

etc. "As the church of Israel was the church of God, typical of his true church," etc., page 234.

We next show that infants were members in that church, and not only circumcised at eight days old, but baptized. Deuteronomy xxix. 10-12, shows their "little ones," of all ages, were included; Genesis xviii. 19, shows the "household" was included; Numbers iii. 27, 28, shows those a month old and upward are there included in the religious charge of the church.

In Joel ii. 15-17 we read:

"Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet. Let the priests, the ministers of the Lord, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Lord, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them: wherefore should they say among the people, Where is their God?"

Here the tenderest age of infancy, "those that suck the breast," are recognized as members of the church. How did they sanctify the congregation—ekklesia—the church? Heb. ix. 13; Num. xix. 13; viii. 7 tell us. They baptized the church. Infants were among the parties specially named. They had membership. We have no need to prove that they are entitled to baptism; all admit membership carries with it baptism. Membership is what we prove; the greater including the less. We read in Matthew xviii. 1-6:

"At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Here it is clearly taught that "little children" are in the kingdom of heaven.

1. Notice verse 1, "who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" is the point before the audience. That was the question.

2. A child so young that it represented innocence; not old enough to be presumed as yet to be guilty of anything needing faith, or conversion, — to become innocent — is the party set forth.

3. Adults have to become converted and become as little children to "enter into the kingdom."

4. It was in answer to "who is greatest in the kingdom" the child is called.

5. We are to receive such little child in Christ's name, verse 5. To this add Matthew xix. 13-15:

"Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence."

Luke xviii. 15 calls them "infants" (aphedias), which interchangeably, verse 16, with "little children" (ta paidia). "Of such [infants] is the kingdom of God."

In the light of such declarations he adds, verse 17: "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in nowise enter therein." Here, again, it is in connection with how adults are to "enter in" who have transgressed, rejected Christ, that infants are held up as the standard of qualification for adult entrance.

Amid such declarations it is declared, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" they are members in it.

This is the more pointed, if possible, when we remember that the Jews had always had their infants in church relation with them. We must remember these words were by a Jew to Jews, who talked to him before this familiarly about the kingdom of heaven; that they all had their infants recognized as in the same. Not only so, but, as A. Campbell says, Christian Baptism, page 335, and debate with Rice: "The believing Jews, down to the end of the New Testament history, circumcised their children. Paul publicly declared, by an overt act, that he had not commanded them to desist from circumcising their children."

Hence, this circumcision of infants in the apostolic church long years after pentecost answers five points.

1. It proves that the old church was not abolished.

2. That no new church was organized on radically different grounds.

3. That, any way, infants were still in the church, recognized as such.

4. That though this is so, that infants were constantly circumcised during the whole period of apostolic history, yet not a case of it is named — no recorded case. This should hush the cry about "a recorded case of infant baptism in the New Testament."

5. If it required a special command to desist from any practice that late in apostolic history (Acts xv. and xxi.), why not equally so as to infant membership and baptism?

Here, then, we have the infants in the church. How will we get them out? It will do no good to quote where Doctor This One or That One has said or written very silly, or foolish, or absurd, or contradictory things. That is not the issue. Is it in accordance with the Scriptures? That is the point.

In accordance with these facts we read, Acts xvi. 15, of Lydia: "And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." And xvi. 33-34: "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." 1 Cor. i. 16: "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other." 1 Cor. xvi. 15: "I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.)"

I ask now—

1. There being some eight "household baptism" recorded in the New Testament, is it likely they were all destitute of infants?

2. Are we not authorized by these cases to baptize such households?

It is answered, the household of Stephanas "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," — waiting on God's ministers, etc., hence no infants. To this we reply—

1. They could have grown up in the years since their baptism to assist older ones in service.

2. Such language does not at all imply that such as were too young for such work would be included; whereas, from the whole history of religion, they would be. See especially Num. iii. 27, 28, where infants "a month old and upward" were charged with a ministry. The jailor "rejoiced, believing in God (panoiki) with all his house;" the word panoiki being an adverb describing how he rejoiced, qualifying the verb — only he rejoiced, verb in the singular number. The old Probit reads, "Lydia and her children were baptized;" "the jailor was baptized, and all his children (kathun)."

All parties are settled in the fact, that infant baptism is established when infant membership — its right — is settled. This we have now done beyond all power of refutation. I need do nothing now but hurl back the onset of the opposition, — foil, — meet the objections urged against it. This is all I need do; — through other and powerful additional arguments will still be adduced.

Dr. Graves wishes this question confined to the New Testament. Why not confine repentance, justification, atonement, Christ's divinity to the New Testament as well? How can you understand the New without the Old?

All he has to read about baptism administered as a means of grace, to quicken, etc., amounts to nothing.

1. No Methodist teaches or believes that.

2. We are discussing whether it is taught in the Bible, not in men's creeds or essays.

He urges, that if it represents nothing, it is a lie. He believes that baptism not only represents things within, but things without. So he is met there. Circumcision represented things within, we know, for of it prophets and apostles declare its inward import. Rom. ii. 28, 29: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." See, also, Col. ii. 11. Rom. iv. 11. It was a sign, "a seal of the righteousness of faith." Yet it was administered at eight days old though Paul says it was "of the heart."

He believes it had not the use and import to the infant of eight days, but served such ends when it grew to comprehend its use and symbolic import. So of baptism.

He wishes our Discipline, the so-called Wesleyan, to prove that Methodists teach that in baptizing infants are delivered from the wrath of God. He knows — ought to know, that we never did, in any age or country, so teach. To force a meaning on these phrases, which our article on baptism in the Discipline, the context and all our standards show we never held, but so far from that, despise, reject them, is not my idea of fair debate. It little becomes those who, till but recently, taught that infants were in hell, and only abandoned it under the effects of our preaching, to bring such charges. We will notice these matters more fully in due time.

He quotes Limborch, Bledsoe, etc., that "there is no proof that the apostles ever baptized an infant." They say, not so, — they say, there is no "express mention" of it in the New Testament, — that is, there is no place in the New Testament where, in so many words, it records that an infant was baptized. This amounts to nothing.

1. It is nowhere recorded that John the Baptist ever baptized a woman, a boy, a girl — you baptize all such.

2. It is nowhere said or recorded that the twelve apostles ever baptized (1) A woman, (2) Boy, (3) Girl, (4) Or man in all their ministry! So to be consistent you should never baptize any of those classes. As to Paul's record, we will examine it hereafter, he not being of "the twelve."

3. It is nowhere recorded or told us in the New Testament that an infant was circumcised in all the apostolic days. Yet we know, and all agree, that they were circumcised daily — every day of the world, more or less.

4. It is nowhere "expressly" said, or recorded, or hinted, that the twelve apostles were ever baptized.

5. Nor that the seventy were.

6. Nor that the one hundred and twenty disciples were.

7. Nor that John the Baptist was himself baptized.

This will do. This crushes the popular objections in toto.

You urge that we justify, prove in adult baptism by inference. Well, suppose that be so. Do you not rely on "inference" for "immersion"? You know you do. You baptize adults solely on inference. You infer from your exposition of Scripture that certain qualifications exist, and all by inference. A fact can as perfectly rest on legitimate inferences as on actual, express declaration.

But he says the church was founded on circumcision. I have overwhelmingly showed the reverse, and until he assails my crushing facts, I can pass that point. What was the remnant? he asks. I showed elaborately. What he means by Jews translating the word (ekhal) by ecclesia ones, I know not, since it is translated by it constantly.

Was the Olive tree, Abraham, or Christ? he asks. Say yourself, and either position destroys your theory and sustains me.

As for those syllogisms — beginning the question each time — taking for granted the very thing in dispute, why that is anything but logic. To parade syllogisms on that order is to stir up all logic. But enough here. If the learned doctor has argument, let them be adduced and we will meet them. I have nothing to do now but to dash back the billows of opposition, hurl back the missiles of the archer. He cannot break the force of truth. My position stands as a column of granite — imperishable, indestructible in its nature, majestic in its strength, resting on the deeply bedded rock of eternal truth. The church of God is one forever — infants are in it. — (Time out).

He quotes Limborch, Bledsoe, etc., that "there is no proof that the apostles ever baptized an infant." They say, not so, — they say, there is no "express mention" of it in the New Testament, — that is, there is no place in the New Testament where, in so many words, it records that an infant was baptized. This amounts to nothing.

1. It is nowhere recorded that John the Baptist ever baptized a woman, a boy, a girl — you baptize all such.

2. It is nowhere said or recorded that the twelve apostles ever baptized (1) A woman, (2) Boy, (3) Girl, (4) Or man in all their ministry! So to be consistent you should never baptize any of those classes. As to Paul's record, we will examine it hereafter, he not being of "the twelve."

3. It is nowhere recorded or told us in the New Testament that an infant was circumcised in all the apostolic days. Yet we know, and all agree, that they were circumcised daily — every day of the world, more or less.

4. It is nowhere "expressly" said, or recorded, or hinted, that the twelve apostles were ever baptized.

5. Nor that the seventy were.

6. Nor that the one hundred and twenty disciples were.

7. Nor that John the Baptist was himself baptized.

This will do. This crushes the popular objections in toto.

You urge that we justify, prove in adult baptism by inference. Well, suppose that be so. Do you not rely on "inference" for "immersion"? You know you do. You baptize adults solely on inference. You infer from your exposition of Scripture that certain qualifications exist, and all by inference. A fact can as perfectly rest on legitimate inferences as on actual, express declaration.

But he says the church was founded on circumcision. I have overwhelmingly showed the reverse, and until he assails my crushing facts, I can pass that point. What was the remnant? he asks. I showed elaborately. What he means by Jews translating the word (ekhal) by ecclesia ones, I know not, since it is translated by it constantly.

Was the Olive tree, Abraham, or Christ? he asks. Say yourself, and either position destroys your theory and sustains me.

As for those syllogisms — beginning the question each time — taking for granted the very thing in dispute, why that is anything but logic. To parade syllogisms on that order is to stir up all logic. But enough here. If the learned doctor has argument, let them be adduced and we will meet them. I have nothing to do now but to dash back the billows of opposition, hurl back the missiles of the archer. He cannot break the force of truth. My position stands as a column of granite — imperishable, indestructible in its nature, majestic in its strength, resting on the deeply bedded rock of eternal truth. The church of God is one forever — infants are in it. — (Time out).

He quotes Limborch, Bledsoe, etc., that "there is no proof that the apostles ever baptized an infant." They say, not so, — they say, there is no "express mention" of it in the New Testament, — that is, there is no place in the New Testament where, in so many words, it records that an infant was baptized. This amounts to nothing.

1. It is nowhere recorded that John the Baptist ever baptized a woman, a boy, a girl — you baptize all such.

2. It is nowhere said or recorded that the twelve apostles ever baptized (1) A woman, (2) Boy, (3) Girl, (4) Or man in all their ministry! So to be consistent you should never baptize any of those classes. As to Paul's record, we will examine it hereafter, he not being of "the twelve."

3. It is nowhere recorded or told us in the New Testament that an infant was circumcised in all the apostolic days. Yet we know, and all agree, that they were circumcised daily — every day of the world, more or less.

4. It is nowhere "expressly" said, or recorded, or hinted, that the twelve apostles were ever baptized.

5. Nor that the seventy were.

6. Nor that the one hundred and twenty disciples were.

7. Nor that John the Baptist was himself baptized.

This will do. This crushes the popular objections in toto.

You urge that we justify, prove in adult baptism by inference. Well, suppose that be so. Do you not rely on "inference" for "immersion"? You know you do. You baptize adults solely on inference. You infer from your exposition of Scripture that certain qualifications exist, and all by inference. A fact can as perfectly rest on legitimate inferences as on actual, express declaration.

But he says the church was founded on circumcision. I have overwhelmingly showed the reverse, and until he assails my crushing facts, I can pass that point. What was the remnant? he asks. I showed elaborately. What he means by Jews translating the word (ekhal) by ecclesia ones, I know not, since it is translated by it constantly.

Was the Olive tree, Abraham, or Christ? he asks. Say yourself, and either position destroys your theory and sustains me.

As for those syllogisms — beginning the question each time — taking for granted the very thing in dispute, why that is anything but logic. To parade syllogisms on that order is to stir up all logic. But enough here. If the learned doctor has argument, let them be adduced and we will meet them. I have nothing to do now but to dash back the billows of opposition, hurl back the missiles of the archer. He cannot break the force of truth. My position stands as a column of granite — imperishable, indestructible in its nature, majestic in its strength, resting on the deeply bedded rock of eternal truth. The church of God is one forever — infants are in it. — (Time out).

He quotes Limborch, Bledsoe, etc., that "there is no proof that the apostles ever baptized an infant." They say, not so, — they say, there is no "express mention" of it in the New Testament, — that is, there is no place in the New Testament where, in so many words, it records that an infant was baptized. This amounts to nothing.

1. It is nowhere recorded that John the Baptist ever baptized a woman, a boy, a girl — you baptize all such.

2. It is nowhere said or recorded that the twelve apostles ever baptized (1) A woman, (2) Boy, (3) Girl, (4) Or man in all their ministry! So to be consistent you should never baptize any of those classes. As to Paul's record, we will examine it hereafter, he not being of "the twelve."

3. It is nowhere recorded or told us in the New Testament that an infant was circumcised in all the apostolic days. Yet we know, and all agree, that they were circumcised daily — every day of the world, more or less.

4. It is nowhere "expressly" said, or recorded, or hinted, that the twelve apostles were ever baptized.

5. Nor that the seventy were.

6. Nor that the one hundred and twenty disciples were.

7. Nor that John the Baptist was himself baptized.

discussing another subject, I do, whether there was a visible Christian church in the Old Testament, and whether it was identical with the visible kingdom of Christ existing to-day. Suppose I grant that there was, what would he gain by the admission? Can he show that the ordinances—baptism and the Lord's supper—were instituted by Christ or observed in that church? Evidently not. Can he anywhere find where, by express command, the Divine Law commanded these rites to be substituted for any existing rites of an existing organization? If he can, he will do what no man before his time has been able to do.

I propose in this speech to notice more specifically the positions to which he is committing himself and his people.

1. He declares the church of God in which there have been infants in all ages, as

ALL THE SAVED BY GRACE IN ALL AGES.

This is what is called by theologians "the church invisible."

With such a body, if there be one, we have nothing to do in this debate. No living infant ever was or can be in that body. That body had no ordinances of any kind. We have to do with visible, local churches that have ordinances.

2. He affirms that all infants are born in a state of salvation.

3. He affirms that all infants are born members of the church—"God's family," flock, yes, household, church, without the need of faith or regeneration! Now, I must here impeach him for inveighing against the Articles of his own Discipline, that he has sworn to mind and not mind. His Discipline defines a church to be "a congregation of faithful men," and not these alone, but in this congregation of believers "the pure word of God must not only be preached," but "the sacraments, baptism and the supper, duly administered."

Let it be born in mind, that Ed. Ditzler holds and teaches that Hebrews xi. 23: "To the General Assembly and Church of the first born," refers to the church invisible, the aggregate number of the saved in all ages. The Word of God is directly against this, as I will prove when I come to examine the true relation of the Jewish Commonwealth to the visible church of Christ—but bear this in mind. He affirms in his first speech, that the church was developed out of God's Covenant of Redemption, etc. Will he state explicitly when and to whom, and where the Covenant of Grace or Redemption was first announced as to bring the church into existence.

Another large part of his two speeches refers to matters that belong to the next dispensation, and have no reference whatever to this—to the future return of the Jews to their own land, to the second coming of Christ, to the setting up of the Royal House of David, with David's divine son and Lord upon his throne and strange to say quotes these events as the re-establishing of the Christian church during the present Gospel dispensation! He evidently has no clear conception of the significance of most of the passages he has quoted, for he intermixes, confuses and confounds them them the bewildering of his people.

Ed. Ditzler affirms that infants are born pure, free from the guilt and consequences of original sin—in a saved state, but Article VII. of his Discipline teaches the very opposite of this:

"VII.—OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.—Original Sin stands not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually."

Ed. Ditzler affirms that infants are born into the church, while the whole office for baptism in the Discipline proceeds on the doctrine that by baptism they are received into the church, and without it no infant, any more than adult, can enter into the kingdom of God. I will read a little under the head of Ministration of Baptism to Infants:

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this child that which by nature he cannot have: that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be a lively member of the same."

"Then shall the minister say, Let us pray: Almighty and everlasting God, we beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon this child: wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's church."

Now, Ed. Ditzler has sprinkled many a babe, and in every instance he has told the parents of it that they, by the act of baptism, caused their infant to be introduced into the church. I read on page 205:

"Then the minister addressing the parents, or others presenting the child, shall say, 'In causing this child to be brought by baptism into the Church of Christ,' etc."

Thus we see in the very outset that Ed. Ditzler takes positions utterly subversive of the articles and of the ritual of his Discipline and his church! Now, I want you all to notice this. Ed. Ditzler came here to maintain and prove that infant baptism as practiced by his church, is authorized by the Word of God, and in his very first speech he has affirmed that the teachings of his Discipline are not sustained by the Word of God!

Has he not made a bad start? He has openly repudiated the teachings of his Discipline! Which will Methodists hold to, their Discipline or Ed. Ditzler? One of the other must be repudiated.

I do not know that I understood Ed. Ditzler's position in his first speech. If I did, he affirmed that the Jewish synagogue in the Old Testament was identical with the Church of Christ in the New! While this has no support in the Bible, and can find no favor in a Christian's mind, it is exceedingly fatal to his cause, for there never was a synagogue that had infant members in it.

He has thus far confounded the "church invisible" with the "visible," the Jewish nation with the Christian church, and the Jewish synagogue with the Christian church. He quoted to prove that there are sinners in the church, "Let both grow together," etc. Christ distinctly said that "the field was the world," and not the church in which the tares were to grow, and strongly deprecated, in his first speech, quoting the authorities of eminent scholars to support our position, and twice before he closed, he quoted a list of Pedobaptist authors to support Pedobaptist views!

Of what weight are such interested witnesses in their own cause? When I quote authorities they will be his own witnesses, testifying to the unscripturalness and untenableness of his positions, and I shall have a large use for these. When an advocate can win his case at law by the witnesses of the opposing party it is a proof that he has a very clear case. Ed. Ditzler will use only interested witnesses—men on the same side with himself, and I shall overthrow his positions by the testimony of his own witnesses alone.

Ed. Ditzler has occupied a large amount of his time, so far, in proving that there was a golly number of Christians in every age, from Abel down. I wish to state again that I do not deny this glorious fact, but that I do assert that they were not separated from others by any visible organization or ordinances. This is the simple issue. The Jewish nation nor local synagogues were composed of the professedly regenerate.

Let it be born in mind, that Ed. Ditzler holds and teaches that Hebrews xi. 23: "To the General Assembly and Church of the first born," refers to the church invisible, the aggregate number of the saved in all ages. The Word of God is directly against this, as I will prove when I come to examine the true relation of the Jewish Commonwealth to the visible church of Christ—but bear this in mind. He affirms in his first speech, that the church was developed out of God's Covenant of Redemption, etc. Will he state explicitly when and to whom, and where the Covenant of Grace or Redemption was first announced as to bring the church into existence.

Another large part of his two speeches refers to matters that belong to the next dispensation, and have no reference whatever to this—to the future return of the Jews to their own land, to the second coming of Christ, to the setting up of the Royal House of David, with David's divine son and Lord upon his throne and strange to say quotes these events as the re-establishing of the Christian church during the present Gospel dispensation! He evidently has no clear conception of the significance of most of the passages he has quoted, for he intermixes, confuses and confounds them them the bewildering of his people.

Ed. Ditzler affirms that infants are born pure, free from the guilt and consequences of original sin—in a saved state, but Article VII. of his Discipline teaches the very opposite of this:

"VII.—OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.—Original Sin stands not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually."

Ed. Ditzler affirms that infants are born into the church, while the whole office for baptism in the Discipline proceeds on the doctrine that by baptism they are received into the church, and without it no infant, any more than adult, can enter into the kingdom of God. I will read a little under the head of Ministration of Baptism to Infants:

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are born in sin, and that our Savior Christ saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this child that which by nature he cannot have: that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be a lively member of the same."

"Then shall the minister say, Let us pray: Almighty and everlasting God, we beseech thee for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon this child: wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's church."

Now, Ed. Ditzler has sprinkled many a babe, and in every instance he has told the parents of it that they, by the act of baptism, caused their infant to be introduced into the church. I read on page 205:

"Then the minister addressing the parents, or others presenting the child, shall say, 'In causing this child to be brought by baptism into the Church of Christ,' etc."

Thus we see in the very outset that Ed. Ditzler takes positions utterly subversive of the articles and of the ritual of his Discipline and his church! Now, I want you all to notice this. Ed. Ditzler came here to maintain and prove that infant baptism as practiced by his church, is authorized by the Word of God, and in his very first speech he has affirmed that the teachings of his Discipline are not sustained by the Word of God!

Has he not made a bad start? He has openly repudiated the teachings of his Discipline! Which will Methodists hold to, their Discipline or Ed. Ditzler? One of the other must be repudiated.

tain that it was constituted in connection with the Covenant of Grace, that was made with Abraham, ratified by the Mass of Circumcision. But my learned friend declares, before Abraham's day, it was, being one thousand years before Circumcision! Others still contended that it commenced with Moses at Sinai.

As I have abundantly refuted my opponent's theory, and with it his whole argument, I will briefly state and notice these also, since it is this proposition, by whosever held, upon whatsoever ground, I wish to disprove.

This this covenant with Abraham is by the most eminent Pedobaptists believed and held and put forth as their only real ground to justify infant baptism. Let me read the statements of a few of their brightest lights. Dr. Wardlaw, of England, says:

"We state our argument thus: Before the coming of Christ the Covenant of Grace had been revealed, [I. e., to Abraham]; and in that Covenant there existed a Divinely instituted connection between children and their parents; the sign and seal of the blessing of the Covenant was, by Divine appointment administered to children; and there can be produced no satisfactory evidence of this connection having been done away."—Inf. Bap p 20

Here God's Covenant with Abraham and his seed is regarded as "The Covenant of Grace," which is the everlasting Covenant of Redemption.

All Pedobaptists who believe the covenant was constituted by the covenant made with Abraham agree with Dr. Wardlaw that the Covenant of Circumcision is the everlasting Covenant of Grace. This is their first and fatal error as I will show when I explain the Covenantants and the law. This egregious error is the main strength of infant baptism! Upon this bank of fog the entire argument to support it is founded.

The great Dr. Wilson of England, Presbyterian, in his work on infant baptism, and the setting up of the church says:

"It is upon the constitution and membership of that church under the immediate superintendence of the author of this covenant [Abraham] that the ARGUMENT FOR INFANT BAPTISM IS ENTIRELY FOUNDED."

The great Dr. Chalmers declared that the main strength of infant baptism lies in the Covenant of Circumcision.

Prof. A. A. Hodge of Princeton, New Jersey, in his outlines of Theology, says:

"The church, as an outward visible society of professors, He establishes them by the covenant he made with Abraham."

With these agree the most eminent Pedobaptist theologians and commentators. Let us examine the claim made for his church, and learn who may be members of it, and how initiated.

The covenant of which circumcision afterwards became the visible token, was made with Abraham when he was an idolater, as his fathers were, living beyond the river Euphrates. See Gen. xii.

If it did constitute his family into a Christian church, the first and model church, then it was composed entirely of idolaters; and as for Abraham's family, there were no infants, not even children in it.

Ed. Ditzler urges that he was here called out from among the wicked and separated out from the world, etc. How could he have been separated from the wicked by this mere change of locality, and when he went forth among a people as idolatrous and more

not an institution of Christianity but a human tradition for which, confessedly by all, no clear example can be found in the word of God.

(2) But there can be no clear example of infant baptism found in the word of God. The proof of this is. From the first introduction of the practice into the world, (it never was practiced by a church of Christ), in the fourth or fifth century, until now, its supporters have been challenged to produce an example and they have frankly confessed that they could not, because it was not in the word.

(3) *Ergo*, infant baptism is evidently not an institution of Christianity but a human tradition. Couple these two arguments into one.

Ans VII. (1) That ordinance for which no express command nor an undoubted example can be found in the New Testament or Bible, is evidently not of God but a human tradition.

(2) But there can be neither an express command nor an undoubted example of infant baptism found in the word of God, and of course not in the New Testament.

(3) *Ergo*, infant baptism is not of God, but a human tradition.

The practice, therefore, hangs upon the second of these two propositions, and I support it with this argument:

Ans VIII. (1) If there was one precept for, or example of infant baptism in the Bible, the supporters of the practice could and would have found it in the course of 1400 years, and the most distinguished scholars and advocates would not frankly admit there was neither.

(2) But they have not found the precept or the example, and their standard scholars and advocates frankly admit that neither the one nor the other can be found in the word of God.

(3) *Ergo*, The word does not contain either precept for, or example of, infant baptism.

Let me here submit sufficient proofs to sustain my minor.

LUTHER.—"It cannot be proved by the sacred Scripture that infant baptism was instituted by Christ."—In A. R.'s *Vanity of Inf. Bp.*, part ii, p. 8

BALE.—"Paul does not seem in Rom. vi. 4 to treat about infants. . . . It was not yet the custom for infants to be baptized."—*Anno*, on Rom. v. 14

CALVIN.—"Because Christ requires teaching before baptism, and will have believers only admitted to baptism, baptism does not seem to be rightly administered except faith precede."—In *Walls*, on *Chr. Bp.*, p. 52

LUTHER.—"There is no express command for it in Scripture; nay, all those passages wherein baptism is commanded, do immediately relate to adult persons, since they are ordered to be instructed, and faith is prerequisite as a necessary qualification. . . . There is no instance that can be produced from whence it may indisputably be inferred, that any child was baptized by the apostles."—*Com. Syst. of Div.*, b. v. c. xxii. § 2

BR.—"There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants."—*Esso* of 30 *Art.*, xxvii.

DA M. BROUAT.—"Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find."—On *Baptism*, p. 201.

B. MEMORRY.—"Scripture makes no direct and authoritative reference to infant baptism at all; it cannot be shown that Scripture gives any open, plain and decisive precept to baptize infants." (*The Gospel*, in *Advocate*, etc., p. 402).

Ans IX. (1) If none are to be baptized by the authority of the Great Commission, Matt. xxviii, which is the only law of baptism, but such as are made disciples by being taught,

(2) Then, as unconscious infants are incapable of being taught,

(3) They ought not to be baptized.

Then none are authorized to be baptized by the authority of the Great Commission but such, etc., as proved by both the command itself and every example recorded in the New Testament.

It is also supported by the most eminent Pedobaptist commentators themselves:

DOBNER.—"I think that illumination, as well as regeneration, in the most important and Scriptural sense of the words, regularly, precedes the administration of the ordinance of baptism."—(Time out).

STRAY NOTES ON THE GREEK TESTAMENT. No. 1.

WE are profoundly aware that we have never re-duced our studying to anything like the system which ought to characterize the work of any man who deserves to be called a student. Still we are always intending and resolving to do better; in the midst of the multifarious duties of a very laborious pastorate, we have found it practicable to make, and to adhere pretty rigidly, to some few rules in the way of systematic study.

We are indebted to Dr. Jno. A. Broadus's book on preaching for one of the most rigid of these rules, and

as we have found it an exceedingly useful one, and one which is continually saving us from sad blunders in our pulpit work, we feel disposed to state it here for the benefit of such of our brother pastors as may think it worth while to reflect upon and, possibly, to adopt it.

This rule ought by all means to be adopted by every preacher who can read the New Testament in the original. It is a simple and reasonable rule. Here it is: "I will never preach from any passage in the New Testament without first reading the text in the Greek, and trying to find out for myself exactly what the passage means." The rule will be all the better if this reading be extended to the whole connection in which the text occurs. If the passage be in one of the Gospels, then let this study of the original be extended to the parallel passages in the other Gospels, if such there be. We know that this will take time, but the great fault in the preparation of most of the sermons that too little time is spent upon the work. We should like to argue this point at greater length, but we must content ourselves with saying that an experience of seventeen years has fully convinced us that time spent in this kind of work is time saved.

Another rule which we manage to follow pretty rigidly is to devote the first half hour of every day, which we spend in our study, to reading the English Bible, and the second half hour to reading the Greek Testament. Our plan is to read regularly through, from beginning to end. In reading the Greek Testament, we now and then fall upon a passage upon which the original throws some new light, and it has occurred to us that it might be worth while occasionally to prepare a short article, embodying the results of such study as we are able to give to some of these passages.

We are aware that this is an experiment, but we do not mean to continue it very long unless we see reasons for believing that the experiment is, in some sort, a success. We know that a considerable number of our ministerial brethren have one or more of the critical and exegetical commentaries at hand, and that such brethren may find more light than we can expect to give. But it by no means follows that even these brethren will certainly reject our humble attempts to throw light upon special passages of the Greek Testament, especially when they remember that the scholars are not the only persons who are interested in critical and exegetical studies, and that many a man who never heard of Olshausen will be glad to know some of the things which a much humbler student of the Greek Testament can tell in a brief and unpretending newspaper article.

Our first attempt, then, will be a brief exegesis of Eph. ii. 8. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." We read, sometime ago, a book published by a distinguished and able preacher, who had studied Greek at college, and, we suppose, at the theological seminary. He wanted to prove that faith is the gift of God, and he cited this passage as decisive. The passage, as he takes it, means that faith is the gift of God, and in this view he is sustained, we believe, by some commentators of no mean repute.

We do not mean to deny that this is sound doctrine, but we do insist that the doctrine is not in this text. If the text means that faith is the gift of God, then it just as well means that grace is the gift of God, too; then the "it" which follows grace and faith would be false grammar, as would also the singular noun, gift. In order to this interpretation, the last clause must (grammatically) read, "they are the gifts of God"—i. e., grace and faith are. The singular pronoun, that, would also be forced to refer to two nouns, grace and faith. Even the English presents these grammatical difficulties. The Greek scholar might be led to question the feasibility of making a neuter pronoun refer to the feminine noun *pitia*. There is no doubt that the passage in the original presents considerable difficulty, but, upon the whole, we cannot (grammatically) adopt any other conclusion than the following, namely, that Paul teaches that the *soferia* (salvation) is effected by the grace of God, faith being a condition of its reception. The *toito* (that) refers to the effecting this salvation by grace, through faith—i. e., it refers to the whole result under the circumstances mentioned. The *it* in the English refers to the salvation wrought out and applied in the manner specified. The idiom of the Greek does not require this *it* to be expressed, and so there is no word for *it* in the original. We should paraphrase the passage

thus: "You are saved, by grace, through faith, by this salvation, thus wrought, is not your own work; the whole work is God's, and he graciously gives you the benefit of it."

This interpretation seems to be sustained by that able and acute critic, Olshausen, though he is very far from being satisfactory in his exegesis of the passage.

Whatever may be thought of the grammatical difficulties of the original, we can hardly suppose that any Greek scholar would, upon a fair examination, conclude that it teaches that faith is the gift of God.

We think that the exegesis given above is entirely consistent with both the Greek and the English construction, and we were pleased to find (after writing this far) that it is fully sustained by Bishop Elliott, whose authority in matters of critical exegesis is equal to that of any commentator, ancient or modern. Greenville, S. C. J. C. HIXON

IN MEMORIAM.

THESE lines are written in memory of a noble man. Capt N. D. Sandeford, who has gone to live in that place which the Lord went to prepare for those who love him, died January 8th, 1876, in the sixty seventh year of his age. Bro. Sandeford was one of the noblest spirits that it ever was our pleasure to meet. In all the relations of life, he was a Christian man the highest and purest sense of the word. He was a man of a bold and sanguine nature, and possessed a lofty ambition, but these, with all their sanctified impulses, were consecrated to the service of the Master. He loved his church devotedly, in which he was an honored deacon. He was one of the pastors warmest and firmest friends. The writer of these lines and the editor of this paper possibly never lost a better friend. Bro. Sandeford took *THE BAPTIST* from the time it began to be published by Dr. Howell till he died, which occurred as above mentioned, at his home near Rutherford Station, Gibson county, Tenn. He left an aged and mainly wife, four daughters and many grandchildren to mourn over their irreparable loss. May God bless them, and save them.

"In the sweet by-and-by," "Beyond the smiling, and the weeping, Beyond the parting and the meeting," Humboldt, Tenn., February 12, 1876. A. J. F.

This sad announcement was handed to us by Bro. A. J. Fawcett just before the accident happened to our son. We had laid it aside to add a word, and, returning to our office, we could not lay our hand upon it until now. Bro. Sandeford was a firm friend of ours for thirty long years, and a warm friend of, and worker for, the paper; and this means that he was a staunch, thorough-going Baptist; and all who knew Bro. Sandeford believed him to be, and loved him as, a Christian. We can but feel that our cause in West Tennessee has suffered a great loss, and we know that we have lost one of our best friends. But he rests from his labors, and with Jesus.

THE MASS-MEETING AT NASHVILLE.

ARRANGEMENTS have been made with the railroads by which visitors to this meeting, to be held May 6th, will go at half-fare rates by procuring excursion tickets from the stations where they start. Let everybody come to the meeting. Let us have a grand rally of the Baptists of Tennessee on the occasion. Heartily welcome and hospitable entertainment will be given to all visitors. Wm. SHASTON, Chairman Gen. Com.

Will some one tell us why Baptist principles prevail more extensively in the South than they do in the North?—*Baptist Banner*, iii. It is because the Baptists of the South have maintained a stricter personal identity, have apologized to nobody for their existence, have more constantly held forth their peculiar principles with a full conviction of their truth, have challenged investigation, and exposed error more fully and fearlessly, appealing constantly to the word of God and leaning on the divine presence and blessing.—*Texas Baptist Herald*.

Our prayer and God's mercy are like two buckets in a well; while one ascends the other descends.

It is good fortune to be not too elevated and confident, It is misfortune to be not too dependent.

The Baptist.

THE BAPTIST IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, No. 251 Main Street, Memphis, Tenn. Editor and Proprietor: W. D. MAFFIELD. Business Manager: Southern Baptist Publication Society. Contributors: J. L. GRAVES, Jr., Order Clerk.

Subscriptions: \$2.70 per annum, in advance. Send Money by Postoffice Order, Registered Letter, Express, or Draft, at our risk; otherwise, at the sender's. If money is desired by mail, send stamp or postal card.

Send all BRACE orders to the Editor and not to other parties in this city, or elsewhere, for we cannot be responsible for money or Braces sent through others.

Don't send book orders to us. We have no connection whatever with the book stores of the Society, and it complicates our business. Send all money and orders for books to W. D. Maffield, Business Manager Southern Baptist Publication Society—never to us.

Circulation of THE BAPTIST this week, 7,840.

WE SHOULD BE INSTRUCTED.

THE issue has at last been made up in the North, and the *Baptist Union*, the organ of the open communion or "liberal Baptists" and its correspondents, and the *New York Examiner and Chronicle* and its correspondents are engaged in discussing the question, whether the pulpit or the ordinance of preaching the gospel, is any more in the church than the ordinance of the Lord's supper? The question, in a word, is being pressed upon the semi-liberal Baptists, whether they will become consistently liberal, or open the ranks, as well as the *baptistery* and the *pulpit*, to all, or close them to all except to the church? In a word, whether they will take sides with the open-communionists or the land-markers.

The "liberals" say they ought to go over to one or the other; that there is no consistent middle-ground; and so say we, for there is no consistent middle-ground, and facts prove it. 1. The "go betweeners,"—i. e., those who open the *baptistery* and the pulpit and close the table,—cannot maintain their ground by Scripture, or reason either, against the open communionists, or the land-markers or consistently strict Baptists. 2. They are constantly furnishing recruits to both these parties; for the thinking ones feel that the ground is shelving under their feet.

The side that is at present the easiest to travel, most popular with the majority of other denominations and the world—the broadest gate—will take the "many," while the straight and narrow way will be chosen by the comparatively "few." Hence, we see such men as Dr. Behrends, Reeves, Jeffery and Smith, Eddy and Gordon, Malcolm and Melish, Carwell and the Pentecosts, Burlington and Wm. Hooper, and a full score of others not so fully developed, gone and going over to the "liberals" who are, as they have good grounds to be, becoming more strong and confident. To be sure, now and then one will start under so full a head of steam as not to be able to put "brakes down" at any way-station, and only stops in Rome, or in one of the families of her daughters, like Behrends.

It is still a regretful fact, that the semi-liberals oppose our land-mark brethren more bitterly than they do the "liberals" or Pedobaptists, notwithstanding they see these defections almost weekly, and hear these brethren say that they feel compelled to take this step because they can see no middle-ground between the strict or land-mark Baptists and open-communionists.

It is no part of our purpose to discuss this question in this article, but to say to our brethren of the South that we should be instructed by what is transpiring in the North, and, foreseeing the evil, like the wise man it. *The Baptist Union* has pressed the *Examiner*

and *Chronicle* for some time past to show some good reason for its distinction between an open pulpit and a close table, and a contributor, who signs himself "G," comes out and essays the task and is replied to by the editor of the *Baptist Union*. We will place the article in upon we whether we will or no; whether you believe it or not, the same influences are at work in the South, and working assiduously and powerfully, that produced the defection that is wide spreading in the North. Unless we put away from us the curses we must suffer the effects.

From the *Baptist Union*. "INSIDE," AND "NOT INSIDE."

"A writer, 'G,' in a recent number of the *Examiner and Chronicle*, has attempted a justification of the discrimination between an open pulpit and a close table, by suggesting the existence of what he calls 'Three Kinds of Recognition.' He speaks, first of a 'conventional recognition,' by which he means the according them the titles which courtesy of social life gives to them the titles which religious custom gives to them holding religious offices. Thus we speak of Cardinal McCloskey, without intending to endorse the theory upon which the Roman Church gives such a title to one of its dignitaries.

"Secondly, there is an 'evangelical recognition,' by which he designates the fellowship of local church and exchanges with ministers of other Christian denominations, on the ground of their common interest in the 'common faith' of the gospel.

"Thirdly, there is an 'ecclesiastical recognition,' by which he designates the fellowship of local church relations. On this point he remarks, 'Now, just here is the point of difference between an open pulpit and open communion-table—the pulpit is not inside the church, the communion table is.'"

To which the editor, Dr. Jeffery, replies: "The above discriminations as inventions may have the merit of being very ingenious, but as an elucidation of the law of New Testament recognition, they are purely arbitrary, not having a shadow of support in the Word of God. It is very easy to say that 'the pulpit is not inside the church, the communion table is.' Such an utterance is only a re-statement of one of those fallacies which, in the current thinking of the day, may seem to be axiomatic, but, when brought to the test of the Scriptures, is found to belong to 'the traditions of men' rather than to 'the commandments of God.'"

"Whether tried by the teachings of Christ, the example of the apostles, or the practice of the primitive church, wherein is the above-named distinction authorized? Wherein is it apparent that 'the pulpit is not inside the church, and the communion-table is not inside the church,' the communion table is 'not inside' in just the same sense.

"Our Savior gave the Supper and Commission to the same identical company of apostles. And there is not a tinge of evidence for 'the notion on which this discrimination rests, that he gave the Supper to his apostles in their characters as baptized believers, and the Commission to the same persons in their character as unbaptized believers; that he gave to them the Supper as being 'inside' the church, and the Commission to them as being 'not inside' the church.

"They that gladly received the word were baptized, and continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer." Such is the charter text of the church organization. And surely it is not to be wondered at, that the breaking of bread were related to the apostles and the breaking of bread was as much alike to the church. The one service was as the other 'inside' and 'not inside' the church as the other. And if we look at the practice as recorded in the Acts and Epistles, it is evident that they make no provision for this distinction. Were not the apostles members of the church? And does the New Testament contain a single hint that any were recognized as ministers of the gospel who did not consider themselves or others of the church as 'inside the church?' And were not considered as 'inside' that Paul and others even if it should be claimed that Paul and others were not in any technical sense 'inside the church,' will it be pretended that on this account they were not eligible to a seat at the Lord's table?

"As a matter of fact, in primitive times, and distinctions were not known in primitive times, and the spirit of the record shows that a person qualified to teach in a church was, by the same consideration, to teach in a church was, by the same consideration, to be recognized as a member of the church. We nowhere read of an order of recognized ministers of the church, and the evangelists would have been denied participation in the evangelical symbol.

"The oral proclamation and the Lord's Supper are both preaching services, and one who might preach in the one form was qualified to preach in the other. And the one is a church ordinance in precisely the same sense and to the same degree as the other. The notion that assumes that Christ instituted a ministry which he called 'inside' and 'not inside' of it, does not belong to the 'all things' commanded.

"The simple fact is, that the ministry and the table are alike 'inside' that church which Christ founded on the rock, which he loved, and for which he gave himself; and it is unwarrantable for any sectional

association of believers to parcel off the privileges and institutions which belong to the common brotherhood. Christ has given no body of his followers exclusively to appropriate the name 'church' exclusively to itself, and to decide for itself what his institutions are 'inside the church,' as thus defined, and what are not 'inside.'"

Our readers can see with what clearness and force this open editor can reason when he stands upon the solid rock of truth, and bow suddenly as reels when he takes one step off, as he does in the last utterance, in which he takes for granted the entire ground upon which all open Baptists stand,—i. e., that all Protestant Pedobaptists and Campbellites,—and why not Catholics and Mormons, and Latter Day Saints, and Dunkards?—are as truly Scriptural churches, which Eld. Jeffery here calls by another name, "body of Christ's followers," as Baptist churches are.

Why to Eld. Jeffery, whose talent and consistency we are compelled to respect, that he is guilty of a logical crime named *petito principii*; and who here asserts him, if he will but prove this one premise which he assumes, that we will the next week come over and take the liberal ground upon which he and the *Religious Herald* of Richmond to day stand. We will treat all those sects and their ministers as in all respects evangelical churches, and equal to Baptist churches and ministers. Will he respect our present convictions and conduct until he furnishes us satisfactory proofs that Catholics, Episcopalians, Campbellites and all other human organizations are truly churches, visible, or even "branches" of the same? We have appealed in vain for thirty years to the semi-liberals for this proof, but received nothing but sneers, when we have not abuse and persecution. Shall this appeal be alike in vain? If they are not Scriptural, which means evangelical, gospel or Christian churches, then we know that it is sinful in us, and treason to Jesus Christ, the founder and head of the church of God, to call them such; to treat or recognize them as such, or associate with them in any way so as to teach or impress the world that they are Scriptural churches, and their preachers Scripturally qualified ministers of gospel churches.

There is another article from the pen of Eld. Jarrell, of Illinois, which appeared in a recent issue of the *Journal and Messenger*, Ohio, that is of peculiar interest, which we will give to our readers.

BREVITIES.

We have only space to announce, as we go to press, the painful news that G. S. Walmesley, Treasurer and Secretary of Mary Sharp College, is dead.

The terrible information reaches us that Eld. Kendrick, pastor of the Columbus, Ga., Baptist church, has fallen a la Beecher. He was in jail guarded by armed soldiers to protect him from the vengeance of an outraged father and to hold him for trial, when last heard from. He tried to escape by flight on foot, through the woods, and was pursued and caught.

Will You Do?—The time of some two hundred expires this week, and unless they renew we must drop, for we are not able to carry them. The few we carried last year, who now owe us, amounts to more than the surplus of subscriptions over expenses, and leaves us with a heavy load to carry. We simply cannot do it, brethren, and don't ask. But will you drop? Say, if this paper ought not to be sustained; say, if your family shall not have it. Renew this week if you are almost out. The editor of *Alabama Baptist* says: "With many, retrenchment is the order of the day. This is well; but let them be careful not to retrench their religious privileges. Retrench in show and luxury, but don't cut down your prayer, and salary, your gifts to missions and 'domestic' work; don't deprive your family of the religious 'par.'"

Kind Words comes to us with good news. Crawford two of our female China missionaries are glad to see and Mrs. Holmes and her school sacrificing servants the editor thus honoring his enterprise will be daily of Jesus, and hope his seal upon. We understand appreciated by the denizens will soon appear, that portraits of either of our Sunday-schools, and Kind Words should see to be missionary Baptists, thus edifying our people among the Baptists of the South, especially in the thorough-going Baptist paper.

Annual faithfulness, and to the energy of the benevolence, God has committed the real history and progress of mankind.

BAPTISMS.

THE National Baptist of March 9th reports one thousand one hundred and sixty-eight baptisms for the previous month. This includes none in the Southern States. The list is very imperfect, for there are many baptisms never reported in the papers. For some years past baptism have averaged about eight thousand a month, or one hundred thousand a year.

While this rapid increase may be a matter of rejoicing, we have reason to rejoice with trembling. There is danger in these numbers, unless they are most carefully trained in Christian knowledge, and in habits of usefulness. Undisciplined members may become a destructive mob. Gideon's little band of three hundred heroes was of infinitely more value than the thirty thousand who left him and returned to their homes. And the one hundred thousand that annually crowd into our churches, unless carefully instructed and drilled by skillful pastors, will ere long become an element of mischief. Indeed, even now we are suffering in our great interests, missionary, educational and publication, from the ignorance, selfishness and covetousness of the thousands, and hundreds of thousands of untrained members. Our denominational power is not equal to our numbers. It is safe to say that all that is done by us denominationally in the way of home and foreign missions, colleges and academies, ministerial education, publication, and other charitable causes, is done by about one-tenth of our membership. The record is a painful one; it is humiliating. It ought not to be so, and will not be so if converts are properly instructed when they are baptised and brought into the church. The new-born child is tenderly nursed and carefully trained as it grows in stature and strength; and so it should be with "new-born babes" in Christ. They should be most carefully nursed and thoroughly trained, so that they may "grow up into Christ," become liberal in giving, zealous in good works, cheerful in piety, in all things examples of goodness.

At this point a solemn responsibility rests upon pastors. Churches are generally what pastors make them. Pastors lead the way by example, instruction and admonition, and the churches follow. The pastors feed their flocks with knowledge. They teach doctrine and practical duties, and if they are faithful to their trust their people will show it in their intelligence, liberality and sympathy with everything that makes men better and glorifies God. An ignorant, stingy, idle, selfish, anti-mission, do-nothing church is a terrible reproach to its minister. It is his work, and shows how utterly unfit he is for office. Or if the church is intractable, and will not be led into better ways by its pastor, it reveals the fact that the church has the wrong pastor and the pastor has the wrong church. The sooner he leaves the better for all concerned.

Converts, when taken into the church, should be carefully instructed in doctrinal truths. They should know what they believe and why they believe it. And the pastor can give this instruction in the pulpit, Sunday school Bible class, and through the religious press, but principally from the pulpit. It is by preaching that God builds up men "strong in the faith and mighty in the Scriptures."

Converts should be trained to work for Christ from the first. They are zealous then and want to do something, but they are ignorant. They need guidance. They need to be put in the way of usefulness. The pastor should lay out work of some sort adapted to the talent, temperament and circumstances of the young disciple. If it is only "to be a door-keeper in the house of the Lord," it will do him good. The essential thing is to keep the convert employed, and he will soon become a power for good. The church of God is no place for drones. It is the place for workers. It is by this ceaseless activity and much prayer and thanksgiving that these baptised multitudes "grow strong in the Lord and in the power of his might," and carry forward the denomination with ever increasing momentum to the triumphs of the future.

As God is yearly putting into our hands so much raw material, let us see to it that it is properly worked up and utilized to "the glory of his grace."

HOW BENEFIT THEM?

THERE is little use of Southern Baptists maintaining the existence of a Sunday school paper for the benefit of their Sunday school children if they do not put the paper into the hands of the Sunday school children. This they can only do by subscribing for

the paper and using it in their schools, thus only can the paper benefit the young.

Then let them have the paper, and not only learn the way of salvation, but learn Bible truth and what the duty of Christians are as to missions, etc. In our early days there were no such children's papers for Baptists, but now while we have them we should not ignore their benefits by neglecting to subscribe for and circulate them among our children.

Kind Words, which is advertised in our columns, is our own paper, and should be extensively circulated.

The Queryist.

BRO. GRAVES:—Please inform us through the columns of THE BAPTIST whether a church, in the absence of her pastor, has a right to discipline her members, administer the ordinances? etc. And really we would be glad to know whether a church without a pastor really is a church. H. L. REYNOLDS. Croswell, Dorsey county, Ark., April 2, 1876.

Remarks:—Is a flock of sheep a flock of sheep if it has no shepherd? Is an army an army, lacking one of its officers?

There can be a church without a pastor, but no pastor without a church. A church can elect one of its own number, or a foreign minister, as her moderator, and transact any business she can do with a pastor, else had she no pastor how could she elect one? She should elect a minister to baptize and administer the supper for her.

THE JOY OF INCOMPLETENESS.

If all our lives were one broad glare Of sunlight clear, unclouded; If all our paths were smooth and fair, By no soft gloom enshrouded; If all life's flowers were fully blown Without the sweet unfolding. And happiness were rudely thrown On hands too weak for holding— Should we not miss the twilight hours, The gentle haze and sadness? Should we not long for storm and showers, To break the constant gladness?

If none were sick and sad, What service could we render? I think if we were always glad, We scarcely could be tender; Did our beloved never need Our patient ministrations, Earth would grow cold, and mis indeed Its sweetest consolation. If sorrow never claimed our heart, And every wish were granted, Patience would die, and hope depart— Life would be disenchanting.

And yet in heaven is no more night, In heaven is no more sorrow! Such unimagined pain will borrow. Fresh grace from new will borrow. As poor seed that under ground Seeks its true life above it, Not knowing what there will be found When sunbeams kiss and love it, So we in darkness upward grow, And look and long for heaven, But cannot picture it below. Till more of light be given. —Sunday Magazine.

OUR PRAYER-MEETING.

OUR Prayer-Meeting opens on each Sunday afternoon, at three o'clock, and it is proposed that every Christian who reads this will consecrate that hour to prayer or subjects presented in these columns.—Ed. BAP.

"There is a scene where spirits blend, Where friend holds fellowship with friend; Though sundred far, by faith we meet Around one common mercy-seat."

If you are the Christian I have ever believed you, I desire you and as many more as will to pray for my nephew, who is just reaching manhood. He is a very bright boy, professed conversion once, but has since danced and done wrong otherwise. His parents are dead, and I have endeavored to raise him in the dead, and I have admonition of the Lord. I have a sad, sad history of my own. Several years ago, by cruel murder, I became a widow and childless. A Widow.

A SUDDEN BAPTISM.

REV. J. R. GRAVES:—As you wish to be informed of all Methodist or Presbyterian ministers who renounce their faith for the Baptist faith, I will tell you of an incident which occurred in Coalsville, Mo. Rev. William Hatton (Presbyterian) had been comparing views with Rev. W. R. Shoemaker, (Baptist). They

were great friends. As they were taking a walk on Sunday evening, they came to water, and the Rev. W. Hatton surprised Rev. W. R. Shoemaker by requesting him to baptize him as Philip did the eunuch. The Baptist complied with his request on the spot. Rev. W. Hatton has since been ordained, and is at present preaching for the Baptist church of Lancaster, Mo. Sparland, Ill. S. NIXON WOOD.

TO GOD'S CHILDREN OF THE SOUTH.

A thousand Baptists of the South will go for pleasure this year to Philadelphia, and spend a hundred dollars each. For the love you bear to the work of Jesus among the heathen perishing for the bread of life, will you not consecrate one-tenth of that amount to this cause? Send it to us at once, and "go on your way rejoicing." H. A. TUPPER, Cor. Sec. Foreign Mission Board, Richmond, Va.

CENTENNIAL MEETING AT JACKSON.

ON consultation with Pres't. Shelton, it is thought best to postpone the centennial meeting at Jackson from the 29th of April to June 1st.

The commencement exercises of the University will be held on Thursday, June 1st and it is desirable to have a large attendance of trustees and friends of education on that occasion. By having the centennial meeting at the same time, in the evening, it is thought will be a convenience to many who would not be able to visit Jackson twice within a month.

We, therefore, invite the friends of the University to come to the centennial mass meeting on the evening of June 1st, and at the same time be present at the examination and commencement of the University.

Brethren who intend to be present will do us a favor by sending their names before hand, and entertainment will be prepared for them. C. R. HENDRICKSON, Chairman Ex Com.

ITEMS.

A Montreal firm has brought suit for \$3,000 against the Sisters of Providence for "wrongfully and fraudulently" infringing on one of its patent medicines. As the nuns travel free or at half fare under the cloak of charity, and appoint priests as agents, they prove dangerous competitors.

The open communion organ in New York, recounting the doctors who it knows sympathize with its view, has openly claimed Dr. Burlington of St. Louis, and the Doctor does not deny the charge. Four others, hitherto not prominent, are now mentioned, and Dr. Behrends has already gone to Rome.

Nashville is beautifully located and nearly each of the seven hills that surround the city is crowned with costly educational institution. The Vanderbilt University has cost thus far \$700,000; the Fisk University \$175,000; the Central College of the M. E. Church South \$50,000; the Baptist Theological Institute \$150,000; the State University of Tennessee \$500,000.

Rev. M. M. Parkhurst, in one of his addresses at the missionary anniversary in Indianapolis, held recently, dropped every significant remark. Alluding to his late round-the-world trip, "In all my travels," he said, "I never saw a new heathen temple. All the pagan worship I witnessed was in an old, dilapidated temple." "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old," saith the inspired writer of Hebrews, "is ready to vanish away." How different is the aspect of Christianity to-day!

Where Originate Failures. A good brother writing about Centennial matters, says: "I do not think much can be done in — church. Their pastor is indifferent to the Centennial work, and it is doubtless through his influence that the church has failed to act. He also preaches at other points in the Association, where his influence will probably have the same effect." Cannot the deacons, brothers and sisters in those churches drive the Centennial work in spite of such pastors?

COMMENCEMENTS.

Or the Mary Sharp College, Winchester, Tenn., examination commences June 12th. Commencement day June 16th. Eld. Geo. Lofton is to preach the commencement sermon Sunday, June 10th.

We regret being obliged to decline delivering the literary address at Waco University, having engaged to preach the sermon before the Reuben Rose Society of Bethel College the same day.

The commencement of Southwestern Baptist University will take place June 5th. Bro. H. H. Jackson will please make the proper announcements in

ARE YOU GOING?

THE Southern Baptist Convention meets in Richmond, Va., on the First Baptist church, on Tuesday, May 11th. The Committee on Hospitalities urgently request— 1. That all delegates intending to attend will so notify immediately by writing Messrs. Starke and Ryland, 913 Main Street. 2. That boards or other appointing bodies will designate delegates at once. 3. That delegates on arrival will please report for assignment to homes at the First Baptist church, corner Twelfth and Broad streets. J. B. WATKINS, Chairman Hospitality Committee.

THE PAPACY.

ONCE give Catholics the ascendancy in this government and religious freedom is at an end. Let those who doubt read the following utterances from high papal authority and be convinced: "Hereby and indubitably have, not and never had, and never can have any right, being, or they undeniably are, contrary to the law of God."—Brownson's Quarterly, Jan., 1855.

For Shepherd of the Valley, a Catholic paper published in St. Louis, says: "In the future, when we shall have gained the ascendancy in this country, as we surely shall, then it will be time, even as our enemies now say, that there will be no more religious liberty, as there ought not to be."

"Protestantism of every form has not, and never can have any right where dominion is triumphant; and, therefore, we lose the breath we expend in declaiming against bigotry and intolerance, and in favor of religious liberty, or the right of any man to be of any religion as best please him."—Catholic Review, Jan., 1855.

"Religious liberty is merely endured until the opposite can be carried into execution without peril to the Catholic world."—Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburgh.

"If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will, an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country will be at an end."—Archbishop of St. Louis. "Hereby and unbelief are crimes; and in Christian countries, as in Italy and Spain, for instance, where the Catholic religion is the essential law of the land, they are punished as other crimes."—Archbishop Kendrick.

"The Catholic church numbers one-third of the American population, and if its membership shall increase for the next thirty years as it has for the thirty years past, in 1900 Rome will have a majority, and be bound to take the country and keep it."—Father Hecker's Lecture in New York.

That the grade of Catholic schools is low is demonstrated from the following facts: Five years ago Dr. J. R. Graves and his brother, Prof. Z. C. Graves, offered a premium of \$1000 in gold for a graduate of any Catholic school in America, who, on strict examination, could enter the junior class of Mary Sharp College, and not one has been found. If they had offered this premium to the graduates of Waco University, or of twenty other Baptist schools in the South, they would have lost it long ago.

Again I would ask those deluded by the boasted superiority of Catholic schools, why are Italy, Spain, Mexico and Ireland, so long blessed with these superior Catholic schools, the most ignorant countries in Christendom? Does not the Bible say: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Why are these countries one hundred and fifty years behind their Protestant neighbors, Germany, Scotland and America.

To all these facts there is one overwhelming, logical argument. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" For in the face of all these facts, there are not less than one thousand Texas Baptist children in Catholic schools, and Catholic schools are springing up as by magic in Galveston, Houston, San Antonio, Austin, Waco, Dallas, Denison, Paris, Clarksville and Jefferson. All largely supported by Baptist money and, I fear, at the eternal damnation of Baptist children.

All these facts demonstrate that "The man of sin," "The son of perdition," "Whose coming was in the beginning with all deceivableness," has lost none of his strength power to make the nations of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornication; when menant her power to delude the nations of the earth by her beautiful, yet adulterous mixture of Pagan and Papal superstitions.

I believe with the celebrated Carson that the Catholic priests we inspired with Satanic wisdom to smix up the legends of Greece and Rome with the religion of Jesus and to adapt it to the weakness and passions of the human heart, as to render its fatal power almost irresistible over the unconverted, the ignorant and the young.—Texas Baptist.

Farm and Home.

Under this heading we propose to write our own thoughts, and gather the best thoughts of others, that we think may benefit the farmer.

TWELVE RULES FOR SUCCESSFUL FARMING.

- 1. Drain your wet, boggy land. 2. Plow deep and loosen the subsoil. 3. Provide good shelter for your manure, and make it you possibly can by bedding with leaves and straw. 4. Use those commercial fertilizers intelligently, and do not use one in excess of another simply because others have used it.

- 5. Manure every crop which benefits by it, and manure wisely. 6. Cultivate only safe, paying crops, and select the best seed for these. 7. Change your seed, at least every five years, especially your cotton and corn. 8. By all means make a plenty of hay, and let your fodder remain on the stack. 9. Feed plentifully of the best hay and peas, and run all your roughness through a chopper. 10. Breed stock, and let not mere accident control the increase. 11. Support breeding and feeding by proper care. 12. Be wise in time, and commence at once and plant a few thousand of the Pyraanth Hedge Plant yearly, and soon your farm will be under a permanent fence, and you will be relieved of the heaviest tax you now have to pay, and a tax that is growing heavier every year. Circulars containing full description sent free from this office. ROCHELL.

UNHAPPY HOMES.—Every day we see long lists of names appearing in the accounts of the proceedings of the divorce courts. What does it mean? It means that the youth of this day are not properly reared. The daughters, especially, are not taught any practical or useful knowledge that fits them to make a one what it should be. No matter if you are rich as Croesus, teach all your girls the art—for art it is—of house-keeping. Force them to learn to bake, to cook meats and plain food, to keep the house in order, and in all the minutiae pertaining to house-keeping. Then, when father's or or husband's wealth takes wings (as it is very apt to do in this country), your daughter may be able to make two in rooms as comfortable and homelike as that place was in other days. Also fit your girls for life, by teaching them some trade or profession, by which they may, if need be, live independent of other aid.—[Golden Dawn.

A START on THE ROAD TO PROSPERITY.—We are in receipt of a circular from three gentlemen in Summit, Miss. H. Cassidy, W. Lee Patton and J. H. Mills, who were appointed to address the people of Pike, Amite, Franklin, and other counties on the subject of getting up a cotton mill in Summit, with the Clements' attachment for the manufacturing of cotton yarns, and domestics, etc. We know that this is a start in the right direction. We know Col Whitfield to be a perfect success. We know Col Whitfield to be a reliable gentleman. We have seen its work. Its thread is on our table, smooth, even and strong, superior to any thread we ever saw made by the old plan. When every county will put up a factory with this attachment, the prosperity of the South will be established. The mills of the Northeast will be compelled to come to the cotton fields of the South.

We have a little farm near Summit, and we feel a lively interest in the prosperity of the place and the county, and we will subscribe one or two bales to the stock of the company to assure every one who knows us that with the right men to manage, it is bound to be a success. Send to H. Cassidy for a circular.

It is only good farming that pays. Five bushels of corn, or one quarter of a bale of cotton to the acre will never pay. But a bale of cotton and twenty five to forty bushels of corn to the acre will prove remunerative; and this much can be done by manuring our lands and adopting the best methods of working them. Try good farming this year. It never fails to pay.

PERYCARANTH HEDGE PLANTS can be planted until the middle of May in Middle Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana and Missouri. The ground will be warm and the plants will grow off. Don't be a few 500 or 1000, and make a start. Send your orders to us or to T. H. McGowen, at Magnolia, Miss. He will send you a circular with full instructions. Plant a hedge, at least enough to fence in your orchard, to protect the young trees against rabbits and your fruit from thieves; or fence your garden, and protect it against rabbits and hens; or your front yard, and thus beautify your home.

RAY'S CORN—EARLY AND PRODUCTIVE.—"It will make more on poor ground, stand drouth better, and the same quantity will feed further; it is richer in its [stapling qualities]." We had this from the lips of Bro. Lowrey, editor of Mississippi Department, and his word can be relied upon, as can our old friend and brother, Dr. M. W. Phillips. It was on their testimony that we consented to act as agent to secure to our patrons the pure, genuine article. So much is sold for Ray's Corn, as there is for Java Cotton, that it is not the genuine. We say to every farmer try one peck if not one bushel. Better for poor neighbors to join together and send for a bushel. But we want to give away one hundred bushels of Ray Corn and Java Seed this and next month to our patrons. How?

1. To every single subscriber—we have twelve hundred, and you are if you get your paper in a wrapper by itself—who will get one new subscriber (\$1.70) we will send two nice packages of Corn or Java, one for the new subscriber and one for the getter; and we will duplicate it for each one you get. Want you do it?

2. To each one, whether you have been dropped or not, who will renew within thirty days we will send a nice package of the Corn or Java Seed.

3. To each one who will send a new subscriber for one year (\$2.70) we will send two packages, worth many times the cost of the paper to you. Will not all get a package? You can plant this corn as late as June and make a crop. Plant all your late crop in this variety.

SEED.—Don't listen to those who cry "humbug" at everything new. You know that you should change your seeds, cotton, and corn and potatoes. We advise and urge you, for your interest, to get one bushel of the Java Prolific, for three reasons: 1. It is fully three weeks earlier. 2. Its yields at least 50 per cent more lint than the common seed, and 3. A crop will bring more in the market. Twenty of the most reliable planters in Mississippi testify over their own names to these facts. Five dollars expended for this seed will be worth one hundred dollars to any farmer in the land. We have tried it, and know what we say. We will secure the genuine seed for any one. We are the authorized agent of Mr. McCarley in this city, and will send the genuine, unmixd seed for \$5.00 per bushel.

OUR WOOD.—Will our farmer brethren listen to one word of advice from us. Don't say, "What does a preacher or an editor know about our work and farming?" Not much it is true, if he has no practical experience. We have more years of experience than most who read these lines. With only a few years exception, we have had soil of our own to cultivate, and we have experimented and observed. But now we only wish to exhort you to do what you know is right, as well as we. You are about pitehing your crop for 1876, don't commit the blunder that is almost a crime, of past years, and plant all cotton or half cotton.

Make corn, sorgho and meat enough to feed your place, and plant cotton for your surplus crop, and don't go one dollar in debt this year.

Whether you owe or not, if you will do this you will be better off one year from this day than you will be if you plant cotton and go in debt for supplies. Don't go in debt. Drink your tea and coffee without sugar; they are in fact better, more healthy without it than with it. Wear, all hands, your old clothes, only keep them clean; brush them up nicely. Better wear yours, if paid for, than the merchant's. Cultivate what you plant well; work diligently, and don't spend your Saturdays in town with your boys, which is a pernicious habit. The man that forgets to he must throw up work Saturday to go to town is a hopeless case. But we have given our advice.

Don't buy a dollar's worth to feed your family and stock; raise it this year, and then make all the cotton you can, and you are safe.

JAVA PROLIFIC COTTON SEED, CANTON, Miss., Nov. 16, 1875. N. C. ORRICK, Esq.: Dear Sir:—In answer to your inquiries, I take pleasure in stating that I planted this year several acres with the Java Prolific Cotton seed. I am highly pleased with the result; it is early, branches well, yields largely of lint, and is altogether more profitable to plant than any other cotton I have ever planted. My stand of it was none other than I yielded more per acre than Dickson's Giant, yet it yielded more at the same time, although Dickson's was on much better ground. The yield of Java, was about two (2) bales per acre. JOHN HARRIS.

CANTON, Miss., Nov. 17, 1875. Mr. W. B. McCarley.—Dear sir: I planted 1 1/2 acres with your Java Seed; the soil was very poor hill land and the stand had I have gathered from the piece of ground over six bales. There can be no question about the superiority of the seed, for the same ground could not have produced more than half the amount had it been planted with ordinary seed. Very Respectfully, N. C. ORRICK.

CANTON, Miss., Nov. 8th, 1875. This is to certify that I planted four acres, common hill land without manure, with the Java Prolific Seed, and made four bales of cotton, 450 pounds each, thereon, and consider it the most prolific cotton I ever planted, and have been a Madison County planter for twenty years. Jno. M. FORRAN.

You can plant Java in June and make a crop.

Mississippi Department.

ALDEN M. P. LOWREY, Editor.

All communications desired for this Department should be addressed to the Editor at Ripley, Mississippi.

INFANT SALVATION.

ACCORDING to request, we give our views briefly on this subject. Let it be remembered, however, that as to the fact that all dying in infancy are saved there has been no difference of opinion among our correspondents who have written on the subject.

ACCORDING to request, we give our views briefly on this subject. Let it be remembered, however, that as to the fact that all dying in infancy are saved there has been no difference of opinion among our correspondents who have written on the subject.

That they are saved is also according to Scripture David's child dying in infancy was saved, and his was, morally, just like all other children.

that they are saved, how are they saved? that is the question. We answer, by the mediation of Christ. His mediation is based upon his covenant with the Father. We quote here from Ed. R. D. Miller's sermon on "Infant Salvation," published in this Department of March 15th, 1873.

We deem it unnecessary to say any more on this subject, and here we leave it. Every Christian has entrusted his own soul to the Savior, and he will be faithful; the same Savior will take care of all the little ones he takes from earth in infancy.

"So let our lips and lives express The holy gospel we profess; So let our works and virtues shine, To prove the doctrine all divine."

NOTES.

"Why do not Dr. Graves and the Religious Herald make friends?" Because there is too much human nature in the way.

The next meeting of the Mississippi Baptist State Convention will be held, D. V., in Jackson, Miss., commencing on Thursday before the first Lord's day in July.

"S." says, in regard to his article "About Saturday Meetings": "My object is to draw out the editor more fully on the subject. It is an important one, and our church here is almost upon the verge of excommunicating (or pruning) many rotten branches for neglecting church conferences."

ELD. T. J. WALKS intended being at the Sunday-school Convention of Tippah Association this week, but has concluded to go to Aberdeen to hold a series of meetings. May the Lord bless his labors there.

"Let us earnestly pray that the presence of the Lord may be with us in all the session of the Convention." So writes Bro. Webb in reference to the contemplated Convention at Jackson. We commend his suggestion to the brethren and sisters all over the State.

"Why have you not published our —?" It was so long. Condense! that is the way to get into crowded columns. Make yourself little.

CENTENNIAL SERIES—WHO HAVE BEEN THE FRIENDS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, AND WHO HAVE NOT?

BY J. W. SANFORD. Chapter 5.

"Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Matt. vii. 16.

HENRY VIII, the father and founder of the Church of England, after a reign of thirty-eight years of tyranny, died in 1547, having fined, persecuted, banished, and burned seventy-two thousand persons.

He was succeeded by his son, Edward VI, who ascended the throne at the age of nine years and six months. Though so young, his reign was better than his father's. He was, it is said, "a prince for learning and piety, for acquaintance with the world and application to business, the very wonder of the age."

His coronation seemed to be a harbinger of better days for England, especially to the oppressed, the persecuted and exiled. Prison doors were thrown open, the laws against the Lollards repealed, the people allowed to read the Bible.

The Baptists who had been driven into exile and concealment by Henry were encouraged by this to appear again and publicly worship and teach.

But they were destined to meet the same sad fate as before. Cranmer, Latimer, Rogers, and Ridley, with their hate for Baptists, were there to influence the young king. These men, with Somerset, the protector (i. e., had the care of the kingdom during the king's minority), with others of like character, commenced at once their alterations in the national faith.

On the day of Edward's coronation the Archbishop reminded him "That being God's vicergerent and Christ's vicar in his own dominions, he was obliged to follow the precedent of Josias, to take care that the worship of God was under due regulations, to suppress idolatry, remove images, and discharge the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome."

Notwithstanding the influence of the cruel, relentless men, the young king in a great measure was mild and gentle. He issued a proclamation of pardon to all prisoners except the Anabaptists, and those guilty of treason.

The first instance of martyrdom for conscience sake was the burning of Joan Boucher, and when a friend pleaded with Rogers, a divinity reader of St. Paul's church, to use his influence to save her, he refused, saying that to burn was no cruel death, but easy enough. The friend who was holding fast to Rogers's hand, was so astonished that he released his hold, and striking Rogers's hand, said, "Well, perhaps it may so happen that you yourself shall have your hands full of this mild burning." Rogers was the first man burned under the reign of Mary.

In 1551 George Van Pare, a Baptist, was burned at Smithfield, and "kissed the stake and fagots that were to burn him," and did more to expose the tyranny and cruelty of Archbishop Cranmer than any one before him.

In the same year a fresh commission was issued against Anabaptists.

An council was called, and its proceedings were chiefly aimed against Anabaptists. This proves that they were no mean sect in numbers and influence, for had they been all these measures were not necessary to suppress them. Israel in bondage "grew and multiplied." If we conceive of the Baptists of Germany, Holland, England, and France at this age, (16th century), or any other age since Christ, as being a "few dissenters" here and there, we have mistaken views of the subject. Baptists have always formed an important and influential element in every age and nation; persecution and hate, fire and sword, have always proved futile in their efforts to exterminate or oppress them. The battering rams of sin and the gates of hell have made assault after assault on these people in vain, because in attacking them they assailed truth, and in a war against truth they rushed blindly against the buckler of God, where the nations of earth are dashed to pieces as the potter's vessel.

Under the reign of the amiable and gentle Edward, (for such he was), Calvinists, Lutherans and Romanists were exempted from persecution. Baptists were

not, because they opposed infant baptism and contended for freedom of conscience.

They were all amiable sovereigns! but if I had the power "I would put a tongue in every wound—poor dumb mouths—that they might speak."

This day's work was the birth of proscription and bloodshed more black and awful than England had seen it for many years. A reckoning was made with those who had opposed Romanism with Cranmer, Ridley and Rogers, who had been so vigilant in displacing the papal power, and who had hunted and burned Baptists with a frantic zeal, were burned at the stake. Persecution raged throughout the empire. Mary drank deep at the fountain of revenge; her mother had been divorced by Henry, and most of the prominent men in the nation assented to it, and she was wreaking vengeance by kindling their funeral piles and bathing her hands in their blood.

Baptists were, with her, special objects of hate. David George's bones were dug up and burned because it was ascertained that he was an Anabaptist.

In Mary's short reign of five years 277 persons were burned.

Mary was succeeded by Elizabeth, her sister, who was as zealous a Protestant as Mary had been Catholic. She at once took the power from the pope and gave it again to the crown.

There was, however, one trouble in the way. It would not do for her to declare herself "Supreme head of the Church," as Henry VIII. had done, as Macaulay truly says, "it seemed monstrous that a woman should be the chief bishop of a church in which as apostle had forbidden her even to let her voice be heard." (If the apostles had ever had anything to do with that church no such question would ever have arisen.) She however obviated this by "disclaiming the sacerdotal character which her father had assumed." But "she retained over the church a vital power of vast and indefinite extent."

Protestantism was again restored and the power given to the crown. What a turmoil was here. What a national confusion arises from a national religion. Within less than a half century the religion of the empire undergoes four distinct changes.

It was not a question of who was right, but it was who had the power? As often as the crown changed heads, so often did many prominent men change their religion. So long as Edward lived the religion of the land must be Protestantism. During Mary's life it must be Romanism. Had Mary given birth to a heir, or had Lady Jane Grey succeeded in her efforts to obtain the English crown, it would still have been Romanism. Elizabeth takes the throne, and it is Protestantism.

"On what slender threads eternal things do hang!" Is this not a lesson on the absurdity of alliance of church and State?

Elizabeth at once displaced the Roman pontiffs, and restored the Protestants. Her proclamation of liberty to all Protestants led the Baptists to hope for freedom, and many Dutch and German Baptists came to England hoping to enjoy their long-sought boon, religious liberty. But Baptist sentiments were incompatible with the politico-religious condition of England. Disputes at once arose, and the Baptists, with the Bible in their hands, drove their opponents from the field. This was too much for the established church to endure, and in 1560 "Elizabeth put forth a proclamation commanding all Anabaptists to depart from the realm in twenty-one days."

From this regal warning some Baptists fled, but the greater part obscured themselves. They only waited for things to quiet a little, and reappeared. Many Baptists came now from Flanders, Holland and other countries, having heard that Elizabeth was an amiable queen. ("Brutus was an honorable man! They were all honorable men.")

But there was no favor shown to Baptists. The fires of Smithfield were again kindled, and John Wheelmaker and Henry Toorwood (Baptists) were burned. Elizabeth was an amiable queen! All the rulers of England were amiable sovereigns! Cruelties continued, splitting noses, cutting off ears, pillorying, imprisoning, etc.

They were all amiable sovereigns! but if I had the power "I would put a tongue in every wound—poor dumb mouths—that they might speak."

Protestantism and Romanism were one and the same thing to Baptists, they were reviled and persecuted, and all manner of evil said against them falsely for Christ's sake.

It was not a question of close communion. Baptists were not allowed to commune unless it was in some very "close" place where they could not be found.

It was not of the act of baptism, for Elizabeth required immersion of even the infants. But it was because of Baptist opposition to infant baptism, and the alliance of church and State.

As yet in our research we find Baptists alone in contending for freedom of conscience, and they made warm times for the enemies of soul freedom in that they ever contended against oppression of conscience, and their war against it will never cease as long as a vestige of oppression of conscience remains.

(To be Continued.)

NOTE.—For full history of the above see Macaulay's Hist. Eng. Vol. i, chap. ii; Benedict's Hist. of Bap. chap. vi. sec. 1 and 2. Struggles and Triumphs of Relig. Lib., Underhill, sec. 1, 2, 3, 4; Hist. Eng. Bap. Orchard, sec. 9, 10 and 11; Bap. Denom., Hayne's, p. 50; Bap. Sac., Ray, chap. iv; Moshom's Ch. Hist., McLain's trans., p. 44

AN APPEAL TO THE LADY MEMBERS OF OUR CHURCHES.

MY DEAR SISTERS.—In this great year of enterprise, this centennial year, when all our churches are enlisted so enthusiastically in the cause of education, other important branches of our work, as a just consequence, are languishing, nay, suffering, notably, that of missions. Indeed, so great has been the falling away in contributions to this department of Christian enterprise, that, though we have not many laborers in foreign fields, the Foreign Mission Board has seriously thought of calling some of them home, fearing that the contents of the treasury will be insufficient to insure them a support. Many of these devoted sons and daughters of Zion, whose lives are full of toil and sacrifice at best, have largely retrenched their salaries, and one noble brother has relinquished his entirely! Should it not sadden our hearts to think of the sufferings they endure, not only from troubles and difficulties which surround them, but from neglect at home? In this extremity, Dr. Tupper (Secretary of the Board) appeals to the ladies of the cross, this heroic behalf of these heralds of the cross, this heroic advance guard of Christianity. Sisters, will you suffer that appeal to say, nay! Here is an opportunity to display your love for the Master and his cause. Here is a test for your loyalty. In you lies a dormant power, a capacity for work, which, if utilized, would accomplish wonderful results. Mission work is a noble, a grand field for your energies and sympathies, if once aroused, and furnishes ample scope for your zeal to serve Christ. I think, too, that it has a peculiar claim upon us, inasmuch as in no heathen country is woman excluded to her proper sphere and place in society, but is allied to her proper sphere and place in society, but is ever conigned to an inferior position, and in some lands degraded almost to the level of the domestic animal, until the beneficent influence of Christianity prunes away the barbarous customs and superstitions. It has also been said that the evangelization of the heathen must be accomplished through the mothers, and we know their customs are such that women can be reached only by women. Should not we, then, be more deeply interested in sending women to them?

I suppose there are very few who love the name of Jesus that do not give something when the pastor takes up a collection, or the agents come; but what is needed is a regular, systematic way of giving. Contributing a few cents at church, once a year, never knowing for what purpose, save that it is for missions, will never awaken much interest; and some plan should be adopted which would bring the work nearer our hearts, and enlist our warmest feelings and our most earnest prayers. Our sisters in the Northern and Western churches band together in societies, or circles they call them, contribute so much each month, procure the best literature, with the latest news from the fields, and meet monthly to discuss mission topics, promote the interests of the societies, and pray together for the Savior's blessing upon their work. The churches are thus thoroughly organized for mission work, and those whom they have sent to

foreign lands need have no fears about a maintenance, but know that their support rests upon a firm and substantial basis. It is astonishing to read, even in the monthly reports from the head offices of these united circles, (all are associated in one grand society), and see so much done with apparently so little effort. But this serves to show what unity of purpose and action may accomplish. There are some such societies in the South, but they are few and far between. Why should there not be one in every church? Wherever there are half a dozen Christian ladies surely one or two active workers may be found who would be willing to engage in this, and organize a society among themselves. Perhaps some one with a view to so doing would like to know something more about them, to understand more fully their design, and manner of work. To such a few words descriptive of the one with which the writer is connected would be uninteresting. We number about fifteen regular members, with five honorary members, (the latter are gentlemen), are governed by a constitution—

too long to be given here—meet at a private house on the evening of the third Sabbath in each month. Our officers are, president, vice-president, treasurer, corresponding and recording secretaries. The duties of each will, of course, be understood by the names. The pastor of our church opens the meetings by reading an appropriate lesson from Scripture, and offering prayer, after which the minutes are read, the dues paid in, and other business, such as receiving new members, electing honorary members, making changes or appointments, attended to, or any other business which may come up before the society. Letters and communications are read by the corresponding secretary. Selections from missionary literature are also read, with original papers by the members. This is an agreeable feature of the meetings, and might be made most deeply interesting and profitable. This society, in connection with one other, is supporting a native Bible woman in China, under the supervision of a lady missionary in Canton. Other societies might simply send their contributions to the Board, to be disposed of to the best advantage.

A correspondence is sustained with this lady, in Canton, which is productive of great good, her letters alone being sufficient to keep our hearts warm in the work and our zeal brightly glowing. Mrs. Hovey, Corresponding Secretary W. M. B. Newton Centre Mass., kindly supplied us with a number of instructive and zeal begetting tracts and papers. We take also the Macedonian, a paper published in Boston, entirely in the interest of missions. Our Southern churches cannot boast such a paper, but the Religious Herald, published in Richmond, contains a department for this work. A box, containing many Chinese tracts, was sent us when Mr. Simmons returned from Canton recently. A marble idol, intended to represent the Goddess of Mercy, sent by the Bible woman, has excited not a little interest. This woman will send us reports of her work through our correspondence, and we will know precisely what we are doing, thus bringing the work close to our hearts, and causing it to assume an air of reality. For this reason, if no other, the society plan is best, for we cannot fail to become interested, when brought into such close relations with the results of our labor.

Dear sister, do not, I beg you, cast this paper aside with the resolution of simply making your offering a little larger. Of course it will cost some trouble to organize a society, and perhaps be a little difficult to arouse the sympathies of the cold and formal Christian, but the pleasure will amply compensate for the trouble, and besides, the labor of love would bring great depths of joy to your heart. Again, can anything be too much trouble when the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom is the object? Can you think of Galvary, the nails, the spear, the cruel thorns, and the Lord, thou askest too much of me? Nay, shrink it not! Lord, thou askest too much of me. Can you not take time when your Savior would have you work for him? When the Master calls will you refuse to answer? Could you behold him covered with blood, and quivering with pain, while his voice, faltering with misery and love, says, "All this is for thee," and then refuse your very life, if he should ask it? How much less, then, a little sacrifice of selfish ends!

If any would like to obtain other information from me, with reference to organizing a society, my address may be had of Mr. Lowrey, and I will cheerfully give all the knowledge I have about them.

COR. SEC. MISSION SOCIETY.

CONSCIENCE—J. W. SANFORD'S VIEWS.

IN THE BAPTIST of March 18th, page 205, in an article by J. W. Sanford, entitled "Religious Liberty," after giving Weyland's definition of conscience, and what is the authority of conscience, proceeds by way of endorsement to say, "To follow conscience there is a probability of man going wrong, yet to fail to follow it there is no possibility of him being right."

I ask, is it true that a person may do wrong if he follows the teaching of conscience, and yet do wrong if he violates it?

Take, for example, the person whose conscience teaches him that he should have his child sprinkled. We believe he does wrong in having it done, and yet if the theory be correct, he does wrong if he neglects to have it done.

So with the person whose conscience tells him he is baptized if sprinkled. He does wrong if sprinkled, and does wrong if not sprinkled.

Take the Jews, of whom Paul speaks in Rom. x. 1-2. They were conscientious, and yet they sought to establish their own righteousness. Did they do right in seeking to establish it? And would they have done wrong if they had not have sought to?

Take Paul himself, Acts xxii. 3, 4, and xxvi. 9, 11. Was he doing right? And would he certainly have done wrong if he had not have done so?

Do you say he was violating the rights of others, and therefore should be restrained. But how, if his conscience told him he was doing right? Would he not have been guilty of doing wrong if he had not have done so?

Then would not restraint have been a violation of his conscience?

But grant that he should have been restrained. Ought not those who have their children sprinkled to be restrained for the same reason? Do they not violate the rights of others?

Would I do right in following any person to do wrong? Would I do wrong in not following him, he believing he was right?

Yet suppose this person has so instructed my conscience that I believe it right to follow him. Is there no possibility of my doing right but by following him, even though I do wrong if I follow him? And why should I follow my conscience which he has perverted any, sooner than him who perverted it?

Is it true that a person does wrong when he violates a perverted conscience? or that he does right in following a perverted one? Is a person ever justifiable in following the dictates of conscience, only as his conscience teaches him to do right?

Is it not one's duty to know, if he may, that his conscience is not perverted? How did Paul regard the matter? 1 Cor. xv. 9, and 1 Tim. i. 13. Did he think that he did right in following a perverted conscience?

J. W. S. says: "This being true, how in the name of reason can any man or set of men claim the right to direct in matters of conscience for a fellow man?" I answer, according to the theory, simply because conscience tells them that it is right. And though it is wrong to do so, it is equally wrong not to do so.

So they do wrong by doing right, or do right by doing wrong. "I know," J. W. S. says, "that conscience will never tell a man to compel his neighbor in any matter touching conscience." This I am not prepared to accept. Neither man nor State has any right to compel a man's conscience in matters of religious faith and devotion, but the person is responsible to God for its exercise. Acts xxiv. 16.

TO THE BAPTISTS IN THE LEGISLATURE.

I AM informed that there are about forty or fifty members of the Mississippi Legislature who are members of Baptist churches, but I have no other evidence of this fact, for although the Legislature has been in session for three months, we have rarely had thirty of the members at our Sabbath services, and generally not more than a dozen, or even less. And at our pray-meetings we have seldom seen more than two or three. Why is this?

I have seen members around the corner near the Capitol on Sunday, but it seemed they were in bad health on Sunday.

We have one of the best preachers in the State, a comfortable house, and it is hard to see why visiting brethren cannot worship with us.

Some of these members are ministers of the gospel. Did they lay aside the Christian ministers when they assumed that of law-makers, and did all forget that God claims their services in Jackson as well as at home.

We have the reputation and justly of having a very immoral community, but I submit that its morals will never be improved by inconsistent church members.

I think it would be well for brethren who visit this (or any other place) to stay for some weeks, to bring with them letters of commendation from the churches of which they are members and place themselves in sympathy with the churches where they visit. It would help them, and they would encourage and help the church, and would at the same time place themselves under its watchcare.

We may when among strangers imagine that we can do things without being noticed, that we would not do at home, but it is not so. Inconsistencies will be noticed, and gross immorality commented upon very severely.

J. T. BUCK. Jackson Miss., April 8th 1876

OBITUARY.

B. V. BARK was born in Dallas county, Alabama January 23rd 1823. Professed religion and joined the Baptist church at Mount Zion in Choctaw county, Mississippi in 1842. Was married to Fannie Winslow March 1st 1843, and died in the Christian faith and hope December 5th 1875. He was consequently 52 years 10 months and 12 days of age.

He sang "Amazing Grace," and "Alas and did my Saviour bleed," in his dying hours and bid the world farewell.

Brother B. was a devoted husband and father and a kind neighbor. He left a large circle of relatives and friends to mourn his loss.

ALICE L. BARK was born in Choctaw county, Miss., January 25th, 1837, and died in hope of heaven through Jesus's mercy February 13th, 1876, aged nineteen years and eighteen days. She expressed a trusting faith in Jesus's love and mercy, saying, when she came to die, that she had prayed to him in secret and he had heard her prayer. Her sufferings were intense, but lasted only thirty-six hours. So quickly God called away one in the bloom of life and health. Hark, ye young and gay! Be ye also ready, for tomorrow the solemn call may come. She left a living mother, brothers and sisters to weep for her. We sympathize with them.

Arkansas Department.

The Christian should make everything bend to his religion, and allow religion to bend to nothing.—J. L. JAMES. There is no middle ground between Catholics and Baptists. All the sects practicing infant sprinkling are branches or offshoots of the Catholic olive tree, and they are with it partakers of its root and "bitterness" (i. e., Judaism).—B. Rev. J. T. TRAVERS, Bp. of Strasburg.

UNBAPTIZED CHURCH MEMBERS.

THE above expression appears to be a contradiction in terms. But Dr. Lasher, who is traveling in England, finds such to be very common there. He relates a conversation he had with a very intelligent deacon on this subject. He said to the deacon, "How do you justify such a course, receiving members into your church without even a nominal baptism?" "Why," said he, "simply in this way: In the first place, we do not believe that we should bar from the Lord's table any who give evidence that they are Christians, even though they may not have attained to our conception of the ordinance of baptism. In the second place, we do not regard it as consistent to admit to the Lord's table those we cannot admit to membership in our churches, and therefore many of our members, and three of our six deacons, are Pedobaptists. But those of us who are Baptists do not regard these Pedobaptists as having been baptized at all. They have been only sprinkled, not baptized. And, therefore, in the third place, if we admit those who have been only sprinkled, we must admit others who, though they have not been sprinkled, have been no less baptized than have these. And thus it is that we have many in our churches that have been neither baptized nor sprinkled." "But some one will refer to the example of Mr. Spurgeon, and claim that such is not the case in his church, and that he does not fail to teach and to preach on the subject of baptism." "To such we answer that Mr. Spurgeon is not a fair example of an English Baptist, for he is so illogical as to admit to the Lord's table those whom he would not receive to membership in his church, and consequently he has no unbaptized persons in his church, while the unbaptized form a considerable proportion of a large number of the (so-called) Baptist churches of Great Britain." Admit this man's premise, and who can resist his conclusion? If profession of Christianity accompanied even with pious deportment secures a right to a seat at the Lord's table, then baptism is ignored. And if we may ignore baptism in one church privilege, we may ignore it in every one, and hence we have unbaptized church members. In these days of sentimentalism and

latitudinarianism, Landmark Baptists have an imperious mission, and they should "stand in the ways, and demand" for the old paths, which are the good ways, and walk therein." J. D. BRADY.

AN EXPLANATION.

BRO. EDITOR.—In THE BAPTIST of March 4th, 1876, there appeared an essay written by the writer of this on "the immortality of the soul," in which this remark occurs:

"As we have no account in the Scriptures of God breathing into any of the lower orders of animals, the breath of life, it is inferable at least, that man was a living creature when God made him." On motion of Brother Seary, "in a foot note," I rise to explain.

It seems to me that the difficulty in the mind of Bro. Seary, is in confounding the words create and make. He says if man was a living creature before God made him God was not his original creator, thus making create an make mean the same.

Webster defines, create, to produce; to bring into being from being nothing; to cause to exist; to make. To form of materials; to fashion; to mould into shape; to cause to exist in a different form, or as distinct thing.

According to the meaning of the word create, man was brought into existence as all other creatures. When God said, "let us make (fashion) man in our image after our likeness, I do not understand the language to convey the idea of create. But he made, fashioned him in this image, when he breathed upon or into man "nishmath hayyim," an immortal soul.

As I am not a Hebrew scholar I quote from an article, published in THE BAPTIST several years ago, by J. J. P. on the creation of man. He says, "If I should be asked to translate from the English into pure Hebrew the expression to endow man with an everlasting soul, I could find no other expression for it than this, 'Fayippah beappov nishmath hayyim.' He goes on to say that 'beappov means upon him or into him, that is all like the Greek 'pernapo,' he breathed into his person a nishmath hayyim.

Nishmath hayyim has no other meaning than the immortal soul."

Now if nishmath hayyim has no other meaning than the immortal soul, now it follows of necessity that it does not mean the breath of life.

The question now stands thus, If a man received his immortal soul when God breathed into him, and I have shown that the language means only the soul and no more, where did he receive his animal life? Who will rise and explain? Said one, around Edinburgh have forced me to the investigation of the immortality of the soul in man.

I have done the best I can, and as a humble enquirer after the truth, will you or any one who may read these lines give me light on this difficult point. If I have written you time, not according to truth, I ask God's mercy upon me. If what I have written is according to the truth of God he will bless it. I. T. CRAIG.

OBITUARY.

DIED in the village of Barnard Ark., on the 8th of Feb., Miss Emily Dupuy, aged eighty-seven. Miss Dupuy was born in Shelbyville, Ky., and was a lineal descendant of the Huguenot family of that name so celebrated in the history of Protestantism in France in the dark days of the Inquisition.

At an early age she made a profession of religion and through her long eventful life, under whatever trials and vicissitudes beset her path, she maintained a constant, a zealous and unerring devotion to the Savior, and in her last hours, while the sands of life were running out, her faith and trust in her Redeemer's love was steadfast and her last words, expressive of that sublimity which throws a mantle of golden sunshine around the Christians dying couch.

Long years had she stood waiting with her lamp trimmed and filled with oil to go forth to meet the bridegroom, and when the heavenly messenger called, with resignation peace and joy she exclaimed, "God knows best" "His will be done. She leaves many relations and friends to mourn her loss, yet with the same Christian resignation let us bow to the will of our Heavenly Father "who doeth all things well."

God has vouchsafed to the American Baptists during the past one hundred years, a degree of temporal and spiritual prosperity demanding the most profound gratitude and thanksgiving; such as should call forth not only lip service, but a munificent donation of money to his treasury.

Louisiana Department.

ELDER W. E. PAXTON, Editor. Communications intended for this Department should be sent to Rev. W. E. Paxton, Shreveport, La., but subscriptions and money should be sent to Rev. J. B. Graves, 301 Main St. Memphis, Tenn.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

THE great practical question with which we have to grapple in Louisiana, is how we are to maintain regular preaching in our churches. It is all well enough to tell the churches that it is their duty to support the ministry, and to urge the ministers to devote all their time to the work. But this does not meet the situation. We, no doubt, have pious ministers in the churches, and perhaps very few who fully appreciate their duty to God in this respect. But such are the impoverished condition of our country that if every church did its whole duty, not one church in twenty could support its pastor. With the great mass of our people it is a struggle to supply the necessities of life. We no doubt have ministers who are not content to preach; but the great body of our people would gladly devote their whole time to the work of the ministry if they could receive a bare support for themselves and their families. No one expects this support to be given by miraculous means.

Can one Baptist church put members into another Baptist church? The church at Shreveport gives a letter of dismission to Bro. A. H. H. presents this letter to the church at Mount Lebanon and is received into full fellowship and is no longer a member at S.

Would not the proper way for him to get back into his old church be to call for a letter of dismission from the church at Mount Lebanon. What Bro. Graves answers a question it is generally an end of all controversy with me, but this time I am not satisfied, possibly from the fact that a few years ago a church in my knowledge acted in accordance with Bro. Graves's answer and the action did not work well. All parties concerned came to the conclusion that the action was irregular.

What does our Louisiana editor think of it. Remarks.—The question presented by Bro. Hartsfield is one of no small difficulty. Can we venture to say that a church may not rescind her act in the reception of a member? Is she precluded by her act from retracing her steps? There are certainly some things which cannot be undone, and we are inclined to think this one of them. The letter stipulates, that the membership shall cease on the happening of the contingency named. When he is received by the church to whom he applies he certainly ceases to be a member of the church granting it, and he could only become one again by the act of the church itself. The church receiving him might so far rescind its acts as to cancel the membership in her own body but certainly she could not put him back again into the former church. In that event the party would stand in a very anomalous situation, certainly a simpler and more regular way would be to grant the party a new letter of dismission. Such action is irregular and can only produce confusion and should be avoided even if technically allowable.

OVER OUR OWN SIGNATURES.

DEAR BRO. PAXTON.—I see that Bro. Hartsfield thinks it would be a good idea for Louisiana writers in THE BAPTIST to write over their own signatures. No one should write an article that he is ashamed or afraid to own. But at the same time cases might arise in which a really good article would lose all its merit, with some by the association of the name of its author with the article, for there is none so great or pure but that he has some enemies, who would not read the article if the author were known. And then again there is a kind of modesty or a shrinking from the public notoriety, that a name in full would give, which is natural with some.

It is evident Bro. Hartsfield is anxious to know who "B" is and as he is such a good, kind soul, he could not want to know "B" only to commend him. Will as "B" is not at all ambitious of worldly fame, he is entirely satisfied to be criticized or applauded simply as "B." But if Bro. Hartsfield really desires to form "B's" acquaintance Bro. Paxton may introduce him privately by postal card.

BREVITIES.

BRADY and Mansfield have continued to call until they are getting a little hoarse. Bro. BRADY will soon ventilate the subject of ministerial support in our columns.

We learn that the Minden church is in a fair way to secure a suitable pastor, but we are not yet authorized to announce the matter definitely.

Our generous correspondents have so kindly remem-

bered us that we will surrender to them most of our space for some weeks to come. This affords a proof that our Louisiana brethren can write when they are waked up.

The Shreveport church has called Rev. Edward Lewis as pastor. Mr. Lewis is a German by birth, and of Jewish extraction. Six or seven years ago he was led to hear the preaching of one of Spurgeon's students who was visiting Germany, and an interest awakened in Christianity. He was then preparing for a Jewish Rabbi. That he might fully investigate the subject without the constraints of his family and people, he came to America. Coming to Richmond, he attended the ministry of Dr. Burrows, and was led to renounce Judaism and embrace Christianity. He was baptized by Dr. B. After attending the Richmond College three years, and the University of Virginia one, he entered upon the pastorate in one of the smaller towns in Virginia, but finding inadequate support he determined to come South. He comes recommended by Drs. Burrows, Boyce and Wilson. He has made a fine impression. We have a large Jewish element in our population, and many of them have attended his preaching.

QUERY.

DEAR BRO. PAXTON.—Our senior editor answers the query of "W. B. S." in THE BAPTIST of April 1st, in such a way as to lead me to ask another.

Can one Baptist church put members into another Baptist church?

The church at Shreveport gives a letter of dismission to Bro. A. H. H. presents this letter to the church at Mount Lebanon and is received into full fellowship and is no longer a member at S.

Would not the proper way for him to get back into his old church be to call for a letter of dismission from the church at Mount Lebanon.

What Bro. Graves answers a question it is generally an end of all controversy with me, but this time I am not satisfied, possibly from the fact that a few years ago a church in my knowledge acted in accordance with Bro. Graves's answer and the action did not work well. All parties concerned came to the conclusion that the action was irregular.

What does our Louisiana editor think of it. Remarks.—The question presented by Bro. Hartsfield is one of no small difficulty. Can we venture to say that a church may not rescind her act in the reception of a member? Is she precluded by her act from retracing her steps? There are certainly some things which cannot be undone, and we are inclined to think this one of them.

The letter stipulates, that the membership shall cease on the happening of the contingency named. When he is received by the church to whom he applies he certainly ceases to be a member of the church granting it, and he could only become one again by the act of the church itself. The church receiving him might so far rescind its acts as to cancel the membership in her own body but certainly she could not put him back again into the former church. In that event the party would stand in a very anomalous situation, certainly a simpler and more regular way would be to grant the party a new letter of dismission. Such action is irregular and can only produce confusion and should be avoided even if technically allowable.

What does our Louisiana editor think of it. Remarks.—The question presented by Bro. Hartsfield is one of no small difficulty. Can we venture to say that a church may not rescind her act in the reception of a member? Is she precluded by her act from retracing her steps? There are certainly some things which cannot be undone, and we are inclined to think this one of them. The letter stipulates, that the membership shall cease on the happening of the contingency named. When he is received by the church to whom he applies he certainly ceases to be a member of the church granting it, and he could only become one again by the act of the church itself. The church receiving him might so far rescind its acts as to cancel the membership in her own body but certainly she could not put him back again into the former church. In that event the party would stand in a very anomalous situation, certainly a simpler and more regular way would be to grant the party a new letter of dismission. Such action is irregular and can only produce confusion and should be avoided even if technically allowable.

OVER OUR OWN SIGNATURES.

DEAR BRO. PAXTON.—I see that Bro. Hartsfield thinks it would be a good idea for Louisiana writers in THE BAPTIST to write over their own signatures. No one should write an article that he is ashamed or afraid to own. But at the same time cases might arise in which a really good article would lose all its merit, with some by the association of the name of its author with the article, for there is none so great or pure but that he has some enemies, who would not read the article if the author were known. And then again there is a kind of modesty or a shrinking from the public notoriety, that a name in full would give, which is natural with some.

It is evident Bro. Hartsfield is anxious to know who "B" is and as he is such a good, kind soul, he could not want to know "B" only to commend him. Will as "B" is not at all ambitious of worldly fame, he is entirely satisfied to be criticized or applauded simply as "B." But if Bro. Hartsfield really desires to form "B's" acquaintance Bro. Paxton may introduce him privately by postal card.

BREVITIES.

BRADY and Mansfield have continued to call until they are getting a little hoarse. Bro. BRADY will soon ventilate the subject of ministerial support in our columns.

We learn that the Minden church is in a fair way to secure a suitable pastor, but we are not yet authorized to announce the matter definitely.

Our generous correspondents have so kindly remem-

bered us that we will surrender to them most of our space for some weeks to come. This affords a proof that our Louisiana brethren can write when they are waked up.

The Shreveport church has called Rev. Edward Lewis as pastor. Mr. Lewis is a German by birth, and of Jewish extraction. Six or seven years ago he was led to hear the preaching of one of Spurgeon's students who was visiting Germany, and an interest awakened in Christianity. He was then preparing for a Jewish Rabbi. That he might fully investigate the subject without the constraints of his family and people, he came to America. Coming to Richmond, he attended the ministry of Dr. Burrows, and was led to renounce Judaism and embrace Christianity. He was baptized by Dr. B. After attending the Richmond College three years, and the University of Virginia one, he entered upon the pastorate in one of the smaller towns in Virginia, but finding inadequate support he determined to come South. He comes recommended by Drs. Burrows, Boyce and Wilson. He has made a fine impression. We have a large Jewish element in our population, and many of them have attended his preaching.

WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THIS?

DEAR BRO. PAXTON.—A few years ago a Baptist minister in one of the villages of Louisiana received a proposition from a miller, who was a Methodist, to grind his corn for him, toll free.

The minister accepted the proposition as an act of kindness on the part of the miller and thus things went on for years, the one resolving the favor of the other.

It came to pass about two years ago that the Methodist and Presbyterian ministers of the village agreed to hold a "union meeting." The Baptist minister was invited to unite also in the meeting, but could not conscientiously do it.

The meeting was held however by the two first named denominations.

On Saturday after the close of the meeting the Baptist minister's sack of corn was sent to mill as usual, when the kind hearted miller sent him word that he could not grind for him any longer without tolling his corn.

G. W. HARTSFIELD.

THE POPE AND THE UNITED STATES.

THE Pope has officially eulogized the religious freedom of our country. In reply to an address sent from America to the imprisoned Archbishop Ledochowski of Posen, Pius the Ninth said:

The United States is the only country where I am really Pope in the eyes of the Government. I am always afraid lest European Governments shall oppose or control my acts, whereas I can freely send pontifical documents to the United States without fear of opposition on the part of its Governments.

And there is the secret of the growing power of Romanism in the country. It knows how to use our freedom and our politics and politicians for its own purposes. But give it final triumph and there will be a speedy end of religious and civil liberty. "Rome never changes," is its ancient boast. It can adapt itself to all men and circumstances, when it is a minority, but its majority means despotism in church and State. The Sultan's reported edict against the circulation of the Bible in his dominions is far less dangerous to its power over souls than the politic benedictions of the Pope upon American freedom, united with the universal proscription of the Scriptures in the language of the common people by the Roman hierarchy.

—Christian Intelligencer.

An open communionist said to Mr. B., an ecclesiastical Baptist preacher: "Bro. B., we ought all to eat together; it is our heavenly Father's table; my father let all of his children eat at the same table." Bro. B. "Yes; my father let all his children eat at the same table, too, but he made us wash our faces first."

On Mr. Spurgeon's return from his recent holiday he found some seventy converts awaiting baptism, the good work of saving souls not being flagged during his absence. During the past year 510 were added to the church, 208 went out to strengthen or form other churches, and 66 died, leaving a clear increase of 255. In speaking of these things Mr. Spurgeon says, "Our number is now 4,813. We must win for our Lord at least one soul each Sabbath, on our loss by death cannot be made up. Our Colortage Society now occupies forty-three districts."

NOW, IF EVER.

IF the time will ever come when the friends of our foreign mission operations should come up to the aid of the Board, that time is now at hand. The

THE VALUE OF THE BODY AND LUNG BRACE.

To Baptist ministers of the South:

I take this method of calling your attention to the celebrated Body and Lung Brace, the agency of which I have accepted that I may make it a benefit to you...

only tight when speaking or putting forth unusual effort. It is a preserver of a good voice and of a sound physical condition.

This invaluable article I am prepared to place within the easy reach of every Baptist minister of the South, and when he has worn it one month, or through one meeting, he will evermore be grateful to me.

I offer it to any one as a premium for 75 new subscribers to THE BAPTIST at \$2.50 and postage, 20 cents. Let the fact be known to your members that you need a Brace, and they will readily help you to secure it in this way.

TESTIMONIALS.

For the last two months I have suffered a great deal from sore-throat, from preaching and speaking. About the first of August my throat became sore that I became unable to preach...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: For the benefit of suffering females I desire to give you my experience in the use of the Banding Lung and Body Brace...

I have worn the Brace for thirty days, and I find it to do all it is recommended to do, and I advise all ministers and students to use it...

Consumption cured. If physicians are correct, in 1873 I bought a Brace. I was in the stage of consumption by the very best physicians...

I can preach day and night for 40 minutes with my lungs and throat as fresh as when I would not speak without it.

I have given the Brace a fair trial. I find it all that is claimed for it. I would not take \$100 for it...

I can preach without getting the least tired in my lungs, or hoarse. I would not be without it for the finest horse in Ohio county.

DEAR BRO: I feel myself this morning to write you a line and forward you some money for the Brace...

I have worn the Brace you sent me about thirty days, and am very much pleased with it.

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I have used your Brace six or seven years, broke it once a little, but I bought another one...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: This is to certify that I have worn the Banding Lung and Body Brace for about sixty days...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I received the Brace you sent me on the 29th of March, 1876. To truly test it I preached for ten days in succession...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: You made me a present, some three or four years ago, of one of Manning's Lung and Body Braces...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: For the benefit of suffering females I desire to give you my experience in the use of the Banding Lung and Body Brace...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I have worn the Brace for thirty days, and I find it to do all it is recommended to do, and I advise all ministers and students to use it...

Consumption cured. If physicians are correct, in 1873 I bought a Brace. I was in the stage of consumption by the very best physicians...

I can preach day and night for 40 minutes with my lungs and throat as fresh as when I would not speak without it.

I have worn the Brace for thirty days, and I find it to do all it is recommended to do, and I advise all ministers and students to use it...

Consumption cured. If physicians are correct, in 1873 I bought a Brace. I was in the stage of consumption by the very best physicians...

I can preach day and night for 40 minutes with my lungs and throat as fresh as when I would not speak without it.

I have given the Brace a fair trial. I find it all that is claimed for it. I would not take \$100 for it...

I can preach without getting the least tired in my lungs, or hoarse. I would not be without it for the finest horse in Ohio county.

DEAR BRO: I feel myself this morning to write you a line and forward you some money for the Brace...

I have worn the Brace you sent me about thirty days, and am very much pleased with it.

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I have used your Brace six or seven years, broke it once a little, but I bought another one...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: This is to certify that I have worn the Banding Lung and Body Brace for about sixty days...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I received the Brace you sent me on the 29th of March, 1876. To truly test it I preached for ten days in succession...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: You made me a present, some three or four years ago, of one of Manning's Lung and Body Braces...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: For the benefit of suffering females I desire to give you my experience in the use of the Banding Lung and Body Brace...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I have worn the Brace for thirty days, and I find it to do all it is recommended to do, and I advise all ministers and students to use it...

Consumption cured. If physicians are correct, in 1873 I bought a Brace. I was in the stage of consumption by the very best physicians...

I can preach day and night for 40 minutes with my lungs and throat as fresh as when I would not speak without it.

I have worn the Brace for thirty days, and I find it to do all it is recommended to do, and I advise all ministers and students to use it...

Consumption cured. If physicians are correct, in 1873 I bought a Brace. I was in the stage of consumption by the very best physicians...

I can preach day and night for 40 minutes with my lungs and throat as fresh as when I would not speak without it.

THE BAPTIST.

Stand ye in the ways, and see and ask for the old paths, which are the good ways, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. - Jeremiah

THE CARROLLTON DEBATE.

Infant Baptism as Practiced by the M. E. Church South Authorized by the Word of God? BLD. DITZLER'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: - As I have in all the argument I want now, or need, till I take up another point (and I need no more at all, - my proposition is put beyond all hope of successful attack, and Dr. Graves realises that fully), - there is only one thing we have to do, - hurl back the attacks of the opposition. We have and hold possession of the field; all we need to do, is hold on to the fort. He wished to confine it to the New Testament. O yes; but how much of the New Testament did he quote in his first hour's speech on mode? Not one letter - not one sentence in a whole hour's speech! Think of the change that has so very suddenly come over the spirit of his team!

Not one word of the New Testament did he quote in his first hour's speech on mode? Not one letter - not one sentence in a whole hour's speech! Think of the change that has so very suddenly come over the spirit of his team!

Not one word of the New Testament did he quote in his first hour's speech on mode? Not one letter - not one sentence in a whole hour's speech! Think of the change that has so very suddenly come over the spirit of his team!

Not one word of the New Testament did he quote in his first hour's speech on mode? Not one letter - not one sentence in a whole hour's speech! Think of the change that has so very suddenly come over the spirit of his team!

Not one word of the New Testament did he quote in his first hour's speech on mode? Not one letter - not one sentence in a whole hour's speech! Think of the change that has so very suddenly come over the spirit of his team!

ized, contemplating adults in all these cases, and only them, as he well knows, the parties so using the "means of grace" are aided, strengthened and established in the faith, and enjoy the pleasant consciousness of doing their duty, while God works within. These writers are not prebarring that enemies are lurking in the bushes, always ready to torture their honest words, garble their sentences, and mar their meanings.

He asks us, what was the "romant?" We demonstrated what it was. Paul told us most emphatically. He asks, "Was the olive-tree Abraham or Christ?" Paul tells us it was "the romant;" that unbelieving Jews "fell," "stumbled," "were rejected," "were broken off," "were cast away," "were cast out," as children of the bond-woman, clinging to the law of commandments contained in ordinances. (Gal. iv. 30. Rom. xi. 16, 17, 19, 20. Eph. ii. 16.) Now, out of what were unbelievers cast, from what were they broken off by rejecting Christ? Whatever it was, all who believe, all who accept Christ, are grafted into the olive from which these were ejected. But are we not incorporated into his church in this process? Of course we are. That tells most plainly what it means.

But he asks, is it Christ or Abraham? What does he mean by that? Simply smoko. Suppose it means Christ, is he not the head of the church? (Col. i. 18, 24. Eph. i. 21, 22; iv. 13-16.) If we be in him as the vine, baptized into one body, "which is Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13), are we not in his church? If we are spiritually Abraham's seed, is it not the same? You can clearly see the whole aim of my worthy opponent here is dust, - smoke.

Alas! now the Doctor goes into "syllogisms" heavily; and what silly ones they are - me! Take the one I first caught. There must be a positive command to you, also you are not under obligation to obey. No such positive command exists as to infants, therefore it is wrong, - does not follow. As Burns says,

"Al! do I live to see it?" 1. Now, there is no positive command in the Bible to any of us, - to any of you, - to be baptized. The sole, the only command we have, is given to the administrator of baptism, not to any subject at all; and our reception of it is purely an inference of duty. As the apostles commanded to "go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them," we infer it is perpetual, - to descend through all ages, - as he promised so to be with them always.

2. We infer our duty to submit to baptism from the fact of the apostles being so commanded. Thus, we see how rash is his position, and how defective his so-called syllogism. He says, "no baptism, no church." But the Jews baptized, - were all baptized. We will notice that in our next speech in full. But he states that the kingdom of God is the church. It takes every visible church on earth to make up the kingdom of God. That is the best truth the Doctor has uttered during this debate. Keep on there and you are bound to get all right. Now, this kingdom is spoken of in David's day often. (Ps. cxlv. 11, 12; xl. 7, 8)

ized, contemplating adults in all these cases, and only them, as he well knows, the parties so using the "means of grace" are aided, strengthened and established in the faith, and enjoy the pleasant consciousness of doing their duty, while God works within. These writers are not prebarring that enemies are lurking in the bushes, always ready to torture their honest words, garble their sentences, and mar their meanings.

He asks us, what was the "romant?" We demonstrated what it was. Paul told us most emphatically. He asks, "Was the olive-tree Abraham or Christ?" Paul tells us it was "the romant;" that unbelieving Jews "fell," "stumbled," "were rejected," "were broken off," "were cast away," "were cast out," as children of the bond-woman, clinging to the law of commandments contained in ordinances. (Gal. iv. 30. Rom. xi. 16, 17, 19, 20. Eph. ii. 16.) Now, out of what were unbelievers cast, from what were they broken off by rejecting Christ? Whatever it was, all who believe, all who accept Christ, are grafted into the olive from which these were ejected. But are we not incorporated into his church in this process? Of course we are. That tells most plainly what it means.

But he asks, is it Christ or Abraham? What does he mean by that? Simply smoko. Suppose it means Christ, is he not the head of the church? (Col. i. 18, 24. Eph. i. 21, 22; iv. 13-16.) If we be in him as the vine, baptized into one body, "which is Christ" (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13), are we not in his church? If we are spiritually Abraham's seed, is it not the same? You can clearly see the whole aim of my worthy opponent here is dust, - smoke.

Alas! now the Doctor goes into "syllogisms" heavily; and what silly ones they are - me! Take the one I first caught. There must be a positive command to you, also you are not under obligation to obey. No such positive command exists as to infants, therefore it is wrong, - does not follow. As Burns says,

"Al! do I live to see it?" 1. Now, there is no positive command in the Bible to any of us, - to any of you, - to be baptized. The sole, the only command we have, is given to the administrator of baptism, not to any subject at all; and our reception of it is purely an inference of duty. As the apostles commanded to "go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them," we infer it is perpetual, - to descend through all ages, - as he promised so to be with them always.

2. We infer our duty to submit to baptism from the fact of the apostles being so commanded. Thus, we see how rash is his position, and how defective his so-called syllogism. He says, "no baptism, no church." But the Jews baptized, - were all baptized. We will notice that in our next speech in full. But he states that the kingdom of God is the church. It takes every visible church on earth to make up the kingdom of God. That is the best truth the Doctor has uttered during this debate. Keep on there and you are bound to get all right. Now, this kingdom is spoken of in David's day often. (Ps. cxlv. 11, 12; xl. 7, 8)

Dr. Warner's Health Corset, Formerly Dr. Warner's Sanitary Corset With Skirt Supporter and Self-Adjusting Pads. Secures HEALTHFUL POSITION OF THE BODY, WITH EASE AND COMFORT.

FATTENING. INVIGORATING. BARON VON LIEBIG'S Liquid Meat Extract. One wineglass containing the nutriment of one-half pound of Fresh Beef...

LODGINS FOR BAPTISTS CENTENNIAL. The American Baptist Publication Society has received numerous inquiries about passing the logo during the Centennial celebration...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I want to bear my testimony for Manning's Lung and Body Brace from you. I bought one in 1870 for my wife, which was a great benefit to her. I was afflicted with a cough and backache...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I want to bear my testimony for Manning's Lung and Body Brace from you. I bought one in 1870 for my wife, which was a great benefit to her. I was afflicted with a cough and backache...

DEAR BRO. GRAVES: I want to bear my testimony for Manning's Lung and Body Brace from you. I bought one in 1870 for my wife, which was a great benefit to her. I was afflicted with a cough and backache...