

"STILL DISSATISFIED."

IN November, 1884, Elder J. B. Gambrell published an article in the *Baptist Record*, "Death of the *Baptist Record*," evidently a thrust in the dark at some brother, as his practice and to which I replied in a proper manner over the signature of "Mississippi Baptist." In his paper of January, 3rd, 1884, the Editor delivered himself in the following style: "The *Southern Baptist* of the 12th ult. contains an article of more than two columns headed, 'Startling Prophecy,' which was throughout, an ill-natured and violent attack on the private character of the Editor of the *Baptist Record*. On demanding the name of this anonymous defamer of our character, we were furnished with the name of Elder Jobe Harrah. From the first we determined that this paper should not become the vehicle of personal controversy and 'we abide that determination.' Besides, in this call, we could not descend to reply to such a place. We drop the *Southern Baptist* and Elder Jobe Harrah, leaving them alone in the field they have chosen. There will be none of it in this paper, the brethren may be sure." What sweet amiability, to provoke personal controversy continually, and then not allow any of it in his paper. He says he will leave me alone; now let us see if he has kept his word. In the *Record* of May 1st, 1884, he proffered a long bill of charges against Dr. Graves, under the above heading, one of them being: "He openly sympathized with an anonymous defamer of our character." When I saw that charge, I had a perfect right, as the above shows, to believe that he aimed his blow at me, and I wrote him respectfully asking if he alluded to me, and he has not replied. He wants it understood that he aimed at me, but he will not say so, because he wants to have it to say he was not personal in his remarks and I have assailed him without a cause. Can anything be more unprincipled and worthy of severe censure than such continued anonymous defamation? When he said he could not descend to reply to me, and dropped me and Bro. Gressett, Dr. Graves simply said, he supposed we would survive it. Can any man, in possession of the foregoing facts, be in doubt for one moment about who he intended his remarks for? But, because I have not before noticed his slander, as I should have done, he repeats it; he is "still dissatisfied," he is still venting his malice in the same anonymous way, and now, when I again apply the blister to him, he will again become a very meek saint, and say that I am the aggressor, and he the patient martyr; and his very few special friends and admirers in this matter will, perhaps, as they did before, "earnestly protest against it" as unfit for a religious paper, although they seem to think it eminently right and proper for him to coarsely abuse and slander me in one, and that one his own, for no other cause under the sun but because I demanded Scripture for his intercommunion "fixturo," and he could not give it. They will insist that he loves me dearly. "I do love those prophets," but love and slander are not twin sisters, and love does not deal in malicious thrusts in the dark, seeking to injure its object. He is the anonymous defamer himself, as his article, "Death of the *Baptist Record*," fully shows and proves! Has he dared to disclose the name of the brother he tried to injure in as covert a manner as ever did a Roman Catholic Jesuit? Look at it brother; its shocking coarseness and vulgarity, its low slang and false from the beginning to the end of it, and then tell me if you consider it worthy of a Christian Editor. I can satisfy any reasonable brother that my reasons for believing that the article was aimed at me are so strong as to put doubts of it out of the question, and while he has not the honest, manly courage to own it, he has not denied it, that I have overheard. Well, if he intended his remarks to apply to me, did I not have a right to reply to them as I did? If his charges are false, did I not have a right to defend myself against his slanders? "But," say the special few, "you did not write in the spirit of Christ," and I asked, "Did he not assault me without provocation, and did he write in the spirit of Christ?" "Well," said they, "if he did wrong, that is no reason that you should do wrong." But I asked with emphasis, "Did he do

wrong at all?" and I got for answer, "I do not say what he did, that is nothing to you. I point out our wrong." Can any man show in all the history of Christ such a spirit as that? If I could be shown that such is the spirit of Christ, most would reject Christianity as a fraud; but I thank God it is not the spirit of Christ, but the spirit of an old defamer who dwells down a long way from Christ. If such talk is not naked cant, it is justice blind in one eye. When Lord Nelson was slaughtering the French, in one of their great battles, they hoisted the white flag; but the savage Nelson ordered the firing redoubled, when his attention was called to it by some of his officers who thought he did not see the flag, and instantly turning his blind side in that direction he said, "You know I am blind on that side and can not see it." It seems to me that a more correct picture of those conspurators could not be drawn. They appear to be utterly blind to Elder Gambrell's faults; his savage warfare upon his brethren all right, and their defence all wrong; they should give him their coats, cloaks, and vests; go with him three or four miles; suffer him to smite the blood out of both cheeks, and break their heads, and slander them without a murmur. He and they will find to their cost, that the Baptists of Mississippi are not made of such stuff. I wrote to Bro. Gressett to give my name as the author of "Startling Prophecy," the moment Elder Gambrell gave the name of the brother he was assailing. He has never unmasked himself yet, and is he not the "anonymous defamer?" When he says he received letters from some brother last fall, or at any time, predicting the death of the *Record*; that he recklessly and rudely collided with the brother and his prejudices, upsetting both with such violence that he "was bereft of his senses, and in his bewilderment thought himself a prophet, and foretold the death of the *Record*, that he ate green apples and cucumbers, had a horrid nightmare, and dreamed of the death of the *Record*; that he was like a negro mull rider who; when rudely handled for some insolence, claimed that the United States were all shaken; and in like manner when he, Gambrell, shook the brother so rudely he was crazy enough to think the Baptist denomination felt the shock and many other things of like character; if he intended his remarks to apply to me they are utterly false, and I replied to such vile falsehoods exactly as they deserved to be replied to. He has not denied that he intended his remarks for me, nor has he had the manliness to say they were so intended, but his best friends do not doubt his aim. If he says he was writing for me, he knows I will ask, when and where all those things took place, and he could not prove one word of it, that all would see they were fabrications of his own; and if he says he aimed at some other brother, he knows that brother would ask the same questions, and demand the proof, and his situation would be very embarrassing. His best friend suggested to me that he might have "playfully" written those things, and I replied, "Then they are playful falsehoods and unworthy of a Christian Editor." While he remains in the dark as he now is, is he not the "anonymous defamer?" To say that he is not, would be like Nelson, blind on one side. Here is his difficulty that he can neither wriggle out of nor back out of without discredit to himself. Did he act without motive in writing the article, "Death of the *Baptist Record*?" Let us see if he did. He tried to make it appear that I had spoken a falsehood when I said he promised me space in his paper to discuss the intercommunion question; he stated positively that he never made any such promise, and I proved that he did promise, and in addition, invited me to occupy his columns. There is not a just man on earth who will look at that proof and then say it is not ample and the case not made out. When he made the promise he thought, with the aid of Bro. Renfro's pamphlet, that he could snuff me, and all others, out on that question, and he great in a day, but finding himself going to the wall (where he has since entirely gone) he closed his doors against me, and denied that he did promise, and when the promise was proved, he let malice enter his heart, as I will now show. He then wrote me

a very insulting, slanderous letter, as usual in the dark, telling me what his friends had written to him of me: one saying he thought me vain; another one thought me a mad fellow; another one called me a blackguard; another one doubted if I was not a hypocrite, and he thought it would be a good thing for me to see myself as they saw me. He refused to give me their names; refused to allow me to reply to them; refused to become responsible for them himself, and I did just what I had a legal and moral right to do, I told him that I did not believe any Baptists in Mississippi, or elsewhere, had written such things of me to him, but I did believe he made them out of whole cloth. He then asked me to wait until the Convention, at Chrysata Springs, and we could talk matters over in person. I did wait, and we did talk them over, and he pledged his word of honor as a Christian minister that he would, as soon as he returned home, write me a letter recalling the offensive one, and in it say did so because it was "offensive and unjust to me," and I agreed, if he did that, to be fully satisfied, and bury our differences forever, and my heart and hand should be to him as if nothing had ever occurred. He wrote me a letter, but would not put in the words, "unjust to you," and any one can see why; and when I urged him to redeem his pledge, he wrote me another insulting letter, and coolly left his pledge of honor to take care of itself. I have the proof of this. At the Cold water Association, in October, 1884, I asked Bro. Walne to say to Bro. Gambrell, that if he did not keep his pledge I would break all friendly relations with him; Bro. Walne did tell him, and soon thereafter we had his article, "Death of the *Baptist Record*." When he wrote that he "could not descend to reply to Elder Harrah," I felt that he spoke true, for a man who could forget his pledged word of honor was at the lowest bottom and could not "descend" any lower. He had tried to injure me, and as a natural result he hated me, and hates me still, as his conduct proves. Can any one fail to see his motive in writing his coarse, defamatory article, "Death of the *Baptist Record*?" I have no hesitation in saying that his pretense that he loves me, or Dr. Graves either, is, in my opinion, a sin for which he will have to repent. His repeated efforts to injure us both warrant me in saying so. He has been charged with assailing Dr. Graves in an anonymous article in his paper headed, "Israel—Aben—Ben—Itchih—Jerusalem," and I have not seen that he denied it. His style is so marked by its want of elegance and Christian courtesy, that there can be little doubt that he is the author of it. But, be that as it may, the sentiments contained in it are a disgrace to religious journalism, and well worthy of a place in the "Police Gazette." One of his special admirers wrote in the *Record*, "My soul recoils with pity and disgust from the sentiments contained in 'Mississippi Baptist,' and I wondered if his soul feasted with delight upon the sentiments in 'Death of the *Baptist Record*,' and the 'Jerusalem' article. If it did, shame lost her blush. Every reader of the *Record* knows how he abused and misrepresented Dr. Graves, even spread it to the world that the Doctor had become an open communionist; challenged him in his bantering style to defend his 'New Treatment,' not to 'dodge' and cry out 'persecution,' for he wanted 'no cheap martyrdoms in the 19th century;' that he would have no discussion with any one but Dr. Graves, but was determined to force the Doctor defend his book, 'Old Landmarkism, What Is It?' and 'Intercommunion.' When Bro. Graves accepted his challenge, and moved to battle, he only stood one fire and fled to the rear, and since then, he fires from his place of concealment, and abuses and misrepresents the Doctor, but keeps out of the reach of his blade, like Shimol did when he ran along through the bushes on the hills; and cursed and abused David but kept beyond his reach. He declines to meet the Doctor face to face, alleging as a reason, that his readers are tired of discussions, and write numerous letters to him demanding that they stop; they have nobler work to do than discussing questions settled long ago, and on which 'our people are fixed and fixed to our liking.' And when Bro. Graves offered to

pay him for space to reply to his misrepresentations he accepted the offer in very bad faith, and violated the law of decent journalism in that he charged too much for the work done; criticised an accepted advertisement in his own paper for which he was paid, and so arranged the article that few, if any could tell what part of it was Dr. Graves? Such trickery and indecency will not pass current with our people long, or I do not understand the people of my choice. Although, he, and his patrons, as he says, are so bitterly opposed to discussion, he has arranged with Dr. Hunter for the discussion, in his paper of a subject debated through the last thousand years, and one on which our people are fixed sure enough, and as he thinks he will overthrow the Doctor, and as I hope he will, we hear nothing of any letters demanding that the discussion stop and 'nobler work' resumed, and that shows where such letters first see the light. Our people are not 'fixed' in favor of intercommunion, as he knows to his grief, and if he would allow his readers to see the truth on the 'other side' he would be left in his fixturo, as he will be before a great while, anyway. There are thousands of our people who would be glad to have it discussed, and if Elder Gambrell could find authority for it in the New Testament, as he can for immersion, he would discuss it, but as he cannot find any such authority, he is very much opposed to any such discussion. It is no pleasure, but a source of grief to me, to say so much about Elder Gambrell, but he makes it necessary; he will have no peace or truce with me, and I am compelled to show the hidden man that he may not have it so much in his power to injure me and others hereafter. He forced me to defend myself against his injustice; he was the aggressor, and is so still; he will not allow me to be at peace with him, he has provoked me to answer his malicious thrusts at me; and now he will play the part of the wolf that charged the lamb with muddying its water, when the lamb was down stream below the wolf; he will say I disturbed him to have some excuse for his assault. His influence in causing the young ministers at Clinton to espouse his quarrel and 'send their sentiments' in violation of the law of Christian morality, by intermeddling without cause, save to bolster up a man in his anonymous slanders and indecencies, ought to dishonor him with every Baptist in Mississippi. If he can influence the young ministers there to assail every brother who defends himself against Elder Gambrell's vile assaults, the college will soon be in a condition 'to let.' He is creating more disturbances among our people than were ever made by all the editors we ever had. Brethren Lyon, Freeman, Lowry and others wrote long for Mississippi Baptists, but where did they ever have a wrangle or angry difference with any of us? Those noble brethren did not think themselves infallible; they did not organize rings to rule their brethren; they sought for truth; their columns were open to all; no trickery was resorted to, to beat an opponent; they offered Bible authority for what they taught, and they are loved and honored by all of us now. But Elder Gambrell is kindling the fires of discord in our ranks by his unreasonable assaults upon brethren, and wranglings with them in many parts of the State, by involving some of his rash friends in his malignant quarrels with other brethren; and by dragging down the young ministry in the college to such a low level, he is making wounds that will not soon heal, even if let alone now, and if fretted a little more, will, perhaps, never heal, and be remembered with bitterness. If his paper is run in the interest of a few, and is open to only one side of a question, and that side the editor's, and those on the other side are to be silenced, if they have to be hunted down by vile slanders, then it is not our paper and, instead of unifying, will drive our people asunder. If he succeeds as well in the future as in the past in getting up wars with his brethren, he will soon be powerless to do any good whatever with his paper. This is the man who says I am an 'anonymous defamer of our character.' Does any brother believe it, with all these facts before him? I will trust the brethren to do me justice.

JOHN HARRAL.

THE TUPPER CHALLENGE AND WHAT HAS BECOME OF IT.

BRO. GRAVES.—You will remember that sometime since Bro. Tupper, through the *Flag*, gave me what he termed an "Arkansas Challenge," and what I considered a very cheeky challenge, to discuss the communion question. Of course, I accepted, and in compliance with his very urgent demand set the time and place. In order to bluff me and cause me to back, as no doubt he supposed I would, he then stated the proposition in his own way, and, as it pleased him, refused to make the "slightest change in a single word." In order to brace him up, and, if possible, get the discussion, I agreed to meet him at a disadvantage and called upon him to come to time. He then tried other tactics and accused me of following the example of "Dr. Graves" and backing down, while I had never thought of such a thing. The wish must have been father to the thought. In reply I informed him, as he already knew, that Bro. Graves had never refused a fair and honorable discussion of this question, nor did I now refuse, but would be on the ground at the appointed time. In his last reply I find that his temperature has run down several degrees, and he is not so anxious for the debate as he thought he was, since he refused to meet me at the appointed place; giving five reasons for his refusal, not one of which is a good one, or will shield him from the humiliating fact that he has backed down from his own proposition.

I now await Bro. Tupper's pleasure in setting his own time and place, and allow him to arrange everything to his own liking, and if I can have anything like fair play, I will be on hand. Will he do it? The brethren here, or many of them, are very anxious to hear this discussion, and if there is any debate left in Bro. T. we want to get it out of him. Will he come up and help us to investigate?

It might be of some interest for you to know that Bro. D. B. Ray is writing private letters to this part, trying to get some church to send him an invitation to come and lecture on the communion question as a kind of reply to your Lectures. Somehow he can't get us much enthused, and no one has invited. But if Bro. Ray really wants to reply to Bro. Graves, perhaps it can be arranged for both to come at once, and then we can hear both sides, and it might be we could find out what those "scriptural arguments" are, of which he has boasted so much, but so few have seen. J. C. R. Elm Springs, Ark., July 21, 1884.

REMARKS.—We will meet Bro. Ray in his own paper and ours, before his readers and ours, and discuss his famous "scriptural arguments" in six, eight or ten issues until he is satisfied, and we will give our dear Bro. Tupper a now hat if he will influence Bro. Ray to accept this, or any fair discussion of the communion question, viz: Affirm his own position, that the intercommunion of Baptist churches is scriptural. Will not our Bro. Tupper do this or withdraw his assertion that we have or do decline a discussion with Bro. Ray? He will, or we are disappointed in our Bro. Tupper, and badly.—ED. BAPTIST.

THE WAY A COMMON LAYMAN READS.

BRO. GRAVES.—I was grieved at the treatment you received from Bro. Gambrell, when he bungled up your article so, charging you so exorbitantly, and then sending that ill-gotten \$12.40 to the State Board of Tennessee to build up what you were pulling down. That Board acted the part of true Christians in rejecting such money. Ingratitude, slander, envy, and ill-feelings towards brethren, "Why are the emissaries of Satan allowed to dwell in the breast of a Baptist?" Who lead the church of Christ out of the idolatrous nations, when they were engaged in pulpits affiliations, and in receiving alien immersions? All say Dr. Graves. Why do Baptists choose to meet the Goliaths of Methodism and other isms of error? The shepherd boy of to-day; the devil and all religious sects tried in vain by wicked means to destroy the Baptists for the first seven hundred centuries, but when religious liberty intervened, they were more success-

ful when they applied harassing and enjoining means and our people had learned to ape. Thus by this embrace, hideous to our Lord, our distinctive features were being obliterated. Who pointed out to us the almost forsaken landmarks of Paul, of the Waldenses, of Monno, and of our martyred fathers? Dr. Graves. Now, if Dr. Graves is wrong on the communion question, let us point out the Scripture to show him his error, and he will at once abandon his position, for he is a true Baptist, and the only motto inscribed upon the banners of true Baptists, is the Word of God alone for their rule of faith and practice. I have observed closely for the past three years, and it seems to me that another ism of error is springing up in our midst, which may be denominated Gambrellism, its tendency being to have a big boss, and an infallible organ to teach Mississippians the true landmarks, such as making ugly thrusts at THE TENNESSEE BAPTIST, and *Southern Baptist*, that the latter was gotten up to pull down the *Record*, and the authority of ministers to baptize without the sanction of the church, as Philip did the Eunuch.

I do not take the *Record* now, because I believed I was doing wrong in supporting it. I hope this will not stir up any bad feelings or ill-will in the breast of any one, for no offense is meant, for if we are influencing Christians to go astray we should be warned of it. And I further hope all our editors will realize that truth cannot triumph when the spirit of inquiry and discussion is not allowed, for it is only by much discussion that all questions are settled and the truth established. Now I write this to utter my protest as a Mississippi Baptist against the treatment on the part of Bro. Gambrell to Bro. Graves, and to try to show that all do not believe like Bro. Gambrell. And I hope it may be a little speck of encouragement to you, Bro. Graves, to continue on battling against error, and remember nearly all ages of the church have had her Diotrophes, and false brethren. Pleasant Hill, Miss. J. B. MOODY.

Get up clubs for the 4 months offer for 50 cents.

DESTITUTION IN LAUDERDALE CO., TENN.

THEY are aware of the destitution in this county, but when I tell you that I am the only Baptist preacher in the county actively engaged in the work, you can begin to form some idea.

Ashport, on the Mississippi river, seventeen miles west of Ripley, is in a deplorable condition. Two years ago they lost their pastor by death, and the floods of the spring of 1883 carried away their house of worship. They are now anxious for a man to reorganize and serve them. They will rebuild whenever a pastor is secured.

Glimpville, ten (10) miles from Ripley, on the Fulton road, has been without a pastor for two or more years. The country around Glimpville is thickly settled—more unconverted material than any neighborhood with which I am acquainted, and they seem anxious for the gospel. For several months I have been preaching to them every Sunday evening, and I always have a full house. In addition to this indication of their desire to hear the Word, they have already raised sixty (60) dollars toward the support of a pastor.

I would like to say more, but am taking up too much space, so to the point:

I want a man to settle in this county, give every Sunday to each of the above churches, and the balance of his time to other destitute points. To do this the Big Hatchie Board must supplement his salary. I believe it will be a paying investment, financially, and in the salvation of souls.

Bro. Borum recommends Bro. Yeargin, of Dyersburg, as the man for the field. Bro. Yeargin is now in business in Dyersburg, and is anxious, even at a sacrifice, to devote his whole time to preaching. Hope the Board may take the matter into immediate and prayerful consideration. The field is an inviting one, and a needy one, and I know can be developed to the glory of God. His occupation will in no sense interfere with our plan of occupying the centres of influence. Brethren of the Board let us hear from you soon. E. C. FAULKNER.

Ripley, Tenn. Aug. 1, 1884.

of an established church that embraces the body of a whole nation, to pretend that all who are admitted to the privilege of membership give satisfactory evidence of piety." (Answer to Brown, 1807, p. 79.) Unitarians, though they differ among themselves in many things, agree in denying the Deity and Atonement of Christ. Membership in such bodies, if made a rule of admission, cannot possibly ensure the reception of those only who hold what even loose Baptists call "fundamental" doctrines, and who also profess "spiritual life."

The following are a few examples of this reckless misuse of that most sacred ordinance, to which none have divine right but members of churches formed of those only who have given good proof of "spiritual life," and have been duly immersed.

Such revivals are sometimes held in connection with meetings to raise funds for the Baptist Missionary Society, in order to identify that society as much as possible with loose communion. One of these festivals was held in the Baptist chapel, in the parish of St. Mary's, Norwich, on May 18th, a chapel which has become notorious, from a Chancery suit, which tested the power of loose Baptists to appropriate chapels built to be used for scriptural church-order. The suit failed to secure it for its intended use. The invitation to join in this "missionary communion" was addressed to "The Members of all Christian Churches." The bodies which in Norwich deem themselves to be Christian churches, include Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, and Unitarians.

Among the persons present were two Wesleyan Methodists who said that they had not to apply to any one for either a ticket or an introduction; but had only to go in and take their places, so that in reality the ordinance was open, without restriction, to any one who cared to attend. What a mockery of all principle! What scorn of admitted duty! What recklessness of the mischief which might be done by giving to unworthy persons the pledge of life eternal! Another such "Missionary Communion" was held in 1859. A proposal which dispensed in like manner with what loose Baptists say is necessary to communion, namely, "spiritual life" and belief in "fundamentals," was made in Manchester, at a meeting in Dr. McLaren's chapel, in November, 1871. The meeting was reported in the *Unitarian Herald*. Dr. McLaren is one of the most able of Baptist preachers. His church is one of mixed membership, but I suppose that the trust deed limits the rights of the unbaptized. A leading member of Mr. McLaren's congregation invited all the nonconformist ministers of Manchester and its suburbs, and about an equal number of laymen, to a *soirée* in the reception rooms of Mr. McLaren's chapel. About two hundred persons met, including nearly all the ministers of the Baptist, Congregational, Swedenborgian, Methodist, Bible Christian, Presbyterian, and Unitarian bodies. There were ten Unitarian ministers, and several Unitarian laymen, present. A Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity proposed that once a year a United Communion service should be held by these bodies, and this proposal was warmly commended by almost every speaker. What divine life can there be in those who reject the one sacrifice without which there is no remission of sins? What doctrines are fundamental, if the Deity and Atonement of Christ are not? (See *Christian World*, of June, 1878.)

A few years since, I think it was in 1879, there was a meeting in London of teachers of Sunday-schools, and of delegates from these schools. Those of them who were members of churches of some kind were present at a united communion service at the Metropolitan Tabernacle. Mr. C. H. Spurgeon presided. There were between 2000 and 3000 present, and the churches of which they were members must have been very various. Mr. Spurgeon named some persons as having come from the United States, some from France, some from Germany, in addition to those who came from various parts of Britain. Mr. Spurgeon, in his own church, receives none to membership but the baptized. If he acts on principle, he must do this because he believes it to be God's will; but if so, no other bodies

professing to be churches are divinely constituted, and in recognizing all these persons as members of churches, and in administering the Lord's Supper to them on the grounds that they were members of Christian churches, he violated the principles on which he acts in his own church. He implied that these were true churches of Christ. He implied also that membership in these churches is good evidence of "spiritual life," though it is not so. When persons violate their own avowed principles it is useless to argue with them; because it is evident that, in matters of this kind, they are not governed by principle, but by something else, such as love of popularity; and that they have more regard for this something than for principle and for God.

In February, 1882, a united communion service was held in Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle, of teachers of Sunday-schools connected with the Lambeth Auxiliary of the Sunday-school Union. This Union represents various denominations. Mr. Spurgeon delivered an address and spoke strongly in favor of loose communion. The report of this meeting which I have, does not state whether those teachers were members of the bodies with which the schools were connected or not. In neither case would there be evidence that they had divine life.

Mr. Moody, your Evangelist, has, I believe, been immersed on a profession of faith. He has just completed 32 weeks of labor, in which he has held about 360 meetings, at each of which the average attendance is said to have been not far short of 5000. But has he preached as, by the rule of common honesty he is bound to do? Judging from the public reports of his meetings, and the approval of what he has done by persons who will not sanction the preaching of baptism, I fear that he has not once called on men as Christ has commanded him to do, to be immersed in his name. If God expects his stewards to be faithful (1 Cor. iv: 2) what praise can such a faithless and disobedient steward expect from God? (1 Cor. iv: 6.) And how is it possible that "the love of God, which is the keeping of his commandments," (1 John v: 3) should be deeply implanted by habitual silence as to the first great duty commanded by God and by leading men to infer that obedience to Him is a matter of no importance? The reason for this silence is that baptism is so hated by the sects, that such large meetings sustained by various bodies would be impossible if Mr. Moody preached faithfully. He pleases men to gain popularity, though Paul said, "If I still pleased men I should not be the servant of Christ." These sects, though they hate baptism, are ready to join in the Lord's Supper, and Mr. Moody closed his meetings with the observance of the Lord's Supper, to which every one was invited who "loved the Lord Jesus;" which means that every one was to be the judge of his own fitness, and that the service was open to every one who pleased to go. To this abuse of a rite reserved by Christ for those who have proved their fidelity by their obedience, and are baptized members of his kingdom, Mr. Spurgeon contributed the loan of his Tabernacle-plate. The communicants numbered more than four thousand. On a slightly raised platform sat twenty ministers. The flegons and salvers were more than one hundred. Mr. Moody, though so little scrupulous about the divine authority of such a service in itself, had scruples about his not being ordained and gave way to Dr. Pentecost, who presided.

These are but a few illustrations of the manner in which men of loose principles are using the Lord's Supper. They drink of human flattery and favor till they become lost to the need of being consistent with themselves. In order to honor and please men, they dishonor God. Like the idolatrous heathen they "serve the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Rom. i: 25.

Tell every body about our 50 cents offer.

EDICRAPH.

Bro. Pennington, Lincoln co., Tenn.: Your inquiry came while we were away from home, and we see it for the first time to-day (June 29.) You say a Methodist preacher says "the German Bible

says that when they brought little children to Jesus that he took them in his arms and baptized them." Will you send us the name of that Methodist preacher? Will you demand of him the date of his German Bible, and where and by whom it was published? Do this without fail.—That the Quaker Department is rapidly growing in interest is evidenced by the multitude of questions that are flowing in upon us. We have more than we have time to answer or space to publish this year. We again say to all, We do not obligate ourselves to answer any save those which challenge our personal teaching. All others which we deem important as time and space will allow. We protest against being implicated in church difficulties and trials unless the parties implicated unite in stating the question submitted.—"Col. R. G. Ingersoll said lately of Christianity: 'It is a religion that I am going to do what little I can while I live to destroy.'" What are you, a professed friend of Christ, going to do?—Bro. W. H. Nichols, of Kenton, Tenn., asks us for the name of David's mother. Had he been taking this paper the past year he would have seen the answer to this and over one hundred of other more important questions in its columns.—"Is it possible to obtain your services to preach say five sermons for us on 'The Plan of Salvation,' instead of the Lectures, and if so, what would be the expense of the same?"—J. Tomba, Tenn. When we have the time it would be possible, and for the same small compensation we charge for the Lectures, \$10 per day and our expenses. We make time by over-working, to go out and lecture, and we would prefer to preach, as often as once a month, that we may be able to fulfill our promise of support this coming year to three young ministers at college. We give the patrons of this paper the privilege of helping us by their voluntary contributions, but the \$400 needed not sent us, we are individually responsible for, and to meet this we are willing to Lecture on to preach, but must require a little remuneration. Churches wishing a visit shall receive an outline of the subjects of the five sermons on Salvation, and the five Lectures on "The Church and Its Ordinances."—Will our patrons see the new list of subscribers to the "Young Ministers' Fund" for the coming session of 1884-5? Are there not at least 500 among our thousands of readers who will be delighted to be allowed to help in this the very best of all our missionary enterprises, since it underlies them all? Without educated ministers we can have no foreign missions; and what about home missions?—Bro. Coleman's last article of corrections and exceptions, with Bro. Harrell's rejoinder, will appear soon. The illness of Bro. C. has prevented an earlier closing of the discussion that has been so fraternal and profitable.—We had promised Bro. Hinton, of Little Rock, that on going or returning from Arkadelphia, Ark., we would preach for the Second church, and on going promised Bro. Yates a call on our return; but the church at Prescott secured the Lectures after the course at A. and it was Monday night when we concluded them and found ourselves completely worsted by the excessive heat, wholly unfit to be of any service to Little Rock, and so came directly home for rest, preferring, when the weather is cooler, to come expressly to Little Rock and preach several times.—We have seen *The Standard*, published at Arkadelphia, since we left, in which the pastor of the Old School Presbyterian church, who transgressed the proprieties recognized by Christian gentlemen, by interrupting us in the midst of one of our Lectures without the slightest cause, as we had announced an opportunity for all who would suggest queries or corrections to lay them on the desk at the opening of the next Lecture—assaults us in language that places him beneath our contempt. He serves as another instance where nature has stamped its unerring estimate of value upon the very face of a man—the metal purely brass.—John T. Warren, Adamsville, Tenn.: Notice of time of Unity Association received and appears in this issue, and we expect without fail to be there and fill our appointment made by the Association last year—i. e., preach the Missionary

sermon before that body; and we will arrange so that the church shall have two or three if not the full course of Lectures; and Bro. W., we must get up a company, one wagon load at least, to visit Pittsburg Landing and picnic on the ground of the battle of Shiloh. Don't forget this.—Any church in Arkansas wishing a pastor can address W. F. Roqua, Paulum, N. Y., and Martin B. Anderson, Pres. of Rochester University, for reference.—Mrs. Mary Smith, Piedmont, Mo.: We cannot tell you where you can get the tracts you call for. There are vastly better ones on the same subjects. Send for "What Is It to Eat Unworthily?"—We call attention to Bro. Senter's address to all the Baptists of Tennessee in this issue, stirring up our pure minds for foreign missions. Tennessee should contribute at least \$5,000 a year for this object.—We hope every subscriber has read Miss Jessie Gray's graduation essay in our last issue; if not, turn back, all ye mothers at least, and read it, and if it is not chastely, beautifully written, and then decide if you would not give thousands if your own dear daughter could only write thus. Parlor education at words or pieces, or a little whitewashing anywhere will not do it, but a thorough education at the Mary Sharp never fails, if the recipient has a fair mind to work upon. Send for a catalogue, and engage a room and seat before it is too late. A large attendance is expected next session.—Brother Lamar, of this city, and Gates, of Brownsville, have gone to the Ozark Mountains, Ark., to hunt and fish and recuperate for the month of August.—Bro. Colgrove's questions will receive attention on our return from Middle Tennessee.

Make our 50 cents offer known at every Association meeting.

IS IT NOT BIBLE MARKISM?

A writer in the *Southern Baptist* warns his brethren and sisters against "visiting and attending the public services of worship of the different sects, societies of the world, organizations of men, claiming to be, what they are not, Christian evangelical churches." He says that, in this way, "we not only encourage them in preaching their false and ruinous doctrines, but we practically endorse them, bidding them go on, and are therefore partakers with them in their evil deeds." Is this the logic of Landmarkism carried out with no flinching?

As we read this statement of this advice of a Mississippi Baptist, pierced by the sneer of the *Index*, it occurred to us we had seen something touching the matter from the father of Old Landmarkism himself.

So we picked up our Testament and turned to Paul's Epistles and soon found this:

"To the church at Rome he wrote:—'Now I entreat you, brethren, to watch those who are making factions and laying snares, contrary to the teaching which you have learned, and run away from them; for such like ones as they are not in subjection to our anointed Lord, but to their own appetites; and, by kind and complimentary words, they pierce the hearts of the unsuspecting.'"

And, alas! how successfully do they do it in this age! Can a Baptist possibly misapprehend this language? Will our churches refuse to listen to so earnest an entreaty? Then let them heed the emphatic command of Paul to the church at Thessalonica:

"Now we charge you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to withdraw from every brother who walks disorderly, and not according to the instruction which you received from us. But if any one obey not our word, by this letter, point him out, and do not associate with him, so that he may be put to shame."

We ask our brethren if Pedobaptists and Campbellites do teach the doctrine that Paul taught, and walk according to his teachings? and if it is "withdrawing from and putting them to shame" to invite them into our pulpits to preach, as ministers of Christ, to our people, and associate with them in "Evangelical Pastors' meetings," "Evangelical Alliances," and "Young Men's Christian Associations?" Brother, you may treat this question lightly at your peril; for Christ has said: "Whoever shall be ashamed of me, and my words in

this age, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with his holy angels."

"That I have not an improper construction upon those Scriptures, the testimony of A. Barnes and Adam Clark will convince all Pedobaptists upon Paul's advice to Timothy (v: 22):

"He was not to invest one with the holy office who was a wicked man, or a heretic; for this would be to sanction his wickedness and error. If we ordain a man to the office of the ministry, who is known to be living in sin [disobedience to the commands of Christ is sin], or to cherish dangerous error, we become the patrons of the sin, and of the heresy. We lend to it the sanction of our approbation, and give to it whatever currency it may acquire from the reputation which we have," etc.

Now every thoughtful reader will see the principle is all the same whether we are personally instrumental in putting a man, whom we know to be living in the sin of disobedience, or who is a heretic, into the ministry, or whether we sanction and encourage his being in it, we equally endorse his errors and make ourselves partakers of his sin. It matters not one whit whether we engage him to preach for us once, or one hundred times, or continually, as our pastor, we cannot divide a principle, if it would be right in us to introduce him into our pulpit to preach once, it would be just as right for us to employ him to preach for us always.

Adam Clark says on v. 22: "To help him forward, or sanction him in it, is to partake of his sin."

Will any one presume to deny that we do sanction a heretic's being in the ministry, and "help him forward in it," when we invite him to preach and attend upon his ministry?

Mr. Clark says on 2 John i: 10, 11:

"For if there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house; neither bid him God-speed."

"He that acts toward him as if he considered him a Christian brother, and sound in the faith, puts it in his power to deceive others by thus apparently accrediting his ministry."

"No sound Christian should countenance any man as a gospel minister who holds and preaches erroneous doctrines."

Do not Pedobaptists and Campbellites hold and preach erroneous and dangerous doctrines? I can prove it by themselves. The Presbyterian and Campbellite will affirm that the Methodists do. The Methodists and Campbellites will agree that the Presbyterians do; and both Presbyterians and Methodists stoutly declare that the Campbellites do; and all Baptists know that they all do. But hear Mr. Clark further, and then show what he says to your Methodist friends, who think you are too strict and bigoted:

"Nor can any Christian attend the ministry of such teachers without being criminal in the sight of God. He who attends their ministry is, in effect, bidding them God-speed, no matter whether such belong to the established church, or to any congregation of dissenters from it." [Italics his.]

Barnes quotes and indorses this view, and says: "It is as applicable then as now."

This is farther than many Landmarkers have generally gone, but I believe it is the true ground upon which we all ought to stand unflinchingly. Does not our crowding their places of worship constantly with our families apparently accredit and sanction their ministry, and encourage them in their work? Let every Baptist settle this with his own conscience before his God. We must not bid them God-speed, or we become upholders of their errors and partakers of their sin.

How the early churches understood the instructions of the Apostles with respect to those who "taught contrary to the Apostolic doctrine," we learn from Prof. Curtiss' statement, who examined the history of those times upon this point, and is undoubtedly authority. He says:

"In former ages of the church—that is, from the close of the second century downwards until heathenism was obliterated—it was generally supposed by almost all, that Christian fellowship, or communion, consisted chiefly in praying together. Christians would never unite in saying, 'Our Father, who art in heaven,' would not even pray in the same house of worship, with those whom they did not consider orthodox Christians. Heathen unbelievers, heretics, persons suspended, or excommunicated, . . . and members of other sects were admitted to hear the Psalms, and reading of the Scriptures, and the discourses, but were invariably excluded from the building before the

prayers of the church were offered."—Curtiss on Com., p. 80.

This testimony establishes beyond controversy two facts:

1. That any practice looking toward "open communion" at the Lord's table received no countenance in those early ages.

2. That there certainly could have been no "pulpit communion," no exchange of "ministerial courtesies,"—as the exchange of pulpits, inter-preachings between the orthodox ministers of those ages and the teachers of manifest heresies, even though the latter belonged to orthodox churches—as the false teachers in Paul's day did—much less when they belonged to opposing sects.

3. That the orthodox ministers and churches in those ages certainly held no "union meetings," did not labor together in public worship, or co-operate in the preaching of the gospel and promoting the spread of Christianity generally with those ministers and members who preached, or held, doctrines contrary to the teachings of Christ, and, therefore, subversive of it. How could two consistently walk or work together unless they were agreed? and, from the teachings of the Apostles, the early Christians understood that they did, by their act of worshiping, even in prayer together, say to the world that they were in fellowship with their doctrine and religion.

Who will say, with the teachings of the Apostles and the facts of history before their eyes, that the apostolic churches, and the orthodox churches of the earliest ages downwards, were not "Old Landmarkers" of the strictest sort? Let the candid Christian reader decide between us and those "liberal" brethren, who say that we are trying to bring in new customs and ways of our own invention, unsanctioned by the Word of God, and unknown to the Baptists of the earliest ages.

Will the *Southern Baptist* please copy?

Send 50 cents and have this paper sent to you, brother or sister, for four months.

THE NEW GREAT IRON WHEEL.

AFTER the most unaccountable, and we must believe, unwarrantable delay on the part of the manufacturers, the first edition of the "Wheel" has been shipped to us and ere this is read every subscriber has received both his book containing two steel engravings of its author, one at thirty-four and one at sixty-four years of age, and the extra engraving for framing. All will confess it is truly a nice book, and fully up to our promise, although in the weight of the paper it is not fully up to the contract, which will be remedied in future editions. Our readers will bear in mind that our part of the work was finished on time—no delay at this office.

Now what will each subscriber do on receiving his book and studying the engravings, but utilize every spare hour he can command, and carefully read it through, and, if he approves it as a fair exposure of Methodism, do as the fathers did thirty years ago, roll it through his neighborhood and county. Let each one make a persistent endeavor to get a club of ten or twelve, or twenty subscribers and receive the advantage of the commission allowed by the publishers, and the satisfaction of aiding in the exposition of error that loads the soul astray.

Brethren, you never saw a wheel that would roll itself, but you never saw one that will come so near doing it as this if you will only give it a little push.

Now all hands for a general push, to roll out 5000 by the 1st of January, 1885.

Send in your orders—\$13 per dozen, or \$1.50 single copy; by mail, postpaid.

LATER.—The printers have only shipped us 1000 copies. We have ordered another 1000, Aug. 12th, and will fill orders in rotation. J. S. MANAFFY.

Our young ministers, C. Owen and Mahon, will canvass Tipton and Lauderdale counties for the "New Great Iron Wheel" and "The Seven Dispositions" and this paper, and we trust our brethren will liberally patronize them, and thus assist them to clothe and book themselves at Jackson next session. Help them to place this paper in every family they visit, and you will help us and them and bless your family.
