

Tennessee Baptist

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1858.

(VOL. XV. NO. 1.)

The Pulpit.

(Our hundred and thirty-second number will appear in this department, during the present week. It contains our annual conference, and is highly interesting to all our readers.)

BY REV. C. H. SPURGEON.

Did you ever see a child of God after he had been washed with a foul sin? He was a changed man. How such an one, who used to carry a merry countenance, and many were the jokes he made in company; but when I met him after an awful sin there was a solemnity about his countenance which was unusual to him. He looked, I should say, something like Dante, the poet, of whom the boys said, "There is the man who has been in hell," because he had written of hell and looked like it—he looked so terrible. And when he spoke of sin there was such a solemnity about him; and when he spoke of going astray the tears ran down his cheeks, as much as to say, "I have been astray too." He seemed like good Christian, after he had been in Giant Despair's castle. Do you not remember, beloved, the guide who took the pilgrims up to the top of a hill called Clear, and he showed them from the top of the hill a lot of men with their eyes put out, groping among the tombs, and the Christian asked what it meant. Said the guide, "These are pilgrims that were caught in Giant Despair's castle; the giant had their eyes put out, and they are left to wander among the tombs to die, and their bones are to be left in the courtyard." Whereupon John Bunyan very naively says, "I looked, and saw their eyes full of water, for they remembered they might have been there too." Just like the man I talked and spoke that I once knew. He seemed to wonder why God had not left him to be an apostate forever, or the loss of Judas or Demas. He seemed to think it such a startling thing that while many had gone aside altogether from God's way, he should still have had his substance in him, when he had lost his leaves, and that God should still have loved him. There are but few such; for most men will go fully into sin; they will go out from us because they are not of us, for if they had been of us they would doubtless have continued with us. But there have been a few such—great saints, then great backsliding sinners, and then great saints again. Their substance was in them when they had lost their leaves. Oh, you that have gone far astray, sit and weep. You cannot weep too much, though you should cry with Herbert—

"Oh, who will give me tears? Come all ye spirits, dwell in my head and eyes; come, clouds and rain; my grief hath need of all the watry things. That name hath produced."

You might well say—

"Let every vein Suck up water to supply mine eyes, My weary weeping eyes, to dry for me, Unless they get new condense, new supplies, To bear them out, and with my state agree."

But yet remember, "He hath not forsaken his people, neither hath he left them off," for still he says—

"Return, O wanderer, return, And seek an injured Father's face."

Return! return! return! Thy Father's bowels still move for thee. He speaks through the written oracles at this moment, saying, "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, O Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zebulun? My bowels are moved; my repentings are kindled together; for I will heal their backslidings, I will receive them graciously, I will love them freely, for they are mine still. As the terebinth and as the oak, whose substance is in them when they cast their leaves, even so the holy seed within the cleft and called vessels of mercy, is still the substance thereof."

And now, what have I to say to some of you that live in black sin, yet yet excuse yourself on account of the recorded falls of God's people? Sirs, know this! Inasmuch as you do this, you wrest the Scriptures to your own destruction. If one man has taken poison, and there has been a physician by his side so skillful that he had saved his life by a heavenly antidote, is that any reason why thou, who art not a physician and no antidote, should yet think that the poison will not kill thee? Why, man, the sin that does not damn a Christian, because Christ washes him in his blood, will damn you. Said Brooks—and I will repeat his words, and have done—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned, but his sins never so few." Try your sins may be little; but you are lost without Christ. Your sins may be great; but if Christ shall pardon them, then you shall be saved. The one question, that I have to ask of thee, then, is—Hast thou Christ? For if thou hast not, then thou hast not the holy seed; thou art a dead tree, and due time thou shalt be tinder for hell. That art a rotten-hearted tree, all touch-wood, ready to be broken in pieces; eaten by the worms of lust; and ah! when the fire shall take hold of thee, what a blazing and a burning! Oh! that thou hadst life! Oh! that God would give it to thee! Oh! that thou wouldst now repent! Oh! that thou wouldst cast thyself on Jesus! Oh! that thou wouldst turn to him with full purpose of heart! For, then, remember, thou wouldst be saved—saved now, and saved forever; for "the holy seed" would be "the substance thereof."

For the Tennessee Baptist.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I do not wish to find a copy of the Constitution, &c., of our Anti-Tobacco Society, adapted by a resolute few in this neighborhood two years ago. Will you be so kind as to publish in your widely-circulated weekly? My humble opinion is, that the "iniquity" of the tobacco consumers is now falling, and that every lover of decency and morality is loudly called upon by the surrounding circumstances to combine his or her influence with others to suppress it.

It appears to you, I shall write more hereafter on this subject.

Ergetical.

Shall Polygamists be Admitted into the Missionary Churches?

BY K. M. CRAWFORD, MEMBER UNIVERSITY, GA.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I take the liberty of writing my opinion on two subjects, one of which has been much discussed in your, and other papers lately; while the other, equally important, has not been discussed at all. I allude to what is called, "a polygamy question." This has been stated thus, "Ought missionaries to baptize and receive as church members heathens who profess conversion, having more than one wife, without requiring them to give up all but one?" On the affirmative side of this question, I find many whom I esteem as most excellent brethren. I do not quarrel with them for thinking as they do, but I must express myself as being of the contrary opinion. The bitterness of feeling which has characterized the discussion, has led me to write you, and I will now design only to briefly state the grounds of my own opinion, while I entertain the highest Christian regard for those whose views on this subject I cannot sustain.

I believe that no Church of Jesus Christ is at liberty, at any time, or in any circumstances, to set aside any law of God, and that the law of God does forbid polygamy at all times and in all circumstances.

The first of these propositions I shall not argue. I hold that a church has neither legislative nor dispensing power. It cannot make that to be law which Christ has not enacted, nor can it nullify or set aside that which Christ has enacted. It any man thinks differently, we have no common ground on which we can stand.

Does the law of God then forbid polygamy? It is admitted by all, I believe, who have taken part in this discussion, that the gospel disallows polygamy, and I give credit to the brethren from whom I differ, that they also, even when advocating the baptism of polygamists, as above stated, disavowed polygamy. But I think that the gospel not only disallows polygamy, but forbids it. I will briefly state my reasons for so thinking.

The original institution of marriage, was between one man and one woman. "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." Gen. ii. 24. This law of God was repeated, re-affirmed, and re-enacted by Christ. "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh." Matt. xix. 5, 6. Mark x. 7, 8. Also Eph. v. 31.

The terms of this law are such that they exclude all idea of more than one wife for one man. It is for his wife, not for his wives, that he is to leave father and mother, and it is his wife, not to his wives, that he is to cleave. It is of the man and his wife, not his wives, that the prohibition is announced. "What therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Matt. xix. 6. Mark x. 9. And it is of the man and his one wife, that it is said, "and they two shall be one flesh." The terms I repeat are exclusive, "they two," there is no provision for a third party, either male or female. By the marriage the two, under the law of God, are made one flesh. A third party is incorporated with the two, or with either of the two? There is no word of God to authorize such an assertion.

If another woman, or another man is taken, it is strange flesh. If another woman is taken, there is a violation of the very constitution of the marriage, for by taking the second, the man ceases to cleave to the first.

This positive enactment of God is confirmed by many collateral circumstances. The law of divorce as laid down by the Savior, forbids polygamy. "Whoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." Matt. xix. 9. See also v. 32. Mark x. 11, 12. Here it is not the simple putting his wife away, that constitutes the adultery, but his marrying another, the marrying another then, would no less be adultery, if the wife was not put away.

Many of the allusions to the nature, duties, and privileges of the marriage state confirm these views.

1 Cor. vii. 2. "Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, (or, companion) and every woman have her own husband, (or, companion)." The phraseology indicates the particular and exclusive possession of the husband and wife, according to the original and divine law of marriage.

Id. vii. 4. "Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence, and likewise also the wife unto the husband." The best critics agree that the proper reading for "due benevolence" is (Gr. *ten ophelien*) the duty, the due, the matrimonial due. The phraseology still indicates the particular and exclusive possession of the parties; and this is confirmed by the following verse:

"The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise, also, the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife." But if there should be two or more wives of the same husband, neither has the power of his body. We are still pointed to the particular and exclusive property of one husband and one wife in each other.

Id. vii. 5. "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency." This direction can have no reference to plurality of wives.

Similar inferences are drawn from the directions contained in the fifth chapter of Ephesians.

Ver. 22 commands the obedience of the wife to her own husband, "as unto the Lord." Ver. 25. "The husband is the head of the wife, [not wives,] even as Christ is the head of the Church." Still the idea is particular and exclusive.

Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own (Gr. *idios*) husbands in every thing." Ver. 28. "Husbands, love your wives (Gr. *osion*) even as Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it."

Ver. 28. "So ought men to love their wives, as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife (more properly, his own wife) loveth himself."

Ver. 33. "Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself, and the wife see that she reverence her husband."

The translation fails, as every translation must fail, to give the force of the original. "Nevertheless you also every one, let each love his own wife even as himself, and the wife that she fear her husband." In all these passages there can be no other idea than that of one husband and one wife, joined exclusively to each other, so as to be one flesh.

So far as I have examined the New Testament I see nothing to modify, much to confirm, the law of marriage as originally enacted, and subsequently declared by Jesus Christ. If, then, the Churches of Christ are to be governed in receiving members by the law of their King, polygamists should not be received.

Still it is argued that heathen polygamists should be admitted into churches, on the ground that the circumstances modify the application of the general law. And here it is maintained that the peculiar circumstances of the Apostolic Churches, and of our Missionary Churches are alike. Admitting this to be so, I shall yield, if a single example or precept in favor of polygamist church-membership can be shown in the New Testament; but none such can be shown. I shall presently consider the only text relied on, inferentially, to prove the existence of such membership.

If, on the other hand, it is contended that our circumstances are different, and the difference is pleaded. I reply that we are not at liberty to warp the law of God to suit human circumstances. God is not a being of compromise. His law is to be obeyed, and man's only duty is submission. Baptist Noel's plea for open communion is the difference of circumstances, but the whole Baptist family in this country repudiate both the plea and the practice it is intended to support. I entertain the same view of the argument whether it bears upon communion or polygamy.

The only passages relied on to prove the existence of polygamists in the Apostolic Churches are, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 6, where Paul directs that the bishop, or elder and deacon should be "the husband of one wife." It is inferred from this phrase that there may have been polygamists in the Churches, though they were not to be made deacons or elders. And when we know that so good a man and sound an expositor as Doddridge was of this opinion, we should surely indulge in no harsh language or thoughts concerning those who happen to think with him. This, however, is only an inferential opinion of Dr. Doddridge and the rest, and does not seem to be of more force than the inference that there must have been babies in the households of Lydia and jailor. Other interpretations have been proposed of this text, which are at least equally worthy. One is that of the Greek Church, which forbids the second marriage of the bishop. Though I do not think this interpretation correct. I think it rests on better philological ground than the former. Admitting that the Apostle intends a distinction between the bishop and other church members, the bishop might refer to the case of men who had divorced their first wife and married a second before conversion. Now before these texts can be relied on as proving the existence of polygamists in the Apostolic Churches, the other interpretations must be shown to be wrong. It is certainly unsafe to base so important a measure as receiving into church fellowship a known and constant violator of God's law of marriage, upon an inference drawn from a text of dubious meaning.

But I cannot understand the Apostle's implying that all other church members are exempted from those things which he demands of the bishop and elder, except in those qualifications which bear directly on the duty of teaching and ruling. For instance, a bishop ought to be blameless, *δεν τον προσηγορον εν βλεποντι* ought not every church member to be the same? The bishop ought to be vigilant and sober, ought not every Christian to be the same? "Let us watch and be sober." 1 Thes. v. 6. A bishop ought to be given to hospitality, so should every Christian. Rom. xii. 13. Heb. xiii. 2. 1 Pet. iv. 9. So, negatively, a bishop ought not to be a striker, a brawler, or a covetous man, is it therefore implied that any Christian may be either? Indeed, we are not left to inference, for every quality of Christian excellence which is here required of the bishop, is in other places, either directly or impliedly required of every church member. Aptness to teach and fitness to govern are especially needed in a bishop, and are not necessary to a private member, and special reasons are assigned why a bishop should not be a novice, and should be of good report. But I see no other qualification which ought not to belong to all church members as well as to elders.

It is said however that the heathen, in ignorance of God's law, has incurred obligations which he cannot set aside. If he is under obligation to support the children his wives have borne him, let him do it, and, if need be, let him support the women also, but he is under no obligation to cohabit with those whom the civil law may regard as his wives but whom the divine law of marriage, as promulgated in Eden and re-affirmed by Christ does not so regard.

Our own civil law forbids polygamy. If a married man pretends by any form or ceremony, to take a second wife during the life of the first the second marriage is not merely void, but absolutely void, *de facto*, from the beginning, and all issue from it is illegitimate. Surely I do no wrong in ascribing to God's law of marriage equal stringency. I must, therefore, regard the first wife as the only one, and all the subsequent marriages as absolutely void, and consequently if I was a missionary or a member of a missionary church in Africa, China, or America, I should say no man having more than one wife should be received as a Church member.

II. I have taken up so much time on the first subject, that I shall barely notice the second. It has been intimated by one of your brother editors, that the Foreign Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention is deliberating and will decide the question above discussed. I will only express my opinion, that the Boards of the Convention and the Convention itself has no right to settle this question. It was indeed somewhat surprised that one so intensely Baptist as the Senior editor of the Tennessee Baptist should even apparently sanction such an idea. I will trust that I misunderstand him. For whom shall the Board decide this question? For the Church whose deputies they are? Shall a thing of clay, like one of the Boards of the Convention, undertake to settle and decide a question like this for the independent Baptist Church of the South? I know the members of that Board too well to believe that they will think of any such thing, and highly as I esteem and dearly as I love them, they know that while I would respect any opinion of theirs, I would disregard any decision they might attempt to make on this question; and so would the Church disregard it. But the Board will be the first to repudiate any such claim; they will not seek to lord over God's heritage, or to play Pope, Priest, or Preacher over the Churches by whose breath they live.

And the same principles of Church independence which forbid them to settle the question for us, forbid them to settle it for the Missionary Churches in Africa and China. They may express an opinion and advise, but they cannot impose an edict, and command. How then can the question be settled, and the difficulties, which have well nigh wrecked the Northern mission, and even now threaten ours, be averted? Gladly by a nearer approach, if not an absolute return to the gospel system of missions. In its split between us and our brethren whom we call "anti-missionary" there was right and wrong on both sides. We were right in supporting missions, they were right in maintaining that our mission machinery was unknown to the gospel. The Churches in the apostles' time sent out and sustained the missionaries. Let our wealthy churches, and our Associations of churches, now appoint their own missionaries—brethren whom they know and love, and in whose piety, discretion, and doctrinal soundness they have confidence. There will then be oneness of spirit and oneness of opinion between the elders and churches at home and abroad. The less intervention between the missionaries and the churches, the better; and I am glad that, not only with the approval, but, as I understand, at the instance of the Board, things have been done to take this direction. I have no personal desire or ambition in the matter, but as an humble co-worker to take my part in furthering the gospel.

Dear Brethren:—I exceedingly regret that it should be thought necessary by me to transfer to the "Index," the contents cast upon brother Bowen in the S. W. Baptist, for the expression of his views on the polygamy question. *Cui bono?* What good is likely to be accomplished by it? It can only tend, it appears to me, to promote alienation of feeling among the children of our Heavenly Father, and to excite the spirit of our good brother H. than whom few men, if any, have mingled less in party strife. He has done much, in days past—more than brethren generally are aware of—to heal divisions among the children of God. He has, moreover, given up all for Christ, impaired his health in labors for benighted Africa, and is seeking to recruit it, that he may speedily return to his appointed field of labor. Nothing tends more to promote his health than quietude of mind. Are not our consciences cast upon one through the public prints, and that by brethren calculated to agitate rather than to quiet the mind?

I do not agree with brother B., in his views of the polygamy question, but I believe that his Divine Master guarantees to him the privilege, and enjoins upon him the duty, to give every one that asks him, (whether interrogated by H. or D.) a reason of the hope that is in him, and a reason for his faith and practice in religious matters.

I would, with all possible tenderness, ask brother "D." prayerfully to consider whether he may not be more deserving of censure, for holding his peace so long on this mooted question, than for expressing his views, which are especially called on to do so. To do him in arriving at a correct conclusion, I will take the liberty to remind him of a few facts.

1. It is a fact that this polygamy question was agitated and acted upon before our separation from our Northern brethren.

2. It is a fact, if I have not mistaken the person of "D." that he was almost invariably appointed one of our delegates to the Old Triennial Convention.

3. It is a fact, that we have before us no evidence that he ever lifted up his voice, in or out of the Convention, against the admission of polygamists into our churches in the heathen lands.

The same is true (to the best of my belief and knowledge) of all who were sent as delegates to the old Triennial Convention from the South.

4. It is a fact, that Dr. Howell, President of the S. B. C., expressed views very similar to, if not identical with, those for which Bro. B. has been censured, in his work on the "Deaconship," published as far back as 1846.

5. It is a fact, that the said work was offered to, accepted and published by the A. B. P. S., without a note or comment to counteract what it appears is now considered as having a demoralizing tendency.

6. It is a fact, that while Bro. B. has been severely censured for the views contained in his letter, not a word of censure has been passed upon Dr. H. for the same or similar views contained in his book, although the one was published in an ephemeral paper, and the other has been stereotyped, published in book form, more extensively circulated than the letter—and its circulation as still extending.

7. It is a fact, that a former editor of the Index called attention to what he considered objectionable in Dr. H.'s views of polygamy, in his notice of the work on the "Deaconship," when it was first issued.

8. It is a fact, that neither "D." nor another brother aided the aforesaid editor in sounding a note of alarm, at the time, or subsequently.

9. It is a fact, that the said editor's objections to Dr. H.'s views of polygamy was placed to the credit of his "ultraism" and drew down upon him not a word of applause, but liberal portion of the commodity now dealt out to brother B.

The following is an extract from Dr. H.'s work on the "Deaconship":

"Men married as many wives as they felt inclined, and the practice prevailed in all nations. Israel offered no exception to this general departure. Ultimately polygamy found its way everywhere, even among the most pious of the servants of God. David, for example, had many wives. Solomon had several hundred; and up to the days of the apostles, every man had as many as he was disposed to take. Among those who professed religion and joined the primitive churches, there were doubtless not a few who had more wives than one. It would have been strange if they had not had. I submit with deference, whether it is likely for many reasons, which may readily be imagined, that every one who joined the Christians was required to separate from all but one of his wives. No such law was enacted at the time, and had it been, its enforcement in the then condition of things would, in many cases, have been attended with incalculable suffering."

While Dr. Howell's book containing the above, and more of the same import, is allowed to circulate with the imprimatur of the A. B. P. S. without a word of caution from the presbytery, shall our devoted missionary be subjected to censure for expressing views long since publicly proclaimed by a D. D., the President of the body from which he received his appointment—views too, to which the denomination of North and South, had given at least an apparent sanction by its silence?

titles appeared in the Tennessee Baptist!!! Elder H. will not deny this.

But he imagined, we suppose, that our position could be used to injury, and he eagerly availed himself of the opportunity, and has placed us in a false light, before his readers, and so far as allowed as an explanation. The fact is, Eld. H. has taken it for granted that the great mass of his readers are profoundly ignorant touching the history of this question, and the views of the leading minds in the denomination. He can command the men who have preached and published these views to the world twelve years since, *views which he advocated strenuously himself a few months since*, but when we yielded our assent to them—without a thorough independent investigation we confessed—the professed horror of Tustin and Henderson is truly wonderful! Why, he cannot so much as pollute his columns with an extract from Howell's work on the "Deaconship!" or a communication like this from Bro. Baker. Bro. B. has sent him one, and he will not allow his readers to see it for fear their minds will be corrupted!!!

The Consensus on Bowen.

Dear Brethren:—I exceedingly regret that it should be thought necessary by me to transfer to the "Index," the contents cast upon brother Bowen in the S. W. Baptist, for the expression of his views on the polygamy question. *Cui bono?* What good is likely to be accomplished by it? It can only tend, it appears to me, to promote alienation of feeling among the children of our Heavenly Father, and to excite the spirit of our good brother H. than whom few men, if any, have mingled less in party strife. He has done much, in days past—more than brethren generally are aware of—to heal divisions among the children of God. He has, moreover, given up all for Christ, impaired his health in labors for benighted Africa, and is seeking to recruit it, that he may speedily return to his appointed field of labor. Nothing tends more to promote his health than quietude of mind. Are not our consciences cast upon one through the public prints, and that by brethren calculated to agitate rather than to quiet the mind?

I do not agree with brother B., in his views of the polygamy question, but I believe that his Divine Master guarantees to him the privilege, and enjoins upon him the duty, to give every one that asks him, (whether interrogated by H. or D.) a reason of the hope that is in him, and a reason for his faith and practice in religious matters.

I would, with all possible tenderness, ask brother "D." prayerfully to consider whether he may not be more deserving of censure, for holding his peace so long on this mooted question, than for expressing his views, which are especially called on to do so. To do him in arriving at a correct conclusion, I will take the liberty to remind him of a few facts.

1. It is a fact that this polygamy question was agitated and acted upon before our separation from our Northern brethren.

2. It is a fact, if I have not mistaken the person of "D." that he was almost invariably appointed one of our delegates to the Old Triennial Convention.

3. It is a fact, that we have before us no evidence that he ever lifted up his voice, in or out of the Convention, against the admission of polygamists into our churches in the heathen lands.

The same is true (to the best of my belief and knowledge) of all who were sent as delegates to the old Triennial Convention from the South.

4. It is a fact, that Dr. Howell, President of the S. B. C., expressed views very similar to, if not identical with, those for which Bro. B. has been censured, in his work on the "Deaconship," published as far back as 1846.

5. It is a fact, that the said work was offered to, accepted and published by the A. B. P. S., without a note or comment to counteract what it appears is now considered as having a demoralizing tendency.

6. It is a fact, that while Bro. B. has been severely censured for the views contained in his letter, not a word of censure has been passed upon Dr. H. for the same or similar views contained in his book, although the one was published in an ephemeral paper, and the other has been stereotyped, published in book form, more extensively circulated than the letter—and its circulation as still extending.

7. It is a fact, that a former editor of the Index called attention to what he considered objectionable in Dr. H.'s views of polygamy, in his notice of the work on the "Deaconship," when it was first issued.

8. It is a fact, that neither "D." nor another brother aided the aforesaid editor in sounding a note of alarm, at the time, or subsequently.

Index, (which I sincerely hope he will not do.) I cannot see how you could, with a due regard to the behests of Justice, deny him the privilege. If the war is to be renewed, I would beseech the belligerents, one and all, to reverence the authority of Him who bids us, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Express errors of sentiments boldly, and content facts, if need be, fearlessly, but presume not, brethren, to assume an attribute of Deity by impugning each other's motives. Our God is a jealous God, and will not allow his attributes to be assumed by mortal man with impunity.

J. S. B.

P. S.—If there be any tenderness in anything I have written, I hope it will be ascribed not to any unkind feeling towards any one, but to my habit of thought and style. I write, I trust, with the fear of God before me, and with the love of Christ, my brethren and perishing sinners, in my heart.

Is the Tendency of Agricultural Fairs Moral, or Immoral?*

However trivial this subject may appear to some, when considered in all its bearings, it is of considerable importance. A question that involves consequences for which we, as citizens and as Christians, are, to a great extent, responsible. A correct answer to this question will indicate the course which should be pursued by all Christians, in reference to fairs. If they exert a moral influence, they are laudable institutions, and Christians should give them their support, and heartily co-operate in sustaining them. But if their tendency is immoral, every lover of the cause of Christianity should withhold from them his countenance and support, and throw his entire influence against them. With the agricultural, mechanical and pecuniary advantages that may result from them, we have nothing to do. But it is very necessary that we ascertain their moral character. This is decidedly, and emphatically, a "fast age"—an age of discoveries and inventions—an age, in which many contrivances of very questionable moral tendency, have been brought into requisition, for the promotion of our agricultural, pecuniary, social and religious interests. And, as the subject of fairs seems, at this time, to have taken hold upon the minds of the people like an epidemic, the present seems to be a very appropriate time to consider and ascertain their moral character. Fairs are now held annually, in almost every town and village of our country, and vast numbers of our brethren, not only attend them, but are personally and pecuniarily interested in them—are stockholders in them.

To the question at the head of this article I answer *immoral*. Not that every one who attends fairs, is guilty of immoral conduct, but they are patronizing and encouraging an institution that is directly and indirectly, productive of much immorality. In the investigation of this subject, not the exhibition only, but every thing connected with it, must be taken into consideration. And when we consider the extent to which they foster a spirit of dissipation, and the facilities they afford for gambling and drinking; and how readily those facilities are seized upon; and the vast amount of revelry and dissipation, with a train of smaller evils consequent upon those, we must look upon fairs as institutions in which there is much evil. But lest it may be urged in extenuation of fairs, that blessings, by an improper use of them, become an evil, and a good institution may be so perverted, or mismanaged, as to prove injurious instead of beneficial, and the best of human institutions are imperfect, and consequently attended with some evil; I will say that in this case the evil very largely predominates over the good, (if, indeed, there is any good connected with it) and so, they are, of necessity, detrimental to the moral, and consequently, to the religious interests of those who attend them, and the communities in which they are held. And whenever an institution is productive of more evil than good, the sooner it is abolished the better. The fact that vast numbers of persons attend them, not for the amusement, but for the purpose of gambling and drinking, and engaging in other immoral and sinful practices, will not be disputed. I presume, by those who are accustomed to attend fairs. Others again go there because of the facilities afforded for getting up balls, and carrying on other vain and sinful amusements. And I would doubtless be correct in saying, that a greater amount of revelry and dissipation of all kinds is carried on at such exhibitions, than at any other in the land. But that is not all. Gambling, if not encouraged, is at least permitted upon the contestants for prizes. It is a well known fact, that wagers to a greater or less extent are staked by the bystanders, upon almost every ring of stock. There is, perhaps, as much betting going on among the spectators, as is usually indulged in upon the race field. And the institution, composed partly of Christians, suffer this, as far as I know, without a word of rebuke. I have certainly never heard of an effort to suppress it.

But passing all this by, is not the exhibition itself near akin to gambling? Is there any material difference between fairs as they are usually conducted, and horse-racing? Let us see. Take, for instance, a ring of saddle horses. The horses are trained, and entered at a certain fee, each. The one that moves the most gracefully, and with the greatest speed takes the prize. But speed is the necessary qualification, and almost, if not that it is necessary to insure success. Take another case. Two or more men train their horses, and pay a certain fee for the privilege of contending for a prize; and run them a certain distance. The fleetest horse takes the prize. Where is the real difference? Are they not parallel cases in every essential particular? Are horse-racing is immoral in its tendency, why are not fairs? Does not every thing that constitutes the former immoral, belong to the latter? It is a trial of speed for a prize, in both cases. When two horses run for a prize, why not call that gambling too? If it is gambling in one case, it is in the other also. The transactions are precisely alike in principle. And, if I exhibit a product of the soil, or an agricultural, or any other implement, against another man, am I not betting the amount that I pay for the privilege, that I raise a better article than he?

Statistics.

THE NORTHERN BAPTIST REGISTER FOR 1859.

—We see the statistics of this Register copied into the Baptist Family Magazine. They are strikingly imperfect, so much so as to render the Register valueless to Southern Baptists, at least.

For instance the statistics of Arkansas less than last year by 74 Tennessee, 266 North Carolina, 101 Florida, 487 Virginia, 1258 Mississippi, 2013 Missouri, less by 4023

Total, 4425

A loss in six Southern States of 4,433! when, doubtless the net gain in these very States is six or ten thousand!!

Those States where any gain is admitted is very small. Say

Alabama, admitted gain of 240 Tennessee, 266 Texas, 134

While one or two Southern States are accorded an apocryphal gain, as Kentucky, a clear gain of 8,355! This work we think the most unreliable of any one we ever examined. We cannot account for its figures. The charge of intent would seem to lie, for whoever compiled the Register had it in his power to know better, since the Southern Baptist Register for 1858, in his possession, which would have furnished him the perfect statistics of all the Southern States, one or two Associations only a year or so behind. We hope our Southern papers will look into this feature before they commend the work. Yet Mr. Tustin declares this to be the only reliable Register. Do not all Southern Baptists see from this the necessity of sending up the following Minutes, which are wanted to make the statistics for 1857 perfect. The new Southern Baptist Register will be ready for orders in the month of November. The Revised edition for 1856, is still called for. All who have it should have a copy of the revised edition to preserve for the statistics. Years hence and you would not take dollars for it. Keep one copy of each year.

MISSISSIPPI WATER.—Will Baptist editors copy those wanted in their States once or twice, and call attention to it, and accept our thanks, or send bill to me to this effect. See list in another column.

Bill and action, resolve and veto, put into the kitchen fire.

If you would see your business done, go to the bank.

It is foolish to lay out money in the way of repentance.

At the request of the Minister and Deacons Meeting of the Nashville County Association, I send you the following table of publications in the Tennessee Baptist.

Two Dollars in Advance. THREE DOLLARS AT THE END OF THE YEAR.

The following is from the pen of a new contributor, whom we cordially welcome to our columns. To his articles now and in future, we call especial attention.

This question divides itself into two. 1. Is it Church? 2. Is it Kingdom?

1. Is it Church? The old Saxon word church signifies a sacred house. I believe Episcopalians generally use the word church in that sense. The Greek words *neos* and *seion*, properly express the meaning of this Saxon word church; but *ecclesia* does not. *Ecclesia*, the Greek word in the New Testament, which is by King James' command, improperly rendered church so often, has no such signification at all, at least never had in the times of Christ and the Apostles. In the Lexicon *ecclesia* is rendered a congregation or assembly. In the New Testament it sometimes means an assembly of Christians—sometimes a mixed assembly gathered together as a mob. This last is its import in Acts 19: 32, and in verse 39 a heathen assembly collected to adjudicate things laid before them, is called in the Greek Testament *ecclesia*, and in verse 41 the whole mass of the infidel mob is called *ecclesia*. Moreover Christians are called *ecclesia* only three times in all the four Evangelists. If King James had not supposed, that to render it church would favor the national organization in England, we should never have had it translated church as it is. In the old translations into English it is generally rendered *assembly* or *congregation*, according to its real meaning? *Ecclesia* occurs only three times in the four Evangelists: all, viz: in Matt. 16: 18; and in Matt. 18: 17, twice; and yet the Christian organization is called "kingdom of God," "kingdom of Christ," "my kingdom," "kingdom of the heavens," (literary translated) expressing the kingdom that exists in the heavens and down to earth—one hundred and twenty-three times, in the four Evangelists. Now it is absurd to suppose that the spirit of inspiration would call it *kingdom* one hundred and twenty

