.

With respect and esteem,
Your brother in Christ,
W. A. HALLOCK, *Cor. Sec.*

*Western Recorder.

### The Question of the Axe—No. 6.

SO WARRANT FOR LAY-PREACHING.

4. THE PROPHETS OF APOSTOLIC TIMES.—We have been referred, with an air of triumph, to 1 Cor. 14: 31, "For ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted," as though that passage established the fact that every one was allowed to *preach!* Alas! what painful evidence have we, that blindness in part hath happened to many of our spiritual leaders! It is truly surprising, that good and intelligent brethren—brethren of highly cultivated minds—as are many of our opponents—cannot see and understand the difference between *prophesying* or foretelling future events, and *preaching* or publicly proclaiming what has already transpired or been previously revealed!—acts as diverse as are "Cheshire cheese and ambergris" walking and flying, sprinkling and immersing, making a child and baptizing it! Indeed, it appears to me far more absurd, unreasonable and injurious in its tendency, to infer the right to *preach*, from what is taught in reference to those who were endowed with *the gift of prophecy*, than it would be to infer the right to *baptize* children, from what the spirit has taught us of our duty to *strum up a chant* in the way he should go,' that when he is old he may not depart from it.

If *we* may resort to such far-fetched and unwarrantable inferences to justify our creed and practice, why, in the name of common sense and common honesty, may not *Pedobaptists* do the same? How often do we warn Pedobaptists, while they build on the same foundation with Romanism, they cannot effectually resist its influence! With equal propriety—if not greater—may we say to members of our own denominational household, while you so reason the same as any with Pedobaptists, and rely upon the same unwarrantable inferences—the same perversions of scripture, the same illogical deductions and erroneous rules of interpretation—to defend your several positions, you can do but little or no service against the spread of Pedobaptist errors. You must stand or fall with Pedobaptists, unless you can show that you have obtained a special license from Heaven, to adopt principles and processes of reasoning that are not allowed to them. Have you obtained such a grant? If not, when you condemn the logic of Pedobaptists, well may they turn upon you and confound you with the interrogatory, "Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?"

I would invite the attention of the reader to two paragraphs extracted from a Baptist publication issued some fifteen years ago:

"*Inferences* cannot be received as arguments unless they are the NECESSARY consequences of some truth previously established."

"Nothing can be admitted as a general rule or an established principle, in a controversy with an opponent, which *it will not be so admitted in a controversy with another.*"

The latter rule is but a variation of the old adage that "It is a bad rule which will not work both ways." That in the days of the apostles, those who were *miraculously inspired*—who had received a special *election*—were allowed to speak, one by one, we are free to admit. "If any thing *he REVEALED to another sitting by, let the first hold his peace.* If *a seer or PROPHET* it is not *prophesy one by one.*" Does it follow as a *necessary consequence*, that every *inspired* person is allowed to *preach?* I cannot believe that the blindest of the mentally blind will presume to answer in the affirmative.

Were we not restrained by our regard to divine truth, we might resort to the lax principle of interpretation adopted by our opponents, and refer to the above cited passage to prove that every believer *has not the right to preach*, for it teaches, that he who has not received a revelation is to "HOLD HIS PEACE." But we cannot trifle with God's word. We cannot apply to one subject, (preaching,) what is taught by another, (prophesying,) with a clear conscience. If our views are not sustained by the obvious import of the sacred scriptures, and the necessary inferences deducible therefrom, let no one adopt them. If they are thus sustained, they cannot be rejected without casting contempt upon the divine oracle, and endangering our own spiritual welfare.

It is very evident that the passage cited above affords no more warrant for every man to PREACH than it does for every man to PRACTICE LAW. He who would practice law must obtain a license from a civil court; and he who would preach must obtain a license from a church of Christ, or produce a special warrant from the Great Head of the church. It may be objected, that this is a mere dogma of our own, introduced without any proof to sustain it. I reply, that all admit, that one who has been regularly set apart to the work of the ministry by a church of Christ, is scripturally authorized to preach. If there be scriptural authority for any other to preach, it has not yet been produced. Our opponents have, so far, been most unfortunate in their references. All the passages cited by them refer to other acts—not one to the act of PREACHING. It is a universally admitted legal axiom, that a law authorizing the performing of one act, does not give a sanction to the performance of any other act than the one specified in the law. It is, therefore, a gross and most manifest perversion of divine law, to apply to PREACHING, what is enacted in reference to PROPHESYING, or COMMUNICATING PRIVATELY.

I will dismiss the passage which has been make examination with two remarks, which it would be well for the reader ever to bear in remembrance. 1. It has no reference whatever to *preaching*—it only refers to *prophesying*. 2. It does not even authorize *every one* to prophesy, as is evident from the verses which precede it. If it be an article of the Baptist creed, that "The gift of prophecy still exists in the christian church," I must plead ignorance of it, and beg leave to dissent from it. Waddington, in his History of the Church," says: "For the first thirty years, perhaps somewhat longer, after the ascension of Christ, the labors of the apostles were aided by certain *ministers*, entitled *Prophets*, who were gifted with occasional inspiration, and taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit. This order of teachers was withdrawn from the church when their office became no longer necessary for its advancement, and it appears wholly to have ceased before the end of the century, at which period, as we have already observed, ecclesiastical government universally assumed that durable shape which has been perpetuated, and with certain variations, preserved through every age of christianity."

I pp. 22—23.

It appears, therefore, from the above, as well as from 1 Cor. 12, 28, that these prophets were limited to specially low preaching were after all a different and temporary order of ministers, specially gifted and set apart to minister to the church, the new body of Christ, as were the apostles themselves.—They were, moreover, unlike Pedobaptists, baptized disciples. How unfortunate for our opponents!—Their witnesses all testify in our favor instead of theirs. J. S. B.

*A History of the Church, from the earliest Ages to the Reformation. Published under the auspices of the Society for the diffusion of useful knowledge. Vol. 1. London: Baldwin and Cradock, Paternoster-row. MDCCCXXXI.

*A brother, the best qualified man in the South, is now engaged upon just such a work, and he writes us to furnish him all the Pedobaptist books and tracts published and circulated in the South West. Who will aid us in this? Send in your old copies of such works. Chapman's books that contradict all preceding Methodist standard authors, and Barrow's book that contradicts itself, and we will forward them to this author, and hope within the year to announce the book prepared for the Tennessee Publication Society.

### "Prospectus of the Mississippi Baptist and Bible Expositor."

The above is the caption of an article, which I find in the advertising columns of the Religious Herald of the 15th ult. The article is what the caption indicates it to be, the Prospectus of a Denominational Paper in the city of Jackson, Miss. with the title displayed in the above caption.

I was present at the Convention in Hernando last fall, when the necessity of a State paper was discussed, I not having recently located in the State, I thought it prudent to be reserved and deferential to those who had been long citizens of the State and therefore took no part in the discussion, except when specially enquired of as to the probable cost of such a paper. I made a calculation of its cost in answer to the enquiry. Had I entertained the remotest idea of being selected to share in its Editorial direction I should have left more at liberty before the Convention.

I find upon examining the published Prospectus, that my name is appended to it as one of six "Associate Editors." I certainly feel that the Brethren have honored me by this appointment so entirely unexpected by me, and I owe to them this public acknowledgment of a grateful sense on my part, of the confidence in me and respect for me which they have evinced by this appointment. Duty to them, to the cause of truth and to myself makes it necessary that I should notice the following paragraph in the Prospectus.

The Bible the only exponent of the will of the Great King, having been written in a language now spoken, no less a man should feel bound to seek over the translations, in which language, learning and ability, and believing that the American Bible Society is trying to accomplish that high and holy work, yet we are decided in favor of the Revision, and regarding it as the grand emancipator of the age and well certainly we are it.

Some time ago I would have said, and said for the paper in Tennessee, Baptist, that the work of A Southern Revision, [illegible] as an evil. But as the progress of the work has developed the plan of Revision, as set forth in the constitution of the Revision Association, and our objections to the Bible Union, [illegible] I have expressed [illegible] the paper that pressed by the Baptist the Revision Association. For this [illegible] I have [illegible] to be a misapprehension of and the wrong [illegible] approach hospitable upon which I was denied the privilege of selfdefense in a paper where I had been severely and unjustly assailed. Brethren, I am and do cheerfully forgive the wrong done me, and I do still love, warmly love the [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] any instance in which I may have [illegible] a false [illegible] or which may [illegible] but to God I [illegible] as I hope to be forgiven, I [illegible] wrong I would not [illegible] the [illegible] of any [illegible] or any [illegible] of any [illegible] or any [illegible] of any [illegible] or any

# Communications.

For the Tennessee Baptist.

BROTHER GRAVES:—As it is always with pleasure that I read of the progress of truth and the prosperity of the Redeemer's kingdom, I have taken the liberty of writing a few lines to you, hoping that it may be a source of gratification a some of the faithful followers of our Lord and Saviour, to know that there is a very flattering prospect for much good to be done in this part of the Lord's vineyard. The harvest is indeed plentiful, and we have the prospect of being blessed with able and efficient laborers.

For a number of years past, this neighborhood has been almost entirely under Methodist influence; so much so, that there were grown persons some the heads of families, who never heard a Baptist sermon until this winter, and there is not quite a large number who have never seen the ordinance of baptism performed in the Apostolic mode, in its primitive purity. Nevertheless, it is a very moral, intelligent and respectable community, possessing some as pious and orderly christians as can be found in any community.

A few of the Baptist brethren in this vicinity believing this to be a field that should be occupied, with the aid of their Methodist friends have erected a neat and comfortable house f worship.

On the fifth Sabbath in December, Bro O. J. Fisk preached a dedication sermon, from the 10th chapter and 18th verse of the Gospel by Matthew. "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The truth of which he fully and ably sustained by history, showing a regular succession of churches from the days of the apostles to the present time. That Roman Catholicism never was the church of Christ; but was a corrupt mass that was adapted from the pure mass by the pure portion here in the minority and withdrawing from them. That the pure church had ever been persecuted, yet never persecuting. That in different ages and places, it had been known by different names but always essentially the same. And most conclusively showed that the Baptist was that church, which had maintained the Apostolic order. It would be impossible for me to do justice to the sermon, unless it were published entire, and I am writing from memory alone. From these brief hints you may infer the importance and appropriateness of the subject.

According to previous appointment twenty of the brothers and sisters having procured letters of dismission from their respective churches, met on Friday before the third Sabbath in this month, and were constituted into a church, to be known by the name of Friendship. Bro. O. J. Fisk delivered an appropriate discourse from Exodus 14 15, "Speak to the children of Israel that they go forward."

Presbyters, Bros. D. Smith, J. Wiseman, J. Weatherhead and J. Wilkes. After the letters were read and received Bro. O. J. Fisk being united with us was then added to the presbytery. We were then constituted on the abstract principles of Enon Association; constitution adopted and covenant agreed to. Prayer and praise were offered, and the hand of fellowship given by the presbytery.

Old Bro. D. Smith has been called to the pastoral care of the church for the present year.

On Saturday two more were received by experience, and others are expected at our next monthly meeting, when the ordinance of baptism will be administered. That this little church may prosper and grow in the knowledge of the truth—that they may ever adorn and practice the doctrines of our blessed Saviour, until all this community may be brought under the influence of divine truth—that they may live in peace and union, and finally be saved with an everlasting salvation—is the prayer of your unworthy servant.

S. C. TALLEY.

P. S.—Bro. Wm. H. Maddox was with us in the latter part of December, and preached an able sermon, in which he boldly advocated those doctrines which distinguish the Baptist from other denominations, which met with the usual opposition the truth has to contend with.

Bro. Maddox is not permanently located at Lafayette, and I think it is very probable that he would locate provided he could get constant employment. I would recommend him to any church, who want a plain, able and zealous defender of the truth, who will devote all his time to the care of the church of which he may be pastor. S. C. T.

*Goose Creek, Sumner Co. Tenn., Feb. 21 1855.*

Vanishing Armony.

*To the Brethren of Tuckaleechee Association*—Dear Brethren:—I write to inform you that your missionaries have performed their labor, but they have received no pay from you. The brethren of the Yalobusha Association will remember that they selected Bro. Peter Folsom a native Choctaw, as their missionary with the promise of paying him at the rate of $100 a year. The last $100 was paid into my hands, which was forwarded to the Treasurer of the board of the American Indian mission Association. Bro. Folsom informs me that he has never received a dollar from your association. Bro. Folsom is a poor man and needs the money. He has labored faithfully, and has effected much good among the people. Bro. S. Worcester was assured more than one year ago by the Corresponding Secretary of the Aberdeen Association that he should receive $100 a year for his services. He has now labored, under the appointment of your Association, about fifteen months, but has received no pay. Will the promise of these Associations attend to the matter, and relieve me from my promises to these brethren. It has placed me in a very uncomfortable position, as I promised them that they would get what was promised.

Very truly yours,

*February 6 1855.* A. MORGAN

For the Tennessee Baptist

BROTHER GRAVES.—A few items from this part of Arkansas, may not be uninteresting to the lovers of Jesus. Last fall I spent a pleasant time with Brothers Lea and More. Our first meeting was at the session of the Caroline Association. We had a pleasant time, and we trust that our deliberations will result in much good. The Committee on Publications recommended the Tennessee Baptist to the patronage of all desiring the *truth*, the whole *truth*, and nothing but the *truth*. Since then, we proceeded to Bonnville and held a meeting—ordained our beloved Bro. S. W. Jackson, deacon. But we are now far apart—Bro. Moore in Texas, and Bro. Lea in Pine Bluff. They, no doubt, are doing all the good possible.

I have just returned from West Tennessee. I found more frost bitten religion there than can be disposed of at fair prices. It is highly probable that they will send it off on the *next train*. I soon became tired of redbills and fortna' prayers. My only resort was to return to the quiet shades of Arkansas. I am now at the house of my esteemed friend, John H. Quisenbury. Our little church in Dea Arc, is destitute. I think, to be the first church in the White River Valley. On yesterday I ordained Brother T. F. Greer as deacon. He is a good Brother. May God bless him. We also received three for baptism. I hope you will pardon me for ——— I so often. I have no one to help me! could my something about preachers coming to this country. It is true, we are alone, but if we have to persuade preachers to come we will have to persuade them to preach after they get here. If only does not prompt them to come, I say let them stay, and they and their God for it.

Yours truly, JAMES P. KEEP.

*Dea Arc, Ark., Feb 12, 1855.*

### Ordinations.

BROTHER GRAVES:—At the instance of Pleasant Grove church, in Newtonville, DeKalb county, Ala., the following brethren met with the church on Saturday the 17th instant, for the purpose of ordaining John B. Appleton, to the full functions of the Ministerial office, namely W. C. Mynatt, J. A. Keene and J. J. D. Renfroe; when the following order was observed:

First, prayer and sermon by Brother Renfroe, text Heb. 11: 5. Prayer by Brother Mynatt. The church presented the candidate, upon which Brother Mynatt proceeded to examine the church on Brother Appleton's general character, conversant piety, zeal and orthodoxy, which were found to be good. Further labors of the Presbytery were postponed until Sabbath morning, not for want of time, but because it was believed that it would be more advantageous to our common cause in this county, to see the work in the presence of a large congregation.

Met Sabbath morning at o'clock. Prayer by Brother Mynatt. The candidate was examined on his call to, and views of the duty of a christian minister, by Brother Mynatt, after which, in a kneeling position, hands of the Presbytery were imposed, and ordination prayer by Brother Renfroe. Then the Bible was presented, and a short charge by Brother Mynatt, then a sermon by Brother Renfroe, "On the duty of Church to Pastor." Text "Communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." Benediction by Brother Mynatt.

The writer has not had the pleasure of hearing Brother Appleton preach, but has been informed that he is a pulpit orator. He is a young man of great attainments, has for a time been principal of the Baptist High School Cave Springs, Georgia.

May the Spirit that is warm in Brother Appleton's heart, for around him "There yet remaineth much land to be possessed." Respectfully

CYRUS BEST.

The Baptist church of Christ at New Bethel Tennessee, called a Presbytery, consisting of Elders R. Dorris, W. C. Chandoin and W. D. Baldwin who in connection with the church met the first Lord's Day in February, 1855 for the purpose of ordaining Brother W. B. Tenney to the Gospel Ministry, order of services as follows:

First, Ordination Sermon by Elder W. D. Baldwin, from 2 Tim. 4. 5. "But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist make full proof of thy ministry."

Second, Presentation of the candidate by the Deacons.

Third, Examination of the candidate in Biblical doctrine, by Elder W. D. Baldwin.

Fourth, Examination of the candidate in reference to his christian experience and call to the ministry, by Elder W. D. Baldwin.

Fifth, Ordination prayer by Elder W. Chandoin.

Sixth, Presentation of the new and charge by Elder R. Dorris.

Seventh, Hand of fellowship extended by presbytery and church.

Eighth, Benediction by the candidate.

S. HOLT, C.

DEAR BROTHER GRAVES:—Observing the late action of various literary institutions I see the degree of D. D. conferred upon a minister of M[illegible] and some of them baptists, and supposing this course intended to testify to the skill of the individual in mosaic interpretation and sacred jedemanship and desiring to see no invidious distinctions nor odious comparisons, by which one shall be *exalted* unduly, and another depressed, I propose to the said institutions a cognomen altogether worthy of their regards. He is a useless, retiring man and no doubt would reject the distinction if he knew it was intended beforehand, therefore be very quiet and say nothing about it until you have the garment ready, (which I suppose to wear like the old Roman toga) then send it to me, and I will arrange to have it on him were he is aware. Now the grounds of the claims I present, is as follows:

Not long since in one of his pulpit efforts it became necessary for him to remark upon the curse denounced against Adam. "The day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die" and said it was generally understood this threat was not literally executed, for Adam did not "die that day," but a thousand years in God as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day, and as Adam did not live a thousand years, it was then not the intention of God for his disobedience to have the sentence of death executed upon him that day, and thus the threatening was not literally fulfilled. Is not this a good claim (while of all the D. D.'s extant this instance in mosaic interpretation is unequaled)?

Again, when asked for an explanation of the expression of Christ, he said he would give his views by a figure, now suppose (said he) an individual desiring to know a piece of timber of such dimensions for a certain star purpose. Well he should hew his timber and hewed and with his square compass and line to his hand [illegible] the forest and find a piece [illegible] he [illegible] knotty and snarly, the other straight [illegible] limbs and [illegible] straight [illegible] He hews [illegible] and with steady strokes fills and shapes his stick. Now said he, has he done any injury to the illustrated [illegible] sawing and [illegible] of any right [illegible] in his unmeasurable [illegible] of wisdom to the children of men.

Now I humbly hope the great man may no longer be overwhelmed. I remain his modest and retiring [illegible] "Dont all speak at once."

A FRIEND TO PLAIN DEALING.

For the Tennessee Baptist

BROTHER GRAVES:—We are happy to inform your readers of the revival of religion recently enjoyed by the Indian Creek Church, in Washington county, Tennessee. The meeting commenced January the 27th, and continued thirteen days. Much good was accomplished. Thirteen were added to the church—sixteen by baptism and two restored. Two others stand approved for baptism. Of those that joined, four were Methodists and two were Campbellites. Bro. Van Ausdal myself did nearly all the labor for the first week, after which Bros. Stone and Hocker came to our assistance. Some fifteen or twenty were hopefully converted to God, and a considerable number were left inquiring the way of salvation.

The church was much encouraged and strengthened, from the fact that she had not been destitute of a regular ministry until she procured the service of the above named brethren, some twelve or fourteen months ago, and also from the fact that she had been much annoyed by the ism of Campbellism. We are happy to inform you that we have restrained the deleterious effects of Campbellism in the bounds of this church.

Yours. DAVID KITZSHELER.

To the Churches Composing the Tennessee River Baptist Association.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I hope you have not forgotten the ministers' and deacons' meeting to be held with the Bootsville church, Saturday before the fifth Sabbath in April next, for the purpose of arranging protracted meetings for the current year. I hope every church that wishes a protracted meeting will have her wishes expressed in that body.

Dear brethren, as you close me at your last Association to travel within your bounds for four months, I take this method of publishing through the Tennessee Baptist some appointments, of which I hope the ministers in the bounds of those appointments will make them public.

First, to commence with Center Point Church, Saturday before the fourth Sabbath in April.

On Monday following at Union; on Tuesday at Liberty, on Wednesday at Bethlehem; on Thursday at New Prospect; on Friday at Lebanon; on Saturday at Bootsville; on Wednesday following at Valley Head; on Thursday at Sand Mountain Church. First Saturday and Sabbath in May with the New Salem Church.

R. H. TALLEFERRO, Missionary.

# Agricultural.

### How to Make One Acre Equal to Three.

G. T. Stewart, Esq., in a recent address before the Ohio Agricultural Society, thus speaks on this subject:

"Many farmers, who are destroying the productiveness of their farms by shallow work, as they find that their crops are diminishing, think only of extending their area by adding acres of surface, as if they supposed that their title deeds only gave them a right to six inches deep of earth. If they will take their deeds, study their meaning and apply the lesson to their fields, they will soon realize in threefold crops the fact that the law has given them three farms where they supposed they had but one—in other words, that the sub-soil, brought up and combined with the top soil, and enriched with the atmospheric influence and those other elements which [illegible] to apply to their ground, will more than double the measure of its productiveness. To show to what extent the fertility of the soil can be increased, I refer to a statement in the last Report of the Patent Office. In the year before there were some [illegible] in the remunerative crop in Kentucky, each of which produced 10 acres. There were [illegible] of 100 bushels per acre. At that time the average crop of wheat per acre in the counties of Great Britain was as it has been for centuries, we admit [illegible] production on the virgin soil of Ohio. Why is this? Simply because British farmers are about [illegible] men and seeple week work. They pay [illegible] to the [illegible] they endeavor [illegible] to double their crops they would [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] farmers instead of labouring to double their acres would rather have to double their crops they would find a vast saving of time and [illegible] and an increase of profit.

Many of them never dig [illegible] unless they have dug a [illegible] or [illegible] had in the [illegible] but if they would [illegible] the work of digging [illegible] every acre would [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] to make a [illegible] of [illegible]

We have a great advantage over British farmers in the fact that our farmers nearly all [illegible] the lands which they cultivate, not as simple wards in Chancery, but they are earthy tenants, having the fee simple and the payment of enormous rents to the proprietors, besides heavy taxes to government. Times here are somewhat different, light and our farmers are their own landlords. Hence they have [illegible] [illegible] wages for labor to the [illegible] Europe pay the cost of transportation, and get [illegible] the British farmers in their own market.

### Preparation of the Soil for Wheat, Grass and other Crops.

Those who [illegible] [illegible] and general [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to apply to their ground, will more than double the measure of its productiveness. To show to what extent the fertility of the soil can be increased, I refer to a statement in the last Report of the Patent Office. In the year before there were some [illegible] in the remunerative crop in Kentucky, each of which produced 10 acres. There were [illegible] of 100 bushels per acre. At that time the average crop of wheat per acre in the counties of Great Britain was as it has been for centuries, we admit [illegible] production on the virgin soil of Ohio. Why is this? Simply because British farmers are about [illegible] men and seeple week work. They pay [illegible] to the [illegible] they endeavor [illegible] to double their crops they would [illegible] and [illegible] and [illegible] farmers instead of labouring to double their acres would rather have to double their crops they would find a vast saving of time and [illegible] and an increase of profit.

Many of them never dig [illegible] unless they have dug a [illegible] or [illegible] had in the [illegible] but if they would [illegible] the work of digging [illegible] every acre would [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] to make a [illegible] of [illegible]

We have a great advantage over British farmers in the fact that our farmers nearly all [illegible] the lands which they cultivate, not as simple wards in Chancery, but they are earthy tenants, having the fee simple and the payment of enormous rents to the proprietors, besides heavy taxes to government. Times here are somewhat different, light and our farmers are their own landlords. Hence they have [illegible] [illegible] wages for labor to the [illegible] Europe pay the cost of transportation, and get [illegible] the British farmers in their own market.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [