

BAPTIST DOCTRINES, PRINCIPLES AND FACTS.

SIX IMPORTANT DOCTRINES.

1. One Lord, one Faith, one Immersion, Eph. iv. 5. That an immersion is the profession of that one faith in the burial and resurrection of that one Lord. See Rom. vi. 4-6; Col. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 29; 1 Peter iii. 21.

2. The Grace of God, the only foundation of Hope and Faith in Christ, the only medium of Justification.

3. The Word of God the Instrument, and the Spirit of God the Agent in the regeneration of adults.

4. Each viable Church of Christ is a company of scripturally immersed believers only, (not of believers and their unconverted children and seekers on probation,) associated by voluntary covenant to obey and execute all the commandments of Christ, having the same organization, doctrines, officers, and ordinances of the Church at Jerusalem, and independent of all others, acknowledging no lawgiver in Zion but Christ, and submitting to no law he has not enacted. Read Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1-6; Acts ii. 41, 42.

5. The "Lord's Supper" is a positive and commemorative ordinance to be observed only by a Church of Christ as such, (that is, in church capacity,) not as a test of Christian fellowship or personal feeling of one communion toward another, as Pedobaptists erroneously teach, but only to show forth Christ's death till he comes again; and being a Church act, it becomes, incidentally, a symbol of Church relationship: consequently, only those churches can participate in this ordinance that agree in faith and practice. The members of one church (though of the same faith and order) can come to the communion of another only by an act of courtesy and not by right, for each church is independent, being made the guardian of the purity of the sacred feast, is invested with the authority to discipline those whose relationship ordinarily gives the right.

6. Christian Baptism is the immersion of a believer in water by a qualified administrator, in the name of the Trinity, in representation of the burial and resurrection of Christ, and profession of a death to sin, union with Christ, and consecration to his service. One mode only, therefore, can answer this design, and the profession of baptism cannot be made by children, except "the children of God by faith." Matt. iii. 16 and xviii. 17; Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 23; Acts viii. 12; Rom. vi. 4, 5; Col. ii. 12; Gal. iii. 26, 27.

Burying is, under of one dead to sin is the only action, which the character of a dead man is the only "likeness" or representation of death in the world, for it is called the likeness of death.

SIX IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES.

1. The Bible, and the Bible alone, unalloyed with human devices or tradition, is, and ever has been, the religion of Baptists.

2. Positive laws (as baptism and the subjects of baptism, etc.) are not left to be inferred, but in all cases require positive and plain commands, or examples.

3. To divide the positive requirements of Christ into essentials and non-essentials, is to decide how far Christ is to be obeyed, and in what points we may safely disobey him. But to refuse to obey one of the least of his positive requirements or to teach others so, involves one in the guilt of violating all.

4. Every positive law, ordinance, or practice in the Church, not expressly commanded or exemplified, is positively forbidden, under the specification of one thing is the prohibition of every other. These are all human inventions and traditions, as infant baptism, sprinkling, pouring, etc., now practiced for religious rites, for which no scriptural warrant can be found, and are, therefore, sinful.

5. Christ gave no men, society or church the authority to traffic with the ordinance or organization of his Church or Kingdom, as to make or change his laws, and substitute one thing for another. To surrender what he has established, is treachery—to change them, treason.

6. Principles can neither be conceded nor compromised.

SIX IMPORTANT FACTS.

1. All scholars, critics and lexicographers, of any note, unanimously declare that the primary (that is, first) and leading signification of "Baptizo" is to dip or immerse, while some of the very best scholars of any age, affirm that it has no other meaning.—(Liddell and Scott, Carson, Anthon, &c.)

2. Standard historians unanimously agree that primitive and apostolic baptism was administered by the immersion of believers in water, in the name of the Trinity.—(Stuart, Robinson and Wall.)

3. Nearly all standard Philological commentators admit that the Bible does not furnish one plain command for, or example of infant baptism, and there is the nearest disagreement and contradiction among them as to what grounds or for what purposes it is to be administered.

4. All standard historians unanimously affirm that the government of the apostolic churches was purely democratic, (that is, vested in the people or membership,) and all the churches independent republics. All religious societies have legislative powers, and clerical or aristocratical governments, (that is, in the hands of the clergy or a few as a session,) are anti-scriptural and anti-republican tyrannies which no Christian can lawfully countenance, or republicanism ought to support; consequently, all the acts and ordinances of such irregular bodies are illegal, and ought not to be received by us; nor should such societies be, in any way, recognized as scriptural churches, or their members as scriptural ministers of the gospel. The Baptist Church is the parent of democratic and republican governments.

5. No society, constituted under positive law, differing from those of the apostolic churches, having different officers, ordinances, orders in the solemn can be justly called a gospel church, or a church of Christ, or a branch of the church of Christ, or "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other."

6. Protestant historians frankly admit that Baptist churches are the only religious communities that have stood since the apostles, and as Christian societies, which have preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.—(See Williams, p. 25.)

"INTERMEDIATE STATE."

J. M. FENNER.

I have read with painful surprise and deep regret the sermon of Elder J. T. Freeman on the "Intermediate State of the Soul between Death and Resurrection." This discourse, it will be remembered, was published in THE BAPTIST of June 5. Why its respected author preached it and consented to its publication, it is difficult to imagine; but it is far more difficult to conceive how he espoused the cheerless theory which he advocates. That theory is, that the soul is unconscious from the death to the resurrection of the body. It has been held by some in almost every age, and is dwelt upon at length by Archbishop Whately, in his volume on the "Future State." I do not think, however, that the Archbishop's reasonings have made much impression on the religious world. He is regarded generally by theologians as a very imperfect interpreter of Scripture.

It is not my purpose to notice in detail the sermon before me. I shall refer to two or three expositions of Scripture with which the author seems satisfied, and then I will call attention to other passages which present an insuperable barrier to the adoption of his view.

Elder Freeman informs us that "texts, numerous and pointed, in both the Old and New Testaments, tell us in language unmistakable, that the soul, the *Pneuma* or *Psuche*, if you please, sleeps in Jesus." This is a very strong statement. I, for one, have mistaken the language which is declared to be "unmistakable;" and I venture to say, that there is not a man in ten thousand who would infer from the teachings of the Bible that it is the soul, the spirit (for *pneuma* means spirit), that sleeps in Jesus. The burden of proof rests on him who affirms. I deny in this case. I deny that there is a passage in either Testament which teaches that the soul sleeps. It is the body that sleeps. The sleep, of course, is not literal, but metaphorical. But why is the metaphor employed? Because there is a resemblance between literal sleep and death. It is the body, however, that sleeps literally and figuratively, and we all know that graveyards are called *cemeteries*—that is, sleeping-places. Are souls sleeping in cemeteries?

Our author is so confident that the doctrine of the soul's consciousness after death is a heresy, he expresses himself thus: "It doubtless is to this the apostle alludes when he says, 'Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already.' These doubtless taught, as Archbishop Whately justly observes, that the spirit arose and enjoyed the heavenly bliss without the body." This exposition will certainly add nothing to the reputation of Whately, it is gratuitous assumption from beginning to end. In what Hymeneus and Philetus "erred concerning the faith" (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18), no one can certainly say, for no one can certainly know. Augustine supposed that their error was in identifying the resurrection with regeneration. Warburton was of opinion that as in some of the schools of philosophy *psyche* was called *death*, the errorists in question thought that a recovery from vice to virtue was the only resurrection referred to in the Scriptures. What they meant by saying that the resurrection was past, I pretend not to know; but the "error" charged on them by the apostle consisted in a denial of the resurrection of the body. That was their heresy, according to Paul's inspired statement; but the dogma that their error was a belief of the conscious existence of the soul without the body, is utterly without foundation. There is nothing in the text or context to suggest this view. An appeal to such a passage of Scripture in support of the cheerless theory of "soul-sleeping," shows that theory to labor under difficulties.

Equally inconclusive is the reference to Luke xxiii. 43: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Our author says the translators of the Bible "accepted the traditions of Rome on this question, and therefore supposed that the adverb 'to-day' qualified the latter part of the sentence instead of the first, but which can be very clearly proved to be a mistake. They therefore put the comma before that word after the sentence 'I say unto you,' making 'to-day' qualify 'you shall be with me in paradise.' But if we place the comma as it evidently should be, after 'to-day,' we will find that it reads thus: 'Verily I say unto thee to-day, (that is, now, that you may be instantly relieved

from suspense,) thou shalt be with me in paradise."

It is difficult to deal with such criticism as this according to its deserts without the appearance of discourtesy. I would be respectful, but I must say that the punctuation suggested would make bad Greek and wretched English. If "to-day" is made to qualify "say" instead of "shalt be," it is plainly superfluous. Did the Savior mean, I say to you to-day—I do not say to you yesterday—I do not say to you to-morrow—thou shalt be, etc.? How was it possible for the words "I say to you" to have reference to any but the present time? and therefore they did not need to be qualified by "to-day." Our author says the common punctuation "can be very clearly proved to be a mistake;" but he ought to remember that assertion is not proof. Thus far he has made several declarations, but he has proved nothing. It is very strange that with the most critical editions of the Greek text and all versions against him, he should expect his unproved statements to be received. If, as he says, "to-day" qualifies the former part of the verse, it is a useless expletive, adding nothing to the force of the expression.

The reference to the "traditions of Rome" is unfortunate for our author, in view of the following extract from the learned Commentary of Lange: "Senseless is the combination of to-day with *lego* [I say to thee], of which Theophylact already speaks, and which is vindicated in particular by Roman Catholic exegetes, in order as much as possible to weaken the proof which has always been derived from this word on the cross against the doctrine of purgatory."

Romish interpreters explain the adverb to-day as does Elder Freeman, but with a different purpose: they to show that the soul of the penitent robber went into purgatory and not paradise, he to show that the soul became unconscious when death occurred. Alas, how often are interpretations vitiated by a desire to maintain a favorite theory!

The author of the sermon having referred to two Scriptures in which the adverb to-day is found, but which have no analogy to the passage under examination, says: "If these references should not prove satisfactory, we have only to refer to the fact that the thief did not die that day."

Here we have a bold assertion, and an attempt is made to sustain it by the fact that crucified persons often live several days. The author assumes that the legs of the thief were broken lest he should make his escape when taken from the cross, and that after the Sabbath was past he was to be nailed again to the cross. I wonder if any man, with no pet theory to support, ever read the scriptural account of the matter without inferring that the legs of the two robbers were broken to hasten their death, and that permission was obtained from Pilate to break the legs of Jesus to expedite his death. "The thief did not die that day," says our author; "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," said the Lord Jesus. There is a mistake somewhere.

I am sorry to say that Elder Freeman attempts to interpret the parable of the "rich man and Lazarus" favorably to his soul-sleeping theory. I shall not inquire whether the narrative is a historical or parabolic statement. Whether it be the one or the other, it teaches the consciousness of the soul after death. It tells us expressly that Lazarus died and the rich man died, and not before, but after death, the one was comforted and the other was tormented. I need not enlarge; if this narrative does not teach the soul's consciousness after death, the Epistle to the Romans does not teach the doctrine of justification by faith.

Having given these specimens of the author's mode of interpretation, I will not further examine the sermon, but must express my profound regret that talent and learning so respectable are utterly wasted on a theory so repulsive in itself and antagonistic with the teachings of the Scriptures.

I now refer to several passages of the inspired Word which teach the consciousness of the soul after the death of the body. At the close of the seventh chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, we have an account of the martyrdom of Stephen. The good man, surrounded by enemies thirsting for his blood, said, "Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." Murderous stones were hurled at him thick and fast, but he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Did he mean, receive an unconscious thing, and let it sleep till

the resurrection of the body? Who can believe it? Did he labor under a mistake in supposing that it was the prerogative of the Lord Jesus to receive the departing spirits of his saints? Strange time to make a mistake, when the glory of God, brighter than the effulgence of ten thousand suns, shone around him. He expected the Lord Jesus to receive his spirit, and all who believe in "soul-sleeping" virtually charge him with indulging an unauthorized expectation.

The first part of the fifth chapter of 2d Corinthians is conclusive as to the soul's survival of the death of the body, and its consequent consciousness. The body is referred to as a tabernacle, a temporary habitation, and therefore susceptible of dissolution. But the apostle refers to something which he clearly distinguishes from the tabernacle. "We have a building," etc. "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened," etc. Verses 6 and 8 are still more in point: "Whilst we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." Who does not see that being at home in the body and being absent from the Lord are precisely equal duration? Who does not see that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord? There is something belonging to a saint that is present with the Lord as soon as the earthly tabernacle falls. What is it? The spirit; the part which Stephen prayed the Lord Jesus to receive. It will not do to say that the spirit cannot be consciously present with the Lord till the body is raised from the dead; for the very truth we are taught is that in the absence of the body the spirit is present with the Lord. Aye, more, that absence from the body is indispensable to presence with the Lord. Hence it follows that spirits in their disembodied state will be present with the Lord till the resurrection of the bodies they have left. Then the saints in their complete person—souls and bodies re-united, will be ever with the Lord. No doubt their bliss will be greatly increased at the resurrection, which will be the public part of their "adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body." But this is not the point before me. What I affirm, or rather what the Holy Spirit teaches through Paul, is, that as soon as the saints are absent from the body they are present with the Lord.

Peter, as well as Paul, refers to the body as a tabernacle: "Knowing that I must shortly put off this my tabernacle." The tabernacle is distinguished from the I, and the I is to put it off. How absurd it is to suppose that the I has the power to put off the tabernacle, and that the putting it off deprives the I, the soul, of consciousness! If the putting off of the tabernacle could divest the soul of its consciousness, it is plain that the soul could not be "master of the situation," so as to put off the tabernacle at all. It is as well to say here as elsewhere, that the theory of "soul-sleeping" is the outgrowth of the materialistic philosophy. The abettors of this philosophy say that as the soul now acts through the body, it can never act in any other way. They therefore say that it will be in a state of non-action from the death to the resurrection of the body. One class of materialists, being infidels, deny that there will be a resurrection, and say that death is the end of man. Christian materialists say that the action and consciousness of the soul are suspended from the death to the resurrection of the body. Peter did not think so. He thought he would be something after he put off his tabernacle.

It seems almost a pity that our materialistic philosophers did not live in apostolic times. They could have explained to Paul a thing which perplexed him, and which he could not understand. The difficulty will be seen from his words as follows: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body I cannot tell; or whether out of the body I cannot tell; God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven." If some believer in the philosophy referred to had been with Paul, he could have said to the apostle, There is no difficulty in the case; for the soul can act only in union with the body, and therefore you were in the body. This view would no doubt have suggested itself to Paul if he had believed the philosophy; but not believing it, he (poor man!) could not tell whether he was in the body or not. I claim that the perplexity of the apostle in the matter demolishes the philosophy of the materialists. To be consistent

they must say that angels cannot act without bodies, and that they have bodies. They must go further, and say that the Bible is at fault in saying that "God is a spirit." They must say, he could not act or be conscious without a body. What wretched philosophy! Let it be trampled under foot, and let no one wish to be "wise above what is written."

IS FEET WASHING OF GOD OR MAN?

J. B. GARDNER.

It is a painful thing to be compelled to differ in religious matters with those for whose opinion we have great regard. Especially is it painful to differ with brethren who have generally taught correctly on the distinctive principles of the Baptist Church. On the subject of feet washing I am compelled to differ with the majority of my brethren, and I may safely say that nothing but an honest conviction that the subject has not been fairly dealt with induces me to write at all in opposition to their views. With regard to feet washing we are confined almost entirely to what is said of it in John xiii. Here we are to learn all that God would have us know on the subject. The allusion to feet washing in Timothy affords but little additional information, yet it is my opinion that both passages should be carefully considered. I propose to ask a few questions in connection with the subject at issue, and at the same time answer the questions myself, inviting those who think differently to answer as they like. Under each question I shall consider the prominent objections of the objectors.

1. Are we to consider the narrative of John correct—that is, are we to believe that the circumstances did occur just as John narrates, and that Christ did teach as John affirms? To this we must answer yes or no. Perhaps none will doubt the relation of John. Then if Christ did teach just as it is said he did in the 13th of John, the fact that the other evangelists did not record this part of Christ's history, cannot affect the teaching of the Lord. Minus, in his exegetical article on this same subject, makes use of the following language: "The fact that the subject is not mentioned in more than two places should, I think, forever settle the question." It becomes us to stop and consider carefully the weight of the objection urged in the above words. The author does not argue that the language of Christ does not imply that we should wash the saints' feet, but one fact alone is urged as being conclusive of the subject. It matters not what may be the import of Christ's words, what the importance of the lesson taught—one thing settles the question, and that is, "we have no account of the doctrine in more than two places in the Scriptures." The inference is, if Christ had meant that his disciples should wash each other's feet, his inspired apostles would have written on the subject. This is mere conjecture. I suppose the immutable word of God once spoken is sufficient. Elder Ray, in his article in THE BAPTIST of April 24th, 1869, says with reference to the omission of this part of Christ's history by Matthew, Mark and Luke: "As a matter of course what they did write they must have considered of equal, if not of paramount importance to the feet washing affair, of which they as well as John were eye-witnesses." One thing in the above extract demands notice. The idea evidently intended to be put forth here is that three evangelists did not think feet washing of enough importance to notice it. I have yet to learn that the apostles wrote from their judgment of the teachings of Christ; I have thought that they wrote as they were moved upon by the Spirit. Taking this view of the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures, I conclude that John penned his narrative in obedience to the Spirit of God, and that it was written for our instruction just as much as any other part of the Word. If John was not a false apostle, this is God's word written for our good, and we are just as much bound to obey it as if it were recorded on every page of the Bible. But why did not Matthew, Mark and Luke record the same? I answer, because God's Spirit did not so direct them, and not because they thought the "affair" of but little importance. By the same process of reasoning we should conclude that John thought but little of the Lord's Supper, for he says nothing of it unless he alludes to it in connection with feet washing. Such sentiments save strongly of impiety, and should have no place in our hearts, heads or public prints. I deny that the testimony of the other writers could add any weight to John's testimony. God needs speak but

once. Taking John's narrative to be the truth, we proceed to the second question, viz:

Does the 13th chapter of John show that it was Christ's will that the disciples should wash each other's feet? There must be one of the two answers to this question: 1st. It does not; 2d. It does. Let us consider the words of Christ: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." In view of this language it is impossible that any one should urge that Christ did not intend that his apostles should wash each other's feet, unless he reverse the import of his words. He had washed their feet, and he tells them that they ought to do likewise. He gave them an example in order that they should do as he had done. This question is of much importance, and I hope those who oppose feet washing will take it on themselves to answer it before we go to the next. It will not do to say that Christ only intended that his apostles should fulfill the design of feet washing in some other way. The definiteness of the language compels us to believe that he designed that they should perform this very act. The object with Christ evidently was to teach humility, and in enjoining feet washing on his disciples he must have designed that the great lesson of humility should be kept fresh in their minds by a repetition of the same humbling act. Bro. Ray has shown that the disciples were strangely inclined to forget his oft-repeated lesson on humility. How appropriate that he should at or near the close of his stay with them, leave with them an ordinance which would ever remind them of his teachings.

The third question we propose is this: Did the disciples wash each other's feet? They did or did not. If our answer to the second question is correct, then if the apostles did not wash each other's feet they disobeyed Christ. Minus himself admits that Christ did enjoin feet washing on the apostles, but ere he is done, he delivers himself in terms which show that he does not believe they ever obeyed the injunction. I repeat, that if they did not, they disobeyed Christ. I conclude that they did. It is urged against this conclusion that there is no record of their having done so. I believe they obeyed Christ, and though there is no place where it is stated. All that was done by Christ and the apostles is not recorded. Enough is written for us to be able to know our duty. We are placed in a condition where we must either believe these inspired apostles to be disobedient, or think their obedience not recorded. Let every one choose on which horn of the dilemma he will fall. I have no hesitancy in deciding that they were obedient to Christ. It may be objected that it is very strange that Matthew, Mark and Luke, together with the other writers, did not give us some information on the subject. My answer is, that many of God's ways are strange to us. John makes no mention of the institution of the Supper. Paul and others of the writers of the epistles, have in a majority of these letters said nothing of the Supper. I do not, therefore, conclude that the churches to which these letters were written, were left without this ordinance, but I believe in the absence of any declaration of Scripture, that this ordinance was committed to these churches by the apostles, and that these churches observed the communion. It is supposed by some that the disciples might have imitated the lesson taught by feet washing in some other way, and fulfilled the spirit of the command, if not the letter. This seems to be Elder Ray's opinion. This idea is eminently Pedobaptistic in its complexion and general bearing. It is on a par with the substituting of sprinkling for baptism, in the belief that it will do quite as well. This substituting one thing for another has no warrant in the Scriptures. Baptists have usually opposed such a spirit, and it is painful to see the same spirit developed in this Baptist controversy. Christ evidently intended that his disciples should teach humility not only by word and act, but by the washing of each other's feet. This the text abundantly proves. Obedience demanded that they do the very thing prescribed by Christ, and not something else. Did they do it or not?

There are several other questions to be put and answered before the subject is fully developed. If this article is received and published, I propose to proceed with the investigation until every vital point is discussed. I am aware that just over the line from me are to be found the D. D.'s and LL. D.'s and a host of the strong men of our Israel who are minus the D.'s and L.'s. I am furthermore aware that I lay myself open to censure from these high sources. In view of these things, I could not be induced to run the risk of being scissored up, if I did not feel that I have the truth on my side. In conclusion of these articles I shall, with the consent of Bro. Graves, state and consider some of the savings and objections against feet washing found among Baptists. I invite criticism in the spirit of love and candor, and right glad will I be to have any argument advanced by myself tried and proven. I desire on this subject as on all others, to embrace the truth. The truth as it is in Christ, is man's most blessed heritage. To know it, to love it, to practice it, is man's highest duty, and secures his highest temporal and eternal good.

BAPTIST COROLLARIES.

1. There is no church, but a body of men, believers who have been immersed by a duly appointed officer of a Scriptural church.
 2. There are no Scriptural ministers but those who have been duly authorized by a Scriptural church.
 3. Since nothing is more evident than the fact that we teach more effectively by example than by precept—therefore, so long as we appropriate our pulpits for the official preaching of the gospel by those whom we consider duly baptized and ordained to the ministerial office, it is equally evident that it is improper for us to invite those teachers to preach when we know they are neither baptized nor ordained, and especially since they claim to be, and construe the action on our part into a recognition of their claims, and thus confirm their followers in error.
 4. Nothing can be more inconsistent than to admit those preachers into our pulpits who hold and teach doctrines, on account of which we would exclude both from our pulpits and churches any minister of our own denomination. This we claim, is one of the old landmarks of the Baptist Church.
 5. That a body of immersed believers is the highest ecclesiastical authority in the world, and the only tribunal for the trial of cases of discipline; that the acts of a church are of superior binding force over those of an association, convention, council, or synod—any and no association or convention can impose a moral obligation upon the constituent parts composing them.
 6. That since each church of Christ is an independent body, no one church can expect any other to endorse its acts, only so far as they are in strict accordance with the laws of Christ. If she excludes a member unjustly, any other church can restore him if it sees fit.
 7. Whenever any church acts in violation of the directions of her only Lawgiver, as found in the New Testament, she becomes rebellious—her acts null and void; and all other churches, and associations of churches and conventions, should withdraw their fellowship from her until she repents and rectifies her order, or they become the partakers of her sins.
 8. That no association, or convention, or council, is a "court of appeal," or has any authority over the churches, but is simply an advisory council; therefore, it has no right to dictate to the churches, or to demand support for any project or scheme which it may originate, but may only recommend, advise, and urge to performance of duty in subsequence to the great Christian voluntary principle.
 9. When any church departs from the faith, or violates the order of the gospel in the judgment of the association, it can and should withdraw its fellowship from her and leave her to herself until she repents. This is no interference with her internal regulation.
 10. Baptists are not Protestants. Since they never had any ecclesiastical connection with the Papacy, they are not, and have been the reputation of the primitive and apostolic churches, whether found in Rome or in the Protestant sects that came out of her.
 11. We regard Protestantism, as well as the Reformation of 1517, as based on the assumption that the prophecies and declarations of Christ touching his church are false, thus making Christ an impostor, and the reformers, and not Christ, the saviors and preservers of the church.
1. The numerous bodies of Christians are not churches, nor are any privileged companies of them the church; hence all Pedobaptist denominations are only religious societies.
 2. That baptism and an official relation to a church are prerequisites to a regular gospel ministry; hence, all ordinances administered by an unbaptized and unordained, although immersed minister, are null and void.
 3. No church has a right to hear a case brought before it in violation of the law of Christ. The specification of the order to be observed is the prohibition of any other order.
 4. No member should submit to an arrangement, or trial brought and conducted in violation of the laws of Christ. Each one is individually responsible to Christ for the faithful observance of his laws.
 5. Since only one, not many, is right, a constitutional majority is in all cases the Scriptural church.
 6. An unconstitutional or disorderly majority cannot exclude a member of an acknowledge and constitutional church.
 7. No church should receive the letters of, or the members of, any other church, or the members of any other church, or in any way countenance or uphold its disorder; and it should keep no company with it that it may be ashamed.
1. To be in all things consistent with our principles, whether we gain or lose numbers or popularity.
 2. To fulfill our peculiar mission, which is to be the witnesses of Christ's truth against every system of error, and those who originate or advocate them; and above all, by no act to countenance, recognize, or protect those who do error, or to confirm those who are in error.
 3. To employ all the energies of the denomination for the conversion of sinners and the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom, through the most efficient means and agencies, not incompatible with the Word of God.
 4. To occupy every village and city in the world with a suitably qualified, faithful, energetic and devoted minister.
 5. To furnish a pastor to every church, and mission, and to the cross for every destitute region, at home and abroad, under the whole heaven, and to sustain them.
 6. The commission to evangelize the nations having been given to the church through the apostles, the pastor delegates his authority, or her responsibility to a body as a board of elders, or to the churches should select, send for and sustain missionaries of the Gospel.
 7. To the neglect and unconformable advocacy of these principles and this policy, this paper is devoted.

Correspondence.

BRO. PENDLETON AND MASONRY.

W. E. FANTON.

It is not my purpose in this article to enter into a defense of Masonry. Bro. Pendleton does not charge the institution with immorality; and if he did, it is friends, in vindication, need only to point to the good and great of the present and past ages who are numbered among its patrons; men who have entered its portals and know whereof they witness—and who are certainly better qualified to judge of its character than those who stand without at a distance, and complain of it as an "impudent incumbrance." My sole object is to vindicate Christian Masons from the grave charge of "discrediting Christianity."

I do not know whether to feel complimented or not in being selected as the only one out of many who have noticed Bro. P.'s article to whom he vouchsafes a reply, particularly as he says, "I do not expect it will be necessary for me to refer to Masonry again." If he expects to snuff out even so small a light as I am with a whiff, he may be mistaken; but if he means to say that he had produced the best argument he could in support of his position, and he has nothing stronger to add, I must confess that I breathe freer. Really, he must pardon me for my obtuseness in failing to perceive that he has met the expectation raised by his confident assertion, that if this cannot be proved, nothing can be.

Indeed, he seems himself to have distrusted the full force of his logic, since he calls in the aid of authority. Now, whether or not the publishers of a book endorse all the views of the writer, I will not stop to inquire. The gray, spectacled gentlemen in the back rooms of the Publication Society, whose critical eyes scan all manuscripts before they pass to the printer, may be infallible; but for my part, the bare name of Bro. Pendleton has more weight than them all. But this is not a question to be settled by authority, but by facts and reasons.

Bro. P. seems to have an idea that by some kind of metamorphosis, when the Christian passes the threshold of the lodge, he loses his identity; that his Christian character is laid aside as a garment, and that he is clothed with a new character, which makes him an entirely different person. His whole argument is based upon the distinction which he makes between a man's Christian and his Masonic character. As if, you could sever a man's identity into two parts, the Christian and the Masonic; and thus when John Smith the Mason is relieving distress, John Smith the Christian has nothing to do with it. Perhaps Bro. Pendleton can comprehend how a man may be so abstracted from himself as not to do as a Christian what he does as a Mason; but I confess it is too deep in metaphysics for the comprehension of men who are unfortunately only endowed with plain common sense. Unwilling, Bro. P. can show that becoming a Mason divests one of his Christian character, his argument is worth nothing; for if his Christian character always attends him and forms a part of his personal identity, what he does as a Mason, he also does as a Christian.

Now, I will not consent that Bro. P. shall go beyond me in insisting upon the entire consecration of the Christian to the service of God; but it must not be forgotten that obedience to God takes in a scope large to our neighbor. It is my duty to do all the good I can to my fellow man, and in so doing, I honor God. If I can enhance my usefulness by becoming a Mason—if I can thus reach men I could not otherwise—if I am thus enabled the better to restrain the bad and to protect the weak and defenseless—I may demand something more than that Hinduistic logic which says, "Which side distinguish and divide?" and "A hot twist south and a hot twist north."

There are many things which you may and ought to do, which are not within the scope of the church. It was organized for a specific purpose, and was never designed to supersede civil government, or our social relations to each other.

Bro. P. says, "If therefore, they do anything outside of their sphere of Christian action, it is because they neglect something inside of it; for all they can do is required within." If this statement be true in all the breadth which is necessary to give it to make it applicable to Masonry, Bro. P. will debar Bro. P. from entering into any agricultural or other association calculated to improve the productiveness of the country; any literary society which has for its object the development of science; because these are outside of the sphere of Christianity.

Bro. P. is welcome to all the aid he can derive from my illustration, but to make any use of it to make him abandon the great question at issue, viz. that there is a conflict between Christian duty and Masonic requirement. But it does not follow because the obligations of Christianity are outside of the sphere of Christianity, that they are outside of the sphere of Christianity.

Bro. P. is welcome to all the aid he can derive from my illustration, but to make any use of it to make him abandon the great question at issue, viz. that there is a conflict between Christian duty and Masonic requirement. But it does not follow because the obligations of Christianity are outside of the sphere of Christianity, that they are outside of the sphere of Christianity.

in the same direction, that Masonry is therefore unnecessary. I can see how that which tends to the same end may aid its accomplishment; but how it can be a hindrance, requires the logical acumen of a Pendleton to discern.

Bro. P. constructs a dilemma for my benefit, which he must allow me to say is sadly in need of reconstruction. What he calls its horns, on examination, prove to be no horns at all. In fact, it is a dilemma without horns—a regular mule! Says he: "If Masonry operates outside of the sphere of Christianity, and therefore in conflict with it, it is wrong. If it operates inside of the sphere of Christianity, it is unnecessary. But it must either operate outside or inside of that sphere. Therefore it is either wrong or unnecessary." If Masonry operates outside of the sphere of Christianity, it does not follow that it is in conflict with it, and therefore wrong. Civil government is outside of the sphere of Christianity, but it does not follow that it is wrong, and in conflict with the kingdom of Christ. Neither if it operates within the sphere of Christianity, does it follow that it is unnecessary. Temperance societies and other benevolent institutions occupying common ground with the church in that particular object for which they were instituted, may be valuable adjuncts to the church, by securing the co-operation in that particular enterprise, of men who are beyond the direct influence of the church. The argument is just as good against temperance societies, associations for the relief of orphans, and the like, as against the society of Masons.

To see the fallacy of this dilemma, which assumes for its premises—not admitted facts or self evident truths—but the very proposition in dispute, it is only necessary to substitute something else in the place of Masonry in its pretended horns. Thus: "If [temperance societies, associations for the relief of orphans, or anything else] operate outside of the sphere of Christianity, and therefore in conflict with it, it is wrong. If they operate inside of it, they are unnecessary. But they must operate either outside or inside of that sphere, therefore (temperance societies, orphan associations, agricultural, civil government, or anything else you choose to name), is either unnecessary or wrong? Shade of Aristotle defend us!"

Not to protract my article to an unreasonable length, I desire to notice Bro. P.'s objection to Masonic prayers, on the ground that they do not contain the name of Christ. Need I remind him that the Lord's Prayer is liable to the same objection? Is, therefore, one of the fundamental facts of the gospel either falsified or kept out of sight by the author of Christianity itself?

CAMPBELLISM IN TROUBLE.

Some forty or fifty years ago a great reformation was heralded to the world, of which A. Campbell was the leader and promoter. He discovered, through his penetrating, long-lensed and powerful theological telescope, as he stood upon his Ararat of vision, that all the sects were in the valleys beneath, so enveloped in the smoke and fog of Babylon as scarcely to be seen, and when seen, only to be loathed and abhorred.

The thought occurred to him in his solitude, that he would bring order out of this confusion, purity out of this polluted mass, and gospelize and harmonize these conflicting elements, and bring together in one all that called upon the name of the Lord; that there were too many sects, too many churches, and that he would harmonize and bring all together. Sectarianism was wrong. But how, he asked, was it to be done? Made another sect—the most sectarian, the bitterest of all.

These thoughts, were suggested by reading an article in the American Christian Review (Campbellite), Cincinnati, from a correspondent who seemed to be in deep trouble, because of a want of harmony among themselves, and because some good brother had said in substance that the reformation was a failure. I will give a few extracts:

Bro. P. constructs a dilemma for my benefit, which he must allow me to say is sadly in need of reconstruction. What he calls its horns, on examination, prove to be no horns at all. In fact, it is a dilemma without horns—a regular mule! Says he: "If Masonry operates outside of the sphere of Christianity, and therefore in conflict with it, it is wrong. If it operates inside of the sphere of Christianity, it is unnecessary. But it must either operate outside or inside of that sphere. Therefore it is either wrong or unnecessary." If Masonry operates outside of the sphere of Christianity, it does not follow that it is in conflict with it, and therefore wrong. Civil government is outside of the sphere of Christianity, but it does not follow that it is wrong, and in conflict with the kingdom of Christ. Neither if it operates within the sphere of Christianity, does it follow that it is unnecessary. Temperance societies and other benevolent institutions occupying common ground with the church in that particular object for which they were instituted, may be valuable adjuncts to the church, by securing the co-operation in that particular enterprise, of men who are beyond the direct influence of the church. The argument is just as good against temperance societies, associations for the relief of orphans, and the like, as against the society of Masons.

To see the fallacy of this dilemma, which assumes for its premises—not admitted facts or self evident truths—but the very proposition in dispute, it is only necessary to substitute something else in the place of Masonry in its pretended horns. Thus: "If [temperance societies, associations for the relief of orphans, or anything else] operate outside of the sphere of Christianity, and therefore in conflict with it, it is wrong. If they operate inside of it, they are unnecessary. But they must operate either outside or inside of that sphere, therefore (temperance societies, orphan associations, agricultural, civil government, or anything else you choose to name), is either unnecessary or wrong? Shade of Aristotle defend us!"

Not to protract my article to an unreasonable length, I desire to notice Bro. P.'s objection to Masonic prayers, on the ground that they do not contain the name of Christ. Need I remind him that the Lord's Prayer is liable to the same objection? Is, therefore, one of the fundamental facts of the gospel either falsified or kept out of sight by the author of Christianity itself?

These thoughts, were suggested by reading an article in the American Christian Review (Campbellite), Cincinnati, from a correspondent who seemed to be in deep trouble, because of a want of harmony among themselves, and because some good brother had said in substance that the reformation was a failure. I will give a few extracts:

Bro. P. constructs a dilemma for my benefit, which he must allow me to say is sadly in need of reconstruction. What he calls its horns, on examination, prove to be no horns at all. In fact, it is a dilemma without horns—a regular mule! Says he: "If Masonry operates outside of the sphere of Christianity, and therefore in conflict with it, it is wrong. If it operates inside of the sphere of Christianity, it is unnecessary. But it must either operate outside or inside of that sphere. Therefore it is either wrong or unnecessary." If Masonry operates outside of the sphere of Christianity, it does not follow that it is in conflict with it, and therefore wrong. Civil government is outside of the sphere of Christianity, but it does not follow that it is wrong, and in conflict with the kingdom of Christ. Neither if it operates within the sphere of Christianity, does it follow that it is unnecessary. Temperance societies and other benevolent institutions occupying common ground with the church in that particular object for which they were instituted, may be valuable adjuncts to the church, by securing the co-operation in that particular enterprise, of men who are beyond the direct influence of the church. The argument is just as good against temperance societies, associations for the relief of orphans, and the like, as against the society of Masons.

To see the fallacy of this dilemma, which assumes for its premises—not admitted facts or self evident truths—but the very proposition in dispute, it is only necessary to substitute something else in the place of Masonry in its pretended horns. Thus: "If [temperance societies, associations for the relief of orphans, or anything else] operate outside of the sphere of Christianity, and therefore in conflict with it, it is wrong. If they operate inside of it, they are unnecessary. But they must operate either outside or inside of that sphere, therefore (temperance societies, orphan associations, agricultural, civil government, or anything else you choose to name), is either unnecessary or wrong? Shade of Aristotle defend us!"

Not to protract my article to an unreasonable length, I desire to notice Bro. P.'s objection to Masonic prayers, on the ground that they do not contain the name of Christ. Need I remind him that the Lord's Prayer is liable to the same objection? Is, therefore, one of the fundamental facts of the gospel either falsified or kept out of sight by the author of Christianity itself?

These thoughts, were suggested by reading an article in the American Christian Review (Campbellite), Cincinnati, from a correspondent who seemed to be in deep trouble, because of a want of harmony among themselves, and because some good brother had said in substance that the reformation was a failure. I will give a few extracts:

it, they did if they loved Jesus. John 13:35. "If a man love me he will keep my words." If Jesus taught with unerring certainty, the disciples did obey his words. Ye also ought to wash one another's feet.

Should a church as such observe feet-washing from the language and example of Jesus? The answer is, It ought. For Christ gave a congregated example of its performance. He was assembled with the disciples, John xiii. 5. To observe feet washing in any other way is to do it outside of the gospel of Christ, and not to do it at all. If we will not take from the Word of God, nor add to it, doing less or more, we must observe the institution of Christ in an assembled manner, or a congregated way, and then the truth is inevitable of Christ's assembly, congregation, ecclesia, church, as such, observing his example institution, and his words, Ye also ought to wash one another's feet.

For a time let us look at the term used by Jesus demanding obedience. Ye also ought to wash one another's feet. The term "ought" possesses all the imperative force of a command. In Acts x. 16 the angel said to Cornelius in reference to Peter, "He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do;" and in verse 48, what the angel said ought to be done, Peter commanded. We see that, ought, in the Scripture, stands upon a parity with a command, which may be seen by reference to other portions of the Bible. Then you assembled followers, you church people, are commanded to wash one another's feet. The saints' feet—not visitors or guests. We argue that no one has a right to take the Supper of the Lord till he is baptized, it being in the kingdom or church, because Jesus instituted the Supper with his disciples who had been baptized. John iii. 22. John was to make ready a people prepared for the Lord, to whom the Savior was to exemplify his institutions and give his commands. Thus it is shown by this example of Christ, that those who take the Supper must be baptized. Then, if we administer the communion to any not baptized into the church, we do so without an example or command. Jesus having instituted feet washing with the same disciples, we see clearly the persons whose feet are washed must be baptized into the church; for Christ gave a congregated ecclesia, or church duty, by the assembled act. If the one is an institution in the church, so is the other, being performed by Christ with the same persons, possessing the same qualifications, at the institution of the one as the other. Different circumstances, being at one place or another, would not affect the relative relations to Christ and his institutions. Therefore, if we celebrate feet washing in any other way than as did Christ, with those who possessed proper church character, it is something else than feet washing commanded by Christ.

Admit feet washing was instituted at Simon's house on a social occasion. Jesus impressed the disciples with one of the things they ought to do, as he had done to them. To argue that it was a social gathering, and must be done only on such occasions, is to say logically, the Supper is to be observed only on a pass-over occasion, being instituted at the passover, and is to say also that occasions give meaning to the institutions of Christ. We are compelled to admit in candor that occasions have nothing to do with Christ's institutions, nor show when or where they are to be observed. Paul, in showing the Corinthians the obligations they were under to observe the Lord's Supper, from what Jesus said and did in instituting the Supper with his assembled disciples, showed them they must regard the assembly idea, as well as others belonging to the institution. 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24. "And does the assembling idea come from a command? No. It comes from Christ being assembled with the disciples. Could Paul be consistent to regard that guiding idea in the Supper, and leave out the assembling guiding idea in the required determining trait in the character of the widow? If she have washed the saints' feet?" 1 Tim. v. 10. Not visitors or guests, but saints, disciples, followers of Christ.

The church in Corinth was to assemble to commune, for Christ assembled with his disciples and gave a congregated or church injunction by so doing. And a church, as such, could only obey in letter and spirit the obligation "when ye come together," as seen in Corinthians. Christ gave an assembled or church injunction in feet washing as certainly as in the Supper, being with the same persons on both occasions, having the same church character at the institution of the one as the other. Therefore, it follows with logical certainty, if we must observe the one as a church, we must observe the other as a church, or not at all. One comes to us under "As often as ye do this," but the other under the binding "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." We have given you an example, what ye should do as I have done to you. Did the disciples wash each other's feet, and if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them? No, those things are

other occasions spoken or taught, but these things on this occasion. The idea that females are to administer in feet washing, because the institution is outside the record, for it was with the disciples. Not that we do not believe that females should not obey (Ye also ought to wash one another's feet), for they are members of Christ's church, and come under the embracing term "ye" as other members. And if our king saw fit to give us this exception to the general rule, who can object?

We are not prepared to admit that the institution took place at the house of Simon, and had we space it could be shown almost if not quite with logical certainty, that it did not. All we can say is a chance to show it up. The many objections to its being a church ordinance admit of an easy refutation, if John's testimony is equal to that of others. To our mind, the course of reasoning that disproves if a church ordinance, would prove infant sprinkling baptism, and extreme unction a Christian sacrament.

KENTUCKY CAMPAIGN.

In my last report from the field, it was seen that I had "fallen back in good order" to look after one T. W. Caskey, the Goliath of the modern Philistines—the Campbellites. He had defied the armies of Israel. He is a giant warrior of more than a dozen battlefields. In his haughty challenge at Murray, Ky., he said, among other things, that, as for little David Ray, I will show him that he's not to keep his mouth shut concerning my people.

Being apprised of the daring movements of this would-be Hercules, I addressed the Disciples of Murray, requesting them, through their representative, to defend their church claims; and in the event they refused, I proposed to deliver a series of lectures on Campbellism in Murray, and divide time with their champion. As I received no reply from them, I supposed that they had declined to accept my offer. But lo! when I reached Murray, I found Mr. Caskey, snuffing the wind as the war horse that "smells the battle afar off."

He would affirm no proposition in defense of his church organization, but came in on my proposition to divide time. The battle opened on Saturday before Christmas. The first engagement lasted only one day—Mr. Caskey fell sick of pneumonia. It is not true, as reported, that I gave him pneumonia. But the truth was developed that he was laboring under chronic spiritual pneumonia, or something worse. I camped for a week in undisputed possession of the field, during which time we had a fine meeting. Bro. T. H. Pettit, the pastor, attended to the burial of the dead.

other occasions spoken or taught, but these things on this occasion. The idea that females are to administer in feet washing, because the institution is outside the record, for it was with the disciples. Not that we do not believe that females should not obey (Ye also ought to wash one another's feet), for they are members of Christ's church, and come under the embracing term "ye" as other members. And if our king saw fit to give us this exception to the general rule, who can object?

We are not prepared to admit that the institution took place at the house of Simon, and had we space it could be shown almost if not quite with logical certainty, that it did not. All we can say is a chance to show it up. The many objections to its being a church ordinance admit of an easy refutation, if John's testimony is equal to that of others. To our mind, the course of reasoning that disproves if a church ordinance, would prove infant sprinkling baptism, and extreme unction a Christian sacrament.

KENTUCKY CAMPAIGN.

In my last report from the field, it was seen that I had "fallen back in good order" to look after one T. W. Caskey, the Goliath of the modern Philistines—the Campbellites. He had defied the armies of Israel. He is a giant warrior of more than a dozen battlefields. In his haughty challenge at Murray, Ky., he said, among other things, that, as for little David Ray, I will show him that he's not to keep his mouth shut concerning my people.

Being apprised of the daring movements of this would-be Hercules, I addressed the Disciples of Murray, requesting them, through their representative, to defend their church claims; and in the event they refused, I proposed to deliver a series of lectures on Campbellism in Murray, and divide time with their champion. As I received no reply from them, I supposed that they had declined to accept my offer. But lo! when I reached Murray, I found Mr. Caskey, snuffing the wind as the war horse that "smells the battle afar off."

He would affirm no proposition in defense of his church organization, but came in on my proposition to divide time. The battle opened on Saturday before Christmas. The first engagement lasted only one day—Mr. Caskey fell sick of pneumonia. It is not true, as reported, that I gave him pneumonia. But the truth was developed that he was laboring under chronic spiritual pneumonia, or something worse. I camped for a week in undisputed possession of the field, during which time we had a fine meeting. Bro. T. H. Pettit, the pastor, attended to the burial of the dead.

Returned to Humboldt, my base of operations, to attend to the commissary department, and go into winter quarters. It may not be amiss to state that during this time we had a volunteer recruit to our infantry company. His name is F. M. Ray, for his uncle.

In feeble health, through bad weather, I advanced at the set time to the scene of action. From Mayfield, I traveled in the same box—no railroad coach, but a wagon box—with Mr. Trimble, a prominent Disciple of West Tennessee. He seems to be a earnest intelligent gentleman, but is a confirmed Campbellite. We spent the night of the storm with Bro. Harding, near Murray. Old Bro. Harding became much concerned for the salvation of Mr. Trimble, and labored earnestly to persuade him to repent, forsake his error, and embrace the truth. From the efforts of Bro. H. I was deeply impressed with the weight of ministerial responsibility. Who can estimate the evil which is accomplished by this kind of error? Shall we mark down the distinction between truth and error by affiliating with and uniting the teachers of the grossest falsehoods to be faithful in the ministry?

On the 20th of April I moved into position to await the arrival of the enemy. It was with much difficulty that Mr. Caskey got his heavy artillery and baggage across the swollen creek. In fact, he failed to leave a part of his command, which was not brought into the action at all. Some of his preaching men, the night in the woods. Owing to these difficulties the discussion did not open till the 21st of the next day, over whom, whether Bro. Caskey or myself, was to be the victor.

In the face of all these adverse provisions, waiting Mr. Caskey not to resist the truth, he seemed eager for the encounter. It is probable that a less reckless man would have considered his sudden sickness in the first engagement, and the sudden stopping of his beast in the deep water, as an evidence that the unseen sword was raised to forbid the contest of the prophet. But William like the Jews, seemed determined to prophesy against Israel. But the sequel will show that this, like the ancient prophet, could make much of a people. The conflict lasted four days and a part of the fifth, without any manifestation of all feeling. Personal friendship was increased, and all were present seemed to be highly interested. Some particulars will be reported in my next.

The Baptist.

AN IMPORTANT DISCOVERY.

We live in an age of discovery. In every branch of human knowledge the minds of men are intensely engaged, trying to discover something new and important. The researches of a recent writer in the *Christian Observer* have been rewarded by a discovery which I am sure is of very great importance to the Christian world, and to no part of it is it of more importance than to the Presbyterians. The writer referred to has discovered, proven and demonstrated that the scriptural mode of baptism is not immersion or pouring, but sprinkling only. How this is proven I do not propose to say, but I wish only to call the attention of the reader to the importance of this discovery. The article referred to will be found in the *Christian Observer* of April 14, 1869, published at Richmond, Va., in the interest of the Presbyterians South, by Dr. Converse and son. There is in the same paper a commendatory notice of the article in question by the editors, which shows that they think the positions assumed, together with the conclusion, scriptural and right. The writer comes right down on the subject, and puts his opponent (Mr. Immerser) on the way to see his pastor for help. The mode is not assumed to be a matter of no importance, but is shown to be a matter of the first importance, inasmuch as it is only in a certain way that the real design of baptism can be met. The mode is decided by the most undoubted arguments, proofs and demonstrations, of the sprinkling.

Well, what then? In the first place, the great Baptist denomination, numbering hundreds of thousands, are just so many unbaptized professors of religion. Nor is this the worst of our part of the results of this grand discovery. We are found opposing Christ, since we oppose his baptism, and practice another instead. Had this, it is not all, or the half. We do that in the name of the Holy Trinity which is positively repugnant to high heaven, unless we can suppose God has no care about our obedience. Yet more: we, having no baptism, cannot, according to Presbyterianism, have any church, or any church privileges, not even the communion.

Truly this is one of the most important discoveries of the age to Baptists. But its importance is not confined to Baptists. The Methodists are largely interested in the matter. Many of their best members, in their ignorance, have been immersed. Some of their preachers have been immersed, and perhaps up to date imagine themselves to have been baptized. But immersion is not less baptism than is pouring; both are equally without scriptural warrant. Neither the one nor the other can answer the design of baptism, and are therefore of worse than no use. The duty of every unbaptized believer to be baptized, none will doubt. About this there is no difference of opinion among Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians. Then, in the light of this great discovery, the whole Baptist denomination, and all the immersed Methodists, together with all who have received the pouring of water for baptism, should forthwith be sprinkled. And each a sprinkling, sprinkling, sprinkling, as there would be.

And if we and the Methodists should profit by the light thrown on the subject of baptism by Verdant—for that is the very appropriate name of the great discoverer—so also ought the Presbyterians. There are at least some in their denomination who have been immersed, and perhaps a very large majority both of their lay membership and ministry have received affusion, and not sprinkling, and "nothing else is baptism but sprinkling." Now, ought not these people to obey Christ by submitting to his commands? Will not the great Presbyterian denomination see to it that their members are properly baptized? Who will commence a great reform in the Presbyterian camp on the principle of this new discovery? Evidently one is needed. There should be no more of this pouring of water in the name of the Trinity. One of the great evils of the time is this baptismal controversy. It divides Christians into various orders, and is the great barrier to the Lord's table. We have all lamented these sad divisions as things not to be helped, but we should rejoice now that the truth is at last discovered and demonstrated as plainly as that two and two make four—a thing which no one can doubt. Evidently the great discoverer is under strong obligations to bring his discovery prominently before the world. Will he not write a book? Will he not take his great idea up to the next Synod for the benefit of that body? And surely the Synod will not fail to give the world the benefit of their opinion. Dr. Converse should give the question no rest in his paper, and he should see that the Presbyterian preachers of the Synod who have not been sprinkled "with clean

water" should employ the best sprinkler to sprinkle them all at once, that they may go home and sprinkle those who have been in the dark up to this time.

Never before, has the baptismal question been brought down to the plainness of this mathematical fact that two and two make four. But Verdant declares this to be true of his demonstration of the subject. Let the printing presses—those mighty disseminators of intelligence—be put to work, and worked to their utmost capacity, till every part of Christendom is full of this great truth. Till all shall see eye to eye, and all shall speak the same thing; for all must see that two and two make four, and none will say to the contrary.

The intelligent reader of the *Pedobaptist* papers must see that they are changing ground. Slowly but surely are their battalions changing their old position for one which they think more tenable. The time is coming when Pedobaptists will combine every effort against immersion, and leave Baptists alone to defend the baptism of Christ and his apostles. How should Baptists regard these changes? Certainly with pleasure. Let us stand fast in the truth, and we have nothing to fear. The lines between truth and error are growing daily more distinct. The mist is vanishing away, and from the mind of the honest inquirer will be brought in contact with truth. Error ever changes, but truth stands immutable. Wellsville, Miss., April 24, 1869.

LETTER FROM TEXAS.

BRO. GRAYES—I send with this a notice of the death of our lamented Bro. A. M. Hamilton, one of our old Georgia patrons; a brother whose warm heart has pulsated with renewed vigor while sitting under the sound of your voice, during some of your visits to Cherokee, Ga. It may be rather long, but I could not well make it shorter. The difficulty was, there was so much I wanted to say. We hope to pay you in now, and then sending a subscriber for your paper, and by patronizing the Southwestern Publishing House. That beautiful house, so finely fitted up and arranged for the business of the Company! How I wish I could see it, and walk through its spacious apartments! But I am too poor and too old to hope for such a pleasure. [We wish you could, Bro. M.; it is equalled in extent and appointments by no House in the South.—Ed.]

I am well pleased with *THE BAPTIST*—the matter especially. I do not like the form so well. I think a single sheet, after the old fashion, would be preferable. But this by the by; you cannot suit everybody—so go on your own way. I suppose the S. W. P. Co. does the printing for *THE BAPTIST* as well as the *Farmer*, but I find a difference in the execution. The *Farmer* is much the neatest job. *THE BAPTIST* is rather carelessly folded; the registering is sometimes so bad I can not stitch the paper properly so as to preserve it. Make my complaints known at the proper place, and ask for a little improvement, for the sake of the old man and all such. A word to the wise, etc. In this connection I intended to say a word of encouragement about its reception, etc. I get every number, and very regularly. I have not missed a single number since I commented taking it. I sent you No. 37, according to your request. I think your subscribers will multiply at this once. I am preparing the way. You may set me down as agent for the paper, and for the publications of the Company generally. I can do something, and if I can raise a little money I want to own a little stock in the concern. I think it the greatest enterprise in the Southwest, and must succeed.

There is another thing I must speak of—the Tract Society. You may set me down as a life member. I can dispose, I hope, of \$5 worth every year of my life. I am pleased also at the move for a Sunday-school library. I hope your little school here will be ready next year to purchase one, with the other books necessary for the conduct of a good Baptist Sunday-school.

We are about commencing to build a concrete house, 30x50 feet, for a school house, and for the use of the church, etc., when we get into it, which we hope to do by the meeting of the Alverado Association, to assemble here in September next. So you see we are trying to do something in these Texas wilds. Towash is on the Brazos river, thirty-five miles above Waco.

One thing more. I have wanted to know who writes, or from whence come the beautiful gems of poetry which are published in *THE BAPTIST* from week to week. I was beginning to think you were the poet, until your "disavowal." Surely they are beautiful. The paper is full of interesting and useful articles. Some of them are the jewels of our best writers. Oh, how the time may soon come when your list shall reach 10,000 good paying subscribers! Persevere in your present course, and in a few years the printing is better. The paper of this vol. will be much better than that of the last.—Ed.]

you will have them. I may not live to hear the announcement, but I think God will preserve you long enough to make it. [We think you will, Bro. Mercer.—Ed.]

I take twenty copies of *Kind Words* for your Sunday school. It is a beautiful sheet, well printed and well filled with matter for the young folks. I wish the enterprise great success. In making up your library I hope you will ignore many, if not all, of the Union books. Let us have a Southern Baptist S. S. Library. Then we can confidently call upon our brethren, to rally around and support Sunday-schools.

Bro. L. A. Daniel, said to me a few days ago that he had just received your Christmas present, in the form of a \$100.00 note, which he owed on the old score. I am glad that you are succeeding in collecting some of your old accounts. Keep after the delinquents; most of them will pay you after a while.

The *Southern Farmer*, that beautiful and ably conducted Southern paper, is well received among our people here, and I think its circulation will increase in Texas. I am anxious to see the Debate. Towash, Texas, May, 1869.

THE ETERNAL YEARS.

How shall thou bear the cross that now
So drearily weighs upon thee?
Keep quietly to God, and think
Upon the Eternal Years.

Austerity is life's help,
Thine oil of gladness is the thought
Of the Eternal Years.

Set hours and written rules are good,
Long prayer also lay our fears;
But it is better calm for thee
To count the Eternal Years.

Rites are but pale unto the eyes,
God's word unto the ears;
But he will have thee rather brood
Upon the Eternal Years.

Thy self-appraising is a snare,
Though meekness it appears;
More humbling is it for thee
To face the Eternal Years.

Be quiet is the thing for thee,
Childing thy doubting fears;
Learn to be still from the thought
Of the Eternal Years.

Beat gently, suffer as a child,
Ner be ashamed of tears;
Kiss the sweet cross, and in thy heart
Bliss of the Eternal Years.

One cross can satisfy a soul,
Late saints and angels cheer;
Were what they were because they mused
Upon the Eternal Years.

Pass not from flower to pretty flower,
Time flies, and Judgment nears;
Haste, make thy answer from the thought
Of the Eternal Years.

Death will have rainbows round it seen,
Through calm contrition's tears,
If thou canst hope but trim his lamp
At the Eternal Years.

THE LUNG BRACE.

BRO. GRAYES—Wishing to add his testimony to that of others who have tried the brace as to its virtues, Bro. J. M. Curry wishes me to state some facts through *THE BAPTIST* relative to one procured from you in February, through the kindness of Mr. A. D. Nelson, who furnished the means at the instance of his wife. During the war Bro. Curry had pneumonia. The disease left its sad effects, to the great annoyance of Bro. C., who could not preach without pain, nor without experiencing a feeling of lassitude—a sinking, gone under sensation. The brace has removed the difficulty to a great extent. He no longer has such pain in preaching, nor such feelings of fatigue after preaching. His spirits are buoyant, his step firm, and his voice much improved; and, doubtless, he will be made tenfold more useful in his Master's vineyard by the action of the brace. Bro. C. can recommend the brace to all his brother ministers as being the very thing they need.

I hope to be able to add my testimony from personal experience, as soon as the church at Middleburg has furnished the money to buy one for me.

C. P. MALONE.
Toon's Station, Tenn., May 24, 1869.

SCIENCE AND REVELATION.

In your issue of March 27 Bristow says, "In *THE BAPTIST* of February 13 occurs an assumption which does not seem to accord with truth or our established notions of God's creative energy." We do not wish in any light to become an apologist for error or errorism, or say anything that would have a tendency to hatch another skeptic to swell their God-dishonoring ranks. I would be more than cautious in every expression, lest I might cause some brother to err, or grant a more sufficient license to some maturing skeptic. I am quite of the opinion that the present age has brought forth the most abominable brood ever hatched by the "dame of skepticism"—abominable, because they are many of them, in the church of the living God! Among them are many names of note, and hence they grow and wax exceeding strong, and there are but few that love to meet them in battle; and therefore, they are rather permitted to slide along in their skepticism without being particularly indignant or condemned. The mightiest of them are found just where Bristow imagines

that Prof. Loomis is drifting—among those who form revelation to fit science. I hope I am willing to hear and acknowledge the authority of the voice of inspiration as it rises clear and distinct above the profane and philosophic babblings of science, when they shall come in contact with the immutable truths of the word of Almighty God, notwithstanding how mighty a lip they have fallen. And I hope that I am willing to buckle on my armor and engage, so far as I am able, any who may presume to fight against the truth or authority of God's word. But I do not conclude that Deity may be so bisected as that the God of the Bible may be one God, and the God of nature another. If the God of the Bible is the God of nature, the laws of nature, and what is more, nature itself, must not conflict with revelation, nor will revelation conflict with nature or natural formations, but each will prove the other true.

And hence if the lovers of revelation offer opposition to science, and do not give sufficient reason for such refusal, will they not lower the dignity of the Bible in every such case? I will not here enter into any main argument to sustain the writings of Loomis, referred to by Bristow, for two reasons: First, Prof. Loomis is doubtless better able to defend his writings than I am, and, therefore, needs no help. Secondly, Bristow does not put himself in shape to be treated. But I wish to examine a little the article of Bristow, as respects its logical force. And what I may say of it may be much less true of Bristow than others. So, what I may say may be much less a criticism on Bristow, than many others who may read what I say.

Bristow says the account of Loomis "does not seem to accord with truth or our established notions of God's creative energy." To commence an argument with such language as this, will invariably weaken its force, notwithstanding from how great a man it may come, for it is a weakly kind of utterance. And to follow it with no argument, when there is much to be gained or lost, is quite to the detriment of whatever the disseminator was advocating.

Simply because a position does not agree with our settled notions of Scripture, or anything else, is not sufficient ground for condemnation. We must present an argument to overthrow the falsehood. Our notions of Scripture are sometimes very vague, and simply because some one else so understands it as to form quite a different notion, and one that can be reconciled with the teachings of science, is not sufficient reason on which to rest the unsupported conclusion that they are "trimming revelation to fit science."

Bristow's idea of God's creative energy is dwarfed more by his own statement than by all Loomis has said, or could say in the same direction. Energy is the spirit, perseverance, and vehemence with which we persevere our designs. If the fiat of God was the accomplishment of his designs in creation, why does not Bristow object to the Bible account on the same parity of reasoning that he does Loomis' papers? If said, and it was instantly done, let me ask, why continue seven days? If, as Bristow thinks, the fiat was the creation, would it not be as ridiculous to suppose that seven days were consumed as seven million of years? I should conclude that the creation, as spoken of by Loomis, instead of dwarfing any idea that we may have had of God as a Creator, would have a tendency to enlarge them. Would not a being who could take into the eternal purview of his mind the whole range of cause and effect in a transaction so awful in its proportions as the one referred to in the papers of Loomis, and so manage the whole as that the result should be a world of beauty and order, be entitled to as much (not to say more), honor than one who only could, or at least did create, in a straightforward way? That the fiat of God would have been sufficient, had he chose to so manifest himself in creation, I do not doubt. But did God so manifest himself? is the question.

Let me say, in conclusion, that these papers of Loomis are a matter of no little importance, not that they set forth new facts, but that they propose at once to introduce old ones—denied by many of the church to be facts at all—right into the mouths of our children and common people, as it has not been done before, and that, too, under the shadow and auspices of the church. If I had such an idea of the creation as Bristow, and Prof. Loomis, or any other man living, was endeavoring to palm off such a tale as this on the children of my generation as Sabbath-school teaching, I would not be content to say it was not true, but I would arise and with all the vigor of my existence would give him battle at every step he made on the hallowed fields of my Lord, until he was vanquished; or, until it might be said, at least, that I had done all that my ability would allow, to save the cause of my Master from reproach. If there are many that believe as Bristow, let the ablest discuss those

papers, and explode the bubble if they can. I may be in error, and know it not. If wrong, I want to see the light quickly. Fight for God under your own name.
County Line, Ala., April 6, 1869.

MEETING EVERY SUNDAY.

Dr. Ryland has been writing a series of articles in the *Western Recorder* on this subject. He makes the following practical suggestions, which we hope will be extensively acted upon.

I conjecture that many will say, "We admit the importance of your suggestions, but we see not how we can carry them into practice." If now your minds are convinced that weekly worship is right, and that you ought to practice it, I do not despair of a favorable result. "Where there is a will there is a way."

Now, then, can it be effected?

Let a Sunday-school, embracing all the children and youth of the vicinity, be opened at an early period in the meeting house of every Baptist church in Kentucky. This can be done if there is in each church one whole-souled active member to take the lead in the enterprise. One warm heart can kindle the zeal of another heart; and these two can agitate the subject, awaken an interest, solicit teachers, hunt up scholars, gather books, and begin the school. When the Sabbath-school is dismissed, the transition to a season of social worship is easy and natural. Cannot some brother, e. g., the superintendent, read a chapter, and add a few words of counsel? Can he not read a hymn and join the company in singing? Can he not offer a brief and simple prayer for himself, and his neighbors? Various and other petitions might be offered, interspersed with spiritual songs, Scripture readings and short addresses. No matter how informal, this, repeated after the adjournment of the school, every Sabbath, would be weekly worship. If nothing can be done at first but reading the Scriptures and singing a hymn, be it so. Everything must have a beginning, and small things may grow. Perhaps a brother might bring a printed sermon and read it to the little group of listeners. Probably another might be willing to use a form of prayer; at least, he could gather courage to extemporize his devotions. Let singing, especially, have a large space in these exercises, both because it is animating, and because many can unite in it. If there be only a striving, doing spirit manifested, and an earnest attempt made, it would be a most cheering omen of success. Let us not say, "I can't." "It would be of no use." "Other churches do not thus." "We would not hold out." etc. "We ought to maintain the worship of God."

By Divine help we will try, etc.

Consider the advantages likely to arise from this course.

The gifts of the church would be cultivated. Many excellent brethren cannot be induced to pray in public, or even in their families. Had they been educated from the first to these duties, they would now find in them a pleasure to themselves and a profit to others. Even now it is not too late to begin, if they have a heart to work in the Lord's vineyard. The effort to pray and sing will improve the capacity for praying and singing. No special gift is requisite. God may raise up a minister among you who would spend much of his time in laboring for your good. Many a man has been led into the ministry by the necessities of Zion. The people meet, but there is no one to instruct them. He is invited to speak. He makes the attempt. His heart is warm. His hearers are attentive. The truth is blessed. He is encouraged to repeat the process again and again, and before he knows it, and long before he thinks himself fit for the work, he is a preacher! Hundreds of men have thus been allured into the paths of active usefulness.

This plan would tend to keep the congregation together. For the members of the church, and especially the young, to remain at home all day on the Sabbath, or to be scattered in every direction, some visiting, and others attending other churches to hear, it may be strange doctrine, is very demoralizing. A uniform, steady attendance at one place, not to gratify curiosity, not to tell or to hear some new thing, nor to talk of politics or husbandry, but expressly to worship God, is the surest way to promote spiritual improvement. There is often more real edification in an humble prayer meeting, where the Bible is read, praises offered to God, and the broken accents of supplication heard, than there is in a crowded house, and in an elaborate discourse. Revivals usually begin in just such meetings.

When Jesus ascended up on high, he led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. Among these are included pastors, for the edifying of the body of Christ. Right pastors are not to be had, it seems to me that worship should not be interrupted, but that the church should use all appropriate means to edify itself.

Let prayer be the key of the morning and the lock of the evening.

A COLUMN TO BE READ.

AXIOMS.

1. All religious acts are acts of obedience.
2. There can be no obedience where there is no law.
3. There can be no obedience where the law is not known.
4. There can be no obedience that is not personal.
5. There is no obedience that is not voluntary.
6. There is no obedience that is not prompted by love, and accompanied by faith.
7. Every act of obedience is like baptism, the answer of a good conscience toward God.

From the above all can see that infant baptism is not a religious act, because it is not and can in no sense be considered an act of obedience. There is no law for it; nor, so the law could not be known by them; nor can infants exercise volition, love or faith; nor have they a good conscience to be answered by baptism. Infant baptism, then, not only is destructive of the fundamental principle of Christianity—obedience—but it effectually puts it out of the power of the one sprinkled in unbelief to obey Christ's command to be immersed, and it introduces the unregenerate and non-believers into the church—if these societies that sprinkle infants could be regarded as churches—working ruin to their souls if they believe they were regenerated by it.

DILEMMA.

1. Is Christian baptism a personal duty—i. e. enjoined upon parents, as was circumcision, or to be administered to their children?
 2. Is Christian baptism the personal duty of a penitent believer?
- If a parental duty, like circumcision, it can never be the duty of the child, though its parents were derelict in their duty; and infant baptism thus effectually destroys believers' baptism from the earth. But if it is the personal duty of a penitent believer, then it is not a parental duty.

FOR CAMPBELLITES.

1. The Baptist Churches are either true churches of Christ, or they are false.
2. If true churches, then the sect originated by Mr. Campbell in 1827 is a schism, and false, and he and his followers having been excommunicated from the Baptists have no authority to baptize.
3. If Baptist Churches are not churches of Christ, then all Campbellite ministers are unbaptized and without authority to baptize.

Now, Campbellite ministers deny that Baptist Churches are the true churches of Christ, or that the design of their baptism is Scriptural. They are, therefore, all unbaptized and unordained. But suppose they grant that Baptist Churches are the true churches of Christ; Campbellites then manifestly are schismatics, having been excommunicated as heretics and schismatics.

Again: If the design of baptism as administered by Baptists is Scriptural, then are the baptisms of Campbellites invalid, and null and void, because they do not practice it. But if the baptisms of Baptists are not Scriptural because of its design, then are all Campbellites unbaptized, because Mr. Campbell and the first Campbellite preachers had no other.

If Protestants and Campbellites cannot meet these dilemmas, they rest impaled upon the third—"we cannot tell"—and this makes a "Trilemma," a three-horned difficulty. [See little book entitled "Trilemma" for the history and argument—price fifty cents. S. W. Pub. House.]

SIMILAR CREEDS.

CATHOLIC.—"If any man shall say that baptism is not essential to salvation, let him be accursed. In baptism, not only are our sins remitted, but also the punishment of sins is graciously pardoned of God. Baptism opens to every one of us the gate of heaven, which before, through sin, was shut."—*Catechism of Trent, highest authority.*

EPISCOPAL.—Every person confirmed is required to answer these questions:

- A. "What is your name?"
- A. "N. or M."
- A. "Who gave you this name?"
- A. "My sponsors in baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."—*Prayer Book Catechism.*

METHODIST.—What are the benefits we receive by baptism?

"And the first of these is the washing away the guilt of original sin by the application of Christ's death."

"By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently are made members of Christ, its head."

"By baptism we who were by nature the children of wrath are made the children of God."

"In all ages the outward baptism is a means of the inward."

"By water, then, as a means, we are regenerated or born again."

"If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless they be washed away by baptism."—*Doctrinal Tracts*, pp. 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251.

CAMPBELLITES.—"The belief of one fact, and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation. The belief of this one fact, and submission to one institution expressive of it, is all that is required of Heaven to admission into the church."

1. "A Christian, as defined, not by Dr. Johnson, nor any creed-maker, but by one taught from heaven, is one that believes this one fact, and has submitted to one institution, and whose deportment accords with the morality and virtue of the great Prophet."

2. "The one fact is expressed in a single proposition—that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah."

"The evidence upon which it is to be believed is the testimony of twelve men, confirmed by prophecy, miracles, and scriptural gifts."

"The one institution is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Every such person is a disciple in the fullest sense of the word, the moment he has believed this one fact, upon the above evidence, and has submitted to the above mentioned institution."—*Christian System*, p. 122.

The Baptist.

"THE TRUTH IN LOVE."

MEMPHIS, TENN., JULY 10, 1869.

TERMS TILL THE DEBATE.

[No Additional Premiums.]

For Twelve Months, . . . \$3.00

For Six Months, . . . 2.00

BAPTIST FAITH.

There is no salvation but by the free mercy of God; no mercy, but through the mediation of Christ; no interest in Christ except by a personal faith in him; no justifying faith but that which works by love and purifies the heart; no love to Christ which does not include love to his people, his example, his precepts and testify itself to the world by implicit and cheerful obedience to all his commands; no genuine love to his people that does not induce a man to do good to them, as he has ability and opportunity.

J. R. GRAVES.

VOLUME III.

With this number we commence the third volume of this paper, with an issue of 6200. Several hundred are reserves for the few hundred new subscribers we expect to receive this month; for all who subscribe in July wish to commence with the first number and have a complete volume. We confidently expect that every active friend—all our friends are not active ones—will make an especial effort to obtain one or five new subscribers this month for the new volume. We shall offer the paper at \$3 per annum until the Debate—if it is a year hence—and \$2 for six months.

The only information we have touching the Debate, is that the correspondence, interrupted by the late misfortune of Bro. Ford, was renewed this week, though we know not one word at this writing of the purport of it. Our impression now is, that it will take place in the early fall, when the weather is cooler and nights longer.

The Mammoth is deferred until September, for reasons heretofore given. We wish to make it truly magnificent, and we must have the time. The engraving of Dr. Dayton and sketch of his life by his daughter were not ready for the 4th, nor was the Prize Essay. Mark all, there will be a fine Mammoth issued early in September as possible, and it will delight and astonish all. This will give every one ample time to get up a large club, and let every brother and sister do his and her best, and see if we cannot issue 50,000 copies. We want to get 30,000 before we issue. *Work is the word*, and let us see what can be done for a ten cent paper.

We now take up our pen with a will, determined, by God's help, to make this volume superior in all respects to any previous one.

We are profoundly thankful that we can this day say that one great and paramount object for which we have labored since coming to this city, is accomplished. The Books of the Southwestern Publishing Company are closed, sufficient stock having been subscribed for the purposes of the Company; and we are authorized to call in all subscribed at an early day, to be invested in additional presses, a stereotype foundry, and books. We have resigned the arduous duties of Secretary and Treasurer, and we shall retire from office on the 21st inst. A competent man has been appointed in his place.

We have now done our work—established upon a solid cash basis of over \$70,000, the largest book manufacturing establishment in the South, with book store added, which is now prepared to publish and to furnish books and tracts promptly and cheaply to meet the demands of the Southwest. Will our brethren now do their duty? i. e., put these tracts and books into circulation. Every one of your libraries needs replenishing. You can read, and then you can loan to your neighbors. You can buy, and you can sell and give away. You ought to do something in the great work of spreading the truth. Will our brethren now do their duty? *Work is the word.*

We shall be prepared after a short rest in dog-days—if our patrons are willing to allow us a little relaxation and travel after such years of wearing labor—to give this paper our best powers, and make it all that our brethren can desire.

We are not concerned about its circulation so much as to make the paper deserving of a circulation. We have gained nearly 6000 in two years. Why can we not gain another 6000 in two years more, easier than the first? Not one Baptist in ten in Tennessee, Arkansas and Mississippi, take it. They will this year, with God's blessing, be able to do so, and they will do so.

We send this number to several ministers in Arkansas and Mississippi whose names are not on our list, and we propose to give it to them this year, if they will obtain each four new subscribers, or make a list of names to be sent to us. Let those who wish it upon these terms write us, and we will enroll them.

We make the same offer to every minister in the South who will send up the four subscribers during this month, to begin with Vol. 3, No. 1. Try, one and all. Only Three Dollars this Month.

THE "METHODIST" and HIGH CHURCH BAPTISTS.

The *Methodist* of New York, a new and independent journal devoted to the interests of Methodism, to which we have before alluded as giving promise of being conducted with energy and talent, thus makes reference to Baptists in general, and to THE BAPTIST in particular:

HIGH CHURCH BAPTISTS.—It is not commonly known that among the Baptists so called, High Church and Low Church parties are found no less than among the Episcopalians and Lutherans. The principal question on which they differ seems to be, whether missionary and other religious associations may or may not be conducted by voluntary organizations.

THE BAPTIST.—The editor of this paper, we learn from our exchanges, is at variance with quite a number of his editorial brethren. One of them, congratulating him upon the appearance of his paper, thinks that "it needs but one thing now to make it attractive, and that is a new heart. When *The Banner*, and its readers all get to heaven, won't they be surprised to find others there? And if they do, will they remain?"

We plead guilty most assuredly to the gentle impeachment of being the advocate of "High Church principles" as these are defined by our cotemporary in the foregoing extract. That the *Methodist* may not be dependent on the testimony of any one of our "editorial brethren"—with "quite a number" of whom he learns we are at variance—for a knowledge of our sentiments, we will briefly give a statement of them ourself. We are the more inclined to do this from having observed that either from ignorance or a want of candor, or perhaps from both, our opponents often mistake and misrepresent them. But then we have generally remarked that the men that do this belong to a class that are but little accustomed "to exercise their senses in discerning between good and evil;" their error, therefore, and the wrong they do us in this particular, awaken within us sentiments more akin to pity than aversion. We ascribe their enmity and animosity toward us, not so much to their having hard hearts as soft heads.

To Episcopalians—whether they belong to the school of Henry VIII. or John Wesley—to Presbyterians, to Congregationalists, and such like, it no doubt seems strange that we should object to an organization modeled after the fashion of those that are found to answer so well in their respective communions. But we think this feeling will be removed when we remind our judicious cotemporary that the polity and church principles recognized and acted on by all Baptists, and the teachings and practices of the bodies referred to, are "as far as the poles asunder." None of the latter make regeneration or a renewed nature an indispensable condition of church fellowship. The Baptists do; they find by reading the New Testament that this principle was maintained inviolate in apostolic times, and they desire that theirs should be apostolic churches.

Now it would not be compatible with the safety of any nation to admit rebels and traitors to a participation in its administrative or executive functions. Accordingly civil governments have invariably to adopt some expedient for securing the services of the more intelligent and virtuous class of citizens to act in a matter in which the honor and even the safety of the nation are so intimately concerned. Hence it becomes a matter of necessity no less than of fact, that they which are accustomed to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them." But in the Kingdom of Christ "it shall not be so." Such a necessity is obviated by the very principles inherent in its constitution.

A difference, then, involving principles and results so opposite, would suggest *a priori*, that there must be a corresponding diversity in the character of the instrumentalities which the parties respectively employ in every effort which they make to evangelize the world. A contrary supposition must involve a practical anomaly. And we cordially confess that our practice as Baptists, in this respect, has for a long time past laid us open to such an imputation. But from the beginning it was not so. That our views do not involve any novelty, or commit us to any attempt that can be regarded as an innovation, can be made apparent by quoting one or two passages from a Baptist author, probably known to our brother of the *Methodist*: a man of many excellencies and of undoubted genius, although not by any means what we should regard as a "High Church" Baptist. The writer we refer to is Robert Hall. In a letter to Dr. Ryland, dated April 10, 1816, he says:

"I am truly conscious to find my purpose is to form an auxiliary society, to have public days, etc.; being deeply convinced of the truth of our Lord's words, 'the kingdom of God cometh not with observation, or, as some translate it, 'it is not ushered in with parade.' The Baptist Society has prospered abundantly, with the blessing of God, and a different management; and the obstructive model of the operations has been and is of its strongest recommendation, and I am grieved that it is about to relinquish that plan, and to vie with others in the noise and ostentation of its proceedings. It reminds me of the fable of the frog and the ox."

Why should we at last initiate what we have so long condemned? Why should we attempt a compromise in a point of view in which we are sure to appear to disadvantage? There appears to me a very simple and efficacious mode of supporting the Baptist mission without any appeal to the public. Let every Baptist minister make an annual collection in his congregation, and apply to his more opulent members and hearers besides, for their annual subscriptions; and all the money will be raised which ought to be raised by our denomination. With respect to others, the success of the mission, attested by its periodical reports, will not fail to make the right impression. The best auxiliary societies, in my humble opinion, that can be devised, are already prepared to our hands, in regular organized churches, and in the certainty of meeting some hundreds of professed Christians every Sabbath day.—*Works*, 3 p. 257.

And again, on another occasion he says: Our missionary societies would be much more successful if the management of them was intrusted to the church, or to associations of churches, in one, two, or more counties, according to their numbers and means of supplying funds. Instead of forming auxiliaries to a metropolitan body, I would have the churches in each district manage their own mission, and choose from among themselves men of prudence, well known to the description given by the apostle: One that is blameless; the husband of one wife; vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, etc. By this plan a reciprocal interest would be maintained between the association and the missionaries, which would be increased by local attachment; they would, as it were, be identified with each other in a common cause. Monthly prayer meetings, and better attended from natural feeling or anxiety to learn the particulars of the operations of their own brethren and sisters in a far country; and by becoming acquainted with their trials, failures, or successes, the people would be excited to that fervent prayer which avails much. In addition to this, expensive metropolitan establishments would be avoided, as well as the large sums for traveling expenses incurred by the present system, called "less expenses," which in many instances amount to ten and twelve per cent. before the money reaches the treasury, where it undergoes another salvage for management before it becomes available for the missionaries.—*Id.*, vol. 4, page 54.

We reiterate, then, that "it does appear to us, if Christ commanded his Church to do this work, that she has no authority to transfer the duty and responsibility to an organization outside and independent of her."

It is not then to agents or agencies, boards or secretaries, that we object, but to any missionary, agency, or organization not directed by the churches, and subject to their wishes. We do not believe that a board of angels would have the right to engage in the evangelization of China, or Africa, or Palestine. They would be assuming the prerogative and work assigned by the King in Zion to his Church. When we place all our missionary agencies, boards and conventions back into the hands of the churches, the churches will take hold of them in earnest, be interested in them and work through them, and God will bless his own appointed instrumentality, and honor his Word preached by his church.

THE COMING CONFLICT.

The following is from a correspondent in the New York *Examiner*, and it is deserving of our most serious consideration:

In our immediate future Protestant, freedom and Popery will measure arguments, and possibly swords, for the dominion of this continent. The *opus cannot be avoided*. Every patriot and every Christian should prepare for the struggle, and endeavor to arouse his countrymen to an appreciation of the danger. Let no man be deceived by the prevalent error, that Romanism is modulated by our free institutions, is compatible with religious liberty or free republican government. They cannot coexist, and one will eventually exterminate the other. In this country Popery accommodates itself to laws and forces it is not yet able to overcome. It assumes a garb and attitude calculated to allay suspicion and obtain favor. In all ages it has been fawning and sycophantic when such is the verdict of history; such is its nature, and what it has been in the past, for Rome declares herself unchangeable and boasts her immutability. Its whole history demonstrates it to be the essence of despotism, delineated in Scripture as "drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." It has fulfilled the prophecy by the apostle of the "autocrat of the ages." Even here, where a subtle policy holds restraint, its persecuting spirit is often seen like glimpses of infernal fires. The rack, the wheel, the stake, are not here in use, because, as yet, of insufficient power, but the dungeons of the Vatican are full, and the worship of God is prohibited in Rome by Christ's viceregent.

Throughout our land immediate and energetic measures should be inaugurated to prevent the designs of the Papal court against our liberties. The political character and despotic tendencies of the Romish church should be made apparent to every citizen, and a correct knowledge of Romanism, its history and its character should be given to every child. The designs and secret operations of the Romishists in our land should be thoroughly exposed, and every citizen aroused to the danger with which he is threatened. Every American to inform himself of the strength of the enemy, of their open and secret measures. The triumph of Popery is the death of our liberties and the destruction of religion, and that triumph is certain unless a mighty awakening occur among the friends of Freedom and Christianity in the United States.

PENN. YAN.

How are we to prepare for this conflict, is the question of the hour—not of years to come.

THE PULPIT.—Let the ten thousand living preachers of this country fearlessly and faithfully proclaim the whole gospel of Christ.

THE PRESS.—Let the Press should be subsidized to the work of multiplying copies of the New Testament, books and religious papers that are true to our Divine denomination—alism, and tracts by the millions, until every residence shall be visited by them. And, not the least instrumentalities.

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.—In which the children of our land shall be made thoroughly familiar with the sacred Scriptures, and brought under the precious influences of the Spirit. By these agencies, consecrated by prayer and

labor, let the standard be raised up against the incoming enemy and its powerful ally, Ritualism—Protestant Ritualism—that is preparing the way for Catholicism. When we have done our duty *juicy*, we can leave the result with confidence to God. Let every one who reads this join the Tract Society at once.

We copy the following from the Methodist *Advocate*, and perchance Bishop Quintus may see and accept a discussion from Mr. Harrison:

PROPOSITIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

In view of the pretensions and assumptions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, and to the end that the people may have the benefit of all the light upon the subject, I enclose you the following propositions. These propositions are made in no spirit of mere controversy, but with a sincere desire on the part of Brother Harrison to develop the truth as it is in Jesus, by means of calm, dignified, friendly, yet thorough discussion. It is to be hoped that some authorized exponent of the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church will in a proper Christian spirit accept the offer, and that the earnest inquirer after light may have the benefit of a publication of the discussion.

QUESTIONS AT ISSUE.

1. That the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, as taught by the Protestant Episcopal Church, is unscriptural, destructive of vital Christianity, and productive of the worst forms of papal error and superstition. I affirm.
2. That the rite of Confirmation, as held by the Protestant Episcopal Church, has no warrant in Scripture, was not practiced by the Apostles, and was unknown in the earlier and purer ages of the Christian Church. I affirm.
3. That the use of Clerical Robes was unknown to the Apostles and the early Church. I affirm.
4. That the practice of prescribing Forms of Prayer, as it exists in the Protestant Episcopal Church, was unknown to the Apostles and the early Church. I affirm.
5. That the doctrine of Uninterrupted Transmission of Ministerial Authority, through a line of bishops, from the Apostles to the Protestant Episcopal Church, is utterly destitute of proof; is a pompous assumption; the offspring of ecclesiastical vanity; is intolerant in itself, and naturally tends to foster a spirit of religious persecution. I affirm.
6. That the doctrine of the Divine Institution of three orders in the Ministry—Bishop, Priest, and Deacon—cannot be proven by the word of God, and is therefore false. I affirm.
7. That the doctrine of Episcopacy, as held by High Churchmen, is unscriptural, and prejudicial to the true interests of the Church of Christ. I affirm.
8. That the High Church party in the Protestant Episcopal Church are laboring to accomplish a union of Church and State, the fruitful source of corruption to the Church, and fatal to the cause of religious liberty. I affirm.
9. That the spirit of Episcopacy, as maintained by the High Church party in the Protestant Episcopal Church, is hostile to republicanism and productive of monarchical institutions. I affirm.

Upon any one, or all of the above propositions, in form or substance, I am willing to meet, after due notice, any recognized representative of the Protestant Episcopal Church anywhere in the United States.

W. P. HARRISON.

Now, since Mr. H. professes to be opposed to any practice unscriptural, we offer to affirm against him or any better man his church may select in this city, the following propositions, viz:

1. Such an organization as that known as the Methodist Episcopal Church South, is unknown in the Word of God, and was never known to the world before the days of John Wesley, and therefore is a human society, and not a Church of Christ.
2. That its membership is an unscriptural one.
3. That pouring and sprinkling for baptism are unknown in the Scriptures, and forbidden by the Word of God.
4. That infant baptism was unknown in the apostolic period, and for centuries after Christ—and is therefore a tradition of men.
5. That the Methodist "Church" is a power and an organization opposed to Christianity, and would, if left alone, blot it from the world.

COMPLIMENTARY TO OUR PROOF-READER.

Bro. Pendleton, than whom no man on the American continent is more particular touching his MSS., writes: "Give my respects to your proof-reader. THERE IS NO ONE IN THE NORTH SUPERIOR TO HIM. What a pleasure to have things done right!"

A Professor in the University of Mississippi says: "Your proofs are perfect!"

Elder Renfro, of Alabama, says: "I never had articles printed without mistakes by any paper before."

ELLAS B. HARRIS, student at Greenville, S. C., writes as follows:

"I am extremely pleased with the *Baptist* you sent me two months ago, while at Greenville, S. C. I can now preach with more confidence, and my voice has improved. For days past have felt no effects of the piles, the disease that has troubled me for years."

"You will please send my five dollars' worth of tracts to Selma, Ala., by mail or express, whichever is cheapest, and as soon as I can I will send you back the five dollars. I regret that the Baptists of the city do not co-operate with us of the West more freely in some things. But may the God of love keep us, as a denomination, together in the unity of the spirit and in the bonds of love. Yours, etc. E. B."

The original articles found on the 1st, 2d and 3d pages of this paper are unusually interesting. Many will read Bro. P.'s article on the first page, who were formerly exercised over Bro. Freeman's sermon. Most of the business matter will be found on the eighth page. The Tract Society is crowded out this week—will appear next, with many new members.

"SECUARVAL."—A brother in Ohio writes: "Have you published 'Secularval' in book form? We need that book in the hands of hundreds of our Baptist families." Ten thousand are wanted in the North. We want canvassers in

Illustrations.

THE HUNTER'S ESCAPE.—An American hunter, according to the *Monte Rana*, in passing over the Mare de Glacé, lost his hold and slipped into one of those frightful crevasses by which the sea of ice is elevated foundations. By catching himself in his swift descent against the points of rocks and projecting spurs of ice, he broke his fall, so that he reached the bottom alive, but only to face death in a more terrible form. On either hand the icy walls rose up to heaven, above which he saw only a strip of blue sky. At his feet trickled a little stream, formed from the slowly melting glacier. There was but one possible chance of escape—to follow this rivulet, which might lead to some unknown crevice or passage. In silence and terror he picked his way down the mountain side, till his farther advance was stopped by a giant cliff that rose up before him, while the river rolled darkly below. He heard the roaring of the waters which seemed to wait for him. What should he do? Death was beside him and behind him—and he might fear, before him. There was no time for reflection or delay. He paused but an instant, and plunged into the stream. One minute of breathless suspense—a sense of darkness and coldness, and yet of swift motion, as if he were gliding through the shades below—and the light began to glimmer faintly in the waters, and the next instant he was amid the green fields and the flowers and the summer sunshine of the vale of Chamouny.

So it is when believers die. They come to the bank of the river, and it is cold and dark. Nature shrinks from the fatal plunge. Yet one chilling moment, and all fear is left behind, and the Christian is amid the fields of the paradise of God.

MARK THE PLACE.—It is said of an Indian that whenever he got into a bad place in a swamp, where the ground was too soft for safety, he put up a stake to mark the place. Thus he not only avoided the danger himself, but kept others from falling into the snare.

Might not every Christian learn a lesson from this rude son of the forest, not only to guard against his own false steps, but, as he prays, "Lead us not into temptation," to be careful to remove temptation out of his brother's path, and point out the place of danger to him?

APOSTATES.—Some commentator—I think it is good old Matthew Henry—says, when commenting on John vi: 66, "Christ was none the poorer for losing what he never had." And he, or some one else, has truly said, "The star that falls never was a star."

Gems of Thought.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—Let the fairest star be selected, like a beautiful island in the vast and shoreless ocean of the azure heavens, as the future home of the criminals from the earth, and let them possess whatever they most love, and all that it is possible for God to bestow; let them be endowed with undying bodies, and with minds which shall forever retain their intellectual powers; let no Savior ever press his claims upon them, no God reveal himself to them, no Sabbath ever dawn upon them, no saint ever live among them, no prayer ever be heard within their borders; but let society exist there forever, smitten only by the leprosy of hatred to God, and with utter selfishness as its all-prevailing and eternal purpose—then, as sure as the law of righteousness exists, on which rests the throne of God, and the government of the universe, a society so constituted must work out for itself a hell of solitary and bitter suffering, to which there is no limit except the capacity of a finite nature! Alas! the spirit that is without love to its God or to its neighbor is already possessed by a power which must at last create for its own self-government a worm that will never die, and a fire that can never more be quenched.—*Macdonell.*

FALLING FLAT ON THE PROMISES.—A negro in Virginia, who was remarkable for his good sense, and his knowledge of the essential truths of Christianity, and especially for his freedom from all gloomy fears in regard to his eternal state, was once addressed in this wise: "You seem to be always comfortable in the hope of the gospel. I wish you would tell me how you manage it, to keep so steadily in this blessed frame of mind." "Why, massa," he replied, "I just fall flat on the promises, and I pray right up," an answer that would do honor to the head and heart of a philosopher, and that contains in it the true secret of earthly happiness.

PRAYING TO SAINTS.—The rich man cried out and said, "Father Abraham, have mercy upon me! There was a time when he might have prayed to the God of Abraham, and have found mercy; now he dares not approach that God whom in his life he had neglected; and he addressed a creature who had neither power nor authority to dispense blessings. This is the only instance mentioned in Scripture of praying to saints; and to the commission of the false doctrine, which states it to be necessary and available, let it be remembered that it was practiced only by a damned soul, and that without any success.—*Clarke.*

TRACTS.—We have just finished 23,000 tracts, (not pages) and shall mail them as fast as possible.

Bro. Wood's article overlooked—will appear next week, and "Eccle. Deus" and Bro. Behold the week after.

Items.

FAMILY COUNSEL.—The *Western Christian Advocate* says that Rev. H. C. Fish, D. D., a Baptist pastor, Newark, N. J., delivering a farewell address at the recent National Sunday School Convention, "alluded to the fact that it was becoming hard now-a-days to tell a Baptist from a Presbyterian, or a Presbyterian from a Methodist, etc. Respecting a climax, he said the division lines between the churches are so insignificant that any one who will can readily step over. Whereupon a Methodist minister, who had been following the Doctor in closest imitation, called out from the middle of the audience, 'Why not step over, then, Doctor?' The Convention greeted the sally with applause, and Dr. Fish had no more to say about taking down denominational fences."

Served him right, and we hope our liberal, soft-and-goasy Baptists will see the point. Bro. Fish wished to make himself popular with all that great Union meeting, and he made himself ridiculous. "He that will save his life or reputation shall lose it."

THE COAT OF MANY COLORS.—One would scarcely imagine how much discussion has been expended upon this garment. In the first place, it will be observed that even in our version there is no small ground for diversity, for the word *coat* is marked as a supplied word, and *colors* is in the margin rendered *pieces*. Hence, it may mean simply a coat of colors, or a coat of pieces. The phrase is used in 2 Sam. xiii. 18, where the use of such garments may be learned also. Dr. Conant renders this a *full-length garment*, and describes it as extending to the feet, and its sleeves to the wrist, and as so being adapted only to persons exempt from physical toil. The usual garment of the tilling classes reached only to the knee, and the sleeves only to the elbow. The idea of pieces refers most likely to the ornamental borders of the garment. The distinction conferred by this garment was certainly adapted to provoke the envy of the hard toiling laborers.

"The salvation of the soul—the great salvation consummated for us through the interposition and sacrifice of the Lord Jesus, the Christ Savior of a lost and ruined world, is the salvation of the soul, consummated through the incarnation and the sacrificial death of the Lord Jesus, whose Divinity was the altar, and whose humanity was the suffering which takes away forever all our guilt."—*Christian (Campbellite) Review*.

This teaches that the suffering of the mere humanity, like our own, made satisfaction for our sins, and that the Divinity was the altar! Where in God's Word did Mr. Franklin learn this? Humanitarians teach that the Divinity forsook, instead of sustained the humanity when it came to suffer—and adduce these words in proof, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" We have always thought that the cross was the altar on which Christ was offered.

Kind Words, which had a circulation of 16,000 at Greenville, has now, we are informed, only 6000 subscribers. Brother Graves says that the falling off is in the East. The *Herald* has frequently urged the claims of this paper, as one may see by referring to our files. We hope that the schools everywhere will patronize this little sheet.—*Religious Herald*.

We regret that the *Herald* should not have obtained correct information rather than have given an injurious report circulation. The July issue of *Kind Words* is 18,000. It is increasing at the rate of 2000 per month—it should add 5000 per month. It is now issued twice each month at the same price, twenty-five cents a year—the cheapest paper in the Union. Let all Southern Baptists patronize it. Let every school send a club this month.

THE DIFFERENCE.—Miss Marsh tells us, in the memoir of her father, that early in the days of the Oxford movement he corresponded with some of its chief leaders on the subject of justification by faith; and in a letter addressed to the Rev. Dr. Pusey, to be forwarded to the other leaders, he stated his own creed in the following words: That we are justified—

FAITH, by grace (Rom. 3: 2).

MERITORIOUSLY, by Christ (Rom. 6: 19).

EVIDENTIALLY, by good works (Jas. 2: 26).

To the third clause objection was made, and the sentence—"Instrumentally, by the sacrament of holy baptism," was substituted on the paper before it was returned to Mr. M. How palpable the difference! What a simple yet clear illustration of the contrast between the Evangelical and Tractarian schools!

BENTON STREET SUNDAY-SCHOOL.—We take the following from a St. Louis paper: Number of scholars on the roll.....1600 Number of teachers and officers.....80 Number of teachers in intermediate and senior department.....63 Number of teachers in infant department.....48 Number of teachers in intermediate department every Sunday.....27 Number of classes in intermediate department.....21 Number of teachers who have visited their scholars.....30 Number of scholars visited.....216 Number of scholars who have attended school without missing.....149 Number of scholars attending church regularly.....172 Number of new scholars.....194 Average attendance of teachers and scholars.....912

EXPOSITORY PREACHING.—A home missionary says: "I have found that giving a running comment on some portions of Scripture instead of topical preaching has given great satisfaction to my people, and so I have followed it more than during any previous quarter."

A contemporary commenting on the above says: "The expository method of preaching is apostolic. The more missionaries practice it, with studious pains taking and perseverance and skill, the greater, other things being equal, will be their success. It is the Word that converts. The Spirit accompanies the Word. 'Preach the Word.' Make plain to the mind as large a portion of it as each week as possible. Dig deep, be thorough, and expound much."

Unwitting testimony is sometimes given to our views as Baptists by those who cordially assail us. The *Biblical Recorder* says: "Mr. Alexander, a Presbyterian minister in eastern Carolina, recently immersed a lady to retain her in his communion." And still more to the point, the *American Christian Review* says: "We recently heard a Methodist preacher in Franklin, Ind., advise the members of his church, if they had any doubts in regard to

their baptism, to be immersed, and that would settle it. Satan would tempt them no more on that point."

That preacher was candid, at least. And he was right. We never knew one who was immersed to be troubled about his baptism.

The Herald of the Coming Kingdom is responsible for the following: A deacon of a Baptist Church recently resigned membership on the ground that they did not preach the gospel; that they believed, and taught contrary to the Bible that man had congenital immortality; and they perverted the Scriptures in teaching that man had a conscious entity, subject to reward and punishment between death and the resurrection. "Rev." Shaver, of the *Georgia Index*, (Baptist paper), said if Paul were to come into his office, and teach that man sleeps in the interval between death and resurrection, he would kick him out of the room.

Would you kick Bro. Freeman out of your office, Bro. Shaver?

LOOSE COMMUNION.—Rev. W. R. Lockhart writes, in the *Baptist Tidings*: "An unprincipled scoundrel of wealth, who had been excluded from a loose communion church within a month, for basely slandering his pastor's wife, is now a member of another church. As he sees the victim of his base slander going to the table, he goes and sits down beside her. She bursts into tears; sobs aloud, and goes away from the table without communicating, while her husband, the pastor, administers the Lord's Supper to her slanderer. This is open communion; is it proper to denounce such a scene, the communion of the Lord's Supper?"

LAY DELEGATION.—All members of the M. E. Church, male and female, above twenty-one years of age, are eligible to vote next June on Lay Delegation. If a majority vote for it, supported by three-fourths of the membership of the annual conference, it can be consummated by a vote of two-thirds in the General Conference in 1872.—*Exchange*.

Then a majority of the bishops must give their assent, which they will pretty sure not to do. What an easy road to "Lay Delegation." "Now you see it, and now you don't see it."

BAPTIST INFLUENCE.—In contrast with the times when good old Dr. Emmons used to caution his people not to countenance the Baptists by being present at their meetings, the *Watchman & Reflector* says: "It was pleasant not long since to hear an eminent Congregational minister declare, 'We can't do without the Baptists. They stand between us and rationalism.' We stood there in the past, and they didn't do without us when orthodoxy seemed on the point of perishing; and we believe they cannot do without us amid the perils of the future."

LOOSE COMMUNION CHARITY.—An article in the *Congregational Review* "undertakes to determine what denominations may, and what may not, be so far admitted to fraternal relations with Congregationalists, as to justify the latter in receiving members by letter from them, and in giving letters to those who wish to join them. It admits the various branches of the Presbyterian Church to this fellowship, but in the most positive terms refuses the courtesy to Episcopalians and Methodists, dwelling at length on the reasons why the Methodists are not to be recognized as a church."

NOT QUITE RIGHT.—The *Liberal Christian* (Unitarian) claims that "the dip of every evangelical sect is toward the Catholic church, and whoever follows its slant and is true to its premises and his own logic, will be carried by its own momentum and the inexorable laws of reasoning into the bosom of Rome." With one exception, this accords substantially with the recently expressed opinion of a prominent Roman Catholic bishop. He affirmed it of all the denominations except the Baptists. Their "dip" is not at all that way.—*Secretary*.

UNGOBLY CHORISTERS.—The *Nashville Baptist* says: "A few years ago we happened to be preaching, one Sunday evening, to a city (Baptist) congregation. Toward the end of the service we were requested to omit the closing hymn—the reason being, as we afterward learned, that the organist was too drunk to remain, and had been taken off by his friends; and the choir, thus abandoned, fearing to be called upon, had also left the house." None but Christians should lead "the service of song."

THE SKULKERS.—The *Church Union* intimates that the Northern Baptist Associations have voted that strict communion views are still held unanimously by their members while many of them (and most of these ministers) have gone home to speak freely of their dissent, and their determination to welcome believers in loose communion into the churches. If this be true—these skulkers are fit material to make up into loose communionists!—*Ga. Index*.

The *Memphis Baptist* says: "Roger Williams never for one day or one hour was a Baptist!" (!) Why? Because a Pedobaptist baptized him? Then one of the leading Baptist ministers of California never was in the denomination.—*Ga. Spirit* never.

A man not a church member or baptized, immersed Roger Williams, and the act was of course a nullity. If any Baptist in California is in like fix, he better demand baptism at once.

"NEW WORK ON BAPTISM."—Not very long since, a brother in this State baptized several persons in a river, reading on the occasion several passages from the New Testament which refer to baptism. An adult person of intelligence and culture, who was present, asked a Baptist to lend him a copy of that new work on baptism, and was greatly astonished to find that it was the New Testament.—*Ga. Index*.

An exchange tells of a Baptist sister who married an Episcopalian, and at this desire, became an Episcopalian. After his death she was wooed by a Catholic, and became a Catholic. She evidently believes in becoming all things to all men, that she might gain some.

How many hundreds are like her—professed but unprincipled Baptists?

Miserable, Look Within! Distressed, Look Around! Happy, Look to CHRIST.

A Primitive preacher (so called) takes for his text the passage about the tree which had twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month, etc. This, he said, was a Baptist Church that had preaching "once a

month," and that weekly service is unscriptural and sinful. We reckon he has been preaching through this region, as many of the churches go on his plan.—*Ex*.

METHODIST SCHOOLS.—The Sunday School Union of the Northern Methodist Church reports 16,084 schools, with 1,165,914 scholars, among whom there were 41,708 converts the past year.

What are Southern Baptists doing in this promising field of labor? Almost nothing in comparison with the above.

We learn that several Baptists have lately become regular attendants at the Howard Presbyterian Church, H. M. Schuder, D. D., pastor.—*South Hour*.

The result of the practice of pulpit and table communion with Pedobaptists Bro. Sawtelle, is laboring to break down the Baptist Church altogether.

Unless Christ was truly God and the eternal God, he was not, and could not have been our Savior, and all that the holy prophets and apostles have taught must have been false.—*Evangelist*.

How then, can any one say that the Divinity did not suffer when Christ suffered? He became incarnate for the suffering of death.

A LARGE SCHOOL.—The South Mission (Presbyterian) Sunday-school in St. Louis, gives the following as the attendance (including teachers, scholars and visitors) last year: Smallest attendance, July 19th, (stormy).....267 Largest attendance, Dec. 20th.....2183 Average for 52 Sundays.....1140

ROMISH REVERENCE FOR THE BIBLE.—The Rev. Mr. Rogers, of Memphis, Tenn., a convert to Romanism, in a recent lecture in Brooklyn, attempted to prove that "the New Testament was not essential to the planting or perpetuity of Christianity."

DIVINITY AND HUMANITY OF CHRIST.—"The Bible teaches that the Divine mind was pleased to take upon itself a human body. We have no warrant in the Scriptures for attributing to Christ any other part of human nature than simply a body."—*Becher*.

CONCORD GENERAL ASSOCIATION.

E. L. CONFERRE. The next session of this body will be held with Zear Church, Crawford county, Arkansas, seven miles northeast from Van Buren, and commencing on Friday before the second Sabbath in August, 1869.

Brethren, get ready. The time is near. The second article of the Constitution reads as follows: "This Association shall be composed of messengers from Baptist Churches and Associations throughout Western Arkansas and the Indian Territory—each church shall be entitled to three, and each Association to ten delegates."

Come, then, brethren. Let all the churches of Brice, Dardanelle, Fayetteville, Cadron, Ca do and all orderly Associations of Missionary and anti-Missionary Baptists be sure to send messengers. And let our brethren from the Territory be sure to come up. We hope to see Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw and Chickasaw brethren. We especially remind our Indian brethren, Elders Lewis Downing, George Cookram, John Smith and Peter Folsom, of this meeting—together with the white brethren among them, such as Elders Murrow, Hogue, Jones, and brother Israel Vere. Come, then, brethren—let us see your faces, and have your prayers and counsel, in promoting the objects of the Association, which are: 1st. "To promote fellowship among the churches. 2d. To secure unanimity of faith. 3d. To encourage concert in operation. 4th. Especially to cultivate the piety of the churches; and to aid this fourth object, several days at each annual session shall be spent in devotional exercises."

The above objects, together with the following four "Distinctive principles of Baptists," make up the basis of union. 1. The Scriptures are the only guide in all matters of Christian faith and practice. 2. Sinners are saved by grace through faith in Christ—and in no other way. 3. Believers are gospel subjects for baptism—and no others are. 4. Immersion by a regular administrator is Baptism—and nothing else is.

These objects and principles determine who will be admitted to seats in the body. The seventh article of the Constitution reads thus: "The annual meetings of this body shall embrace the Sabbath day," etc. Hence the Constitution provides that members cannot go up and sing and shout all day Friday and Saturday, and then reproach the cause of God by robbing him of his day—and starting home Sunday morning. Remember, brethren, we will not be adjourned till after all the services of the Lord's day are over.

In the ministers' and deacons' meeting of the third district of Dardanelle Association, held with Mt. Nebo Church, embracing fifth Sabbath in May, some questions were presented that drew forth a number of interesting speeches.

1st. Is the "Love Feast" among Methodists a church ordinance?

2d. Can Baptists be justified in uniting in Love Feasts with Methodists?

These two queries were answered unanimously in the negative by rising to the feet.

3d. May a Baptist Church receive a member who claims to have been immersed by a Pedobaptist or a Campbellite, and refuses to be immersed by a Baptist administrator?

The decision of the body was most positive and without a dissenting expression, that Baptist Churches should never receive the immersion of either Pedobaptist or Campbellite ministers.

Executive Committee of Dardanelle Association held its regular meeting in connection with the ministers' and deacons' meeting at Mt. Nebo, and adjourned to meet with the General Association, to be held with Zear Church, embracing the second Sabbath in August. Let the members of the committee remember this note.

ELIJAH H. F. REESE.

This brother was appointed at the late meeting of the Executive Committee of Dardanelle Association, to labor as a home missionary in the Southern and Western portions of Scott county. The churches in his district are reminded that Bro. Reese looks to them for their support—and the members of the Executive Committee, and the deacons in each of the churches, will remember that they have been appointed as the special agents of the Association, to collect money, meat, corn, wheat, clothing, potatoes, molasses, or anything your missionary needs—and pay, over to him. Brethren, co-operate with Bro. Reese, and the Lord will bless you abundantly.

Secular.

We cite the following address from the appeal of the 2d inst., with the remarks of the editors. We believe that we will be compelled to look to China for our reliable labor. Let our farmers make a trial. The *Southern Farmer* for August will contain the proceedings of this Convention, and from month to month all the information desirable touching the labor question and the Chinese. Let every planter subscribe to it at once. See prospectus in another column.—*Ex*.

THE LABOR QUESTION.

ADDRESS OF COMMITTEE OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CONVENTION.

MEMPHIS, TENN., July 1, 1869.

The undersigned, appointed by a meeting of citizens to make arrangements for a convention of planters and others, to be held on Tuesday, the 13th instant, for the purpose of considering the matter of introducing Chinese labor for agricultural and other purposes, submit to their fellow-citizens the following suggestions:

It is not our purpose to argue the necessity of more laborers. That we take as a foregone conclusion; every man of sense can see and feel it. It is a fact. More labor we want, more labor we must have. This point conceded, our next duty is to ascertain and discuss the ways and means for procuring such labor. Our necessities are pressing and immediate; hence we must look to a source of supply which even under our demand will prove inexhaustible. That source we believe to be China. That empire, overburdened with a population trained to obedience, economy and industry, can and will supply us, we think, at once. These people, we understand, require but one argument to induce them to come, to wit: The certainty of bettering their condition by receiving wages for their labor. That we are ready and willing to give, consequently no difficulty can occur, nor is any persuasion necessary. Another point: the empire of China extends within the limits of the tropics, where in the valleys of her great rivers, rice, sugar, tobacco and all other products flourish as they do with us. And it is well known that where rice and sugar grow the climate must be unfriendly to the white men who labor in the sun. It is so here, and it is the same there; therefore the Chinaman comes to us acclimated—prepared to withstand malarial attacks in our river bottoms and alluvial lands.

We are authoritatively informed that on the 13th of July next a merchant from San Francisco will visit this city with the object of ascertaining our wants and requirements in this behalf, and who is responsible and able to comply with all his contracts. We therefore earnestly urge every planter who is interested in this business—and who is not—to come forward and meet with us on the day specified, then and there dispassionately to consider the whole matter in detail. Each and every one should remember that now is the time to prepare for the coming season. The railroad companies have agreed to grant round tickets free to all who may attend the convention.

Geo. W. Gift, Wm. R. Moore, H. D. Brinkley, J. W. Clapp, E. M. Apperson, Leon Truandale, W. H. Hunt, M. M. Tresevant, A. J. Hays, John C. Nyer, W. H. Cherry.

In our issue of to-day will be found an address from the Committee appointed by the late meeting, which earnestly urges our planters and others to meet together in this city on the 13th inst., for the purpose of considering the question of Chinese laborers. We are promised the presence of a prominent Chinese importer from San Francisco, who will be prepared to tell us exactly what we want to expect. The matter is now coming to a business focus, where we have long wished to see it. It will be the part of wisdom for our planters, from far and near to come and acquaint themselves with the matter in all its bearings. The Convention will doubtless be attended by many who are practically acquainted with the Chinaman, and Mr. Koopmanschapp will be able to tell us the cost.

Germain to this matter, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, in speaking of the meeting there, to be held here on Wednesday last, says: "The Tennesseans should consider this question in all its bearings. If they provide themselves with Chinese, will they treat them after the manner of the Californians; or will they regard them as they do their present white and colored laborers? The Chinese labor question is a knotty one, and we earnestly hope that the West-Tennesseans in convention assembled will render it less intricate and perplexing."

We answer for the Tennesseans, and all the South, that they will not treat the Chinamen as they are treated in California. We will impose upon them no onerous or unequal taxation as is done there. We will not drive them from places of Christian worship, should they there assemble, as was lately done at San Jose in that State. On the contrary, we stand prepared to say that the people of the South will protect them in all their just rights, seeing that they are not abused or maltreated by any one.

We cannot see why the Chinese labor question should be a knotty one. We know that the Chinaman will work and work well, and for moderate wages. We further know that we are in want of just such a man, who we can and will pay. Thus both parties being satisfied, we cannot see why there should be any difficulty.

Some months since our attention was called to an article in the *Overland Monthly* on the subject of the Chinese. It was stated that in all some 80,000 of these people are employed in California. Five hundred are operatives in the woolen factories; two thousand make cigars; the paper mills and paper bag factories employ them; all the small fruit farms and hop plantations are worked by them; they follow the reaping machines, which cut the \$17,000,000 worth of wheat which the Golden State exported last year, and they rent fairs by the acre or on shares, and carefully tend and harvest their crops. Their market gardens are unsurpassed. Nearly all the house servants—books and men of all work—were Chinese. They cut the firewood, drive the plows, dig the soil, make the railroads, wharves, canals; in fact, all the rough labor is done by Chinamen. Will not this kind of people be an accession to us?

Will our farmers object to men who will work ten hours a day during twenty-six days in the month, and who hold elections of all kinds in the winter? Will our housekeepers, with visions of old-time servants before their eyes, say, "No Chinaman for me?" Will our railroads refuse hire labor when they have in view his example in the Pacific Railroad? Scarcely, we think.

Twenty years ago the city of San Francisco was a small collection of shanties, somewhat resembling the dilapidated little village of Raleigh—Raleigh were surrounded by several thousand tents, and had in front of it a great bay instead of Wolf river. Now San Francisco is four times as large as Memphis, with factories and foundries, mills and machine shops, bustle and stir the year round. The resources which built San Francisco, and are still pushing her, are not now, and were never, equal to the resources of the country tributary to Memphis. Revolve this proposition over and study it, for therein is much food for reflection. When did San Francisco commence her rapid progress? Not whilst she imported every article of consumption for her population, and exported nearly fifty millions of gold annually. By no means. Then were to be seen scores of buildings idle and closed up, and property was a drug. It is a fact that a party erected a building on a corner lot at the crossing of her two principal streets, and a year after it was finished proposed to give the house and lot to any one who would pay for the building of the house—the rents did not pay the taxes. A steady change has since been going on. And what has caused that change? The woolen factories worked by Chinamen commenced keeping money at home, then followed one branch of manufacture after another one; this one source was developed and then another, until now if you were to take your note-book and pencil and go into a California store, you would ascertain that a majority of the articles would be there found of California manufacture. There is the key to her great and recent prosperity. Do we want prosperity like that of San Francisco and California, or not; do we want Chinamen or not? The same answer applies to the question.

FOREIGN NEWS.

Meetings are being held in Ireland protesting against the disestablishment of the Irish Church. It is stated that should the House of Lords reject the bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, Mr. Gladstone will prorogue Parliament and make another attempt to pass it. It is also suggested to create a large number of peerages in order to pass the bill in the House. The London press generally condemn the position taken by the House of Lords.

The Cuban insurgents have been recognized as belligerents by Chili and Peru. The Ministers of both countries at Washington have been instructed to ask a withdrawal of the promise made by Peru to keep the Peruvian monitors out of a conflict with the Spaniards.

For the purpose of testing the power of French railroads to concentrate a large number of troops at a given point quickly, 200,000 soldiers are to be moved to Strasburg, near the Rhine, this month.

Advices from the Balize state that the scheme for colonizing British Honduras with colonists from the Southern States has failed. The colonists are returning home.

The Norwegian immigration to this country is perfectly enormous. It is stated that some 200,000 will arrive during the ensuing eighteen months.

The Greek elections are ended, and show a large majority in the Chambers in favor of the Bulgarian Ministry.

Advices from the Sandwich Islands state that half the population of Tahiti are infected with leprosy.

The entire population of Hirisra was on an unanimous drunk in consequence of it having been proclaimed that "God is dead."

The Dominion Parliament have adopted resolutions for the admission of Newfoundland into the Canadian federation.

The election of a King to fill the vacant throne of Spain is declared to be impossible.

Bogota (Central America) advices to the 2d of May report serious trouble in the Colombian Republic.

Citizens of Spain are preparing for a celebration of that nation's birth-day on Oct. 16th next.

The British Government is trying to throw the cost of self-defense on each of her American colonies.

DOMESTIC NEWS.

The *Fraser's Point Delta* says of the crops: A gentleman who has traveled over every portion of the county informs us that the crops, both of corn and cotton, are in a flourishing condition. The farmers are in high spirits, and many say that the prospects for a good crop were never more flattering than they are at present. The freedmen as a general thing are working well; their crops are clear of grass, and if not led off from their work by politics, we have no doubt they will be rewarded for their labor.

There are five cotton and one woolen mills in Lawrence county, Tenn., as follows: Crescent Mills, Lawrenceburg, which run 1200 spindles and 28 looms on yarns and sheetings; Laurel Hill Cotton Mills, Lawrenceburg, sheetings, 2000 spindles and 50 looms; Hope Cotton Mills, Lawrenceburg, yarns, 1000 spindles; Shoal Cotton Mills, Lawrenceburg, yarn, 850 spindles; Eagle Cotton Mills, Lawrenceburg, yarns, 1400 spindles; O. A. Williams' woolen mill, Marietta Falls, jeans, linseys, etc.

There are two mills at Gallatin, Tenn., one cotton and one woolen. The Eagle Woolen Mill is a new building with new machinery, and turns out about 225 yards of jeans and linseys per day. H. Fitzgerald & Co.'s cotton mill has 4000 spindles and 64 looms, which are used in the manufacture of cottons, sheetings and cotton yarns.

Accounts from Indiana state that the recent heavy rains have done some damage to the wheat, but not enough to make any material change in the prospect for the largest crop ever harvested in the State. Corn is backward, but the recent hot weather has brought it forward rapidly.

The *Memphis Town (Tenn.) Gazette* says: We never recollect to have seen the crop in this

section in better condition than it is the present season. It is not so forward as we have seen it, but it has been well worked, and if the season continues favorable the crop will be a heavy one.

Many of the wheat fields of Williamson county, in this State, are standing still unharvested for the want of reapers. The work was heavy and the laborers few, and several farmers in that county have sowed their hogs on the wheat as the only means of saving it.

It is pleasant to know that affairs at the cotton-oil factory in Gonzales, Texas, are working smoothly and profitably. Its product brings \$2 40 a gallon in New Orleans.

Dan Alford having published a revised and corrected edition of the New Testament, new notices its purchasers, through an advertisement, to supply several omitted words.

The market at St. Albans, Vermont, gathers in annually nearly two and three-quarter millions pounds of butter, and one million pounds of cheese.

Immense droves of Texas cattle have arrived and are expected at Ellsworth, Kansas. 70,000 head are looked for this season.

Andrew Johnson intends to write a history of his administration, which the South-western Publishing Company proposes to print.

The prairies of Northern Texas have been literally covered with strawberries this season.

Recently, in New York, first-class velocipedes have been sold at auction for from \$15 to \$30.

Over 4000 tons, or 8000 bags of cotton seed have been consumed during the past season, in Cincinnati, in the manufacture of oil.

The cotton worm is at work in some counties in North Carolina.

The Valley of Virginia will yield five million bushels of wheat this season.

Only three citizens of New Orleans return incomes in excess of \$30,000.

Four Kentucky newspapers have ceased publication within a few days.

DEATHS.

[Obituary notices not inserted unless accompanied by responsible names, and within six weeks of their occurrence. No obituary notice of more than one hundred and sixty words will be admitted, unless all over that amount is paid for at the rate of ten cents for every eight words. Please count the words. Any notice out of time or length of any one not a patron of this paper inserted at paid matter—twenty cents for each eight words.]

PILLOW.—Bro. Alonzo Pillow, after a long and painful illness of a complicated disease of the throat and lungs, which he bore with Christian fortitude, fell asleep in Jesus at the residence of his father, in Henry county, Tenn., on Saturday morning, June 10, 1869, aged twenty-four years.

He had been from a boy a devoted Christian and orderly member of High Hill Baptist Church. In all the relations of life he was faithful, as a son dutiful, as a brother kind and affectionate, as a soldier true and brave, as a citizen upright and honest in all his dealings with his fellow man, but above all, a Christian, living pure and undeviled before the world.

He leaves a father and mother, three sisters, a little brother, and a host of friends to mourn his loss. But they "mourn not as those who have no hope," but feel that what is "our loss is his eternal gain."—*E. H. B.*

WALKER.—Mrs. Mary Walker, daughter of Joseph and Mary Manes, was born in Union District, South Carolina, October 23d, 1813. She was the youngest daughter of her father's family. About twenty years ago she made a profession of religion and joined the Baptist Church, receiving the ordinance of baptism from the hands of Rev. James Dennis, at Beech Grove, DeSoto county. Six children preceded their mother to the spirit world. The husband and one daughter remain to await the call of Him who has the power of life and death. She bore her afflictions, though long and lingering, with great Christian fortitude.

On the 30th day of May, 1869, she died in the faith of Christ, fully believing that he was able to keep that which she had trusted to him even to the end. In life and the vigor of health she was kind, always ready to administer to the distressed, devoted to her Christian profession.

Peaceful in the grave so low. Show this to your postmaster and oblige us. Will you not help us?

SPECIAL NOTICES. Another loss.—No postmaster can forward a registered letter without the pre-payment of eighteen cents by the sender. Now scores of postmasters send letters and retain ten or fifteen cents of the postage, and we have to pay it again to the postmaster here, or we cannot get the letter. We keep a list, and report the cases to the Department, but it does not pay us the dollars per week of our labor. Show this to your postmaster and oblige us. Will you not help us?

MAGNIFICENT LITERARY FABRIC.—Webster's Quarto

The Home Circle.

THE STOLEN APPLE.

I had been married fifteen years. Three beautiful daughters enlivened the domestic hearth, the youngest of whom was in her eighth year. A more happy and contented household was nowhere to be found. My wife was amiable, intelligent and contented. We were not wealthy, but Providence had preserved us from want, and we had learned that "contentment without wealth is better than wealth without contentment."

It was my custom, when returning home at night, to drop into one of the many shops that are constantly open in the business streets of the metropolis, and purchase some trifling dainties, such as fruit or confectionery, to present to mother and the children. I need not say how delighted the little ones were at this expression of paternal consideration. On one occasion I had purchased some remarkably fine apples. After the repast, half a dozen were left untouched, and my thrifty companion forthwith removed them to the place of deposit, where it was her custom to preserve the remains of our nick-nacks. A day or two after, when I had seated myself at the table to dine, she said to me, smiling, "So father has found the way to my safety-box, has he?" I was at a loss to understand the meaning, and desired her to explain.

"Have you not been in my drawer?"

"What drawer?"

"The upper drawer in my chamber bureau. Did you not take therefrom the largest of the pippins I had put away from the girls?"

"No, I did not."

"You did not?"

"Not I. I have not seen an apple since the evening I purchased them."

A slight cloud passed over the countenance of my wife. She was troubled. The loss of the apple was in itself nothing; but we had carefully instructed our children not to appropriate to their use any article whatever of family consumption, without permission. When the demand was at all reasonable, it had never been denied them. She was loath to suspect any one of the offense; we had a servant girl in the family, but as she was supposed to know nothing of the apples, my wife hesitated to charge it upon her. She at length broke the silence by saying, "We must examine the affair. I can hardly think one of the children would so act. If we find them guilty, we must reprove them. Will you please look into it?"

The girls were separately brought into my presence—the eldest one first.

"Eliza, did you take from your mother's drawer an apple?" "No, sir."

"Maria, did you take from your mother's drawer an apple?" "No, sir."

"Mary, did you take from your mother's drawer an apple?" "No, sir."

"It must have been taken by the servant; call her to me," said I, addressing my wife.

"Nell, how came you to take from the drawer of your mistress, without permission, the largest of the apples she had placed there?" "What apples?"

"Did you take no apple from the drawer of your mistress?" "No, sah."

Now, it was evident that falsehood existed somewhere. Could it be that one of my children had told me a lie? The thought harassed me. I was not able to attend to business. I went to the store, but soon returned again. Meanwhile the servant-girl had communicated to her mistress that she had seen our youngest go into the garret with a large apple the morning before. On examination, the core and several pieces of the rind were found upon the floor. I again called Mary to me, and said to her affectionately:

"Mary, my daughter, did you not go into the garret yesterday?" "Yes, sir."

"Did you go there with an apple?"

"No, sir."

"Did you notice anything on the floor?"

"No, sir."

I was unwilling to believe my sweet child capable of telling me a falsehood, but appearances seemed against her. The fault lay between her and the servant, and while I was desirous to acquit my child, I did not wish to accuse unjustly the negro. I therefore took Mary into a room alone; I spoke to her of the enormity of lying—of the necessity of telling the truth—of the severe penalty I should be compelled to inflict upon her if she did not confess the whole to me; and with tears in my eyes urged her to say that she had done it, if indeed she had. Gradually I became convinced of her guilt; and now I felt determined she should confess it. My threatenings were not without effect. After weeping and protesting her innocence, and weeping and again protesting, my threatenings seemed to alarm her; and, raising on her knees, she said, "Father, I did take the apple."

Never shall I forget that moment. My child confessed that she was a liar, in my presence!

Suppressing the emotion, I retired; and Mary, rising from her position, ran to her mother, and in a paroxysm of grief

cried out, "Mother, I did not take the apple, but father has made me confess that I did."

Here was a new aspect of affairs. Lie multiplied upon lie! Could it be possible? My dear Mary, who had never been known to deceive us—so affectionate, so gentle, so truthful in all the past—could it be possible that she was a confirmed liar? Necessity—stronger than the tenderness of the father. I chastised her for the first time in my life—severely chastised her! It almost broke her heart—and I may add, it almost broke mine also.

Yet Mary was innocent! After events proved that the negro was the thief. She had conjured up the story of the garret, knowing that Mary would not deny having been there; and to make the circumstances stronger against her, had strewn apple rinds on the floor. I never think of the event without tears. But it has taught me a useful lesson, and that is, never to threaten a child into a lie, when it may be he is telling the truth. The only lie I ever knew Mary to tell me, I myself forced upon her by threatening. It has also fixed in my mind the determination to employ no servant in my family whom I can possibly do without. *Hall's Journal of Health.*

THE HEAVENLY MARRIAGE.

When I turned With Ortel from our lonely mountain watch To that fast-falling vale of Paradise, Who first of all those white-robed multitudes Should greet me, but my own, my sainted wife— Her spirit, like mine, dismantled of the flesh, But radiant with the likeness of her Lord; Our infant cherub clinging to her skirts, The mother with the children; (how not so?) My wife—yet deem not by that name, her soul Had not put off its earthly, and put on its heavenly. In a moment I was aware She was forever, altogether mine; Not spouse, but what is symbolized by spouse; Not consort, but what consort typifies; The meaning now made fact; the ideal here Transparent in our real unity, A reflex glory and image of myself, An helpmeet in the house of God. O, never in her levellest on earth Of bud or bloom, appeared she lovely as now, Nor ever had I loved her as this hour, When, hanging on my neck, as she was wont, She looked up with her tender, pleading face, And sobbed for very ecstasy, not grief, "My husband!" This was all, but this was heaven.

THE WIFE.

Only let a woman be sure she is precious to her husband—not useful, not valuable, not convenient, simply, but lovely and beloved; let her be the recipient of his hearty attentions; let her feel that her cares and love are noticed, appreciated and returned; let her opinion be asked, her approval sought, and her judgment respected in matters of which she is cognizant; in short, let her only be beloved, honored and cherished, in the fulfillment of her marriage vow, and she will be to her husband, her children and society, a well-spring of happiness. She will bear pain and toil and anxiety, for her husband's love to her is a tower and fortress. Shielded and sheltered therein, and adversity will have lost its sting. She may suffer, but sympathy will dull the edge of sorrow. A house with love in it—and by love I mean love expressed by words and looks and deeds, for I have not one spark of faith in love that never crops out—is to a house without love as a person to a machine; one is life, the other is mechanism—the unloved woman may have bread just as tight, a house just as tidy as the other, but the latter has a spring of beauty about her, a joyousness, a penetrating kindness, to which the former is an entire stranger. The deep happiness of her heart shines out in her face. She gleams over. It is airy and graceful, and warm, and welcoming with her presence; she is full of devices and plots, and sweet surprises for her husband and family. She has never done with the poetry and romance of life. She herself is a lyric poem, setting herself to all pure and graceful melodies. Humble household ways and duties have for her a golden significance. The prize makes her calling high; and the end sanctifies the means. "Love is heaven, and heaven is love."

NELLIE AND BELLA.

Nellie is such a kind-hearted, unselfish little girl that everybody loves her. She seems to be always thinking of what she can do to make others happy.

If grandma loses her spectacles, up jumps Nellie, saying, "I'll look for them," and runs up stairs, down to the kitchen, into the parlor, and all over the house, until she finds them. Then grandma gives her a loving look, and very likely a kiss, and says, "Thank you, my dear little Nellie."

When father comes home, he finds his dressing gown and slippers all ready for him by the grate. Then he sends a loving glance to Nellie, and sometimes says, "I know the little fairy who anticipates my coming."

When Willie is fretful, or teasing his mother while she is busy, Nellie knows at once what to do. She gets one of her pretty picture books, seats herself in her rocking chair, takes Willie on her lap,

and amuses him until mother has finished what she was doing, and Willie has become pleased and forgotten his unhappiness. Then mother looks approvingly upon her, and says, "That is right, my dear little daughter."

Sometimes auntie drops her spoon or her thimble. Nellie springs to pick it up; and for that too she gets a smile of love, and "Thank you, darling."

The servants like to see Nellie come into the kitchen. She is always ready to oblige them, too; and many a "Thank you, Miss Nellie," she hears from them.

And so she goes through the day, exchanging loving acts for loving looks and words, and is as happy as a little girl can be. Not so with her sister, Bella. She is very selfish. No one ever hears of her offering to do any of the kind deeds that make Nellie's days so bright. If asked to do anything, she always has a headache, or her foot hurts her, or she is busy, or she has some other excuse for not doing it. She seldom receives a loving or approving look. Her father never thinks of calling her little fairy, nor her aunt her little darling. All are kind to her, but they cannot love her as they do Nellie.

The servants do not like to see her in the kitchen. After she has gone out, they say: "Wish Miss Bella would stay in the parlor!"

Nellie scatters seeds and gathers flowers all the day, while Bella wounds and is wounded by thorns.

Of course, Bella is very unhappy. She always looks either cross or sad. A selfish child cannot but be unhappy. But it is her own fault. If she would do as Nellie does, she would be happy, as Nellie is.

BESSIE BELL.

"Dear mother, why do all the girls Love little Bessie Bell? I've often thought it o'er and o'er, And yet I cannot tell. My favorite cousin always was Dear gentle cousin Bess; But why the girls all love her so, Indeed I cannot guess."

She's not so pretty, half, as Kate; Her hair don't curl like mine; Candies and cake she never brings; To school like Caroline; She has no garden large and fine Like Amy, Grace, and Jane; No coach, like Rose, to take us home, When falls the snow or rain.

She's no piano, like Christine, No harp, like Julia May, Parties, she never had but one, That on her last birth-day. Money she never seems to have, She has but one silk dress; Why is it, mother, all the girls So love dear little Bess?"

"They hear her gentle voice, my child, And see her mild, soft eye, Beaming around on every one With love and sympathy. They see her striving every hour, For others' happiness; These are some reasons why the girls So love sweet little Bess."

She never speaks an unkind word, She's never passionate; I never knew her to complain, Or tease, or scold, or fret. She's lowly in her own esteem, She's gentle, kind, and true; The blessed Bible is her guide, Its laws she keeps in view.

The widowed mother's heart she cheers By love and tenderness, And by her daily walk with God, And growth in holiness. Sweet Bessie is a Christian child, She loves the Savior dear, One of the lambs of his own flock, She has no want or fear.

Money, which other children spend In candies, toys, and cake, She carries to the poor and sick— She loves them for Christ's sake. Poor old black Diannah down the lane She reads to every day, And ne'er forgets it, though sweet Bess Is very fond of play.

And now, my little daughter dear, Would you be loved like Bess, Go, ask of God to change your heart From pride and selfishness. Better than beauty, rank, or gold, To be like little Bess, Clothed in the spotless garment Of the Savior's righteousness."

Scientific.

CONSAINGUINEOUS MARRIAGES.

Abundant induction of facts seems to show that deterioration of offspring follows consanguineous marriages. Dr. Nathan Allen has compiled numerous facts illustrating this. No where are cretinism, idiocy, and congenital deafness so frequent as in the secluded valleys of the Canton of Berne, where the families are all connected, and cousins intermarry as a matter of course, so as to keep the inheritance undivided. M. Bandin found that while consanguineous marriages form but two per cent. of the marriages of France, 25 per cent. of the deaf mutes are the offspring of such marriages. Scrofulous and tuberculous diseases are frequent in the progeny of such wedlock. Dr. Bemiss collected statistics of 833 consanguineous marriages. The wives, number of children was 3,742, of which 1,184 were defective; 145 were deaf and dumb, 85 were blind,

308 idiotic, 38 insane, 60 epileptic, 300 scrofulous, 78 deformed, and 383 died early. In 1848, in Massachusetts, the percentage of 350 idiots in an asylum was ascertained, and 17 were the children of parents known to be blood relations. In these 17 families there were born 85 children, of whom forty-four were idiots, and twelve others scrofulous and puffy. In one family of eight, five were idiotic. Another family had four idiotic and three other deformed children. A late report of the Kentucky Deaf and Dumb Asylum states that from ten to twelve per cent. of the deaf mutes are offspring of the marriage of cousins. Dr. Mulligan, of Dublin, found 100 mutes among the children of 154 families where the parents were cousins. Dr. Baxton, of Liverpool, found 269 mutes among the children of 170 such marriages. *Independent.*

We advise parents to read the preceding to their children, and explain to them its meaning in simple terms which they can understand. The happiness of many a family has been completely wrecked for want of the information which may be thus imparted. Nature's boundaries cannot be passed with safety, and where she punishes their violation by idiocy and the other fearful visitations named in the foregoing, we should not be slow to learn these boundaries and respect them.

WHAT MAKES BLUE WATER.

Any one who has made a veritable sea voyage, cannot have failed to notice the intensely blue color of the water in certain parts of the ocean. In the vicinity of land, he will have seen the water of a bright green color, which will be found to prevail until soundings cease to be struck. In the deep, unfathomable part of the ocean, he will have seen the water of so deep a blue as to be fully as dark as the strongest solution of blue vitrol; and even in the regions where deep blue water is the general color of the sea, he may have seen, if he have been in the Gulf Stream, or gone "down the Trades," a deeper blue than the deepest, in certain particular localities. There is a current in the China Sea that washes the Aleutian Islands, and is so dark as to compare with the other waters of the ocean, that the Japanese call it the Black Stream. Other ocean streams there are, and particular portions of the ocean itself, which are more blue than their neighbors. Every West India voyager knows the marvelous blue of the Trade-wind waters. The true cause of the blue color of the ocean is to be found in the saltiness of the ocean; and in the case of the West India waters, to the absence of those causes which are in full operation in more northern latitudes, and which as clearly mark the seas of those regions to be different from those more southerly, as their respective climates are distinguished by different degrees of heat and cold. It is observed in the pools or brine-pits of salt works that the more concentrated the water the bluer the color of it, the saltiest of all being of a hue nearly as deep as that of the intertropical waters. The light green color of the North Sea and the Polar Sea is to the blue of the more southerly waters what the middle brine-pit is to that in which crystallization takes place; and the Gulf Stream, off the coast of the Carolinas, and the waters of the Trade-wind region, are to the other waters of the Atlantic what the last pit is to the penultimate pit, that is to say, the dark blue sea is saltier than the light green sea, and the deeper the blue the saltier the water. *Chambers' Journal.*

THE Moustache DEFENDED.—A correspondent declares that clergymen who wear the moustache are not as easily understood by auditors who are hard of hearing, as those who shave, for the reason that "it muffles the voice," and that it prevents such hearers from aiding their comprehension by watching the motion of the speaker's lips. And he asks, "As the object of preaching is to be understood, may it not be duty to Christ to put off any ornament which defects even in a partial degree, that object?" To which we reply: (1) nobody, that we know of, wears the moustache as an "ornament," but because God made it to be worn, and having so made it, made such wearing essential to the best health and vigor of all the parts adjacent; (2) that we doubt the fact, and conceive that all individual cases which may have been observed, and referred to this as a cause, were really explicable on some other theory. It is at least certain that many of the public speakers of the day who are most distinct in utterance, and most easily heard, wear the full beard and moustache, while, on the other hand, some of the feeblest, poorest, and most inaudible whom we recall, shave, altogether. As to the matter of the motion of the lips, there may be something in that; but if a man will wear his beard, and unlive his whole physical nature as God meant him to do, he will be up to have sufficient physical vigor to speak loud enough for the deafest man who can hear at all, to hear with his eyes shut—which strikes us as being a more excellent way.—*Ec.*

The House and Farm.

THE SOUTHERN FARMER.

OF N. W. PULFITT, Editor-in-Chief, published by an able corps of Southern writers and practical farmers. Published at No. 311 Main Street, Memphis, Tenn. This is considered by the press to be the most reliable and beautiful agricultural paper published in the South. It has increased in interest and beauty each month, and has already gained a large circulation. Every farmer should take and read it; every farmer's wife should take and read it; every farmer's boy, that may become a man, and every farmer's girl, should take and read it. It is published weekly, except on Sundays, and is sent by mail to subscribers at the rate of \$1.00 per year. Send 20 cents for a sample copy. Only 25 cents per year. N. W. PULFITT & CO., Memphis, Tenn.

My presentation of the subscribers, we extract the following that appear under the head, from the pages of the Farmer.—*Ec. Farmer.*

Plaster of Paris.—The New York Semi-Weekly Tribune, for March 30, contains a valuable article on this subject, from the pen of Honorable George Giddes. Mr. Giddes says:

"This substance consists of lime, sulphuric acid, and water, in very slightly varying proportions. Cleveland's Mineralogy gives of lime thirty-two parts, sulphuric acid forty-six, and water twenty-two parts. An Onondaga specimen yielded: lime, thirty-two; sulphuric acid, forty-seven; and water, twenty-one parts. The value of gypsum as a manure is said to have been discovered by Mr. Mayer, a German clergyman, in the year 1768 (Rees's Cyclopaedia, article Gypsum). Farmers, who have for many years used it, differ in their opinions as to the manner of its operation, and as to the best methods and times for its application, and scientific men know just as little on these points as the farmers.

The experiments at the Michigan Agricultural College, show that about the one thousand five hundredth part of an inch in thickness of gypsum, sown on clover, and timothy, added to the production of hay, on an acre, in the course of three years, the enormous quantity of four thousand, four hundred and eighty-four pounds; or to state the case in another form, one pound of gypsum produced, twenty-eight pounds of hay."

Facts are presented to show that it is almost equally efficacious when applied to wheat, barley, oats, potatoes, etc. An extract from a book published in 1890, gives the results of experiments with it on wheat:

"A five-acre field (nearly a level surface), situated in the State of Maryland, was divided into five equal parts; they were equally well plowed, and laid down in wheat, three bushels of seed to the acre. These five places were manured as follows: (1) number one was sown six and a half bushels of gypsum, powdered rather fine. On number two was put a compost manure, which consisted of some lime, the bed of a fresh water river, common dung, etc. Number three was sown with the usual manure, as usual in America, by panning the cattle during the night. On number four was put stable manure, only rather thin. On number five oyster-shell lime was applied in the usual way, as in England and Ireland.

"The production of each acre was as follows: Number one produced four hundred bushels; number two, three hundred and thirty bushels; number three, three hundred and thirty bushels; number four, three hundred and thirty bushels; number five, three hundred and thirty bushels."

Mr. Maesman asserts that gypsum is a direct food for plants; and Mr. Giddes says he has "observed that clover, though only once treated with gypsum, continued to show its beneficial effects during all the life of the plant." The substance is a disinfectant also, and when used on heaps of decaying manure will remove bad odors.

"It has raised on bottom lands, and on the seacoast. But the farmers in the county of Kent, in England, nearly surrounded by the sea, sow it on the stalk and leaves of clover with good effect."

Curing Corn Fodder.—In June last (exact date not now recollected) I sowed broadcast, on two-thirds of an acre of land, common field or Dent corn, at the rate of three bushels per acre. Ground, an old field, and the corn was sown with grass and weeds; first deeply plowed, harrowed, and in about two weeks thereafter re-plowed very shallow; corn then sowed and harrowed in with a common two-horse harrow. All this was done in accordance with the advice of an intelligent neighbor farmer who had had experience in the crop. The ground being rich and the season propitious, the corn came up finely and grew most rapidly, soon hiding the ground from view and preventing all weeds from germinating.

When beginning to tassle, I applied to my friend for further instruction as to cutting and curing. He said I had better feed it green to my cows, as I could not probably cure it for winter use. This was a poser, for I designed it for winter feeding. I then inquired of other neighbors, who told me that by letting it cure on the ground after cutting it, and tying it in small bundles and putting it in small shocks or stacks it might save, but that I could only store it in the barn as fast as I fed it, as it would mold, even in winter, if put up in any considerable quantity.

I commenced cutting it with a corn knife (for the stalks were from eight to twelve feet in height), laid it in swath on the ground, and after a day or two of clear weather, commenced to tie up and stack the small quantity I had cut for experiment. This tying and stacking being tedious, I concluded to "stack" it loosely, without tying, each side of a horizontal pole supported at the proper height by forks. Against this pole I stacked all my corn fodder, except the two or three stacks tied in bundles. By the excessively wet weather during the time of harvesting I was unable to get any of it cured on the ground. "The result was an entire success. Not the least mold or fermentation occurred.

In the beginning of winter I hauled into the barn as much as a mow, twelve by thirty feet, would hold by standing the fodder up compactly one tier deep or in height. It is yet in a perfect state of preservation, and is eaten by my stock with avidity, with healthy effects and without waste.

The bundles tied up and stacked molded where compressed by the bams, and were quite inferior.

I shall report this practice next season with such improvements as suggest themselves.—*Practical Country Gentleman.*

Cutting Bushes.—A writer in the Manchester (New Hampshire) Mirror gives the following on this subject:

"The question is often asked by those who have pastures covered more or less with bushes, 'How can we kill them?' Many think it hard, if not impossible, to kill bushes by cutting them, especially the white birch and some other varieties. But it can be done. Cut your bushes the longest days in June, and they will not trouble you more. You will kill them. I have cleared a number of acres during past years by cutting at that time, and I have killed them. On the land, where white birch, alder, pine, hazel, etc. If I do not want to cut more than two or three days in a year, I select the middle longest days; as there are a number of days the same length in June. There are other seasons of the year, probably when they can be killed, but I have never seen above time, and have succeeded in getting rid of quite a quantity of bushes. Brother farmers, just try it."

Manure.—Notwithstanding the great use made of artificial manures in Great Britain, the value of the produce of the yard is not overlooked. A late number of one of England's best agricultural journals speaks as follows on the subject:

"The produce of the farm yard is to every farmer the first and the chief assistance. The production and use of farm yard dung is the foundation of all successful farming. A very large proportion of the manure thus produced is employed for the root crop. Its employment differs very widely according to the nature of the soil. In some cases it is drawn upon the land as soon as it is made, and plowed into the soil without delay. In other instances it is heaped in the field until the spring tillage are well advanced; while some adopt the rule of drawing it fresh from the yard, and putting it in bouts or ridges, ready for being at once covered up by the ridge plow. Each system has its advocates, and there are circumstances under which each may be preferable."

Destroying Stumps.—The Baltimore Leader suggests the following method for getting rid of the stumps, without making a large hole in the ground:

"We have heard of two methods of getting rid of stumps, which, as they appear feasible and inexpensive, we hope some reader will try, and report upon. Bore with a two-inch auger, to the heart of the stump, fill the cavity thus made with sulphuric acid, or with crude oil of petroleum. In the first case the acid becomes the destructive agent within a few months; in the latter, when the stump becomes saturated with the oil, it is fired, and will then burn out to the last particle like a candle."

Salt as a Manure.—A valued correspondent writes as follows on this important subject: I have tried salt on spring wheat at the rate of two bushels per acre, as manure. It ripened about one week earlier than that by the side of it that had no salt; I could not observe any other effect. Sowed it immediately after the drill.

I sowed salt fall on fall wheat, and will also let you know the result. If salt will forward the ripening of fall wheat as much as it does of spring, we shall be able to raise the same wheat, notwithstanding the midge, and not be compelled to grow those midge proof varieties that are neither hardy, do not yield well, or sell well in the market.—B. W. in Farmer's Advocate.

Useful Memoranda.—A box 24 inches by 16 inches square and 28 inches deep will contain a barrel, or five bushels; or 10,752 cubic inches.

A box 24 inches by 16 inches square and 14 inches deep will contain a half barrel, or 2 1/2 bushels, or 5,376 cubic inches.

A box 16 inches by 16 inches square and 8 inches deep will contain one bushel, or 2,150.4 cubic inches.

A box 12 inches by 12 inches square and 8 inches deep will contain half a bushel, or 1,075.2 cubic inches.

A box 8 inches by 8 inches square and 8 inches deep will contain one peck, or 537.6 cubic inches.

A box 8 inches by 8 inches square and 4 1/2 inches deep will contain half a peck, or 268.8 cubic inches.

A box 7 inches by 4 inches square and 4 1/2 inches deep will contain half a gallon, or 134.4 cubic inches.

Size of squares containing the fractional parts of an acre:

One-sixteenth of an acre contains 2,722 1/2 square feet, and the side of a square inclosing that area will be about 52 feet 2 1/2 inches.

One-eighth of an acre contains 5,445 square feet, and the side of the inclosing square will be about 73 feet 10 inches.

One-fourth of an acre contains 10,890 square feet, and the side of the inclosing square will be about 104 feet 4 1/2 inches.

One-half of an acre contains 21,780 square feet, and the side of the inclosing square will be about 147 feet 7 inches.

One acre contains 43,560 square feet, and the side of the inclosing square is about 208 feet 7 1/2 inches.

Two acres contain 87,120 square feet, and the side of the inclosing square is about 295 feet 2 1/2 inches.

Health of Farmers.—There are seven reasons why farmers are healthier than professional men, viz:

1. They work more, and develop all the leading muscles of the body.
2. They take their exercise in the open air and breathe a greater amount of oxygen.
3. Their food and drinks are commonly less adulterated, and far more simple.
4. They do not overwork their brain as much as professional indolent men do.
5. They take their sleep, commonly during the hours of darkness, and do not try to turn night into day.
6. They are not so ambitious, and do not wear themselves out so rapidly in the fierce contest of rivalry.
7. Their pleasures are simple and less exhausting.

