

wife of his partial kindred, namely of Ishmael; but half-breeds will not do for the patriarch Isaac and his princely wife Rebecca.

Among the Israelites the custom was for them to marry only among their own race—a custom founded on the most positive and stern law of God. There would now and then be one, a son of Belial perhaps, who would marry among the enemies; but it would be attended with the worst of evils. As much of their idol worship crept in through such marriages as perhaps in any other way.

Enough is thus shown us to teach this—that there is a fitness in marriages. While we do not contend that any New Testament law now prevails that forbids an American from marrying a Frenchman, or a German; yet we hold that from an honest, fair deduction, drawn from the Bible teachings on this subject, there should be such a similarity and union between the parties marrying as will fulfill the intent and requirements of the scriptures.

There is such a difference in color, and some other respects, between the white and black races—and a difference that God, and not man, has made, and put between them—that we hold it to be our duty to respect those barriers so as to preserve the individuality of each race. In what way could the voice of God's works more loudly speak, telling us here are two separate, distinct races in which he has put a difference, than in the one under consideration? If Moses or Samson, exceptions to the rule, depart under a divine impression and marry of other nations, that does not warrant us to marry—not in other nations merely, but where the difference is much wider than in that of mere nations—but even in another race of people, unless God gives us such right. Where has he done it?—Doth not nature herself teach that it is uncomely?

Can there be such congeniality and affection between these different races as to make them proper marriages?—We think not! Would any of our brethren of either race, who truly love their brethren, and love the truth, and desire to regard God's laws in nature and grace, wish to so offend their brethren as to thus marry?—Would not a true lover of Zion prefer to marry only in the Lord; that is in letter and spirit according to the will and word of God?

We should take it that one of either race, who would step over these barriers of nature, of State law, of social feeling, of christian fellowship and divine law, would show such a disregard of his brethren and of the spirit of marriage, as to forfeit all right to the fellowship of the Church. If one should marry in a State or among a people who are reconciled to it, let him abide there.

I mean no offence to the white man or the colored man. It seems that each ought to respect his own race and color too much to wish to marry out of it. I would not have the colored people otherwise than free, and hope to see them prosper—if in the right way, by honesty, industry, &c. I regard them as human beings, and believe that God has a people

among them. It is not the flesh we fellowship, as Baptists. If it were, a rich white man would fellowship only rich white men; and poor white men would fellowship only poor white men; young men would fellowship only young men; and old men would fellowship only old men; and colored men would fellowship only colored men. It is not fleshly or worldly relationships that we fellowship. It is not the colored man, nor the white man, merely in the flesh, that we fellowship: but it is the spirit and principle that is in the man. If we believe that Jesus is in him the hope of glory, we fellowship the colored man; unless we do we could not fellowship the German Emperor on his throne. In the relations of earth we must regard the claims that appertain thereto. The voice of nature cries to us—labor for your bread; so that if we do not labor six days, because the Bible commands it, this whip of natural want, may drive us to labor some. So in the other and many claims upon us in time; for these must be regarded. There is a fitness of things that guides the wise.

Men may pretend to be wise above what is written, and raise the cry: "because we are opposed to the marriage of white and colored people, therefore we do not fellowship them." If the fellowship were of the flesh that would be true. But people who are desirous to know and obey the truth will not be misled by such fleshly appeals to the corrupt passions of men as these. True, colored people give us trouble sometimes. So white people give us trouble sometimes too.—After all, I believe I give myself more trouble than others give me.—We must expect to be troubled sometimes. It is our duty to bear with troubles. Let the strong bear the infirmities of the weak. What if the Lord should turn us off because of our black conduct? The Lord has a people of every race, kindred and tongue under heaven. These he calls out and brings under his laws; and they wish to obey his laws, and respect the rights of others, doing no man any harm. When they abide in their respective places, in the flesh and in Spirit, and obey the Lord they all fellowship each other, and help each other.

In the resurrection, where there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage, nor any flesh and blood, nor any differences that pertain to this world, but where all are as angels of God, and all are one in Christ Jesus, there will of course be only one—a glorious one bride, one temple, one body.

Only among the old-fashioned, apostolic, predestinarian, Bible, Primitive Baptists do you see different races and colors dwelling in unity.—All others divide and separate. But Baptists as yet cling together. Whenever they cease to love one another and divide on account of color, or politics, it will be a sad day for them we think. Let us not mind what enemies may think. Let us not cast off the colored man—to induce some people—too proud to fellowship a colored man, to join us. When grace humbles the white man properly he can bear the infirmities of a colored

man, provided he sees and believes that he is a christian. And if grace teaches the colored man he will not be despising the white man—nor wishing to go beyond the state God has put him in; but will endeavor to abide humbly in his calling and wait God's time to change him. God does nothing in vain. If we have the right spirit we can live in peace. Where one fails to regard that spirit the sword of Church discipline or the word of God, executed by the Church, will do all that is needed.

LAYING ON OF HANDS.

I was requested, some months ago, to give the Bible authority for laying hands on Preachers and Deacons, in their ordination.

Perhaps it will be well to state also that it is not done, because Baptists do claim any power of imparting the Holy Ghost. For, while they hold that the Holy Ghost is indispensable to the spiritual understanding of truth, and the acceptable performance of any duty, they also disclaim any and all power of bestowing that blessed Spirit.

The twelve apostles were given the power of performing miracles, and did lay hands on believers for the purpose of imparting to them the Holy Ghost. For what purpose? not to make believers, for they were believers before. (See Acts 8: 14, 18.) Can one believe without the quickening of the Spirit? No! Faith is a fruit of the Spirit. But, besides that power of the Holy Spirit leading men to believe, the apostles conferred the gift of the Spirit on believers. But we profess to possess no such power—nor has that power been possessed, so far as we know, by any since the apostles' day.

Then we ask why, if preachers cannot impart the Holy Ghost in this day to any one for any purpose at all, do they lay hands on deacons and preachers in their ordination? If preachers are empty-handed what is the use of laying empty hands on people? The question can be answered in part by asking another: Did the mere laying on of hands, even of the apostles, confer the Holy Ghost on deacons? See the sixth chapter of Acts, wherein the apostles instruct the Church to choose out of their number (out of the Church) seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost, &c., whom they might appoint, &c. Now these seven men were to be full of the Holy Ghost before they were selected as deacons.—After they were chosen, the apostles prayed and laid their hands on them. It is plain that the apostles did not lay their hands on deacons to give them the Holy Ghost. How was it in the ordination of preachers? Were hands laid on them by a presbytery to give them the Holy Ghost? See Acts 13: 1, 3—where there were certain Teachers, as Barnabas, Simeon, Lucius and Manaen, to whom the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have called them." When these men fasted and prayed they laid their hands on Paul and Barnabas, &c. Now did not Paul and Barnabas have the Holy Ghost before this?—No one can doubt it who understands

the case, I suppose. For it is said of Barnabas before this occurrence (Acts 11: 24,) that he was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.—And of Paul there could be no such question, for before this event, (Acts 9: 17,) Ananias is sent to him by the Lord that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost. Then it is proven that all of them, both Deacons and Preachers, were filled with the Holy Ghost before the laying on of hands; and if filled could they receive any more? Timothy is exhorted to commit the same gift to faithful men—that is men seen to be faithful before the committing of the gift. But was not this gift in Timothy by the laying on of hands? "Neglect not the gift which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" The gift was given him by prophecy—accompanied with the laying on of hands. It was foretold in that way. Prophecy is foretelling that which is to be, not making something. So it was given by prophecy to Timothy and indicated publicly by the laying on of hands, and hence was by the laying on of hands.

From which it is not only proven that the gifts came from God, and not from men, but it is also proven that they laid hands on them at an ordination. This then is our rule and authority, and it should never be departed from. If we see no special reason for this it is enough for us if the Bible teaches it. It is not the laying hands on a man or ordaining him that gives him the gift of preaching. It is shown to the Church that one has a gift, and the Church requests that he be liberated or set apart to the work, publicly, which the Lord has qualified him to perform. *Hands ought never to be laid on one until it is made manifest that he already has the call and qualifications from God to preach.* Then hands should be laid on such to indicate that they are ordained and set apart by the presbytery and Church for the work which the Holy Ghost has appointed them unto. Laying on of hands is a solemn, pointed way of saying "thou art the man."

Beverly, Washington Co., Ohio, May 22, '76.

Elder P. D. Gold—Dear Brother:—

I got the advertisement of your paper from sister R. Anna Phillips' Pamphlet, in which she has given her experience, and also has traced out the marks and evidences of the true church of Christ, and has tried them that say they are apostles and are not, and has found them liars. As to my part, I like her little book so well, that I am unable to express the comfort and consolation that I have received from reading it. Thanks be to the Lord, who is the giver of all good, for such a gift as her book is to his poor and afflicted people.—Her views on the new birth are the best that I have ever seen in print—outside of the bible; indeed it is bible, for it all agrees therewith.

O! that all God's people could see as sister Phillips does, and come out from all worldly institutions of men's getting up, both moral and religious, and provide things honest (not in secret, but) in the sight of all men.—Her book ought to be in the hands of every one that is seeking after truth. This is at your disposal.

Yours respectfully,

CHARLES M. MATTHEW.