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ART. I.—RIGHTS OF OFFENDERS.

The grossest offenders have rights, and it becomes the christian and the church of Christ to respect the rights of every individual. We are required, in the scriptures, not only to love mercy and walk humbly, but to deal justly, Mic. 6. 8. To render "unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's"; Matt. 22, 21. Cæsar, it is certain, was not the friend of God; for it was by Cæsar's laws that the son of God was immolated upon the cross: yet even Cæsar was to receive his due.

Is our civil government the guardian of our civil rights? So should the church be of our spiritual privileges. Is it necessary, in the one, that before a person can be disfranchised, he should be fairly tried and condemned, upon the testimony of credible witnesses? So should it be in the other. But instead of this, we have known a charge brought against an offender, and, in several instances, the motion made and carried to exclude him, although the charge was sustained only by the testimony of the accuser—the whole process occupying, perhaps, not more than five or ten minutes. And all this occurring—where? Not in the confessional of a son of apostate Rome; not in the class-room or closet of a tyrannical itinerant; not in the sessions convened by a haughty and aristocratic presbytery; but in the conference of a church that has ever gloried in being the champion of equal rights and of apostolical practices. Brethren, we write these things not to shame you, but to profit you; not to blazon forth your failures in duty, but to point out errors for your correction, "that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God." View us not as an enemy, who glories in your shame, because we speak the truth; but as one whose interests are identified with yours, who is honored when you are honored, and who bleeds when you are wounded.

A procedure, like that we have noticed, has not the least semblance of justice in it. It is in direct opposition to the teachings of God's word, tends to the establishment of a dangerous precedent, and frustrates the ends which should be had in view in the exercise of church discipline.

1. It is at variance with the rules of God's word, for,

1st, The word of God teaches, that an individual is not to be condemned except upon the testimony of "two or three witnesses." See Deut. 17, 6, and 19, 15, for the original law on this subject. In the
latter passage, it is said, "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be established." For evidence of the incorporation of this law in the christian code, see Matt. 18, 16—2d Cor. 13, 1—1st Tim. 5, 19. We would refer the reader also to our remarks on this subject in No. 2, p. 19.

2d. From the word of God, it further appears, that witnesses were required to give "in their testimony in the presence of the accused. This is evident from all the reports of trials recorded in Sacred Writ. In that most iniquitous trial, the most unparalleled for injustice of any recorded in the annals of criminal jurisprudence—in the trial of the Prince of Peace, the right to confront his witness was not withheld. That the witnesses gave in their testimony in his presence, is apparent from the whole narrative, as well as from the interrogatory of Pilate; Matt. 27, 13. "Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee?"

Reason and observation concur in teaching the importance of respecting this rule of right; for there are many persons, who are sufficiently malicious to accuse one behind his back, but are not sufficiently bold to sustain their accusation before his face. The consciousness that the accused knows the accusation to be false, has often confounded a false witness; and this it will generally do, where the accuser is not hardened in iniquity. Thus this rule is calculated to afford protection to the innocent against, at least a dastardly enemy. We have not unfrequently been punished and disgraced at the course pursued by accusers, and truly mortified, when the accuser has happened to be a brother in the church. That which had been affirmed as a matter of fact, behind one's back, turns out to be, before his face, but a matter of opinion, or an unwarrantable inference; and the charge which was thought to be based upon personal observation, is found to be based upon nothing more substantial than a very questionable hearsay.

3d. The same authority teaches us, that the accused should be allowed to answer for himself. This privilege was conceded to the Saviour, by the high priest, when the false witnesses gave in their testimony. "And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee?" Matt. 26, 62. The same right was conceded to the apostle Paul, on that occasion on which he delivered his eloquent and ever memorable address before Agrippa. "Then Agrippa said unto Paul, thou art permitted to speak for thyself. Then Paul stretched forth the hand and answered for himself," &c. Acts 26, 1. &c. When the Pharisees, on one occasion, manifested a disposition to condemn the Saviour unheard, Nicodemus appealed to them, John 7, 51. "Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" He evidently considered their conduct, in this instance, as of a most unjustifiable character, abhorrent alike to the principles of natural equity, and the spirit and letter of their judicial code.

Testimony may be given that appears direct, that is strong and true, as far as it goes; it may appear so conclusive as to leave no doubt on our minds relative to the guilt of the accused, and yet, when circumstances are explained, and important omissions in the testimony are supplied, the case may present a very different aspect from that which was at first presented. A case which occurred under our own observation will serve for an illustration. A very excellent brother brought a charge of intoxication against another. He stated, that he passed from one town to another with the accused, was in his company some ten
or fifteen minutes—the time occupied in the passage—that the accused was very talkative, but was so much intoxicated, that he could not speak distinctly. As it was known that the accused had once been in the habit of taking an occasional glass of liquor, and as the witness was one in whose veracity all had confidence, the impression made on every mind was, that the accused was guilty. Subsequently, the case was taken up. The accused being allowed to answer for himself, stated what was known to every one, that he labored under an impediment of speech, and that certain variations in the atmosphere, or any mental excitement, tended greatly to increase that impediment. He added, what had not been known, that his mind had become somewhat excited, by his anxiety to reach the neighboring town in time to secure a passage to some place which he was about to visit. He ascribed his inarticulate address to the combined influence of his mental excitement and the cold and damp atmosphere to which he was exposed on his passage, and affirmed, that on the day on which he was said to have been intoxicated, he had not touched a drop of spirituous liquors, nor indeed had he tasted any for many months previously. The church was satisfied with the defence, and the accuser apologized with, “I thought he had been drinking, and thought that it was the influence of liquor that caused him to speak so indistinctly.”

In this case it will be observed, that the facts stated by the accuser, as proof of the charge of intoxication, were admitted to be true by the accused; but when the circumstances were explained, they were not deemed sufficient to justify the inference deduced from them.

II. To try and condemn an individual, either in the church or out of it, without giving him a hearing, and allowing him to face his accusers, is to establish a precedent that is dangerous in the extreme. If this thing may be done with impunity, the character of no one can be secure; for there is no man who has not his enemies, and no man who has not failings, which may serve as the ground work for the basest of charges. How often have those, who have been engaged in tracing reports to their origin, been astonished to find how great a fire a little matter is capable of kindling, and how odious a tale a little imprudence may give rise. We will not hazard the assertion that it is never lawful to exclude a member from the church, without affording him an opportunity to confront the witnesses and defend himself; but we will say, that if such a course is ever lawful, it is only in extreme cases, which but rarely occur, and which should not be allowed to serve as precedents for other cases. To justify even this departure from the usual routine, three things must hold true. 1st, The offence committed must be of a highly criminal character. 2d, The proof must be such as to admit of no possibility of a refutation. 3d, The circumstances of the case must also be such, that the character of the church would suffer by the delay which was necessary for a formal trial. It should ever be remembered, that it is much easier to inflict a wound than to heal one. The injuries committed in an hour of excitement, a whole life time may be insufficient to repair. If, therefore, we err, it is best to err on mercy’s side.

III. To withhold from an offender any of his just rights, is to preclude the likelihood of effecting the ends for which we resort to the exercise of church discipline. To inflict a wanton injury upon an individual, is certainly not the most effectual way of bringing him to acknowledge the injuries he has done, either to the church or to the cause of Christ. The slightest deviation from the rule of right, on the part of the church, will tend rather to confirm the offender in his offences. It
will excite prejudice against us, close the doors of his head and heart against our appeals and remonstrances, and, like a coat of mail, render him invulnerable to the most pointed reproofs. Such a course of conduct moreover, instead of shielding the church from reproach, will expose her but the more. While she is attempting to stop up the breach which the offender has made in her walls, she pulls down a whole broadside. Learn, then, to respect the rights of offenders, if you would have them brought back to the exercise of a godly sorrow for their sins, and would shield yourselves, and the cause of Christ from reproach. These, as we have stated in our former numbers, are the great ends, for the accomplishment of which, the exercise of church discipline has been enjoined. Much wisdom and discretion is needed, to preserve us from an undue laxity on the one hand, and an unjustifiable severity on the other. In seeking to be lenient, we may be over-indulgent: and in seeking to be just, we may be tyrannical and oppressive. May He, who is the light of the world and the head of the church, enable his people to steer clear of either extreme. But to do this, beloved brethren, we must cultivate a spirit of prayer and diligently study the word of God.

ART. II.—NOTES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS.

The hurried manner in which we are compelled to prepare our articles for the press, not only precludes our paying due attention to the elegances of style, but sometimes leads us to express ourselves in such a manner as to render a subsequent explanation or correction necessary. An instance of this occurs at the present moment. In our last article on the ‘Early History of the Baptists,’ (No. 6, p. 97,) we propounded a query, which was calculated to convey the idea, that the authors, whose testimony we had introduced, had lived about three centuries prior to our day. The truth is, one of them lived as early as the fourth century, and some few of them are our contemporaries; but the greater part of them lived about the time of the reformation in Europe—some a little anterior, and some a little subsequent to that period. In our inquiry, we had particular reference to the major part of our witnesses. This correction we thought proper to make in the body of our ‘Notes,’ that it might not escape the observation of those whose attention may be attracted to these articles.

The apostolical fathers, from whose writings extracts are given in our 6th number, wrote in the latter part of the first century. Barnabas, according to Echard’s Chronological Table, wrote his ‘Epistle’ A. D. 72, and Hermas his ‘Pastor,’ A. D. 93. The former is supposed to be the Barnabas of whom we read so much in the Acts of the Apostles, and the latter, the individual mentioned in Rom. 14, 16. We proceed to give,

V.—THE TESTIMONY OF THE GREEK FATHERS OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

Justin Martyr, whose testimony we first introduce, was a native of Palestine, but a Grecian by birth. According to Echard, he was born A. D. 103, was converted to Christianity, A. D. 133, and wrote his first ‘Apology’ for Christianity, about the year 150. Thus it appears, that he was born four years before the close of the apostolic age, which is supposed to terminate with Simeon, who succeeded to the pastoral office in the church at Jerusalem, on the death of James, and who suffered martyrdom, A. D. 107. It further appears, that his Apology was
written sixteen years before the death of Polycarp, a disciple of the evangelist John. It was designed to defend the christian religion from the unjust aspersions cast upon it by its enemies, and was inscribed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, his two adopted sons, M. Aurelius and L. Verus, to the Senate, and, through them, to the whole people of Rome. In this work, he undertook to make the Emperor and his subjects acquainted with "the innocent rites and usages of the christian assemblies." As baptism was then, as it still is, one of the most prominent of the innocent rites practised in christian assemblies, we would very naturally expect that he would give a very clear account of the administration of this ordinance. In this expectation the reader will not be disappointed. His account of it, is as follows:

"Whosoever are persuaded that those things are true which are taught and inculcated by us, and engage to live according to them, are taught to pray to God, fasting, for the remission of their former sins, while we pray and fast with them. Then they are led by us to some place where water is, and are regenerated even as we ourselves were regenerated, for they are then immersed in the water, in the name of the Father of all, the Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost." (Apol. 1. ch. 61, apud Waddington's Ch. Hist. vol. 1. p. 27.)

We have met with versions of the above passage in the works of several Baptist authors, but prefer to give it, litteratim et verbatim, as it stands in a Pseudo-baptist work, that was "published under the superintendence" of a Pseudo-baptist society, formed expressly for the "Diffusion of Useful Knowledge." Let it be remembered, in the first place, that this father represents those who are admitted to the ordinance of baptism, in "the christian assemblies" of his day, as being first taught, as being persuaded of the truth of what they were taught, as uniting with the church in prayer and fasting, and, finally, as being led to the water and there immersed in the name of the sacred Trinity; all of which representations effectually preclude the idea of infant baptism. Let it be remembered, in the second place, that he makes not the most distant allusion to the subject of infant baptism. Is it credible, that this father, in giving an account of the "rites and usages of the christian assemblies," would have wholly omitted to say anything about the "usage" of baptizing infants, if there was such an usage in the church? Let reason respond. Would a Pseudo-baptist clergyman, in this or any other age, who should undertake to describe the usages of his church, say nothing, think you, about the baptism of infants? We appeal to the plain common sense of our readers, and to their candour, and leave our questions under the care of their consciences.

The same author, in his second 'Apology' p. 93. says, "We were born (corporeally) without our will, but we are not to remain children of necessity and ignorance, but in baptism are to have choice, knowledge," &c.: praeiresese kai epistemes; tuchomen en to boudos. See Christian Rev. vol. 3 p. 205.) If this does not amount to a declaration that an exercise of volition and the possession of knowledge are requisite to prepare one for the reception of baptism, and, consequently, that infants are not proper recipients of the ordinance, we confess we know not what it amounts. The author adds, "This we learned from the apostles." And let it be remembered, that when this was written, those were still living, who had received instructions directly from the apostles, and who would not have failed to contradict him, had he asserted what was false.
The same author says, "the person baptised, was received into the number of the faithful, who sent up their public prayers to God, for all men, for themselves, and for those who had been baptised." He also represents that the baptized were admitted to the eucharist. (Apol. 2, in Biblioth. Historico. Sacra. Art. Baptism.) Speaking of baptism, he moreover says, "it can cleanse only those who have repented"; to baptismai to monon katharisai tous metanoeantos du-namenon. (Dial cum Tryph. 14.) Again, "the name of the Trinity is pronounced over him who has desired regeneration, and has repented of his sins"; to helomeno anagnennetha, kai metanoeantai. (Apol. 1, 69.) And again, "he who has been enlightened is baptised; ho photizomenos loutai. For the last three extracts we acknowledge ourselves indebted to the Christian Review; (vol. 1, p. 207.

We next introduce to the notice of our readers Clemens of Alexandria, who wrote his Exhortation to the Gentiles, A. D. 189. The author of an old work* in our possession, says, "Clemens Alexandrius wrote largely for baptism accompanying faith and repentance; not at all mentioning that of infants," and sustains his assertion, by reference to Jacob Menaingus' Hist. part 2, p. 213, 214. In the Christian Rev., vol. 3, p. 99, we meet with the following extract from the writings of this author: "You were led to a bath, as Christ was conveyed to the Sepulchre, and were thrice immersed, to signify Christ's three days burial." (Mystagog.) Do those who practice infant baptism usually lead their infants to a bath? Do they not rather bring; not a bath, but a bowl or basin of water to the child?

In the same work from which the last extract was taken by the Reviewer, there is a passage bearing more directly upon the subject before us. We will give it as rendered by Du Pin, a Romanist. The author is speaking of the Saviour, the word incarnate, as our instructor, and says, "he performs his functions by forgiving our sins as he is God, and by instructing us as he is man, with great sweetness and love: He equally instructs all sorts, because in one sense, all are children; yet we must not look on Christian doctrines as childish and contemptible: on the contrary, the quality of children, which we receive in baptism; or regeneration; renders us perfect in the knowledge of divine things, by delivering us from sins through grace, and by enlightening us with the illumination of faith, so that we are at the same time both children and men; and the milk with which we are nourished, being both the word and will of God, is very solid and substantial nourishment." Milner, who transferred this passage to his pages, seems to be fully aware, that it was calculated to make against infant baptism, inasmuch as the language used could in no sense apply to those who were baptized in infancy. In order, therefore, to obviate, as far as possible, this effect, he appends to the bottom of his page, the following note. "The outward sign and the inward spiritual grace, on account of their usual connexion in the primitive church, are used as synonymous by a number of primitive writers, which has, unhappily given occasion to one of the worst abuses, by those who place all grace in form and ceremony only." (vol. 1, ch. 4, p. 147.)

But even this note, if we are not very much deceived, will produce an effect the very opposite of that which it was designed to produce; for the reflecting mind, will not fail to inquire how it happened that "the outward sign and the inward spiritual grace," were usually connected in the primitive church, and why it should not be usually connected in the present day.

Thophilus, another Greek writer of this century, in his letters to Autolycus, which are still extant, alludes to the practice which had, at that early period, been introduced, of making an application of oil or balm to the newly baptised, and represents it as significant of the inward union of the Holy Spirit, received by the person baptised. (See his Letters, Ad Autolycum, p. 35. Ed. Oxon. 1684, and the reference to it, Wheatley's Book on the Common Prayer, p. 367.) This author lived and flourished within 70 years of the Apostle John.

Melito, who wrote an Apology for the Christian Religion, A. D. 170, wrote largely on the subject of baptism, but we have never seen a solitary passage from his writings which favored infant baptism.

Irenæus, also wrote during this century. His work against Heresies was written about the year 187. One passage in this production has been seized on with great avidity by Pseudo-baptists, and triumphantly exhibited as proof positive of the practice of infant baptism. We well remember that the first time we met with the passage, it was in a Pseudo-baptist work, and we were not a little puzzled to conceive how they could extract from it any thing bearing, in the slightest degree, upon the subject of baptism. We are still unable to discover that the passage has any more reference to the subject of baptism, than it has to the art of coming, or indeed to any other subject, of which the author never even so much as dreamed. The writer was not discussing the subject of baptism, but was contending for the full incarnation of the Saviour, against the Gnostics, who denied it. But we give the passage entire, as we find it in the Christian Rev. vol. 2, p. 106—(See it also in Wheady, on B. com. Pray, p 310. Ed. 1769.)


"Christ came to save all through himself; all, I say, who through him are regenerated unto God, infants, and little ones, and children and youths, and the aged. Therefore he passed through every age, respectively, sanctifying infants by becoming an infant to them; to little ones, as a little one, sanctifying those of this age, at the same time, being made to them an example of piety, and of justice, and of subjection; to youths as a youth, becoming an example to them, and sanctifying them to the Lord." We would particularly commend to the reader the comments made upon this celebrated passage, by the able editor of the Review. They will amply repay him for the perusal.

If the word "regenerated" which occurs in this passage, means baptized, as Pseudo-baptists affirm, we would simply ask, what does the author mean by being "baptized through Christ unto God?" We imagine the reader would be as much puzzled to find a satisfactory answer to this question, as we have been to find a loop in the above passage whereon to hang an argument in favor of baptism.

But there is something in the arguments which our Pseudo-baptist brethren, deduce from the above that speaks volumes in our favor. It proves conclusively, that they have no direct testimony to prove that infant baptism was ever practiced during the first two centuries after Christ. Would they resort to such fastened and unwarrantable inferences, to sustain their tottering fabric, if they had a better support for it? It is said a drowning man will catch at a straw; but would he
do it, if he had a life boat at his side? Many were the Christian writers of the second century. Is there nothing in all their voluminous productions which has a direct reference to infant baptism? If not, surely our Pecdo-baptist brethren will yield the point and admit, that the practice of infant baptism did not prevail in the second century.

ART. III.—THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION.

Or, the sinfulness of indulging in the ordinary use of intoxicating Liquors.

In judging of the morality or immorality of any action, it is important to have distinct and clear views of the rule of right and wrong. We have frequently heard the expression that such a thing was or was not sinful, per se, that is in itself. Such expressions seem to us to indicate a very imperfect knowledge of the nature of sin. We know of nothing that is sinful in itself; nothing that is sinful irrespective of the Divine will. Paul says, "by the law is the knowledge of sin," (Rom. 3, 20.) And again, "I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust except the law had said, thou shalt not covet." (Rom. 7, 7.) John says, "sin is the transgression of the law, (1 John 3, 4.) and all unrighteousness is sin," (1 John 5, 17.) But the law was only an expression of the Divine will. All want of conformity, then, to the Divine will is sin, and is offensive to God. A conformity to it is commendable, and well pleasing in his sight. Now as there is no act that is neither conformable nor destitute of conformity to the will of God, there can be none that is of an indifferent character; none that God does neither approve nor disapprove.

If these postulates be admitted, it will necessarily follow, that God must approve or disapprove the ordinary use of intoxicating liquors, if he approves their use, every man woman and child ought to addict themselves to their ordinary use; for all are bound to do that which God approves; and if he disapproves it, no one can indulge in their ordinary use without sin. There must, therefore, be sin somewhere; either in those who use, or in those who abstain from the use of intoxicating liquors. This is a matter into which it becomes us to look carefully and prayerfully. We are decided of opinion, as stated in our last number, that 'God has clearly revealed, through the sacred scriptures, his disappoachment of the ordinary use of intoxicating drinks.' We shall refer, as briefly as possible, to the grounds upon which our opinion is based. God's disapprobation of the use of intoxicating liquors is manifested.

1. In his interdicting their use to those who were required to be preeminently holy. Thus it became the priests, who were set apart for the special services of the altar and the sanctuary to be peculiarly holy. The Lord, therefore, strictly enjoined upon them total abstinence from the use of wine and strong drink. "And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine, nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations." (Lev. 10. 8, 9.)

The same injunction was laid upon the Nazarite, who voluntarily entered into a solemn vow, to separate himself unto the Lord, for some special purpose. This vow was sometimes made for a limited time, and sometimes for life. Until the vow was performed, whether it was...
for a longer or a shorter time, the individual who had entered into it, was required to abstain from all intoxicating liquors. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, when either man or woman shall separate themselves to vow a vow of a Nazarite, to separate themselves unto the Lord; he shall separate himself from wine, and strong drink, and shall drink no vinegar of wine or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any liquor of grapes," &c. (Num. 6. 1, 3.) On one occasion, the Lord re-proved Israel for the violation of this law. "But ye gave the Nazarites wine to drink; and commanded the Prophets saying, prophesy not." (Amos, 2, 12.)

When the Lord would prepare Manoah's wife for becoming the mother of one that was to be consecrated to him, he sent an angel to her, who admonished her as follows: "Now therefore beware, I pray thee, and drink not wine nor strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing." (Judges 13, 4.) To the husband he says, "Of all that I said unto the woman, let her beware. She may not eat of anything that cometh of the vine, neither let her drink wine or strong drink, nor eat any unclean thing; all that I commanded her let her observe." (v. 13, 14.)

Under the new dispensation, we have seen in our last No. p. 115, that the bishop or pastor of a church is required to be nephelcon, i.e. no drinker; and the deacon is not to manifest a disposition to indulge in the use of wine. (1 Tim. 3. 2, 8.)

Is it reasonable to suppose, that if God approved the use of wine and strong drink, he would interdict their use to his most favored servants? To contend that the ordinary use of intoxicating liquors is a good thing, which God approves, appears to us equivalent to an attempt to prove God a liar; for he has declared, that "no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly." (Ps. 84. 11.) But we have seen that he withholds the use of wine and strong drink from the most upright of his servants.

II. The use of intoxicating liquors is interdicted not only to those who are prominent in the church, but to those also who occupy prominent stations in civil society. "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine, nor for princes strong drink, lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted." (Prov. 31. 4.) Has God two laws opposite in their character, one for the exalted, and the other for the lowly? Are wine and strong drink more injurious to persons in public life, if given to those in private? Are not those in authority uniformly required to be examples to those who are placed in subjection to them? In short, let conscience answer the question, does this injunction, or the reason assigned for it, favor the idea that God approves of the use of intoxicating drinks? Does it not rather indicate the contrary?

III. A further intimation of the Divine will in this matter is given in the commendatory manner in which mention is made, in the sacred scriptures, of those who abstained from wine and strong drink; as of Israel in the wilderness, who drank not either "wine or strong drink." (Dent. 29, 6.) Honorable mention is made of Daniel's abstaining from the portion of wine allotted him by the king. (Dan. 1, 8.) See also ch. 10, v. 3.) We may refer moreover to the Rechabites, (Jer. 35,) and to John, (Matt. 11, 18. Lu. 1, 15, and 7, 33.)

IV. Those are censured who manifest delight in wine, as "Israel who look to other gods and love flagons of wine," (Hos. 3, 1.) "And the harp and the viol, the tabret and the pipe, and wine, are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord," &c. (Is. 5, 12.) Is
it credible that God would censure one for loving flagons of wine and introducing it on festival occasions, if he approved of its use?

V. Many woes are pronounced on those who indulge in strong drink. 
"Wo unto them that rise up early in the morning that they may follow strong drink." (Is. 5, 11.) "Wo unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink." (v. 22.) "Wo to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, &c. (Is. 28, 1.)

VI. A wo is pronounced against him who gives his neighbor drink. 
"Wo unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him," &c. (Hab. 2, 15.)

VIII. The Lord clearly exposes the evil effects of intoxicating liquors, and cautions against their use. Thus we are told, that they lead "to forget God's law, and pervert judgment." (Prov. 31, 5.)—To "err in vision and stumble in judgment," (Is. 28, 17). That they take away the heart. (Hos. 4, 11.) That they are productive of wounds, sorrow, contentions, babbling, wounds without cause, redness of the eyes. (Prov. 23, 29.) That "wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging," and that "whoso is deceived thereby is not wise," (Prov. 20, 1). That it leads to transgression and other evils, (Hab. 2, 5.) And a caution is given, "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last, it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder," (Prov. 23, 31.) How can it be possible that God can approve the use of that which tends to lead men to forget and transgress his law, pervert judgment, and induce such a train of evils as those described above? If God approves the use of intoxicating liquors, why has he given us such a minute detail of their evil effects? Why does he caution us against them?

VIII. Not only are the evil effects of intoxicating drinks faithfully exhibited, but numerous instances are recorded, in which individuals, while under their influence, were either led to the commission of evil, or were overtaken by the judgment of heaven. The antideluvians were eating and drinking, as well as marrying, and giving in marriage, when they were overtaken by the deluge, (Matt. 24, 38.) Noah's use of wine led to the exposure of his own nakedness, and the entailment of a curse upon Ham and his descendants. (Gen. 9, 24.) Lot, under the influence of wine, committed incest, (Gen. 19, 32.) Amnon was slain, while his heart was made merry with wine, 2 (2 Sam. 13, 28.) The Amalekites, who burnt Ziklag, were eating and drinking, when David fell on them, and routed and destroyed them, (Sam. 30, 16.) Elah, who reigned over Israel in Tirzah, was drinking in the house of his steward, when Zimri conspired against him, and slew him, (1 King 16, 9.) Benhadad was drinking, when he formed the wicked purpose of making that attack upon Israel which led to his overthrow, (20, 12.) Wine had no small influence in turning against Haman, the shaft which he aimed at another, (Esther ch. 7.) Job's sons were eating and drinking in their eldest brother's house, when they were destroyed by a blast from the desert, (Job 1, 18.) Belshazzar was feasting and drinking, when he profaned the vessels of the Lord's house, praised his gods of gold and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone, and had his doom inscribed on the walls of his palace by a mysterious hand, from heaven, (Dan. 5.) Instances of a similar kind might be multiplied, but surely, these are sufficient for our purpose. For what end were they recorded? We know that they were designed for our instruction. Did God intend by the record of such facts to encourage or discourage the use of intoxicating liquors?
IX. In enumerating the sins of his people Israel, the Lord classed the use of intoxicating drinks with the grossest offences. Thus it is classed with *whoredom.* "Whoredom, and wine, and new wine, take away the heart." (Hos. 4, 11); with *idolatry,* (Hos. 3, 1); with debauchery, (Is. 5, 12, et passim.)

X. The ordinary use of inebriating liquors is contra-indicated in the general principles which the Lord has established for the government of our conduct, such as those which teach us to avoid temptation; the appearance of evil; the shortening of life, &c. &c.

We are free to admit, that there are passages which evince that God approves of the use of intoxicating liquors under certain circumstances. Their use as a remedial agent is sanctioned, 2d Sam. 16, 2; Prov. 31, 6; and 1 Tim. 5, 23. Their use in the performance of certain religious ceremonies, is sanctioned in very many passages of scripture. The advocates for strong drink, generally seize hold of these, apparently forgetful or ignorant of the fact, that it is a dangerous perversion of the sacred scriptures, to make an *unlimited* application of a *limited* rule or precept.

It is also true that there are passages which prove that God did *tolerate* the use of spiritual liquors, on other occasions than those which we have specified; but two remarks will be sufficient to convince the conscientious, of the impropriety of adducing these passages to sanction their ordinary use.

1st. It should be remembered, that God has tolerated many things which he was very far from approving. He allowed the Jews to put away a wife for *other cause than that of fornication.* The reason which the Saviour assigned for this, was the hardness of their hearts. He gave them to understand distinctly, that God had never approbated the act which he permitted. There is more evidence in scripture that God has tolerated, in his servants of old, acts which he did not approve, than there is of his tolerating the use of wine and strong drink; but who would think of adducing the examples of the patriarchs of old, to justify acts which God has evinced are offensive in his sight?

2d, The conscientious christian will be more careful to enquire what *does God approbate,* than what *will he permit?* He would not wilfully pursue a course which he believes God would not approve, even if liberty to pursue that course were allowed him.

With one more remark we will dismiss the subject. The dutifull son would feel himself as much bound to do what his father indicated to be his will, as to obey his express precepts; and so should we who profess to be the sons of God, as promptly comply with the clear intimations of our heavenly father's will, as with his express commands. Now, God has clearly revealed, in a variety of ways, his disapprobation of the use of intoxicating liquors on ordinary occasions. It certainly becomes us, therefore, carefully to abstain from their ordinary use.

ART. IV—EXPOSITIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

1st Tim. 5, 22, "Lay hands suddenly on no man."—Cheiras tache-os medeni epititheti.

The passage before us has been rendered more faithfully than many other passages of the Bible, and yet we think it would be an improvement of it to substitute the word *hastily* for *suddenly.* The one pre-
cludes the idea of mature reflection; the other does not. What is done hastily is done without due reflection; but we may perform an act suddenly, upon which we had deliberated most maturely. It was evidently the design of the apostle to teach, that the act to which he refers, whatever that act may be, was not to be done without a previous serious consideration of it in all of its bearings. But what is the act to which the sacred writer refers, is the main enquiry to which the attention of the reader will be directed in this article.

The commonly received opinion is, that the apostle has reference to the ordination of elders, and that it was his design to teach Timothy the importance of circumspection in admitting persons to the sacred office. From this opinion we dissent, for the following reasons—

1st, It appears to us, that had the apostle designed, in this epistle, to caution Timothy against the hasty admission of persons to offices in the church, he would have introduced the subject while speaking of the qualifications which they were required to possess. But the passage before us is wholly unconnected with any thing that has the least reference to their qualifications or their induction into office.

2d, There is, in the verse immediately preceding the one in which this passage occurs, a manifest transition from things of a public and general interest, to things appertaining to Timothy in his individual character. "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality." Then follows the passage under consideration. "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure." Timothy, and not the church, is now the object that is most prominent in the mind of the apostle.

A second opinion is, that it was the intention of the apostle to teach Timothy, that he should be slow to engage in strife, or to resist a wrong or resent an injury. We have two reasons for rejecting also this interpretation.

1st, There was nothing in the character of Timothy to suggest the necessity for such an admonition.

2d, To admit this interpretation, would be to admit, that one would be justifiable in engaging in strife, and resisting wrongs, provided he did not act hastily. But this admission would be at variance with the spirit of the gospel and the whole tenor of the apostle's instructions, and in direct opposition to many express precepts; such, for instance, as those which teach, that "the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle unto all men," 2d Tim. 2, 24—that he must be no striker; not a brawler," &c. 1st Tim. 3, 3; that christians should "rather take wrong," than resist or resent it. 1 Cor. 6, 7.

We next proceed to state the views, which a recent examination of the passage, with its context, has led us to adopt. We understand the apostle to teach Timothy, that he should be cautious how he admitted persons into his confidence and favor. In our intercourse with friends, it is very common, when we would make one feel perfectly free in our presence, and would impress him with the idea that we recognise him as an equal and friend, and confide in him as such, to lay our hand upon his shoulder. And when we would encourage the familiarity of a child, we lay our hand upon his head. Hence, to lay hands on one, may signify, to admit one into a state of familiarity or into our confidence.

We have numerous instances in scripture, also, in which favor to an individual is signified by the stretching out or laying on of the hand, accompanied sometimes with the invocation of a blessing. Thus Ja-
cob laid his hands upon Ephraim and Manasseh, when he gave them his last blessing. Gen. 48, 14. The Saviour laid his hand upon the children that were brought to him, and blessed them, Mark 10, 16. Nehemiah says, “the King granted me according to the good hand of God upon me.” Neh. 2, 8. Here the hand of God upon his servant evidently signifies his favor. The Psalmist also speaks of the withdrawal of God’s hand, when he would denote the withdrawal of his favor. Ps. 74, 11.

We will add a few reasons for adopting the interpretation which we have given above.

1st, It will harmonize with what follows in the same verse. We should be cautious how we admit persons into our confidence, and recognise them as our associates; for if we give countenance to an unworthy person, we make ourselves, in some degree, a ‘partaker of his sins,’ and he cannot preserve himself “pure” who will admit the impure into his society.

2d, The easy, affable, unsuspecting disposition of Timothy would render him peculiarly liable to imposition, and would very readily suggest to the apostle the necessity of admonishing him not to form hasty connexions with any one, however gifted by nature, prepossessing in his appearance, or imposing he might be in his address.

Whether the views expressed above are correct or not, we feel well assured of one thing; that both our ministers and our private members have much need of just such an admonition as that which we have represented, that the passage before us contains.

We have suffered much by the admission of unworthy persons into our pulpits and into our fellowship. May our past experience combine with the word of God, to impress upon us the necessity for greater circumspection in time to come.

__

RELIQUS OF A FORMER AGE.

Old Books and Older Truths.

We observed, a few months since, some notices in the papers of an old Bible in Philadelphia, published in 1573, and of an old copy of Quintillian’s Institutes, some where else, which was published in 1521. We too happen to have in our possession an old work, that has rested for years amid the gloom and solitude of cloistered retreats, but of late years has been dragged forth to public view, by hands profane, and ultimately deposited in the library of a reputed heretic.

Dionysius, a Carthusian Monk, of some reputation in his day, wrote a book, or rather compiled a work, which like Noah’s ark, and the honest Theban’s sack, contains “in a manner every thing as a body may say, all the good cheer of Thebes,” &c. This was printed in 1555, in two large quarto volumes, four inches and one-fourth in thickness, including the covers, which are literally of boards one-fourth of an inch thick, covered with black figured leather. The copy in our possession was once the property of John Baptiste of Rebdorff, as appears from an inscription, in his own hand writing, bearing date, 1558. The work is written in Latin, with many abbreviations, which renders its translation a very laborious work. It is composed of four books two in each volume. The first treat of the “inexplicable mystery of the holy Trinity.” The second of “the creation of all things, animate and inanimate,” The third of “the incarnation of the World, the recovery
of the human race, and of virtue." The fourth of "the sacraments, sacramental signals, the resurrection, and the last judgment." It contains the text of Peter Lombardi; and a collection of the opinions of the "orthodox fathers," on the several subjects introduced. The extracts from their writings are copious. Amongst those whose opinions are quoted, we have noted, on turning over a few pages, the following names: Gregory, Cyprian, Hilary, Augustine, Dionysius the Areopagite, Chrysostome, Ambrose, Isidorus, Rabanus, Macrobius, Alexander de Hales, Udalricus, Aegidius of Media, Bede, Hieronymus, Boniface IX, Rupertus, Eckbertus, Albertus, Hugo, Thomas Aquinas, John Scotus, Damascenus, John Brunnart, Bonaventure, Guilielmus Antonius, and others. Every capital in the work has a red dash across it, and within the spacious periphery of some of them may be seen his holiness, exalted upon an ivory throne, with a footstool of crowns, (very expressive of popery!) or some monk or friar, or winged saint, quietly reposing or silently engaged in his devotions. But we have introduced this work not so much with the view of exhibiting its curious mechanism, as to furnish a specimen of its contents. We doubt whether another copy of it is to be found on this side of the Atlantic.

The author has much to say about baptism, and to express the act uses mergero, immergero, and dimmero promiscuously, and sometimes interchangeably with baptizo. In B. 4, p. 35, 36, in the text of Peter, the author states, that the Synod of Agelou declared, that he who had been immersed without the invocation of the trinity, (quicunque sine Invocatione trinitatis mereret se) had not received the instituted seal of the kingdom; since it was invariably true, that if any one had been immersed in the baptismal font, (si mereret in fontem baptesan quis fuerit,) without the invocation of the trinity, he was not to be esteemed a perfect Christian; that is, he adds by way of explication, unless he had been baptized (fuerit baptizatus) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Thus it is evident, that mereret fuerit and fuerit baptizatus are used interchangeably, and that immersion and baptism signify one and the same thing in the estimation of the author. This is one of the truths to which we adverted in our caption, as being older than the books to which reference is made.

In a paragraph consisting of 22 lines, in which the author discourses on baptism, the word baptism occurs six times, inflections of the verb baptizo twice, immergo nine times, mergo four, dimmero once, immersis and mersis, each three times. Thus in 20 instances out of 28, in which reference is made to Christian baptism, mergo, or some of its compounds or derivatives, is used to express the act. And yet some of our modern divines would persuade us that baptizo does not mean to immerse, but to sprinkle or pour! We would as soon believe that white means black, or day light, darkness. What a pity it is, that some of our Millers, or Burgesses or Brownlees, had not lived in the days of these voluminous authors, to illumine their ignorance!

In B. 4, Quaest 3, p. 45, the author answers in the affirmative the inquiry, is an immersion of the whole body necessary to baptism? and assigns his reasons. He cites Dionysius, Damascenus, Chrysostome, Augustine, and others, to prove that baptism represents the death, burial and resurrection of the Saviour. This is another old truth. See Rom. 6, 3, 5, and Coloss. 2, 12. We have noted several rare passages in this work and may, possibly, introduce some of them to our readers at a future day.
The Futility of Pædo-baptism.

We have recently seen an article in some of our exchange papers, extracted from a Pædo-baptist work, which testifies to the futility of infant baptism. This has served to remind us of testimony borne many years since, to the same point, by individuals who succeeded in gaining no little celebrity in the Christian world. We have recurred to their musuy tomage, and extract for the benefit of our readers, the passages to which we refer. Archbishop Secker in his lectures on the catechism of the church of England, p. 28, ed. Lond. 1736, testifies:

1st. That the baptizing an infant does not increase its obligations. "Things promised in baptism," he says, "would have been absolutely incumbent on us, whether they had been promised or not?"

Again, "now certainly we are not bound to do whatever any other person shall take upon him to promise in our name."

2d. The baptizing an infant does not make its salvation more sure. "As to the pretence of the child's danger, we may be sure that its salvation may be as safe in God's mercy without any baptism, as with such a one, as he has neither commanded, nor made any promise to."

ibid. p. 343. This remark, it is true, is made in reference to baptism administered by unauthorized persons, but we see no reason why it should not apply with equal propriety, to every unauthorized baptism.

3l. It imposes no new obligations on parents.—"Anciently, the parents were the persons, who, at baptism, both represented their children, and promised for their instruction and admonition. But it was considered afterwards, that they were obliged to do it without promising it; and therefore other persons were procured to undertake it also." ibid. p. 27. Wheatley also, in his "Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer," p. 315, ed. Lond. 1769, says, "By the twenty-ninth canon of our church, no parent is to be admitted to answer as godfather for his own child. For the parents are already engaged under such strict bonds, both by nature and religion, to take care of their children's education, that the church does not think she can lay them under greater." If these things be so, we should like to know what is gained by substituting for an ordinance of heaven, and the tradition of men. It just occurs to us, that Dr. John Mason contends, that it swells their number and increases the pecuniary resources of the church. Essay on the church of God, p. 156-159. How blindness is error! How surprising is it, that a man of Dr. Mason's eminent piety, did not discover the impropriety, not to say sinfulness, of bringing such motives to bear upon a Christian's heart? Alas! how frail, how prone to err is man; even the best of men! Daily have we need to breathe the prayer,

"Oh that the Lord would guide my ways
To keep his statute still!
Oh that my God would grant me grace
To know and do his will!"

One reminiscence induces another. We remember, that in the summer of 1833 or '34, a Pædo-baptist church, in Virginia, whose rules prohibited baptizing the children of unbelievers, convened its elders, at the call of their pastor. He proposed to them to depart from the rule of their church, so far as to allow him to baptize the children of the unbelievers, and argued in favor of the measure, that if they did not pursue this course, the Methodists in their vicinity, who were rapidly increasing, would soon outnumber them, as they were in the habit of baptizing the children of every description of persons.
We state the fact, as we received it from a man of unquestionable piety, the venerable father of one of the leading members of the church session, and append a few enquiries. First, are the ordinances of the gospel to be regulated by the decisions of church sessions or ecclesiastical council? If not, we would further enquire. Did not this church admit that infant sprinkling is not a gospel ordinance, but an ordinance of man, when they admitted, by their action, that it might be modified or amended by men? And if so, why are we censured for denominating it a human invention? If our first question be answered affirmatively, we would only ask, what reason can their be assigned to justify a separation from the church of Rome?

"We would add, that we were boarding at the house of the member of session, to whom we have referred, when the transaction occurred, which we have narrated and that others heard the report of their proceeding in this case as well as ourselves.

EDITORIAL NOTICES.

Errata—In our remarks on rule 3d, p. 107, for lonquendi, read loquendi. In the last line, page 116, for amachom read amachon. On page 116, after the word parainon, in the 14th line, place a comma, and enclose in a parenthesis the clause, in the vulgate, vinolentum. The word in the vulgate is vinolentum, and not parainon. As these are errors which would escape the observation of the English reader, we think proper to point them out. Other errors there are, but it is not our practice to notice every typographical error. We leave them to serve as whetstones to the critical faculties of our readers. As an apology for the frequent errors that occur in our periodical, we will state, once for all, that having five religious services to conduct each week, and the undivided cares of a family to encounter, we seldom have time to copy one of the articles which we prepare for the press. Our proof sheet is often corrected too, while the printers boy is in waiting at our elbow. It should moreover be remembered, that our periodical, unlike our weekly papers, is filled, not with extracts, but with original matter. Even our statistics are compilations rather than extracts. But we almost regret this apology, for none but editors will ever understand it fully.

Correction of our Receipts.—Hon. L. Warren should have been credited with $1, instead of $2. Mrs. Robison, with $2, instead of $1. The name of Miss Martha Meredith should have been added to that of Miss Jane Meredith, 3d line from the bottom. The names of the following individuals, who have paid for the first volume of the Chronicle were omitted some months ago, viz. Rev. A. P. Repiton, Mr. J. W. Potts, Mrs. Martha Rives, Mrs. H. F. Wyche. We or the Printer were in fault for the omissission of the first two names. Our correspondents are chargeable with the omission of the last two, as their letters on file will show. We are thankful for corrections. If our subscribers fail to receive their numbers regularly, or discover errors in our credits, or receive defective copies of any No. we hope they will communicate the fact. Errors will evidently occur. We hope we shall not be censured before we are made acquainted with them, and fail to correct them.

We were sadly disappointed on having the proof sheet handed to us to find that our notices of exchange papers were crowded out. We crave the indulgence of our brother editors, and of friends who have forwarded us minutes, &c. Their favors shall not pass unnoticed,
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A long article, containing notices of new publications, both occa-
sional and periodical—of Baptist Periodicals circulated in the South,
—and of the resolution of the Columbus Association to establish a
Baptist Book Depository in this city,—we have had the unspeakable
mortification to learn from our publisher has been necessarily excluded
from this No. for the want of room.
ARTICLE I.—PUBLIC OFFENDERS.

While we affirm that there is no law of Christ's kingdom which imposes upon us the obligation to admonish an offender privately, before we introduce his case to the notice of the church, we would not be understood as pronouncing it unlawful in any case to pursue such a course. Circumstances may render it not only lawful, but manifestly our duty to labor with an individual in private, before we act upon his case in public.

There is a wide and material difference between a positive obligation and a moral duty. The one rests upon a positive precept or express example; the other upon general principles established in the word of God. Thus we may speak, with propriety, of a positive obligation to perform a moral duty; for there are positive precepts to do the whole will of God, and the will of God is revealed, in part, in the general principles to which allusion has been made. It may, therefore, be our duty to do what it would be very unlawful in the church, by an express rule, to require us to do. The church has no right to pass any law for which it has no express warrant in the word of God; but we are morally bound, as individuals, to do many things for which there is no express precept. Were an express precept necessary to impose a duty, what an endless number of volumes must have been written to teach us "the whole duty of man." The long life of a Methuselah would have proved insufficient to enable one to acquaint himself with the thousandth part of those precepts, which it would have been necessary to give; and, consequently, insufficient to teach him the thousandth part of his duty!

The question then occurs, under what circumstances is it our duty to go to a public offender and admonish him in private? Before attempting to answer this query, we would premise, that the Scriptures certainly justify us in making a distinction between offenders. Jude, in his Epistle, speaking of certain false teachers, and those who were led astray through their artifices, says, "And of some have compassion, making a difference: And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh."—V. 22, 23.

The sum and substance of the instructions on this subject appear to be this: That gross, wilful and obstinate offenders are to be promptly excluded from the church, while such as have been misled by them, and have sinned inadvertently,—not through a settled purpose to do
evil, or any perverse disposition of the heart, but through the weakness of their frail natures, and the infatuation of the moment,—should be treated with greater lenity. If they are tractable, can be made sensible of their errors, are ingenuous enough to confess their faults, and honest enough, not only to reform their conduct, but to seek to make some adequate reparation for the wrongs they have done, they should be retained in communion. But even in such cases, it is necessary that the church proceed in such a manner as to evince, very clearly, that while she retained the offender in fellowship, she held his sins in utter abhorrence.

Churches, in the present day, are ready enough to make distinctions in the treatment of offenders; but the distinctions which they make are too often founded upon the influence which individuals possess in the world,—upon an influence which is produced, not by a holy life, but by the adventitious circumstances of place, property or worldly reputation. If one animadverts upon the improper conduct of a member who is thus favored, the reply is, "O, he is an officer of government, he is a man of wealth, or he is a man of talents, a man of great erudition—We must bear with him." It is thus, in the church, as it is in the state: wealth, office, and worldly reputation, cover more sins by far than the robe of charity. Christians, as well as men of the world, but too frequently verify the truth of Shakspeare's remark:

"Through tattered clothes small vices do appear;  
Robes and furred gowns, hide all. Plate sin with gold,  
And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks;  
Arm it in rage, a pigmy's straw doth pierce it."

It is scarcely necessary to add, that the only distinctions which are warranted by the word of God, are those founded on differences in moral character.

These remarks, we trust, have prepared the reader, in some degree, to give a due consideration to the views which we shall express in answer to the query anticipated. In reply to that query, we would observe, in general terms, that when three things occur in the case of the offender, we may safely conclude that it is our duty to reason with him in private, before we arraign him publicly: 1st, When the offence committed is evidently ascribable more to an error of the head than of the heart, and savors more of what the world would call an impropriety, than of an immorality; 2d, When it is in the power of the individual, by his own act, effectually to secure the church from all unjust imputations on his account; and, 3d, When the general character of the individual is such, as to justify the belief of his willingness, when convinced of his error, to make any reparation in his power, for the wrongs committed. If any of these things be wanting in the case of the offender, the duty to admonish him privately will be, at least, very questionable. If all are wanting, it certainly cannot be proved the duty of any one to do it.

If the offence consist in some grossly immoral act, such as the sin of drunkenness, the commission of assault and battery, fornication, &c., no acknowledgments, no professions of penitence on the part of the offender, can shield the church from reproach. It will, therefore, be absolutely necessary that the church should act upon his case. She should act promptly, act with decision, and act effectually. Our churches, almost uniformly, are guilty of two flagrant errors in reference to such cases. The first is, that of delaying action unnecessarily; and the second, that of receiving an acknowledgment, perhaps reluctantly
made, as a sufficient satisfaction for the injuries done to the cause of Christ.

1. The delay of action. The church of Rome, in the height of her arrogance, and in the supremacy of her power, issued her decrees, that the ordinance of baptism should be administered only on specified days,—at Easter and Whitsuntide.* We, while loud in condemning this usurpation of power, scruple not to imitate her example, by adopting a rule which requires that offenders shall be tried only on certain appointed days; and the number of these days amount only to twelve,—on only twelve days out of the 365 is it lawful, according to the usage of very many of our churches, to investigate and act upon the moral delinquencies of our members! Where is the Scripture to justify such a restriction? The truth is, there is no more sanction given in Scripture to the restriction which we adopt, than there is to that adopted by the church of Rome. Whenever the disciples assemble in the name of the Lord, they are as fully authorized to investigate and act upon cases of church discipline, as they are to unite in the worship of God. “When ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto Satan,” &c. (1 Cor. v. 4, 5,) was the direction given by an inspired apostle.

According to the rule which custom has established among us, if a man on our church meeting day gets drunk, murders his neighbor, or commits highway robbery, we can do nothing with him until the next church meeting. His case is then perhaps introduced; but the offender is generally absent, consequently nothing final can be done. A committee is appointed to cite him to appear before our next church meeting. Another month rolls round—his case is taken up—some one notifies the church, that it was out of his power to attend that day—he had a friend to meet, a neighbor to visit, a debt to pay, or something of the kind to do, and requests that the case be deferred. It is deferred, accordingly, another month; and sometimes it is put off from month to month, for six months or more. We knew an instance, in which a member committed murder, was tried by a civil court, condemned, and came near being hung before the church could act upon his case. And why was this? Because she had bound up her hands, not with the rules of God’s word, but with the rules of her own invention. We are sticklers for the rules which God has prescribed for the administration of gospel ordinances. It is well; but, brethren, let us be equally tenacious of the rules which he has prescribed for the regulation of our own conduct, and the government of our churches.

Perhaps some may respond, you condemn the course which custom has established amongst us, what course would you have us pursue? We answer, the first time the disciples are “gathered together” after the offence becomes known to the members of the church, let the case be taken up. If the offender be absent, let persons be appointed to prepare him of the charges alleged against him, and cite him to appear at your next meeting. Let your meeting be appointed at an early day. If you should not be able to dispose of the case at your next meeting, adjourn from day to day, and be sure to make a final disposition of the case as soon as practicable. Remember, that every day the offender continues in the church, the wound he has inflicted upon her

honor is kept open, and her spiritual strength is wasting. Moreover, promptitude in acting upon the case of offenders, will have a tendency to restrain others from the commission of evil.

If it be deemed too much for an individual to assume the responsibility of laboring to produce a reformation in this matter, could not something be done in our Ministers' meetings, and at our Associations, which would have a tendency to direct the attention of our churches to this subject and lead to the correction of the existing evil?

(To be continued.)

For the Baptist Chronicle.

ART. II.—HINTS ON THE DANGERS OF POLITICAL EXCITEMENT.

Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou and rule over us. —Jotham.

We are of the number of those old-fashioned Essayists, who think even a Title should be appropriate. The Spectator looked wisely upon the world of his day; the Tatler made an engaging use of his tongue; and the Guardian threw his shield round most important public virtues. Our paper, in this day of endless declamation—political, moral and ecclesiastic,—will be strictly a collection of Hints.

The ablest modern lexicographers give us a hopeful definition of this word: "Something taken," the past tense of hent an. (A.-Sax.)—Horne Tooke. We suppose this first connected the idea of brevity with hints. And that it may afford us one reason why much good advice is so often lost upon both the church and the world—It is so long that it cannot be taken.

I. We would hint the dangers of political excitement to the political world. As we are not partizans on either side of the political strife now urging, our visits into this region are comparatively "few and far between." But we peep into it enough to gather a few hints from history and older heads. Modern political excitements "tear a passion," as Shakspeare has it, (every passion they would move) "to tatters." Is it the amor patriae? Who has any faith in it? As "a charm," a cant, it ceases even "to lull to sleep." The claim to it has been so generally felt to be mere pretension, that when any discretion is left, it is rarely made. Is it the love of Truth? Political partizans so entirely cease to expect it that they feel this a full discharge from the duty of regarding it, in their uncivil war of tongues. Is it the yet more honorable love of a personal good name? What public man, if half what "honorable" opponents say is to be believed, can be so superannuated as to indulge it? Every candidate for political distinction must abandon this passion as quite a beardless folly!

The amount of these Hints is, That if the existence of Patriotism is ever again to be a part of the public creed, party must be sacrificed to it, to a degree that none of our active leaders in the party strifes believe. Everywhere must truth and character be respected, as few of the leaders we have heard or read respect it, or the ablest men of the country—all men of highly honorable feeling—will renounce all connection with public life. A creditable faith in political men,—the believing them honest until proved knaves,—is entirely lost sight of, and will soon, as these excitements proceed, be lost irrevocably. The better established modern doctrine is, Believe them knaves until you find them honest.—Not that Caesar's wife must not be suspected, but that Caesar cannot find a virtuous companion!
2. We would, if possible, more earnestly hint the moral and religious dangers of political excitements. They pay the highest wages in the country—employ some of the most powerful writers, for—slanders. Political zeal is beyond all historical parallel morally reckless zeal. In the recollection of how many of us has it greatly deteriorated!—and become, as it never before was, all party spirit—an international party spirit, as opposed to a patriotic public spirit! Not urging a body of freemen to contend for great national questions with a common foe; but a body of such men to be interminably at strife upon local and sectional topics between themselves. It is, therefore, as the malicious bitterness of a civil war, contrasted with the remote evils of a foreign one, at once more individual and more inhuman; less generous and less capable of yielding honorable laurels to any combatant. While all respect and confidence in public men is well high extinct, (a great political evil,) so that the outrageous language of party writers becomes only practically harmless because of its sheer absurdity,—is it morally, privately harmless? Has it not debased the public mind—poisoned the channels of daily intelligence, and polluted with a murderous spirit every cause and party that can stoop to be thus advocated?—Certainly, if the high morality of our Saviour's exposition of the sixth commandment is orthodox with us. His peaceful, holy, honorable and common-sense doctrine of murderous words leading more quickly than anything else in civil society to murderous blows,

These excitements are clearly dangerous to religion and our spiritual life, because they have their whole origin and scope in "this present evil world." All these Scriptures, therefore, that remind us of Christ's disciples being not of this world, but selected out of it; being, so far as truly spiritual, hated by it; of the friendship of the world being enmity with God, &c., apply here. They seriously endanger a Christian's humility. All their efforts are on the side of pride and power. The old strife of who shall be greatest? The incessant, absorbing struggle of who shall get first and go first? We say not that in all cases this is unlawful, but that for it to be long and steadily and grossly pursued, is always spiritually dangerous: hence, that among Christ's disciples, as such, it is absolutely forbidden. It is just the opposite spirit to that which He came into the world to teach. They endanger our religion by so much as they harden the conscience and spoil the temper. How cheap the name and character of God in the oratory of the hour! How fully sacrificed the day of God to the political meeting, or the journey to the meeting! How degrading the canon, "All is fair when it comes to politics;"—and shameful the perjuries as to age, residence, &c., apologized for by "It is only an election oath!"

We will add, political excitement is unfriendly to the religious temper and spirit, because it so shamefully degrades so much of the intellect of the country. It is the market for bright, shallow minds, and half-educated men. Hence an enemy to sound education, of which Christianity is so warm a friend, and with which she is, in the face of all opposition, doing such wonders! Nothing so much multiplies low, trashy publications and readers. It furnishes the Sunday reading of a large majority of the country. And to little purpose shall a whole country read, we will contend, when the party newspaper becomes their only reading! Better never to have learned, we fearlessly add, where this is their only Bible!

We have had no space to interpret our motto. Jotham meant that
Abimelech, as contrasted with Gideon, was the political bramble of that day, contrasted with the vine and the olive. We meant to ask, whether another sound moral of this the earliest and one of the best fables of antiquity may not be, *That few good men care to be the world's great men?* It is as the olive leaving its fatness, the fig its sweetness, and the vine its cheering fruit, when they do. Your place-men are certainly the bramble characters of all history.

**ART. III.—NOTES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS.**

(Continued from page 66.)

To the testimony adduced, in our last, relative to the practice of the primitive church, we cannot forbear adding that of the Council of Paris, A. D. 829. In one of their canons they affirm, that "In the beginning of the holy church of God, no one was admitted to baptism, unless he had before been instructed in the sacrament of faith and baptism."—Boothe introduces the testimony of many others to the same effect; but we pass on to testimony of a more specific character.

3. Testimony defining more explicitly the period that intervened before the introduction of paedobaptism.

Dr. Barlow, who filled honorably a professor's chair in the University of Oxford, and was one of the most distinguished scholars of his age, says, "I do believe and know that there is neither precept nor example in Scripture for paedobaptism, nor any just evidence for it, for *above two hundred years after Christ.*—In the primitive times, not only Pagans and their children, but also the children of Christian parents, were first Catechumeni, then Illuminati."

Salmatius and Suicerus.—*"In the two first centuries no one was baptized, except, being instructed in the faith, and acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, he was able to profess himself a believer; because of those words, 'He that believeth and is baptized.' First, therefore, he was to believe. Thence the order of catechumens in the church. Then, also, it was the common custom to give the Lord's Supper to those catechumeni immediately after their baptism."*  

Curcellaeus.—*"The baptism of infants, *in the two first centuries after Christ, was altogether unknown*; but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. In the fifth and following ages, it was generally received. The custom of baptizing infants *did not begin before the third age after Christ was born.* In the former ages no trace of it appears."*

Mr. Brandt.—*"That good and very ancient custom of baptizing infants, is advanced with too much violence by some, and opposed with no less by others. This ceremony, as some think, prevailed first in Africa and Greece; but in such a manner that some doctors of the church declared that they could not consent to it."*

Rigaltius.—*"In the acts of the apostles we read that both men and women were baptized, when they believed the gospel preached by*
Philip, without any mention being made of infants. From the apostolic age, therefore, to the time of Tertullian, the matter is doubtful.∗

Venema.—"Nothing can be affirmed with certainty, concerning the custom of the church before Tertullian; seeing there is not anywhere in more ancient writers that I know of, undoubted mention of infant baptism."†

M. Formey.—"They baptized from this time (latter end of the second century) infants as well as adults."‡

Limborch.—"The necessity of paedo-baptism was never asserted in any council before that of Carthage, held in the year 418. So that, since there are no marks in antiquity, before the said council, of the necessity of infant baptism, there is no reason why at present it should be held as necessary.§

Dr. Taylor.—"The truth of the business is, as there was no command of Scripture to ordite children to the suspicion of it, (baptism,) so the necessity of paedo-baptism was not determined in the church, till the canon that was made at the Milevitan council, a province in Africa, and never till then. I grant that it was practised in Africa before that time, and some of them thought well of it although that is no argument for us to think so; yet none of them did ever pretend it to be necessary—none to be a precept of the gospel. Austin was the first that ever preached it to be necessary, and it was in his heat and anger against Pelagius, who had so warmed and chafed him, that made him innovare herein.‖

Grotius.—"Infant baptism was not enjoined till the council of Carthage."‖

Luther.—"It was not determined till Pope Innocent's time."***

Platon.—A writer in the Baptist Advocate, Vol. 1. No. 44, says:—

"Platon declares that he cannot decide against those who say, that there is no mention of infant baptism for the first two centuries after Christ, and that it first arose in the third century in Africa only; and after saying that Ambrose, and Basil, and Gregory, and Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom, and many of the emperors—as Constantine, and Constantius, and Valentine, and Gratian, and Theodosius, and innumerable others,—were baptized in adult age, he adds, 'It is difficult to decide when infant baptism became common throughout the church.'"

The writer in the Advocate informs us, that he quotes from a copy of The Articles of Faith of the Greek Church, prepared by Platon, and translated into Greek by Dr. Covay, the father of modern Greek literature, in 1772, and printed at Athens in 1836, for the use of the Greek schools.

We again avail ourselves of the fruits of Professor Sears' researches into German authorities, and add some of the testimony with which he has enriched the pages of the Christian Review.††

Prof. Hahn's Theology, p. 556.—"Neither in the Scriptures, nor

* In Stennett's Answ. to Rupen. pp. 74, 75.
¶ Annot. on Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, in the same p. 193.
** Extr. in Danv. p. 107.
†† Vol. iii. No. 10, Art. 4.
during the first hundred and fifty years, is a sure example of infant baptism to be found; and we must concede, that the numerous opposers of it cannot be contradicted on gospel ground."

Winne's Manuscript Lectures.—"Originally only adults were baptized; but, at the end of the second century, in Africa, and in the third century generally, infant baptism was introduced; and in the fourth century, it was theologically maintained by Augustine."

Matthies, p. 187.—"In the first two centuries, no documents are found, which clearly show the existence of baptism at that time."

Kaiser's Bib. Theology, p. 178.—"The first traces of infant baptism are in the second century."

Rheinwald, p. 313, states that the first "traces of infant baptism are found in the Western church, after the middle of the second century, and was the subject of controversy in Proconsular Africa, towards the end of this century. Though its necessity was asserted in Africa and Egypt, in the beginning of the third century, it was even to the end of the fourth century by no means universally observed,—least of all in the eastern church. Notwithstanding the recommendation of it by the fathers, it never became a general, ecclesiastical institution, till the age of Augustine."

To this long list of Pædobaptist authorities, which might be greatly increased, we will add the testimony of two of the fraternity of Quakers, who, as far as the historical facts which we are laboring to establish are concerned, are certainly to be considered disinterested witnesses:

Thomas Lawson says, "Sprinkling of infants is a case unprecedented in the primitive church; an irrepetitious custom, sprung up in the night of apostasy, after the falling away from the primitive order.—Such as rhamtize, or sprinkle infants, have no command from Christ, nor example among the apostles, nor the first primitive Christians, for so doing."*

Elizabeth Bathurst says of infant baptism, "This they (the Quakers) utterly deny, as a thing by men imposed, and never by God or Christ instituted; neither is there any scripture precept or precedent for it.—Indeed, how should there, since it was not taken up, nor innovated for above two hundred years after Christ died."†

---

ART. IV.—DR. HOLCOMBE'S VIEWS OF POLITICS.

What the worthy author of Dr. Holcombe's Memoir has recorded of his views on the subject of politics, we have learned, with unfeigned regret, has been considered, by some, as sanctioning the political excitement of the present day. We therefore deem it our duty to exercise the right, which we reserved to ourselves, of following the Memoir with some additional remarks of our own.

We feel fully persuaded in our own mind, that had Dr. Holcombe lived to the present day, instead of abandoning his flock and traversing the country, to deliver political harangues, as too many ministers have done, he would have been found amongst the foremost of those who are laboring to arrest the political mania, that has disturbed the quietude of the domestic circle with midnight broils—that has entered the holy

---

† Testimony and Writings, pp. 44, 45, Ed. 4th, in codem.
sanctuary, rent asunder the threefold cord that bound in one the hearts of the children of God, defiled the temple, prostrated the altar, hid waste alike the mental and the moral powers of those who officiated thereat, and spread confusion amongst the host of God's elect,—setting forever at variance those who once moved on in happy unison, like "a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariot." Our reasons for this belief are founded upon three considerations:

1. Dr. Holcombe ever taught, even in his political discourses, that the kingdoms of this world were to be kept subject to the kingdom of heaven—or, in other words, that all things were to be made subordinate to the purposes of religion. Even in the extract which has been perverted from its true use, he condemns, in the most unequivocal terms, paying "a disproportionate attention to politics," and teaches that "we should attend to the political affairs of our country as for only as will consist with our other and more important duties." It is incredible that one who held and taught such doctrines would ever sanction the conduct of those who league with the prince of darkness, and, to promote the ambitious views of some political aspirant, seek to blacken the character of members of their own communion, over whom they are taught in Scripture to cast the mantle of charity, and whose infirmities they are instructed to bear.

2. Dr. H. was ever bold, fearless and unceasing in his opposition to everything that militated against the cause of Christ. That the political excitement of the present day has exerted a baneful influence on the church, its warmest advocates admit. It has clothed Zion in sackcloth and deluged our country with crime.

3. Dr. Holcombe, it is well known, in the latter part of his life, was opposed to the most admissible form of warfare, and became the warm and strenuous advocate of peace establishments. He publicly taught, as his biographer informs us, "the inconsistency of war with the principles of those who profess godliness." (See No. iv. p. 87.) Is it likely that one who opposed international warfare, upon such principles, would ever become the advocate of civil strife? Surely, there are none so simple and so credulous as to believe it.

But we may be told, that actions speak louder than words, and that Dr. Holcombe's example, at all events, gives a sanction to those who launch out into the troubled sea of politics, and suffer themselves to be tossed high upon its broken waves. To this we have a few things to say, in the way of a reply.

We do not learn that Dr. H. consented to serve but once in the councils of state. This was in the earlier part of his life. The office which he then filled was not one after which he sought and which he coveted, but one that was thrust upon him by the concurrent voices of his fellow citizens. It is a little surprising, if Dr. H. believed it to be commendable for ministers to make themselves political leaders, that he was not found, on subsequent occasions, filling a seat in the legislative halls. The fact of his consenting to serve once, and but once, evinces that he considered the circumstances of the times peculiar, and that he was influenced by these peculiar circumstances in his acceptance of a civil office. It was the peculiarities of the times that justified the course which he pursued. To render, therefore, a similar course of conduct justifiable in the present day, the same, or similar peculiarities must exist. Is there any similitude between the present posture of affairs and the state of things which then existed? We think not; for
1st. The questions which then agitated the public mind, were of vital importance. They involved not only our civil, but our religious liberties. It certainly well became the church and the ministers of the gospel, as well as the community at large, to feel a deep interest in the decision of such questions. The church, in fact, had more at stake than the civil community; for she had rights peculiar to herself, while she was equally interested with others in the cargo of rights with which the ship of state was freighted. The question, which was prominent above all others, was, What principles of government shall we adopt? Is this question still pending? It is not. It was answered by the several States, definitely, when they adopted the present constitution of the United States; and their answer is embraced in the several articles of that compact. The question which now causes the community to divide and file off into parties, is not what principles, but what men shall govern us; for, as just stated, the principles by which we are to be governed have already been settled and become the law of the land. Thanks to the great Arbiter of all events that it is so. Thanks to God that the temple of civil and religious liberty is not now to be built. It has already been reared. Its proud spire towers above the highest hills, and is reflecting, far and wide, that light, which we trust is destined ultimately to chase away the last remaining cloud of despotism, and to illumine, with its blended rays of science and religion, this benighted and chaotic world of ours.

2d. When Dr. Holcombe consented to serve in the councils of state, there was a great dearth of men of talents. Our country was then in its infancy. War had also extended its ravages through our land, and swept away a large proportion of the few who had addicted themselves to mental culture. The consequence was, that the ministry had to be taxed to supply deficiencies in the profession of law, in the profession of medicine, in the legislative assembly, and even in the army. Such were the exigencies of the times, that the minister was not unfrequently under the necessity of acting in three or four capacities at the same time. But how very different is the state of things at present! Halls, and Athenæums, and Lyceums are found in every section of our country, and men of ability in every class in society. The professions of law and medicine are filled to overflowing; scientific lecturers are strolling through the country, for the want of better employment, lecturing in every town, and almost in every hamlet; politicians are treading upon each others' heels, and jostling each other out of office. In the ministry only, is the demand for men of ability greater than the supply. While the reapers, in the field of politics, are so numerous as to crowd in each other's way, it is still, in the gospel vineyard, as it was in the days of the Saviour: ‘The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few.’ The injunction, too, ‘Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his vineyard,’ is still sounding in our ears, commingled with the imploring cry, ‘Come over and help us.’ How exceedingly strange is it, that any minister should feel it his duty, under such circumstances, to abandon the vineyard of the Lord who bought him, where ‘the laborers are few,’ and rush into an alien’s field, to gather sheaves, where the laborers are incommode by their number! We will not ask, does revelation sanction such a course, but simply, dare even reason do it?

Before the examples of Dr. H. and others who acted with him in settling the government of our country, can serve as safe precedents for us, it will be necessary that two important changes should take
place in our country: 1. Our present constitution must be revoked, and the question be again submitted to the people. By what principles will you be governed? 2. Knowledge must decrease to such an extent as to render it impracticable, without the aid of the ministry, to obtain a sufficient number of men duly qualified to organize and administer the government.

When a minister neglects the work to which he has, in a most public and solemn manner, declared his belief that the Lord has called him, and engages in the political contests of the day, does he not cast a reflection upon the community? Does he not virtually declare his belief, that there is not sufficient virtue or intelligence in the community properly to conduct such discussions without his aid? If he believed there was a sufficiency of virtue and intelligence for this end, without his aid, is it credible that he would abandon a work, to which he professes to have been specially called of God—a work, the most important of any that ever claimed the attention of mortals—a work to which his Saviour before him devoted himself exclusively while on earth, and to which he instructs those, whom he calls, to give themselves wholly? "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; Give THYSELF WHOLLY TO THEM; that thy profiting may appear to all." (Can he make proficiency in the ministry when his attention is diverted to politics?)

"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; CONTINUE IN THEM: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."—1 Tim. iv. 14, 15, 16. The plain inference from the latter part of this passage is, that if he neglect to do this—neglect to give himself wholly to the work of the ministry—to continue in it, he endangers his own salvation and the salvation of his hearers. We ask again, would a man do this, if he believed there was virtue and intelligence enough in the community to conduct affairs of state without his aid?

A more solemn inquiry has occurred to our mind, and induced a train of gloomy reflections. The Lord has not only taught that those who engage in the "ministry" should "wait on their ministry,"—Rom. xii. 7—give themselves wholly to it, &c., but has issued a command, so express and comprehensive, that it does seem to us that a departure from it would be an impeachment of the wisdom of God: "Let every man abide in the calling wherein he was called."—1 Cor. viii. 20. Does not the man who even intermits his labors in the ministry to engage in a political warfare, cast a reflection, not only upon the community, but upon Him who has given this injunction? With what consistency can he call upon the sinner to repent, believe and obey the gospel, while acting himself in open violation of the most express commands of the gospel? May not the sinner turn upon him and condemn him out of that very gospel which he preaches? If the sinner does it not, will not conscience thunder in his ear the interrogatory, "Thou, therefore, which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorst thou God?"—Rom. ii. 21, 23.

In the views which we have expressed on this subject, we have impugned no man's motives; neither is it our design to excite a prejudice against any one. Ministers of every denomination, in the South, have thought and acted differently from us. We cheerfully yield to them the rights which we claim for ourselves—the right of discussing the
propriety or impropriety of mingling in the strife of politics, and the right of acting according to the dictates of our own conscience. When the present excitement has subsided, we purpose giving more fully our reasons for believing it not only inexpedient, but scripturally untoward for ministers to make themselves the leaders, or the tools of the leaders of a political party.

We deem it our duty to add, that since we have been engaged in the ministry, we have never intentionally said or done anything to advance the interests of a political party; neither have we exercised the right which we possessed of voting at the election of a civil officer—not even at that of a mayor or an alderman, a sheriff or a constable. The course which we have hitherto pursued, we hope to be enabled to pursue, by the grace of God, to the end of life. Notwithstanding these asseverations, it is very probable, that some in both of the contending parties of the present day, will take umbrage at our remarks, inveigh against us, and pass upon us a sentence of condemnation. We appeal from their decision to the court of heaven.

ART. V.—ANNOTATIONS ON 1 COR. XV. 27, 29.

We have been requested to give an explanation of the passage of scripture to which reference is made in our caption. As we do not profess to be endowed with any supernatural gifts, or to profess any uncommon skill in biblical criticism, we will confine ourselves to a brief exposition of our own understanding of the passage.

Verses 27, 28—We understand the reference here to be, to the mediatorial character of the Saviour. Christ is a mediator between God and man, and acts with a delegated authority. See John V. 19, 27, 30, 36, 43—viii. 29—xiii. 3, &c. He was clothed with all the power requisite for the accomplishment of the great object which was to be effected in his mediatorial office. Matt. xxviii. 18, Jno. xvii. 2, &c. Not only the powers of earth, but the powers of heaven and hell were placed in a state of subserviency to him. Hence devils trembled at his name, Jas. ii. 19, and fled at his rebuke, Jno. iv. 36, and angels which excel in strength, Ps. 103, 20, were prompt to execute his will, and joyfully flew on the kind errands of his love. Luke 2. 10, Matt. 13. 41, Mark 13. 37, Acts 10. 7, &c. But in clothing the Son with these powers, the Father did not abridge his throne; neither did he make the kingdom of heaven tributary to, or in any way dependent upon the mediatorial kingdom, which the Son was to establish. So far from this, the reverse was the case. The mediatorial kingdom of the Saviour was to be established, in pursuance of the plan devised by the Eternal, before the world began, for the display of his sovereignty, and the manifestation of the riches, and the power, and the glory of his kingdom. When all the designs to be answered by this mediatorial kingdom shall be accomplished, and its last trophies won from death and hell, then shall the son surrender up his mediatorial office, return to the bosom of his Father, and reign one with the Father, God of all.

Verse 29—It would require a huge folio to contain all the wild speculations that have been published to the world, as expositions of this solitary verse. We will not even attempt an enumeration of them, but will content ourselves with offering a few thoughts on the difficulties which present themselves.

It should be observed, that some had denied the resurrection of the dead, v. 12, and that the principal part of this chapter was written with
a view to refute their heresy, and explain more fully the doctrine in dispute. The apostle first argues the doctrine of the resurrection, from what was admitted to be a well established fact, viz: the resurrection of the Saviour. He next exposes the inconsistency of those, who were disposed to question the doctrine he was laboring to establish. It was inconsistent, 1st, With their profession of faith in a risen Redeemer, v. 14, 17. 2d, With the baptism to which allusion is made in the passage under consideration; 3d, With the general course of conduct which they pursued, in enduring privations, and exposing themselves to peril for their religion, v. 19, 30, 32.

It seems to us to follow, as a necessary consequence, that the baptism to which the apostle alludes, of whatever character it may have been, did amount to a declaration of a belief in the resurrection of the dead. We are disposed to believe that the reference is to christian baptism. For this ordinance is designed to serve as a memorial; 1st, Of the death, burial and resurrection of the Saviour; 2d, Of our obligation to walk in newness of life with him, having been raised up from the grave of sin to spiritual life, by virtue of his death and resurrection; 3d, Of God's purpose to raise up, in the last day, to reign with the Saviour in the world of glory, those who patiently suffer with him here.

Still the question will occur, what are we to understand by being "baptised for the dead?" We understand by the expression, the being baptised for (as a consequence of) our belief in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The term, νεκρόν, the dead, is in the plural, and evidently refers to the dead generally, and not to Christ in particular. "Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming," v. 23. We have no precedent to justify us in applying it to Christ alone.

Some have raised a difficulty from the fact, that in the verse upon which we are commenting, the apostle uses the third person plural, "else what shall they do which are baptised for the dead," &c. And in the next verse, 30th, uses the first, person plural, "And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" They hence infer, that the apostle alludes to some obsolete rite, which was observed by particular persons in those days.

We conceive, that in the 30th verse, the apostle had in view particularly the inconsistency of those baptised believers, who questioned the resurrection of the dead. This particular view, very readily led to a more general one. But if they are right, we suppose the apostle to argue, we are certainly all wrong. For, if it be so, that there is no resurrection of the dead? "why do we live in jeopardy every hour?" Why do we live abstemious lives, and peril so much? Why do we not rather adopt the Epicurean maxim, "Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die?" v. 32. The transition from such a particular view to a more general one, is both natural and easy. Another transition equally great occurs in v. 23, "Be not deceived; evil communications corrupt good manners." Your scepticism is the natural result of associating with the heretical. But, brethren, be not deceived: There is a truth—a solemn reality in the doctrine which we have taught, and which you, by word and act, have professed to believe. For "the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." v. 52, 53.

If any brother has discovered more of the divine mind from this passage than we have been able to do, we would invite him to reveal it to us, through our paper. Gladly would we drop our pen, sit at his feet as a learner, and imbibe instruction from his lips.
ART. VI—A MEMORIAL FOR A FUTURE AGE.

Such is the virulence of party spirit in the present day, that a number of worthy brethren have refused to patronize us in our efforts to advance the cause of Christ, merely, as they affirm, because our periodical is issued at the office of a paper which sustains the present administration! We do it but an act of justice due to our brethren, to accompany this record with the statement of a few facts, calculated to extenuate their conduct. They were probably ignorant,

1st, That we have ever abstained, since we have been engaged in the gospel ministry, from identifying ourselves with any political party.

2d, That the arrangements for printing were not made by ourselves, but by a brother to whom, on account of our inacquaintance with the editorial corps of the town, we entrusted this business.

3d, That he selected the Argus office because the work could be executed there on more moderate terms than at any other office.

4th, That at the time the contract was made, there was no Harrison paper edited in the place. The Enquirer came out in favor of Mr. H. subsequently to this period, if we have been correctly informed.

5th, That the proprietor of the Argus office is respected, even by his political opponents, for his integrity and his many moral virtues.

6th, That since we commenced our periodical, the leading editor of the Enquirer, and another individual of his own party, had a pamphlet published at the Argus office, as we are informed, full of misrepresentations of Baptist doctrines and practices.* This we consider as satisfactory evidence of what is affirmed in our 3d and 5th items.—

(Why is it more criminal in us to patronize the Argus office than it is in the individuals to whom we have referred?)

7th, That the views of an editor and publisher have no necessary connection with each other. Proof of this is afforded in our last item, and also in the fact, that the proprietor of the Argus office is connected with the Methodist church; and we doubt not as much attached to the doctrines and discipline of his church, as we are to those of ours. We deplore a spirit of proscription, wherever it occurs, whether in church or state.

We would not have a succeeding generation conclude, that it is a general practice among Baptists of the South, to have greater respect to the political creed of the publishers of religious papers, than to the religious creed of their editors. There are, to our certain knowledge, more than half a score of Baptist periodicals circulated, even in the State of Georgia, and we will venture to warrant, that there is not to be found one in a hundred of the subscribers to those papers, who know the political creed of the editors—Much less is known of that of the publishers. Our general rule is, to inquire into the character of the editor, his religious persuasion, his object, the means by which he proposes to accomplish his object, and our ability to aid him. If we are satisfied on all these points, we do not hesitate to afford the patronage solicited.

We hope posterity will not trouble themselves to inquire, why is the Chronicle and its editor made an exception to this general rule? For it would puzzle even us to answer. All we know is, that it is not ascribable to the dread of any superior talents or superior influence, which the editor may command.

* We learn that these gentlemen only acted as agents for others. The case is introduced, not to condemn them, but to justify ourselves in having our periodical printed at the Argus office.
We suppose it was needful that some one should serve as a kind of 

*lusus naturae* in the moral world, to break the dull monotony of the 
ordinary course of things, and ours was the misfortune to be elected to 
answer this important end.

As we cast a glance around us, upon the editorial field in which 
we are rambling, we cannot refrain from exclaiming, in the language of 
Horace,

> Ho! miseri,

Quibus intuentia mites!"

which may be rendered, "unhappy those to whom, untried, this field 
seems fair."

---

**EDITORIAL NOTICES.**

While commendations of our paper are multiplying on our hands, 
the number of new subscribers is diminishing. We have not 
received, during the last month, half the number received during the 
preceding month. If our friends cease their efforts in our behalf, we shall 
ot only be unable to enlarge our periodical, according to our original 
design, but shall be constrained, much against our will, to abandon our 
undertaking, at the close of the present volume. Brethren have said 
to us, *you must not think of abandoning it*; but as we have not pri-
ivate resources with which to meet the current expenses, we shall be 
compelled to abandon it, unless it is sustained by the efforts of our 
friends and patrons. Our field is a wide one. It extends over the 
whole of our Southern and Southwestern country. We have paying 
subscribers in ten different States—surely, in a field so wide, were due 
efforts made, there would be no difficulty in obtaining not only the 
1,000 subscribers for which we ask, but 5,000. We are desirous of 
commencing a series of articles on American Church History, and are 
only waiting for something like an assurance that we shall be sustained 
in our work, sufficiently long to enable us to complete the series.

We add, principally for our agents, a specimen of the commendations 
lately received. We trust that those whose commendations have 
been omitted will not think that we do not duly appreciate theirs, or are 
not sufficiently grateful for them. A moments reflection will convince 
them of the propriety of the course which we have adopted, in publish-
ing only *specimens* of those received.

Resolution of the Liberty Association, passed at its late session in 
Chambers county, Alabama, Sept. 26th—29th.

> *Resolved, That we feel a deep interest in the success and general 
circulation of the Baptist Chronicle and Monthly Monitor, published in 
Columbus, Ga., by Rev. Jos. S. Baker; and that we recommend it to 
the patronage of the brethren in the bounds of the Association, be-
lying it to be a useful medium of religious intelligence.*

Resolution of the Columbus Association, passed while in session at 

> *Resolved, That we recommend the Baptist Chronicle, published by 
Rev. J. S. Baker, at Columbus, as a monthly periodical, worthy of 
circulation amongst the Baptists—Price $1.*

Extract of a letter dated October 15th, received from a distinguished 
brother, who is at the head of a highly prosperous Literary Institution,
and is also the author of one of the most popular works now circulating in our denomination.

"I am pleased with the plan of your undertaking. I hope the work will not languish for the want of support. The historical information it will contain, independent of other instruction of great value, will be worth ten times the subscription price."

Several editors have noticed our publication favorably, but they have so blended their remarks in relation to the ability of the author with their other remarks as to render it impossible for us to repeat their commendations, without violating alike the rules of propriety, and our feelings of delicacy.

**Take Notice**—We are still sending the Chronicle to about 200 persons from whom we have not heard. After December we shall discontinue sending it, unless they indicate their wish to be considered as subscribers. The loss to us will be about $100 in cash! If each of these would subscribe, they would, by the payment of $1 each, secure the benefits of our periodical to themselves and families, aid a good object, and save the editor the amount above specified. What will they do? We await their answer. That answer will probably decide the fate of our periodical. It will be life or death to our undertaking, and to all the fond hopes of usefulness connected with it.

From the first, we requested those to whom we sent our paper, to return it by mail, if they were unwilling to take it. Some promptly returned the first No. Others have returned the 2d, others the 3d, and others still the 4th, and retained the rest. Is this fair? If they are unwilling to pay eight cents and a third per number, we are willing to pay 12½ cents for each copy of No. 1, returned, as we are every week receiving orders for our work from the beginning. Some are unwilling to take unless they can obtain all the numbers. Those who retain the early numbers, and return a later one, do us a double injury. They retain what is our due, and prevent others from subscribing.

**To our New Subscribers.**—As soon as we can obtain copies of our first number, we will forward them to those who have not received. Should we fail to obtain a sufficiency for this purpose, will make up to our subscribers for the deficiency, in a way that we are persuaded will prove satisfactory to themselves. Should we fail to do this, we are willing to receive the work back, and refund the money paid. Let others do as they may; we are resolved to endeavor to live and die an honest man.

**Explanations.**—There may appear to be some discrepancy in the views presented in our first article, and those presented in a preceding number, on the subject of public offences. This discrepancy, however, is more apparent than real. The substance of what is contained in these articles, taken conjointly, amounts to this: That conscience, directed by the general principles of the gospel, may require us to do that for which there is no express precept in the word of God, and which, therefore, the church has no right to enjoin, under any circumstances.

Our remarks, relative to ministers making themselves political partizans, were made in reference to pastors of churches, and to their acting publicly as partisan leaders. We designed not to condemn a mild expression of their political preferences, in private circles, when circumstances, in their estimation, imperiously require it.
Receipts to November 7th.—S C Parks, $1—E H Beall paid for Gen E Beall, $1—R Stradford for self, R Blakey, J M Saunders, A Auburn, D McGill, Dr Chas Boyd, J Cook, $7—P M, Newville, for Rev J L Gwaltney, W H Marshel, D G Potts, Wm H Niblett, Joel Petway, D G Adkins, F Mason, Mrs Mary Underhill, and one extra, $10—J Mott, $1—E Read, $1—Wiley M McClendon for self, Z Darden, D H Caglburn, F J Howard, J W Rothon, J M Mickle, W W Taylor, $6—R S Baker, for T J Shepard, Dr R T Holcombe, Mrs F H Hoff, H H Tucker, J G Holcombe, $5—Mrs Terry, through J Bovkin, for Wm Hudson, L Oliver, W T Moore and Mrs Sarah T Spencer, $4—P M Woodhawn, Va. for Elder Wilkinson, Mrs S Parramore, Mrs E White, Miss M A C Bundick, and Mrs A C Taylor, (the last two gratuities) $5—Rev J C Keeney, for J E Kilt, Wm Walker, Wm H Glenn, Mrs M Gillispie, $4—Miss M A C Bundick, for Miss P Custis and Mrs Mary Rowley, $2—T A Thornton, $1—H Watt, $1—J Gibson, $1—Mrs M J Jackson, $1—Mrs S R Cobb, $1.

Errors will be promptly corrected.

ADDITIONAL AGENTS.

S. CAROLINA.—Rev. J. H. Pearson, Orangeburg; Mr H. H. Tucker, Charleston;
GEORGIA.—Rev. Jacob King, Thomson.
ALABAMA.—Mr. W. M. McClendon, Roanoke; Rev. Thos. D. Armstrong, Milton;
FLORIDA.—Mr. John G. Holcombe.
LOUISIANA.—Dr. Benjamin T. Holcombe.
ARKANSAS.—Mr. W. B. Smith, Cabeens.
THE

BAPTIST CHRONICLE,

AND

MONTHLY MONITOR,

Will be edited by the subscriber, and issued monthly, at Columbus, Ga., at the low price of $1.00, per annum, payable in advance. Each number will contain 16 pages, stitched in covers. If payment is delayed 3 months, the subscriber will be subjected to an additional charge of 25 cents; if it is delayed 6 months, he will be charged $1.50, per annum. No subscription for less than a year.

This periodical is devoted to the cause of Christ at large; and the interest of the Churches of the South and South-west, in particular. It is intended to contain Essays, both Doctrinal and Practical; Historical, and Biographical sketches; Articles on Ecclesiastical polity; Solutions of cases of Conscience, and cases of Church discipline; Comments on different passages of Scripture; occasional Reviews; Notes on the Sport of the Times, and Passing Events, &c.

Any individual who shall send us the names of five subscribers, and enclose at the same time, $5; shall be entitled to the sixth copy gratis. Missionaries, and Ministering Brethren in general, are requested to act as agents, for this work.

Payment may be made in bills current in the States in which our subscribers reside; but we hope they will save us the expense of postage, by making remittances through the Postmasters.

“A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, it written by himself.” The Postmaster General.

The difficulty of making remittances from Va. may be obviated, by each one obtaining four or five others to unite with him—by sending us N. C. bills—or by paying over the amount of subscription to any authorized agent.

Communications, except from agents, to insure attention, must be post paid.

Columbus, Ga., May 1840.

JOSEPH S. BAKER.