

## BAPTIST DOCTRINE, 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. x: 2; 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. A real visible Church of Christ is a company of scripturally immersed believers only, (not of believers and their unconverted children and others 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. See Rom. i: 4; 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 communicant 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 xlviii: 17; Mark xvi: 16; John iii: 2, 8; Acts viii: 38; Rom. vi: 4, 6; Gal. iii: 27.

Burying in the case of one dead to sin is the only action; since the burial 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 FAUCIBLES.

1. The Bible, and the Bible alone, unalloyed with human devices or traditions, 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 as 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, since 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 alter 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 age, unanimously declare that the primary (that is, first) and leading signification of "Baptize" is in dip or immerse, while some of the very best scholars of any age, affirm that it does so best meaning.—(Liddell and Scott, Carson, Anthon, &c.)

2. Standard historians unanimously agree that baptism 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 Pedobaptist commentators admit that the Bible does not furnish one plain command for, or example of infant baptism, and there is the utmost disagreement and contradiction among them on 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, rested in the people or membership,) and all the churches independent republics. All religious societies have legislative powers, and clerical or ecclesiastical governments, (that is, in the hands of the clergy or a few as a session,) are anti-scriptural and anti-republican systems which no Christian can lawfully countenance, or republish from any source; consequently, all the acts and ordinances of such irregular bodies are useless, and ought not to be received by us, nor should such societies be, in any way, recognized as scriptural churches, or their preachers as official ministers of the Gospel. The Baptist Church is the parent of democratic and republican government.

5. No society, organized upon principles differing from those of the apostolic churches, having different objects, ordinances, orders in the ministry can justly be called a gospel church, or church of Christ, or a branch of the church of Christ, for "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 the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.—(See Robinson, p. 56)

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

A. A. WOODRILL.

In THE BAPTIST OF June 19 appears an article from the pen of Bro. F. J. Jessop, asking for "some more light" on my communion essay, published some months ago in THE BAPTIST.

When I consented to have the essay published, I did so hoping that if wrong, some one would set me right. Truth—the truth, "the truth as it is in Jesus"—is, if I know my own heart, that for which I am searching. Accordingly, he who, in a spirit of kindness, shows me my error on this point or any other, shall have my lasting gratitude.

As Bro. Jessop suggests certain points of difficulty in the way of his receiving my essay, I will in like manner, try to remove them. Bro. J.'s objections I will notice in order.

1. "As the institution is a church ordinance, church-fellowship alone would seem to be the necessary qualification to participation in it. Do I understand it to be affirmed that any Baptist in good standing at home, has not this qualification?"

(a). "Church-fellowship," as here used, signifies nothing more, I suppose, than denominational fellowship. This latter I may cherish for every good Baptist, but I certainly do not, in the strict sense of the word, have church-fellowship for any except members of my own church; i. e. for the First Baptist Church in Lexington, Ky., where my church membership is held. Moreover, when we say that communion is a church ordinance, we use the word "church" in its proper sense—to denote a local church, just such as each Baptist Church is; and church-fellowship is exactly of the same scope, being confined to the limits of a single congregation. Hence, in this sense, church-fellowship implies the right of communion, and this right implies fellowship.

(b). "Do I understand it to be affirmed that any Baptist in good standing at home, has not this qualification?"

I reply, a member of one church, i. e. one local organization, is not a member of another at the same time. He may have all the qualifications necessary to membership in any one of the thousand churches in the land, but this does not imply that he has, nor indeed can he have, membership in but one at a time. In this one he has church-fellowship, but in none other.

Bro. J. seems to use the word "church" in a Catholic sense, to denote a grand unit, or a consolidated ecclesiasticism; whereas, the word, used correctly, (and it must be used thus when ordinances are ascribed to it,) denotes a single congregation of properly baptized professors of religion, etc.

2. "We are told," continues Bro. J., "that every Baptist has, or may have, his own church; that is, I suppose, hold membership and be in fellowship. If that be so, why should he be denied the ordinances of the church?"

I stated in my essay, and meant to teach, that every Baptist has or may have, his own church; i. e. may be a member of some local church; that in this he has a right to commune if he is in good standing; and nowhere do I intimate that the ordinance of communion should be denied to him by his own church.

Bro. J. seems to me to have in the last extract, the same erroneous view of the word "church" as that previously noticed. Indeed, all his difficulties, thus far considered, grow out of an improper conception, I think, of the words, "church" and "church-fellowship."

3. Bro. Jessop refers to Acts viii: 4, as presenting a difficulty in the way of adopting the doctrine of the essay. The verse reads thus: "Therefore, they that were scattered abroad, went everywhere, preaching the Word. Bro. J. seems to think that as these Christians were driven from their homes, and consequently deprived of the privilege of commemorating the Lord's death at home, therefore they must have had this privilege abroad."

I do not suppose, first, that those dispersed Christians found churches everywhere they went; nor, second, that it was required of them, or any other Christians, to partake of the Supper, when the providence of God manifestly, for a time, forbade it; nor is it stated that while thus scattered, they did commune. If Bro. J. affirms that they did, the "burden of proof" rests upon his shoulders.

4. It is asked again, "Where is the ordinance of the Supper to be observed?"

Bro. J. asks, "Where is the ordinance of the Supper to be observed?"

Bro. J. asks, "Where is the ordinance of the Supper to be observed?"

Bro. J. may have all the qualifications necessary to membership in the First Baptist Church in this city, and if he were a member, he would have the undisputed right to vote, and take part in all the deliberations of the church; but he is not a member, (though he has all the necessary qualifications,) and, therefore, he cannot vote and act with us. This I regard as a full answer to the objection.

5. Bro. J. objects that, in "paragraph 9," of my essay, the results, claimed as likely to follow the adoption of the suggestion of the essay, are "hypothetical." Indeed, my brother, they could not be otherwise. Let the doctrine of the essay be adopted; then, in my judgment, the "results" will follow. The facts cannot be given until the thing hypothesized occurs.

6. The objection, based upon Acts xx., as furnishing a precedent for intercommunion, does not, in my judgment, sustain the present practice of our denomination.

1. It cannot, I think, be established as an indubitable fact that Paul and the visiting brethren did celebrate the Supper with the church at Troas; and if the fact were admitted, it does not follow as a necessary logical sequence, that all uninitiated Baptists should, in all ages of the world, commune with every church.

I do not know whether there was a regularly established church at Troas when the brethren met to break bread; nor do I know (if there was) whether Paul and his visiting brethren communed with the church. And if I am debarred the privilege of drawing an inference such as that set forth in my essay, until I shall prove that Paul and company were members of the church at Troas, or that they did not partake of the Supper on the occasion referred to, then by parity of reasoning I might contend that the doctrine of intercommunion cannot be inferred from this passage until it has been proven that they did; we infer that, though present, they did not participate.

In the absence of all direct testimony on the subject, we can, I think, infer nothing, either for or against the doctrine of the essay.

I know not whether Bro. Jessop will be satisfied with these explanations, yet I trust that he and all other Baptists will consider the subject impartially, and follow the truth whithersoever it may lead them.

And in conclusion I say, I will thank any brother who may convince me of my error, if I be in error. Produce a "thus saith the Lord," and I will strike for the opposite shore without a moment's hesitation.

Lexington, Ky., June 22, 1869.

## MASONRY—A MISTAKE SOMEWHERE.

J. M. FENDELTON.

In THE BAPTIST OF June 12 Bro. George pays his respects to me. He thinks I labor under a mistake in supposing that the prayers in Masonic services are not presented in the name of Christ. He says of himself: "I am a Mason, and the chaplain of a lodge, and have been for many years, and never thought of praying in any other name than that of the Lord Jesus Christ." Perhaps Bro. George prays extemporaneously as every man ought to pray. A Baptist minister has said to me within the last week: "I am chaplain of two lodges; I ignore the prayers in the books, and pray extemporaneously." If a Christian man prays thus, no doubt he prays in the name of Christ. Bro. George says: "Our lodge always opens and closes with prayer in Christ's name." I of course believe this statement. I shall never have any personal knowledge as to the way in which lodges are opened and closed. But I have been present when Masons were buried. I have heard the funeral service read, including prayer, and there was no mention of Christ's name in the prayer, as contained in the books used. I had supposed there was a uniform service. I now see my mistake. Bro. George has a service of his own and makes his own prayers. I hope I will be excused for not knowing this.

Many years ago, when I lived in Bowling Green, Ky., it was known that I objected to Masonry, and that one of my objections had reference to the exclusion of the name of Christ from Masonic prayers. The Master of the Lodge, Hon. A. W. Graham, Judge of the Circuit Court, a prominent Presbyterian, said to me, "Masons pray in the name of Christ." I had heard him so pray very often in prayer-meetings. About that time a Mason died, and it was desired by his friends that I should offer a prayer at the

grave, after which the regular Masonic service was to be performed. It was so done. Judge Graham read the service, and at the close of the prayer, he said: "We ask this for Christ's sake." My eyesight was good then. I was standing near the Judge. I could see distinctly what was in the book from which he read. The words I have just quoted were not in the book. That circumstance made an impression on me which I have never forgotten. I saw how a Mason prayed in Christ's name; but neither before nor since have I seen in any Masonic book the name of Christ in a prayer connected with the burial service. But there may be, as I have intimated, more than one burial service. I do not know.

Bro. George says, that "every Mason knows that Masonry has nothing to do with a man's religion." This being so, I would like to know why he interferes with the religion of Jews, who reject the Messiah, by offering prayers in his name. It will not do for him to say there are no Jews in his lodge. There are Jews in many lodges, and Masonry has to do very materially with their religion if it tolerates the offering of prayers in the name of One whom they consider an impostor and a blasphemer. It is needless to enlarge.

## MY FATHER'S WILL.

My way I dare not choose,  
I knowest what is best;  
I cannot sleep Thy hand the while,  
And Thy gracious, loving smile—  
I feel Thy peaceful rest.

I was not always thus;  
I knew my way would choose;  
I did not seek to learn Thy will,  
I thought that Thou my cup would fill,  
And naught of God refuse.

Now, O Lord, I feel  
Thy bliss are loss and pain;  
Thy meekly borne, new strength they give,  
They teach the soul to Thee to live,  
And lead to endless gain.

Why I Cannot Commune with Pedobaptists.

No. 2.—Intention of the Lord's Supper and Ground of Objection.

J. P. BRATTON.

In my first article I set forth an objection to open communion on the ground of the wrong intention of baptism, as held forth by Pedobaptists, and also showed that they would, if left without the opposition of Baptists, banish believer's baptism from the face of the earth. I avoided saying anything about their mode of administering it, or the invalidity of even their immersion; because these facts, which I believe with all my heart, have been many times set forth in the columns of the old Tennessee Baptist and the late BAPTIST with more force than I could do, if I wished. I now object to open communion on the ground of the Supper itself, as touching its intention.

We hold and firmly believe that the Lord's Supper, call it by what name you may, is an ordinance of the Church of Christ. Pedobaptists do not believe that it is—notwithstanding what they may say in the way of apology—but hold that it is a means of grace, like fasting, prayer, etc. Is this a slight difference? Let him who will say so tell us what would constitute a wide difference. One says, I eat the Supper, that by so doing I may be brought into the favor of God. The other says, I eat it because I have been brought into His favor. If one thing can be more opposed to another than these two positions, I want to know it, for as yet I am quite unable to see how it could be. Talk no more to me of this as a slight difference; tell me as soon that day is night.

Holding as we do that it is an ordinance of the church, we most firmly believe that none have a right to take the Supper except such as have been born of God, to say nothing of other requisites, and therefore hold that it is sinful and dangerous for any other to dare to touch it. Doth not the Scriptures say, "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body?" O, man! tremble when you touch the cup of God! But listen and hear the Lord speak once more: "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." What awful responsibility! What everlasting consequences! Is it a small matter to deal lightly with the cup of Jehovah? I tremble while I think of it. Keep me thus careful while I live, O, God!

Pedobaptists look not at the matter thus, but invite all who desire to be saved to come and partake. Mark what I say, they do not only invite the regenerated

of all the denominations, but sinners too. Do you tell me that this is a slight difference? Deceive me not—deceive not yourselves. The difference is broad and radical. We hold that the communion is commemorative, and sets forth, as an ordinance of the church, the death and sufferings of the Captain of our salvation, and that we, as members of Christ's body, are brought in remembrance of him as often as we observe it. Doth not the Scriptures say, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come?" I can see why God would have the death and sufferings of Jesus thus set forth by those who loved him, and why his friends would bring him into remembrance publicly; but the dignity of God in having it set forth by those who love him not, and roll sin under their tongue as a sweet morsel, I cannot see. Nor can I see how a sinner would dare to remember in such a way, the Son of God.

Pedobaptists give the Supper no such rank, but clearly teach that it is a means of grace. Must I be called uncharitable because I refuse to sanction by communion, so horrid a perversion of both the ordinances of the church? Seek not to intimidate me by telling me that the age requires it; for if God does not—which I most firmly believe—I will not do it, though Satan should stand broad across the way to spill my soul for my disobedience.

County Line, Ala., May 3, 1869.

## TRACT DISTRIBUTION IN TEXAS.

N. T. N.

At an early day, when religion was at a low ebb in Texas, and professors found out each other by a kind of religious Masonry, I was attending the first sitting of our congress in the city of Houston, (which was then a little shanty town on the bank of Buffalo Bayou), when I made the acquaintance of a Presbyterian minister, who informed me that he had a large box of tracts, published by the American Tract Society, and asked me if I would take some up the country with me, (as I was then in the act of starting home—some 200 miles above). I told him I would take just as many as I had room for. So he went with me into the store where his box was, and gave me as many as I could conveniently carry, done up in neat little packages. So I started on my journey, and the first house I came to after leaving the suburbs of the city, there were two ladies sitting in the gallery, and about a dozen children. Thinking it a fine opportunity to distribute tracts, I unceremoniously alighted from my horse, and as I entered the house I commenced distributing tracts, when the lady of the house gave me a look I shall never forget, and in a peremptory manner she asked:

"What's that?"

Seeing the spirit in which the question was asked, I replied, "Madam, I have not read them all, and therefore I cannot tell. I want you to read them and see what they are."

"Well," said she, "if it is anything besides these G-d-d-tracts, I don't care; but if it is them, I want you to take them away, Sir."

I replied that I had not read them, and therefore could not tell what they were; and in this time I had given every child in the house, and each lady a tract, and I was off in double-quick.

Some twelve months afterward I was again in the city of Houston, and met with my minister, and immediately the question was asked:

"Have you distributed your tracts?"

"Oh, yes, sir, and could have distributed as many more."

"Well," said he, "when you get ready to start, go to that same box and supply yourself again," which I did, and made straight for my house of many children on Big Cypress again.

On my arrival, I saw no person stirring, but the doors being open, I alighted from my horse and carefully approached the dwelling. Just before reaching the door I cast my eye toward the kitchen, where I discovered some one poring over something that looked like a tract. I turned to approach the door with soft and steady step, when she happened to spy me, and spring to embrace me, with the salutation:

"Have you got any more of them God-blessed little books?" and with a firm grasp on my hand, and with brimful eyes, she related the story of their emigration to Texas and settling where there was no preaching, nor schools, and although her husband had belonged to the Methodist Church, he was now a home-racer, and how those blessed little books had shown her that they were all going to destruction together.

## Rates of Advertising—Not.

This paper is without question, the best advertising medium in the South or Southwest. The weekly circulation of THE BAPTIST is known to be the largest paper issued from this city.

No. Square.	1 Month.	3 Months.	6 Months.	12 Months.
1	\$4	\$10	\$18	\$30
2	3	7	12	20
3	2	5	9	15
4	1	3	5	8
5	1	2	4	6
6	1	2	3	5
7	1	2	3	4
8	1	2	3	4
9	1	2	3	4
10	1	2	3	4

Professional and Business Cards of three lines or less, will be classified and published at \$10 per annum. Special Notices will be inserted at 50 cents per line, each insertion; in reading columns, 30 cents. Yearly and half-yearly advertisements, quantity in advance.

## Religious Intelligence.

### ALABAMA NEWS.

On the 5th Sabbath in May last Sunday-school mass meetings were held at a number of points in our State, which were attended by delegates from all or a greater part of the Sunday-schools in the association, within whose boundaries the Sunday-school meeting was held. The Alabama association held its meeting in the interest of Sunday-schools at Greenville, a young and prosperous city on the Mobile and Montgomery railroad. This association is one of our oldest bodies, and embraces the churches of Montgomery and other important points. I have heard the meeting was well attended and the exercises for two days very interesting.

But it is of the meeting in our place I wish to write. The Sabbath-school Society of the Tuskegee Association held its third annual meeting in Tuskegee, beginning on Friday before the 5th Sunday in May. There was a number of our best ministers in attendance, and all alive to the Sunday-school work, and we had a feast of fat things. The speeches were all enthusiastic, practical discussions of the great work of teaching or disciplining the children.

Our citizens were all delighted with the meetings of the society, especially teachers of both ours and other denominations. This seemed a little strange to some, since the speeches were all thoroughly Baptist, and every one advocated the most attentive labor to inculcate in our teaching the doctrines of the Bible. In the language of our pastor, in one of his efforts, "we are in favor of no compromise with God's word. We must teach the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, in our Sunday-schools." Nor do we believe in union schools, but that every school should be considered the foundation-stone or beginning of a Baptist Church, if there be none there already, and if so, teach those scholars to both believe and be buried with Christ in baptism.

After a very harmonious and pleasant session, the society adjourned to meet in Union Springs before our next association. Before adjournment a resolution was passed, calling for a State Convention of Sabbath-schools at Oxford two days before the meeting of the Alabama Baptist Convention at that point, in November.

On Sabbath, the ministers of the society, at the request of our church, were organized into a Presbytery to ordain to the work of the ministry, Bro. Wiley A. Mason, Rev. E. H. Talliaferro conducting examination, Rev. A. C. Barrow acted as Moderator, Rev. J. S. Paulin Clerk. Rev. W. H. Carroll preached the sermon, Bro. Talliaferro gave the charge, and Bro. Paulin led in prayer, with the imposition of hands by the Presbytery. Bro. Mason is the son of the late Judge Mason, a prominent Baptist of this State, and spent last session at the Theological Seminary. He is a promising young man, and was ordained at the request of the Greenville church, of which he had been unanimously chosen pastor. He has already entered upon his work, and is succeeding finely. His position is an important one—in the very heart of Methodism, but with a promising Sabbath-school, and a good building and good congregations. We hope he will do well.

Our church, Tuskegee, enjoys the pastoral labors of Rev. A. C. Barrow, formerly of the Second Baptist Church in Montgomery, where he built up, by God's blessing, a strong church, adding, we learn, in the three years of his pastorate, considerably over one hundred members. He is very much beloved here, both as an able preacher and a good pastor. He draws large congregations and has many elements of popularity. The only drawback is his bad health in this climate, and for this reason we fear he may leave us to go further North. It would be a great misfortune to us, but if resulting in his better health, a great blessing to the cause. We have a fine Sunday-school, and a growing interest among the congregation. We are looking for a blessing from the Lord.

I have learned from a private source that Bro. Given, of the First Church at Montgomery, has baptized about twenty persons in a recent meeting. They are having meetings every night in Greenville, Bro. P. H. Lundy, pastor, Bro. Carroll assisting for a few days.

I have recently subscribed for your paper, and enjoy it very much. I may write again.

A. M. M.



## BAPTIST DOCTRINES.

1. There is no church but a body of immersed 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, as 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 occupy them when we know they are not baptized nor ordained, and especially since they claim to be, and generate 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, as 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 presbytery—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 assent for any proposal 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 now, and have been the repudiators of the principles and practices of Popery, 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.

## AXIOMS.

1. The unimmersed bodies of Christians are not churches, nor are any privileged companies of them the church; hence all Pedobaptist denominations are only religious associations.
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 arraignment 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 right only, not might, is right, a constitutional minority is in all cases the Scriptural church.
6. An unconstitutional or disorderly majority cannot exclude a member of an acknowledged constitutional church.
7. No church should receive the letters of, or the members baptized by, a disorderly church. Nor should it admit to its communion the members of such a church, or in any way countenance or uphold its disorder; it should keep no company with it that it may be ashamed.

## BAPTIST POLICY.

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 where all by no act to countenance, recognize, aid or abet those who teach 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 effectual 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 missionaries of 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, she cannot delegate her authority or her responsibility to a body as a board outside of her. The churches should select, send for and sustain missionaries of the Cross.
7. To the steadfast and uncompromising advocacy of these principles and this policy, this paper is devoted.

## Correspondence.

## BAPTISM DOGE INTO THE KINGDOM.

J. A. HACKETT.

BRO. GRAVES:—In THE BAPTIST of March 6 I find Bro. Wiseman's difficulties in regard to baptism as the door into the church, as advocated by yourself; while you say in the same paper, "The church of Christ is his kingdom," etc. In the 2d volume of "The Heroine of Faith," on page 48, the author says: "The church is a local organization changed by Christ with the execution of his laws. It is in the kingdom, it makes a part of the kingdom, it is subject to the laws of the kingdom, but it is not the kingdom, any more than the courts of law and the executive of any State are themselves the State." On page 69 he says: "The kingdom was that economy of separation or assortment into which the penitents and the believing who trusted in Jesus as Messiah the Savior, were introduced by baptism, according to Christ's appointment." Again, on same page: "Baptism is, therefore, the door of entrance into his visible kingdom."

Now while you and Wiseman and Courtney doubtless would indorse each other as sound Baptists, and if agreed would make a three-fold cord not quickly broken, what must be done with the strands which have been twisted different ways, so that one cannot put them together to make the cord? In the mouths of two or three shall every word be established; but what if the witnesses do not agree? Why, then, to the "law and testimony," and "if any man speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in him."

Now as you have given a challenge to a "free fight" or contest for the faith once delivered to the saints, I may show "mine opinion;" at the same time acknowledging myself under obligation to A. C. Dayton for explaining to me, in second volume of "Theodosis Ernest," the way of the Lord—for though dead he will long speak, to the enlightenment of Baptists and others on the kingdom; and the church, the executive of the kingdom. If this shall induce any reader of your excellent paper (prized not the least for its openness to all sides of every subject) to examine said volume, I feel assured he will be aided in his "search for the church" as it has been developed in the New Testament.

Aided, then, by Dayton's book, I have learned from The Book inspired by God, the Spirit, that the "law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of heaven is preached, and all men press into it." "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Could it be taken by force until it had come? Could men press into it before it had come? In Matt. iii. 2 John the Baptist said "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (or as Dayton renders, "has come near"). After Mark i. 14 the historian says, "After John was put in prison Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand" (or as Dayton says, "the kingdom has come," for the Greek word *eniken* is in the perfect, and not in the present tense). Now this time fulfilled was the time designated by the prophets; the time for the setting up of the new kingdom which should never have an end, and should be given unto one like unto the Son of Man.

May we not say, then, that John and Jesus both testified that the organization which Christ did establish was this kingdom? Let none suppose, then, that any thing in existence before this time of John and Christ, is this kingdom. How sang those that went before and they that followed after as Jesus rode into Jerusalem? "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord." And thus was the prophecy fulfilled, "Fear not, daughter of Zion; behold thy King cometh to thee sitting on a colt." etc. Now if men were pressing into the kingdom, taking it by force, how say some that the kingdom was not set up till the day of Pentecost—which was the time at which (as Christ said) some should not taste death till they had seen the kingdom of heaven come with power? How says your correspondent O. Alexander, that the kingdom has not yet been set up, nor will it be until Christ the Savior comes the second time to this earth? John the Baptist was not a subject of this visible kingdom, because he was never initiated by baptism, and therefore he was never a member of the executive, the church; not even a charter member, Bro. G., and in point of privilege the least in the kingdom was greater than he.

Allow another quotation from second volume of "Theodosis" in reference to the kingdom and church; page 75: "During the lifetime of Christ the kingdom was established; but the church, as the executive of the kingdom, was not needed, for the King himself was present, and acted as his own executive. The apostles, who were with him receiving

instructions, may be regarded as in some sort his *ekklesia*. They were an assembly of his people, and were engaged in the preparatory business pertaining to his kingdom. We may without impropriety, therefore, consider the meetings of the apostles to receive the laws and ordinances of the kingdom from the mouth of Christ, as meetings of his *ekklesia*. We may consider the apostles as constituting a church when they, after the passover, received the ordinance of the Supper, with instructions for its continuance; and so we may consider that as a church meeting, in which Thomas saw and believed, and that in which Peter was restored to favor and specially charged to feed Christ's sheep. And so each of those assemblies which gathered around the Savior during the forty days that he remained upon the earth, to receive instructions in the things pertaining to the kingdom, may be regarded as a church meeting."

We may consider the church as organized from the time that Christ called the twelve to be with him; but it was not till he was about to ascend that it received authority to transact the business of the kingdom, as his judiciary and executive. Now do we find any formalities or ceremonies other than "gathering together in the name of the King," on the part of those who had been initiated as subjects of the kingdom by baptism? If so, where were they performed, and what were they? When Christ called the twelve to be with him, and thus organized the church, we find no ceremonies. In all the meetings above cited, when Peter was restored, and in which Thomas saw and believed, and Christ instructed his disciples, etc., we find nothing but the fact of their "gathering together in his name" needful to constitute them a church, and to secure his presence, according to Matt. xviii. 20.

After Christ spent some forty days with the disciples teaching the things of the kingdom, he ascended up to heaven; having charged them to continue in Jerusalem till they should receive the promise of the Father. They returned to Jerusalem and went into an upper room, where abode Peter and the other ten of the remaining eleven; and there all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren. And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples (120 in number) and proposed to choose another witness of Christ's resurrection, when Matthias was added to the eleven apostles. On the day of Pentecost they were all with one accord in one place, etc. No right hand of fellowship or any other ceremonies or formalities as yet, by which they were to be recognized as a church, except the fact of their "gathering together in the name of Jesus," who will ever be in the midst of such. And now what act is required of those who repent and believe, or gladly receive the word, and are baptized, to be recognized as members of any church of Christ, except this same "gathering together in his name" by mutual consent, either implied or expressed, on the part of the new members and the others? Look to Saul's case at Damascus. At the command of Ananias he arose and was baptized. "Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus." Will any man say he was not a member of the church, when straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues that he is the Son of God? And he confounded the Jews who laid wait to kill him, watching the gates day and night. The brethren let him down by the wall in a basket, without any letter of dismission. When he was come to Jerusalem he assayed to join himself to the disciples; they were afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple, but the Son of Consolation took him and brought him to the apostles, and declared how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of the Lord Jesus. "And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem." He assayed; they were afraid; but Barnabas giving evidence of his discipleship, they consented, and he is with them. Who shall require more?

Any man giving satisfactory evidence of repentance, faith and baptism, with nothing to vitiate his Christian character, is entitled to membership in any church of Jesus to which he may assent to join himself, and it is both the duty and privilege of the church to receive him, as the church of Christ is not a private concern, but a public institution.

As to making the church of none effect, may not any province in a kingdom have authority through her officials to administer the oath of allegiance, and thereby initiate citizens into the kingdom, when such citizens may not settle in that province, but passing on to another province, with proper evidence of citizenship, choose their location where they please? I hold that the ordinances are in the keeping of the church, and all officials subject to the church so long as the church shall be subject to Jesus, whether that church be

a majority, or a minority. By the way, don't we mistake when we compare the kingdom of the church to a democracy or a republic, which is a commonwealth without a king? Such a kingdom as that of Ahasuerus would be a better illustration, which consisted of one hundred and twenty-seven provinces.

## OVER AND OVER AGAIN.

Over and over again,  
No matter what way I turn,  
I always find in the Book of Life  
Some lesson I have to learn.  
I must take my place at the altar;  
I must grapple with the golden grain;  
I must work at my task with a resolute will,  
Over and over again.  
We cannot measure the need  
Of even the tiniest flower,  
Nor check the flow of the golden sands  
That run through a single hour.  
But the morning dew must fade,  
And the sun and the summer rain  
Must do their part and perform all  
Over and over again.  
The path that has once been trod  
Is never so rough to the feet;  
And the lesson we once have learned  
Is never so hard to repeat.  
Though sorrowful tears may fall,  
And the heart to its depth be given  
With storm and tempest, we need them all  
To render us meet for heaven.

Thos. A. Sullivan's Difficulties and J. A. Hackett's Questions—May 29th and June 5th.

T. A. SULLIVAN:—How are you, my dear brother? In days of yore we used to meet in Cherokee, Ga., but until your article appeared, I knew not whether the tides of fortune had drifted you. How I would like to take your hand and talk of our adorable Savior; of what he said and did, and suffered; and of his glory in the World of Light! The whole question of Christ's wonderful sufferings involves difficulties hard to be understood, especially when we attempt to solve them by human reasoning. Regarding those you mention, allow me to say, Christ was a real person—the anointed one. He was the Son of God; the Son of God was the second person in the Trinity. This you believe. Well, then, he, Christ, the Anointed One, the Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, assumed humanity, and suffered, and died, as surely of his people. So, that whatever of Divinity was involved in him as God: man, in his mediatorial character, was concerned in the whole work of salvation. Take one passage which you mention, to make plain my views: "And saith unto them, my soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death." That is, Jesus, the Savior, Christ, the Anointed One, the Son of God, the second person of the Trinity, "saith my soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death." Remember, that the Son was not the Father, the second person was not the first, and apply the process which I have mentioned, to the other passages to which you refer, and we have a straightforward interpretation of Scripture in harmony with the theory which I have presented.

## J. A. HACKETT'S QUESTIONS.

I may truly say that to answer an argument is one thing, and to ask questions another; and that a child may ask questions which an old man cannot answer. I have carefully read Bro. Hackett's questions, and confess a doubt whether he thinks he has any difficulty on the subject, or thinks that I cannot answer his questions. With this doubt in mind, as I have leisure, this morning, I will notice his article.

1. "Christ, in his entirety, is the object of worship." How, then, can you escape the charge of idolatry, or, at least, of some idolatry? Christ, the Son of God, the Savior of his people, was manifested in the flesh; that is, assumed humanity; humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. I worship him as he is, for all that he assumed, and for all that he is, and for all that he did, calling him brother, my Lord and my God, and do not think I am an idolater on that account. I think of him as having suffered untold agonies for his people, in his true, his entire being—his humanity swallowed up in his Divinity. If you hold that his humanity only suffered, allow me to ask a question or two: Do you worship him as having suffered for you? If so, and his Divinity did not participate, what is left to worship, except his humanity?

2. "Was then the Divinity of Christ the Father? If so, who was then the 'Regent' of the universe while the Father was dead?" Answer: This is too solemn a question to trifle with. May I not ask, was the Son the Father? The second person in the Trinity the first person? If so, what "Regent" spoke to the Savior at his baptism, and on the Mount of Transfiguration? Was the Savior the Son of God? Was the Son of God the second person in the Trinity? Was the second person Divine? Did he assume humanity, suffer and die? If not, who did? If one that had personality suffered and died, how can you say he (using the personal pronoun) suffered and died?

The difficulty which you present was met in the Essay, and twice since in published

articles. By death, we do not mean annihilation, nor a state of spiritual unconsciousness.

3. You inquire, "Why require more than an infinite sacrifice?" Answer: I could not do that, (as nothing can be added to infinity) and have not attempted it, but thought that much was required, and that Christ offered that much, and no more, in good faith, in his own way. I also think the Bible shows that way to be in his own body, on the "tree;" his body, flesh, humanity, being the chosen, tangible, visible medium through which it was done in sight of men and angels, so that even his crucifiers said, "truly, this was the Son of God!" But do you not hold that an infinite sacrifice was demanded? If so, do you hold that Christ's distinct humanity was such an offering? If not, how was it spiced or augmented without Divine participation?

4. If the thought of your fourth series of questions is shown to be the will of God, I have nothing more to say, except amen! I pray never to resist his will. But this is begging the question. I do not think his revealed will is so expressed. I think Christ bore the aggregate griefs which would have been inflicted on the redeemed but for his interposition. I hope I may be pardoned for volunteering a suggestion for those who wish to investigate, as it need not disturb those who do not so wish.

J. M. WOOD.

Another Richmond in the Field—Sufferings of the Divinity.

It must be taken as a fact, demonstrated by revelation and logic, that nothing finite or created can serve, essentially, as an atonement for the broken law, or sin. Flesh and blood can play no part in the drama of Redemption but as an accessory. Divinity put on the flesh simply to manifest or externalize itself to the view and comprehension of finite beings. It is against all the testimony of the revealed Word to say any thing finite, any thing or being created, or assumed by Divinity, as made or created, forms any essential part of the atonement. It was necessary in the purpose and economy of God, to make use of a form, of matter, a real human form, an *image* of the eternal, ideal archetype of humanity—him who was ever in the bosom of the Father—Son of God. That "holy thing," who, through the power of the spirit of truth entered in "due time" the matrix of the virgin, assuming the "form of a man," and "being found in the fashion of a man," he (the Divinity) humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. And thus the Divinity suffered, "in the body of the flesh," suffered in this human casket—this finite apparatus, for the purpose of, externalizing some faint views of the infinite sufferings of the pure, immaculate, eternal, substantial Son of God; this second person of the Trinity being, ever in the bosom of the Father, as "the power of God, and the wisdom of God" was of old from everlasting, and "His delight was among the children of men." Prov. viii. It was his part of the economy and providence of God to create and prepare this world of matter, and all the glorious apocalypse of starry worlds above—this earth and all its appurtenances, as the theater of his awful denouement as a sacrifice in honor of the everlasting throne of Jehovah—to eliminate and manifest to finite creatures the entire constellation of attributes of the Father of Spirits. That which sufficed upon the cross, to the glory of the Father, the wonder of all worlds, was the same that was in the bosom of the Father, from eternity—the same that talked with Adam, Noah, Melchizedek, etc., represented in Scripture as "the angel of the covenant." In order to perform his part of the covenant, with the Father he became manifested according to the requirements of the law: "A body thou hast prepared me," as "written in the volume of the book." This refers to that material which inclosed and externalized the infinite substance of the Son of God. Matter cannot, in itself, suffer; it is the spirit which animates it, that is the subject of suffering. When we speak of "the soul of Divinity," we speak not figuratively, but of a fact—of Christ, the archetype of the soul of humanity, the essential Divinity, of the Messiah, of the great heart of God, of the depository of spiritual holiness, with all its attendant sympathies, compassion, love, etc., in short, all of the mind of Divinity, the image of which was imparted to man. Christ's soul was, and is, infinite in holiness and duration, and that which constitutes an archetypal humanity. And it must be this to constitute a valid sacrifice for sin—for a breach of the infinitely just and holy law of God.

If that "holy thing" deposited in the matrix of the virgin was anything created, anything finite, it was something infinitely inadequate for the canceling of sin, or removing the atonement of humanity. All Christians will agree on this point. Whatever of material substance was from time to time added to that "holy thing" was for the purpose of manifesting the Son of God, that finite

being might behold something of the mysterious processes and purposes of God in his great work of Redemption. That which was manifested to the vision of finite beings of the sufferings of the man Jesus, could be but a faint outline of the sufferings of the Divinity.

That theory which makes the Divinity retire during the sufferings of "the man" Jesus Christ, abandons the doctrine of the perfect unity of the Divine and the human of the Christ, for if the unity is so imperfect as to suffer a separation, the Divine from the human, during the infinitely interesting moment of expiation, surely the human is the only participant and exiator of the infinite liability of humanity. It is of no avail to urge the transfer of dignity to the humanity by a fugitive unity, when suffering comes to the human nature; Divinity is not present, ignores the unity. And why doth Divinity fly at the hour of suffering? Our opponents say that "it is impossible for Divinity to suffer." But if it cannot suffer why does it fly its unity? The theory we oppose should make the Divinity stick to its frail unity, at least as the better part cannot suffer, for consistency. But I prefer that sacrifice which was prepared entire, "before the foundation of the world," from everlasting—an infinite soul, the soul of Divinity, full of sympathy, for the purpose inaugurated from eternity.

## MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE.

BRO. GRAVES:—Permit me to announce to the Baptists of Mississippi, through your widely circulated paper, that I have again become the agent of our Mississippi College; that I am anxious to present its claims to every association this fall, and to do this I must know the time and place of each one's annual meeting. All will see that I need the last year's minutes of each association. I therefore appeal earnestly to the clerk of each association to send me a copy of the last year's minutes at Clinton, Hines Co., Miss., immediately after reading this notice. I also appeal to the Moderator of each association to write me, informing me when and where the next annual meeting is to be held, and how I can best reach the place; whether the place is on the railroad, or how far from the railroad, and whether any brother will volunteer his services to meet me at the depot and convey me to the association.

Bro. Graves, the 50,000 or more Baptists of Mississippi cannot afford to do without a college, and the spirit manifested at our last Convention in Canton, shows that they will not be without a college. The sons of these 50,000 Baptists are crying for it. The many, say fifteen or twenty, and perhaps fifty young men, whose convictions compel them to look forward to the work of the ministry as their calling, are coming upon the denomination to build up this college, that they may not be under the necessity of leaving the State to get an education. And should they leave how few of them would ever return again.

Brethren, of Mississippi! Baptists! God in his providence is calling upon us to rally again to this college. It is the school of the Baptist denomination of Mississippi. It was accepted and adopted by the State Convention as such, and when the war opened upon us it was among the first colleges of the South, having an endowment, mostly scholarships, of more than \$100,000, and 230 pupils in both departments. Through the war much of the endowment was lost, and what is not lost is, as yet, unavailable, and we cannot afford to wait till it becomes available. Our caremen of a certain age must be educated now or never. In three or five years more they will be out of the reach of an education.

Our college buildings and the buildings of the Central Female Institute have been almost miraculously preserved through the war. We now have room for 200 or more students in the college, and for 100 or more in the Central Female Institute. What we need is money. The Baptists in Georgia, we are told, appealed to every Baptist in the State for one dollar each, and they obtained \$40,000 the first year. We now make the same appeal. Let each send the agent at Clinton, Miss., one dollar, and in one year from this we will have 200 or 300 students, for our professors and fifty or more young men preparing for the ministry. Now, let every Baptist, male and female, old and young, send through the postoffice to E. C. Eager, Agent of the Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss., one dollar, or the name, with a promise to pay one or more dollars on or before the first day of January, 1870.

Brethren, don't let this appeal pass unheeded. Don't wait one for another. Follow the first impulse as soon as you get through reading. Take up your pen and write. It is the best investment you can make. Try it, and God will pay you back ten-fold.

E. C. EAGER.  
P. S.—The President of the Board of Trustees and one of the Trustees, and the President of the college, have each subscribed \$500, and numbers \$100 each, so that the sum is now nearly \$50,000, and now let others do likewise. Let each do something—one or five dollars, so far as it goes, is just as good as \$500 or \$5000. Only one dollar to each Baptist in the State will give us at once \$50,000.







## The Baptist.

"THE TRUTH IN LOVE."

MEMPHIS, TENN., JULY 17, 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 to the world by his life and death; no love to his people that does not influence a man to do good to them, as he has ability and opportunity.

J. R. GRAVES.

## AN IMPORTANT QUESTION.

"Is it the Presbytery or the Church that Ordains?"

We are called upon to decide this question under somewhat unpleasant circumstances. A brother we assisted in ordaining some years since, has not yet received his credentials from the church, because the church takes the ground that it was the presbytery that ordained, and therefore he must look to it for his credentials! The brother, who has ever been a dear friend of ours, demands of us his credentials, and indicates that it will be used to our injury unless we comply—certainly to the loss of one subscriber, if not more. Now we are willing to do anything reasonable, that we feel we have a right to do, for a friend, but we cannot do what we are convinced we have no right to do—strike a blow at church authority and independency—to save our best friend or last subscriber.

If it is the presbytery that ordains, then it is its duty to give credentials to the candidate over its signature alone; and two ministers can go forth and ordain whomever they please—every other man and woman in the land. But if it is the church that ordains, assisted by the presbytery, then it is clearly the duty of the church to give the credentials. We take the position that in all cases it is the church, and not the presbytery, that ordains; and that if any other body assumes the right to ordain, that body, be it association or presbytery, trenches upon the rights of the church, and usurps authority not granted in the written constitution. We are aware that this has been repeatedly done by both the associations and by standing committees on ordination appointed by association, and by presbyters, and credentials given bearing no other authority than the names of such associations, committees, or presbyters—but a thousand such instances are not sufficient to establish a law; they are flagrant infringements upon the rights of, and fraught with imminent danger to, the independency of our churches.

The churches are the repositories of all authority. They are in their individual capacity the representatives of Christ on earth. When he was in the flesh, he was possessed of all power and authority in heaven and earth touching the government of his kingdom. When he left his church, he delegated authority to no other organization or body of men. He commissioned his church to preach, to administer the ordinances and the discipline of his kingdom. It is therefore his duty to select and authorize the ministers he deems called of God and qualified, to act as his officers; it is her duty to send these forth, and to have the oversight of their work; nor can she delegate this her delegated authority to boards, to associations, to committees or presbyteries—not even to angels. Her Master holds her responsible for the faithful performance of the duties he has imposed.

Each individual church being an independent democracy, is authorized to receive and expel members without consulting any other body—has a right to select and to ordain her own officers, deacons and pastors, celebrate the Lord's Supper, send out and direct missionaries, nor has any other church the right to interfere with her, or to participate with her in those acts without her consent.

If it is contended that the church cannot ordain her own deacons and pastors, but is dependent upon some foreign power, as a committee or presbytery, to do it for her, then it must also be contended that the churches are not so independent, but dependent upon some superior body, which position is fatal to our whole denominational polity. As we understand it, the church degrading to ordain a minister, or about to discipline one, through courtesy to her sister churches, asks for a council or presbytery—not to exercise a joint authority with her in the contemplated act, but to assist her by advice only. The ordination is therefore by the authority, and is the act of the church, and she so inscribes it upon her records, if she records it correctly. She authorizes her clerk to give a copy of that record to the candidate if he desires it, and that paper constitutes his ministerial "credentials" when he labors or removes beyond the bounds of the church.

But, even that paper gives him no right or title to the pulpit of any other church, any more than does his letter of dismission, for one church has no authority over any other church. If the church giving the letter of ministerial credentials is regarded as sound in the faith, and orderly, exercising a healthy discipline, the letter is cheerfully received, unless it is of an old date—in which case the holder's walk is or should be inquired into. If in addition to the known character of the church, the presbytery which assisted her is also known to have been composed of ministers of sound doctrinal views, all doubts as to his qualifications are at once removed, and upon this certificate any other church can authorize him to preach for her.

We would be understood. While we hold that any church is competent to call and qualify its own officers, we are not opposed to councils or presbyteries, acting in an advisory capacity, but utterly opposed to them as independent and authoritative bodies.

It is therefore clear to our mind that the church, and not the presbytery attesting, should in every case give the minister a record of his ordination, as an evidence to others that she has authorized him to preach.

If our position is the correct one, will that brother or church censure us for declining to participate in usurping authority over that church? If so, we accept it most cheerfully for Christ's sake. We are open to conviction, and desire to hear from our seniors in the denomination, as well as from our editorial brethren. It is the truth we desire, and not controversy, for itself.

We are willing to give our certificate that we assisted the church in ordaining the brother, but this is more than he has a right to demand. Our ministerial credentials are as valid as any minister's in the land, and we have only a copy of the church records.

THE ORIGINAL ARTICLES this week are as they were last, very fine. "Tota" is a strong, clear writer. D. B. Ray's article on Feet Washing is peculiarly clear and conclusive. We think he mistakes the record in this; there were two suppers in Bethany—one at the house of the sister of Lazarus six days before the passover, and the other at Simon's house two days before the passover. Mary at the former anointed the Savior's head, and the sinful woman at the latter. There were two separate suppers, and at the latter, two days before the passover, Jesus washed his disciples' feet, and exposed the treason of Judas.

Bro. Billingsley, an old subscriber, is welcomed back into our columns as a contributor. There is a good writer behind his pen.

Bro. Wood successfully replies to his interrogators. We do not understand Bro. Wood to affirm that Christ had a double consciousness—that he possessed a human soul and a Divine one; but standing upon the ground of those who so teach and yet deny the sufferings of Christ, he has overthrown them most conclusively. We hope ere long to hear Bro. Wood's views in full touching the nature of Christ—Was he more than the second person in the Trinity manifested in the flesh—in a body prepared for it—for the sufferings of death? If a human soul was also prepared for him, in what chapter of the Old or New Testament are we to find it clearly taught, not implied?

The article of Bro. Pendleton and others on the first page will be read with interest.

J., and B., and others many, write: "Find \$1 for ten Mammoths; will you trust me for fifty until I can sell them?" We answer, yes. We will send fifty copies on sale for every ten paid for. We take all our brethren for honest men until they prove themselves otherwise, and then we shall publish them. We desire to issue 100,000 of the Mammoths. Why not? It can be done, if our patrons each will send a club of ten—\$1 worth. But some, many, will not. They never do anything. So a few real active ones, will take one hundred copies; and have we not one thousand such? There's plenty of time, and the paper shall be a fine one.

News?—Under News Items the Religious Herald has the following: The Central Baptist of St. Louis, Mo., has 5000 bona fide subscribers. It is now the organ of the Baptists of Missouri, Arkansas and Kansas. We have admired very much its spirit and ability with which this paper is conducted.

The Central Baptist may now be the organ of Arkansas as well as Kansas, but where, and of whom did our brother of the Herald learn this news? Did the Arkansas Convention adopt the Central Baptist as its organ at its last session? Not one word of it, but recommended the Baptist. Has even one association in the State adopted it as its organ? We think not. Did Mr. Moore, the ex-editor of the Arkansas Baptist, do it? He was in too great a hurry when he left to attend to it. Who did make it the organ of Arkansas? Did Elder Roberts, of Little Rock, or Bro. Fox, the junior editor of

the Central? By what authority, is the question. We have three times the subscribers in Arkansas than all other Baptist papers have, and the indorsement of a half score or more of associations; but the Herald knows that the Central Baptist is the organ of Arkansas Baptists. How?

## QUERIES AND DIFFICULTIES.

Does the Right to Talk Involve the Right to Preach?

"Bro. G., a compromise brother, lately need this argument in conversation, and claimed that it was unanswerable. I do not think so, and would like very well to see it answered in our paper for the good of all present—especially of those who seemed satisfied with it. His idea originates it—some D. D. did that, but I think you will be able to show its sophistry to those who don't want to be convinced."

This is the gist of the argument:

"If any man is able to talk ably and eloquently about Christ, we have the right to hear him, and if we have the right to hear him, it makes no difference where—in a schoolhouse, or meeting-house, on a stump, or table, or in a pulpit; set apart solely for the use of those who are regarded as regularly baptized and authorized members of evangelical churches. What say you to this?"

"ONE WHO WON'T WANT TO SHY AROUND CHRIST'S APPOINTMENTS."

We have been compelled to meet this position often in one form or another.

There are several egregious fallacies in it.

1. It assumes that the right to talk about Christ, is the same as to preach Christ. What then is the conclusion? Viz, that talking about Christ is preaching Christ, and the talker is a preacher.

But A., an able and eloquent man, often talks about Christ, but invariably blasphemes his name. Still, A. being a talker, is a preacher, and there is no impropriety for him to be listened to more in one place than in another.

Your reasoner then would admit the above, or concede that talking about Christ is one thing, and preaching Christ quite another. But to admit the last, is to give up the whole argument, i. e. that talking about Christ is preaching Christ.

2. Your sophist assumed that no one is divinely called to preach the gospel, but that it is equally the duty of all, and that he is the best preacher who is the best talker.

3. Your cavalier also assumed that ordination is a useless ceremony.

4. He assumed that Christ has not laid down and established a divine order in his house, and consequently that it is a matter of indifference whether a man preaches before he is baptized or after, or communes before or after baptism.

Your sophist and all his class are waging a war upon the order of God's house, and laboring to subvert the appointments of Christ.

5. Finally, Your quibbler—for he is none else—ignores the fact that we teach more effectually by our acts than our words. Now, we build a house for worship, and in it we place a pulpit, which is expressly and solely set apart to be used by one whom we consider authorized to preach the gospel. The man who occupies it, is considered by his congregation a preacher, and the church by placing him in that place indorses him as a baptized man, and as one whom she considers called and qualified to preach the gospel. This is the teaching of the act.

Bro. GRAVES:—You will confer a special favor by answering through THE BAPTIST the following questions:

1. Is a brother who gives a party and permits young members to dance in his house, as censurable as the parties who dance?

Yes, more so.

And is it the duty of the church to deal with both parties?

Most assuredly.

In case a young member was reported for dancing and on motion to appoint a committee to wait on the offending party, an old brother was to oppose the motion and earnestly contend that there was no harm in Christians dancing at private parties, or at neighbors' houses, that there was nothing in the Bible forbidding Christians to dance, that the young must have amusement, and dancing was as innocent as any other, was opposed to dealing with the party, for no wrong had been done, and that as regarded dancing being wrong, it was a mere matter of opinion, and if members were to wait on the motion and wait on their opinions, the church had as well commence with him now (members danced at this old brother's house, and he in conference boasted of the great effort he had always made and would make while he lived, to aid the young to enjoy themselves in their amusements—this old brother is Superintendent of a Sabbath-school)—what should a church do in such a case? An answer to this will be thankfully received by several.

Dismiss him from his office, and if he will not hear the church, exclude him for conformity to the world in sinful pleasures.

"You will greatly oblige me in giving your construction or idea on a passage in a gospel by Matthew, ch. 11: 'Verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.'"

We believe that if the pronoun before the last were written with a capital letter, i. e., "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he," John, the proper sense would be indicated to any mind. "Christ was comparing himself with John, and asserted that while none of men or women born was greater than John, yet He was greater." As he said upon another occasion, "A greater I shall be than he."

than John is here," and "A greater than Solomon is here." But he evidently did not intend to say we was least in the kingdom of heaven—Christ's visible church, and he did not say least. He used the comparative, not the superlative degree of the adjective mikros, which we consider an adverb in this place, and should render it, He that is—mikrotros (comparative degree) later in the kingdom, is greater than he. This would correspond with John's declaration: "He that cometh after me is preferred before me," etc., and "There cometh one after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unlatch," etc.

THE COMPLIMENTS OF FRIENDS.—We have uncounted evidences and expressions from our readers to convince us that we are making a paper that gives them increasing satisfaction. Such expressions as these we receive or hear weekly:

"I cannot get along without THE BAPTIST. I would sooner give up all my other papers than it."

"A good, sound, consistent landmark Baptist paper in this age is a precious, invaluable treat. May God bless you and bless our paper."

"The only Baptist paper on the American Continent sound in doctrine, consistent throughout with the New Testament and the principles of policy; it should be read, it will, it shall be sustained. May its 5000 become 50,000 in a few years."

"I cannot express to you my satisfaction with your paper. Its discussions are of the most important and interesting and able character. You are doing more than all our papers in developing the writing talent in our denomination. You did this before the war. The denomination is under obligations to you; it can never repay. I know it is not known how much you pay out to encourage and aid our brethren to write."

"Worthy of all praise is your office, or yourself for the almost perfect proof reading. I don't see a religious paper—the best proof-read of all—so perfectly proof-read as yours. It is a satisfaction to be put in print correctly. You lead the van in this respect."

"The poetry of THE BAPTIST is truly Orient in its rarity, its beauty, its gem-like character. Whence comes it? and how is it that each piece is as beautiful, and so rare, and so valuable? Why, air, to me the poetry in one paper is often worth the whole year's subscription."

"There is more fine poetry in THE BAPTIST than in all other papers I see. They are real gems; and then the Pulpit Illustrations are priceless. If you will some day gather together the poetic gems and illustrations that have appeared in THE BAPTIST and publish them in a book I will freely give ten dollars for one copy."

"Don't pull down your colors—the 'standing columns.' They float like banners on the outer wall. Nail them there, Bro. Graves; nail them there. Fight under them, die under them, and their triumphant waving will cheer and gladden your expiring eye."

"Your paper with me has an advantage over all others I take. I like to give away copies to my Pedobaptist and Campbellite neighbors and friends. I make selections from the issues of my other Baptist papers and save those that have something explanatory of our peculiar views. But every one of yours is complete. Keep the columns standing; they are the very thing, and are doing a good work."

"Hearings.—You do not imagine how badly your inside column, showing the ritualism of Protestants and Campbellites, is hurting! Each issue of your paper is a broadside of grape and canister. The Campbellites are writhing under your incessant blows, and they hate that column let it stand." [It shall stand.—Ed.]

Bro. GRAVES:—On looking over the "Table of Contents" for the Mammoth No. 2, it occurred to me that a collection of the views expressed by leading Pedobaptists on the rendering of the word *kyrios* and its cognates, and also their expressions in regard to the ancient mode of administering baptism, would be a very valuable addition to the proposed table.

Such a collection, prepared by a competent brother, giving the authority, page, etc., for reference, would be of great assistance to those of us who are not familiar with such writers. I think it would be peculiarly appropriate for the Mammoth, as thousands will be likely to read that number who are not regular subscribers. Will you not prepare something of the kind? or if you have not time, will not some of your contributors oblige us with the article?

W. J. L. TEXAS.

Magnolia, Miss., June 21, 1869.

This is an excellent suggestion, and we should be pleased to receive one or two columns of such admissions judiciously made, for the September Mammoth.

EXPLANATION.—We some months ago cut an article from an exchange paper entitled "Spiritualism and the Demons," for our own examination, not having read but a portion of it. During our late absence it found its way into the paper. The writer teaches the extinction of the wicked at death. Our readers know we do not hold or teach this doctrine, but that we did some months since publish twelve articles to disprove it. Our readers should know what all the readers of secular papers know, that an editor is not held responsible for the sentiments of communications, but for what he writes. Our views do not accord with those of many eminent and worthy brethren, yet we freely open our columns to them.

## THE MAMMOTH.

## One Hundred Thousand Copies!

This will appear in September, and be a most splendid paper—far superior to the first one. We have a fine engraving of Dr. Dayton's race cut expressly for it, and a sketch of his life written.

All work for the Mammoth, and let us circulate 100,000. It can be done. Each one of our patrons sending ten and \$1. will give us 50,000; and how many can obtain one hundred!

A brother in Alabama writes: "THE BAPTIST is gaining ground here. I can see it in the face and heart of everyone of my members who reads it. I hope to be able to put it in the hands of fifty Baptists before Christmas? Who will hope likewise?"

APPOINTMENT.—We will prepare in Gadsden, Tenn., next Sabbath, at 10 o'clock.

OSBORNE'S LECTURES.—Ed. A. B. Miller, of Paducah, Ky., writes to the Publishing Company: "I have read Osborne's Lectures with much interest. They are beautiful. Find the money you have more copies." Four thousand copies are now ready for orders. But what are these among the tens of thousands that wish to read them? Price reduced to-day to 40 cents per copy.

"KIND WORDS."—The new paper for July is out, and a magnificent one it is, and does credit to Mrs. Ford and the Depository Agent. All Southern Baptists should patronize this, the Sabbath-school paper of the Southern Baptist Convention. It is now issued twice each month at the same price (25 cents) per year. It should receive at once 25,000 additional subscribers. Will not pastors and superintendents take hold of it?

## Illustrations.

Artesian wells are sunk in the sod of the prairies, through the loam, through the gravel, through the hardpan, which is almost granite, until at last 1000 or 1500 feet beneath the surface the hand of man reveals a deep and rapid river coursing through those solitary snareless depths, at a speed of ten miles per hour, swifter than the Ohio, Mississippi, or Hudson, or any of the beautiful and imperial streams of this country, flowing as they do through picturesque mountain scenery, stately forest-enslaved meadow, amid towering cities or cultivated fields. And when the shaft has reached that imprisoned river, and the rent for the first time has been made through its dungeon wall, the waters, remembering the august source of far distant mountain tops, whence ages ago they fell, leap upward to the light with terrible energy, rising in an instant far above the surface of the earth, and pouring forth their healthful and fertilizing current to delight and refresh mankind.

And even so it is when half-forgotten humanity bursts from time to time out of the depths in which it has pursued its joyless, senseless course, moaning and murmuring through long centuries, but never quite forgetting its Divine and distant origin. Such was the upward movement out of intellectual thralldom which we call the Reformation, when the shaft of Luther struck the captive stream, and oppressed millions leaped with a bound into the full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty.—Molloy.

The prolonged existence of a veteran reminds us of what may sometimes be witnessed beside the waters of a petrifying spring—tufts of vegetation, with their upper sprigs green and flourishing, and the lower converted into solid stone; the vital influences vigorous in the newer portion of the plant, while the older are imperishably fixed in marble.—H. Miller.

THE HALO.—One of our animated preachers lately said, "The painters put a halo around Christ's head; but it's a mistake—it's all wrong; it wasn't around his head, but his heart!"

Like the inn of Bethlehem given to lodge meager guests, a heart full of pride has no chamber within which Christ may be born "in us the hope of glory."

## Gems of Thought.

REMARKABLE ESCAPES.—On a dark night the mate of a vessel under easy sail heard in the waters what seemed to be music. Calling the captain, they listened, and distinctly caught a female voice singing,

Hide me, O my Savior, hide,  
Till the storm of life be past;  
Safe into the haven guide,  
O receive my soul at last.

Lowering the boat, a lady was found, with her child, lashed to a raft. She had been a passenger in a ship that had foundered.

Capt. Thomson, of the British army, took passage in a bark from Madras for England. The vessel having been compelled by weather to enter an Indian port, the captain took a short excursion into the interior. The wind becoming fair, the ship left him behind among strangers; and without even his trunk. Though a pious man, he murmured against this dispensation; but he soon learned a lesson of special providence, which was ever after an unspeakable blessing to him. For the bark and all on board perished.

That man gave the atheist a crushing answer, who told him that the very father with which he peined the words "There is no God," refuted the audacious lie.

Sickness should teach us what a vain thing the world is, what a vile thing sin is, what a poor thing man is, and what a precious thing an interest in Christ is.

Do the Lord's work in the Lord's time. Pray while God hears; hear while God speaks; believe while God promises; obey while God commands.

We have no faith in terror dissociated from tenderness. We trust more to the process of drawing, than driving men to Jesus.

Would we do our heavenly Father justice, we must look on Calvary as well as on Eden.

The magnet which drew a Savior from the skies was not our merit, but our misery.



UNION OF METHODISTS AND EPISCOPAL

ise and tyrannical, the action of the presiding  
ers in not regarding their petition for the  
appointment of their pastor, as has been the  
custom. They add, "We think the time has

away to Roman Catholic schools, and say they are the best schools, for it is all a mistake. There is no Roman Catholic school equal to Brownsville Female College. The next session begins August 9, 1889.

## THE CHINESE LABOR QUESTION

will they say? "We have large bodies of land which are now utterly worthless. Give us more labor and we treble our crops; this will treble the country's production of food. The country trebles the present non-producing population, which must be fed; we will feed

mean in regard to the diversity of the races here, that we may be said to have touched bottom on it. First we had the red man, distinguished by peculiar characteristics; next we have had the Canadian, and have also had the African, and as to diversity of races this country has nothing to complain of; and yet there is little or no amalgamation between the races. The

God has given us. God has established a  
remedy of races, and it is no use to argue  
otherwise. God has given greater capacity to  
one than another. Now, philanthropists  
tell you that the African was degraded  
because he was a slave. The reason he was a  
slave was because he was degraded. Why was  
the Caucasian made a slave the same as the

ed in three words—Spain, justice, and  
7.  
ten are all the rage for the open-  
the Suez canal. The empress of the  
will have hers of blue and white, the  
of Egypt red, and white, and Madame  
of white silk with green and white

## CHINESE LABOR CONVENTION

in regard to the diversity of the race, that we may be said to have touched upon it. First we had the red man, distinguished by peculiar characteristics; next we had the Caucasian, and have also had the Negro, and as to diversity of races this country has nothing to complain of; and yet there is no amalgamation between the races. The

that God has given us. God has established a supremacy of races and it is no use to argue otherwise. God has given greater capacity to one race than another. Now, philanthropists might tell you that the African was degraded because he was a slave. The reason he was a slave was because he was degraded. Why was not the Caucasian made a slave the same as the

ed in three words—Spain, justice, and  
7.  
ten are all the rage for the open-  
the Suez canal. The empress of the  
will have hers of blue and white, the  
of Egypt red, and white, and Madame  
of white silk with green and white

BROWNSVILLE FEMALE COLLEGE

away to Roman Catholic schools, and say they are the best schools, for it is all a mistake there is no Roman Catholic school equal to Brownville Female College. The next session begins August 9, 1889.

away to Roman Catholic schools, and say  
they are the best schools for the children.

There is no ~~Roman~~ Catholic school equal to Brownville Female College. The next session begins August 9, 1889.











