



This paper and the Southern Baptist; or Ourself and J. B. Tustin.

UPON the fourth page of this paper will be found a copy of a letter from the son of brother Tustin, editor of the Southern Baptist, and Corresponding Secretary of the Southern Baptist Publication Society, Charleston, South Carolina. It is just such an article as we have now seen from the pen of a Baptist editor upon a brother. A certain Committee has sent through the Western Recorder Ky., some very nice epistles. We do not wish to speak publicly, nor do we think we shall, for we have no audience in our West towards brother Tustin, though a few we had, and in these have not forgave. But in his article there is an account of pastorial visitations and exhortations, & it was a violation of spirit in the author that is really remarkable.

It is in bad places who don't want to be pleased. Since the article is offensive we hardly need say much of it, save that we ought to repeat it and make a hit. Brother T. has inflicted a deeper injury upon himself by his editor than upon us, and we can, therefore, let much of it pass without notice.

A few points we review briefly, and since brother T. has opened the wound so deeply, we must probe it to the bottom—it can be healed in no other way; and we receive his sincere thanks that we were a pastor and fully, we do as we can—afflict, exhort, and in a helping spirit. Will the reader refer from figures (1) & (2) due, to corresponding ones in brother T.'s article.

(1) We most object to brother T.'s drawing upon his imagination to assist him in making out charges against us. If he is interested in a charge or two, we can give him another, but we have no room for much less of having gone out of your way to do so. We simply deny this count, without a qualm. It is allлагation. We now call upon brother T. to produce every instance of complaint, and we will readily or reluctantly furnish them with time reference. Can we damage?

(2) And this is a grievous charge, but we presume the context will explain it to her brother, a deserved rebuke. We have sent no little time with our Epistles and second find it. Will brother T. give to the members of the paper that, means it? It is very easy to manufacture complaints and imagine they are intended; and we never yet knew a man who was even conscious of having deeply wronged a person, who did not try to make himself believe that that person was his enemy and had done him many great wrongs, or intended to do so.

(3) What reply can we make to a paragraph like this? It seems to us exceedingly questionable, and I—however, and very safe! set any man; but we may be wrong. We cannot help what our contributions, in their good sense, say of this paper, and we would not if we could. But why does brother Tustin extract one, amidst so many others, as the next? We are a remnant to the very heart, and would do it for the principle of justice as well as for the sake of our cause. It is a certain charm about that State—that touch turns all to gold. If he has lived in Virginia he will be tempted to make at for having been born in Virginia.

(4) This is a long paragraph. We ask the reader to look it through only once, and then blot it from his memory, and forgive his author, as we do so. Who will not say the temptation to do great to reflect severely? No man living is more deeply impressed with his weaknesses, short-comings, and insufficiencies than ours!, or trembles more under the fearful and increasing responsibility resting upon us as a public journalist occupying the position of editor of a paper having the most circulation enjoyed by that paper. We have sought and daily seek grace from above to discharge our daily duties as one of the watchmen placed upon the walls, to lift up the voice fearlessly and proclaim the approach of danger to the true. Loyal of God's labor under the impression that it is as much duty to rebuke sin in a brother, however high his position, as in an oxen!—to seek to correct errors in the camp within or in the opposing camp without the wall. And this we have done according to the grace given unto us. We have resisted and shall continue to resist the teachings of those brethren who would affiliate Baptists with Campbellites or Pedobaptists. We have set our face to a fight against every species and phase of open communism with acknowledged aversion—not at the table roundly, but in baptism, the pulpit, in the Atonement and Convention. Our position, we know, and are made to feel how often, of all conceivable cases, the most enviable. We are a remnant to the very heart, and would do it for the principle of justice as well as for the sake of our cause. It is a certain charm about that State—that touch turns all to gold.

We are not always either of having or not having the regular right, for the Baptist, just divine, or just human, to the general denominational papers of the South. Its publishers have said that "We send our paper of universal circulation, for purposes of intercommunication. The Tennessee Baptist is rapidly becoming that paper." (See advertisement of Tennessee Baptist in this paper.) Now if there is anything morally wrong in the Publisher's case, will brother Tustin write a proper card, and will he press me to have our influence with a publisher of his paper to have it adopted at place of the present one—if it pleases, a better than the one now in use. We are willing to do anything that is right and pleasant in an effort to win back our brother T. to a better mind, and spirit towards us. But, alas, what hope is there for us? What compensated territory lies in the West, to which we can lay claim for our own?

These are two papers—the Western Recorder and Western Watchman—that lay a claim to the West. This includes Tennessee. There is another excellent one—the Southern Baptist—but that claims the whole South, and this includes the Southern Baptist—whose claim is large in an average ratio in its circulation, for it lays a claim over all these papers to the whole South, and has the smallest list of subscribers! And he purports to find fault with us simply failing to be allowed to fill up the intention between these papers, as short-hand between custom books, or more appropriately, as philosophers may say, like the small spaces between the drops of our tears and smiles! We beg brother T. to let us kind as possible towards us, for I can see no greater ill for us, for we have labored hard for it, and well might we have ourself put upon its columns to make it a good, strong, influencing Baptist paper, and now when we are within almost a hand's length of our earthly editorial crown—the largest circulation of any Baptist weekly paper in the world—it does seem too bad, for in a fit of asperging heat (or envy) to dash all our hopes—ours if we have done some wrong. Why not, He is a good Baptist and loving brother, rejoice in the success of one Baptist paper in the South, and when we are in a loving, brotherly, Christian-like way, protest our error, or expose sin in us, and not mold, and cast, and accuse or wrongfully, in such an unloving way as this. It is not becoming in brother T. We have so high a respect for him that we are positive, for his sake, and for mine, I have no readers, or friends—no! two!

(5) We are still members of over having said one word to justify brother T. in antagonizing upon either our personal character or those of our party? He says we represent, "nor do we think he has the moral right to write as he has about us. We have rebuked the moral sense and Christian feeling of the Baptists of South Carolina, if they oppose us. We have not intended to trespass upon him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated, and did not say that what we supposed was extreme, according to brother T., for all who know him know well that he would have regarded it as an impudent digression to the Christian church and the views of party, had we claimed that he approves of our views of Baptist policy. What could we have said? Or do we improperly represent him? We have not said that he is a good Baptist, and we have looked up to him as a leader, and his works, and his life. Brother T. is a brother to us, and we have no reason to be angry with him upon any score when he is the spiritual monitor. We did say, in February last, that brother T.'s views of Baptist policy—not the views of my own—were not in accordance with the South's comment with ours, but we were not enabled to meet the partisans in our own judgment of spirit. We simply stated



For the Tennessee Baptist.  
A Novel Occurrence.

**M.** R. EDITOR.—I am very little in the habit of writing to communications as at all in my newspaper, but I am induced to call your attention to what I consider to be quite a novel occurrence in the history of Baptist churches, which happened not many days since in connection with a church of which I have charge. In order that I may make myself intelligible to you, I shall have, in the first place, to relate a situation which took place some eight or ten years ago, in order to bring the whole matter before you.

Six or eight or ten years ago a worthy and good brother, pastor of a certain church, was holding a pretreated meeting with his church. During the meeting quite a number professed faith in Christ, and when the time had served to baptize the converts, the pastor was so much impressed from the spirit that he did not feel able to administer the ordinance. As it happened there was a certain Doctor T., who was a new come from the State of Georgia, and had been long a preacher, and a presiding elder in the Methodist connection; but had changed his views in relation to baptism and other doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal church, and was now in the habit of preaching as a Baptist preacher. The church was consulted as to the propriety of this Doctor's administering the ordinance to the converts, and when the pastor gave its consent and approbation, and accordingly, the Doctor baptised several candidates.

And now the novelty of the case is made manifest. Some short time since it became necessary to elect a Deacon in a church of which I have the pastoral care. One of the individuals who had received baptism at the hands of this Doctor was elected Deacon. The next day was set apart for his ordination—another preacher and myself to officiate. In the meantime the question was raised as to whether the said Deacon had been baptised by a regular Baptist minister—one who had been ordained to the ministry, under and by the authority of the Baptist church; whereupon it was found that he had not received any ordination at all from a Baptist church, or any authority whatever to preach from a Baptist church. These facts being ascertained, the Doctor (for he is an M. D.) did not want the church to ordain him, or was the church disposed to do so?

Now what I wish is, that you will give an expression as to the correctness of the course pursued by the elected Deacon, the church and Ministers who were to have officiated in the ordination. This is, in fact, truly a novel case, and one that has not before, and may never occur again. Doubtless many, and even Baptists, (and it may be that brother Deacons are among the number) may differ with this church in the course pursued. But why ordain a Deacon, who had not been baptised by a proper administrator, any more than ordain a preacher of the Gospel, under like circumstances? There is a difference in the two offices, but none in the principle.

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.  
Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

It is no man's or man's duty to be baptised until it can be done scripturally—and by those scripturally authorised to baptise. This is evident, and cuts all the tangos fixed up to embarrass and confuse the practice of the church—a company of men upon a desert island becoming converted, etc., and hopeless and dying invalids. Where there is no ability to be baptised according to Christ's directions, and by those authorised by him, it is not required.

## Baptism.

We copy the following extract from the last New School Presbyterian Quarterly Review, that our readers may see how Presbyterians scholars regard the inconsistency of some Baptists who will admit those ministers to their pulpits to preach as ministers and evangelical ministers when they reject from their communion tables, and would exclude from both their church and their pulpits were they Baptist ministers, sed hinc a moiety of their errors. The article will be reviewed on the Southern Baptist Review for August.—En. Bar.

The Baptists are exclusive. They exclude them from the communion, but not from the ministry. They recognise the ministers of other denominations as ministers of the Gospel. They allow none to preach in their pulpits; they exchange pulpits; they co-operate with these ministers of the Gospel. They regard them, in all respects, as ministers, as on a level with themselves, but never as Christians as on the same level, for in their apprehension, they have never been baptised.

But while they recognise ministers of other denominations as ministers, they never recognise the members of other churches as members. They admit none of them to their communion. Even the Presbyterians, the Episcopals, or the Methodist minister that is aided by a Baptist brother to preach for him, will not be allowed to approach the table of communion, even as general as Dr. Church's language would make it. We must think that his acquaintance with the great body of the Baptists in the country has been limited. We presume it has been confined chiefly, perhaps entirely, to the North and East. We know that, with the exception of a few low Southern ministers, the Southern people are almost unanimously in favor of rejecting immersions that have been administered by unbaptized administrators. So that if any of them should be excluded for "heresy" it would be the "heresy" of the other side of this question.

We suspect, moreover, that hundreds among the Baptist churches at the North, would prefer that immersion by Pedobaptists should be regarded as valid. If we remember rightly, Dr. Spencer H. Cone refused to receive applicants for membership on such immersions. We know that he once gave his opinion against receiving such low immersions at the hands of a Baptist minister; whether he was ever tried on this opinion for "heresy" has not yet transpired.

We hope that the time is not far distant when the Baptists generally will speak out on this question of Pedobaptist immersions, and if the preachers do not lead the people in the right way, we hope the people will lead the preachers. This is the case when the denomination should wake up on this as well as on some other questions.

## SLEEPER &amp; LINDLY,

## Setting and Growing Hedge Fences.

## Bro. Tustin's Mild (?) Reply.—The Tennessee Baptist.

baptised, can be recognised as members of the church.

(Referred to by an article on the inside.)

**BACRASS TUSTIN,** is this true? A minister in the Southern Christian Advocate, is writing against Ravison now is:

"It meets with almost, perhaps we should say altogether, no favor among the leading men of that denomination at the South. Those of whom about Charleston are as loyal to the American Baptist Society as the ministers of any other denomination."

The first sentence we know to be false, for we know that as many if not more of the leading men of our denomination South are in favor of a revision of the present version than there are opposed to it. But is it true that the baptists of Charleston are still loyal to the American Baptist Society, and do the funds of Carolina Baptists flow into the Channel? And is this the reason that scarcely a dollar from the Baptists of South Carolina ever reaches the Southern Bible Board? If this is the character of their loyalty to home institutions have they a right to expect the patronage of the Southern States to the Southern Publication Society, located in Charleston? Brother Tustin is competent to correct this sentence if he sees fit.

The Southern Baptist—Charleston S. C.

Brother Tustin's Attack.

WE find the following characteristic editorial in the above paper, to which we invite the attention of our readers. They are the remarks with which the editor, Bro. Tustin, introduces Dr. Jeter's article on Pulpit Communism to his readers:

"The following communication we find in the Tennessee Baptist relating to a topic which has excited some discussion among the Baptists in the West and the South. We do not know that the author has ever been open to the question, the older and more matured portion of the denomination on the eastern side of our country; and we have never heard of such a test as 'Pulpit Communism' till it was recently started in the quarters where partyism, both in religion and politics, is commonly expected to run pretty high. The dogma of the Baptists is that baptism is a divine ordinance, and that no man can be baptised but by a minister of the church, or by one who has been specially authorised to do so."

Now what I wish is, that you will give an expression as to the correctness of the course pursued by the elected Deacon, the church and Ministers who were to have officiated in the ordination.

This is, in fact, truly a novel case, and one that has not before, and may never occur again.

Doubtless many, and even Baptists, (and it may be that brother Deacons are among the number) may differ with this church in the course pursued. But why ordain a Deacon, who had not been baptised by a proper administrator, any more than ordain a preacher of the Gospel, under like circumstances?

There is a difference in the two offices, but none in the principle.

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and are within our power to correct we should do so. We hope to hear wa long, that the Doctor has been duly baptised. Infidelities may possibly have existed in connection with some of our churches in years past, but as that is may; we have not to answer for them, but for those that we allow to occur through our unfaithfulness. And what shall we say of that man's faithfulness to Christ his Savior, and of his loyalty to Jesus his King, who will plied the unfaithfulness or possible infidelities of churches in ages past, to warrant or justify him in a constant course of irreligiosity or infidelity as a rule, and when there is no shadow of excuse for it—no necessity in plain!

But I am giving my opinion, that the thing I am seeking from you. Please give your views!

Yours, etc. N.

Cross-Ky., March 16, 1857.

**BEMARKS.—** Since the discussion of the validity of the admissions by Pedobaptist ministers in Tennessee, one or more Baptist Deacons, have sought re-immersion, and of lay members we know not how many—ones to our knowledge as this city, after a membership of six years in a Baptist church, disgraced and received Scriptural baptism in the first church. When infidelities and disorders exist, and