

# CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY A COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS FOR THE NORTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE, M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH.—RUFUS T. HEFLIN, EDITOR.

Vol. II—No. 42.

RALEIGH, THURSDAY OCTOBER 15, 1857.

\$1 50 a Year, in Advance.

### Original.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate. Proselytism and Proselyters.

NUMBER III.

MR. EDITOR—I will now direct attention to another phase of proselytism, that is in my opinion far more reprehensible and criminal, than that which has passed in review before us, viz: educational proselytism. In my former article, I noticed the subject as occurring in the ordinary course of ministerial or church operations: as being conducted where countering influences might detect, and probably defeat the unprincipled and unscrupulous proselyter. Even in that aspect of the case, it is a business too little and too mean for an honorable Christian man or woman to engage in; but when we come to consider it as practised in Institutions of Learning, we are brought to give it an appropriate designation.

The practice of which I am speaking, is a *most heinous* and *unholy* one. Literary Institutions have for their object the impartation of learning, and as such should never be converted into hot houses, or ecclesiastical fountains for any particular Church. I speak of course, now, of those institutions which profess to be purely literary, and disclaim sectarian preponderancy. Institutions essentially denominational—such as are created for the special and avowed purpose of teaching and enforcing the stipulated principles of any particular Church, may not come under the same degree of censure as others professing neutrality. When parents and guardians send their children and wards to schools or colleges that are known to be sectarian, then they all, with their eyes open, and knowingly, assume all the responsibility consequent upon such a selection; and in after years when their hearts bleed in consequence of the alienation of their children and wards from the church of their fathers; and their feelings are wounded and outraged by their contemptuous remarks about their church, her ordinances and ministers—when they refuse to *commune* with their fathers and mothers, and declare their Church organization a *nullity*, and their hopes *baseless conjectures*, they will have no one to blame but themselves; and hence their severest sufferings are a just reward for the stipulated price of their own palpable inconsistency, and their infidelity to the Church of their choice. For such ingrates I have no sympathy; they invited, and in the nature of the case, almost necessitated the results that embitter their lives.—Let them bear the humiliation and anguish which they invoked, for they richly deserve every pang they subsequently experience. But while I leave them in tears, I am not prepared entirely to exonerate the unprincipled agents of such institutions from blame. If they received the children with the *knowledge* that those who placed them there belonged to other Churches, the principles of *high toned honor and Christian integrity* should have prevented them from taking advantage of the inexperience, and ignorance of those committed to their charge. They were placed under their care and supervision, not to learn the peculiarities of a creed, but to be indoctrinated into theological technicalities, but to be taught the arts and sciences; to receive the best education—*liberal*—that their institutions could impart; and while it was incumbent on them to watch over their moral deportment, it was no part of their business to mould their religious opinions. If a family were to receive the child of a friend as a visitor, and should see that child gradually drawn away from the Church and faith of the parents to their own, would they not be looked upon and condemned as the betrayers of confidence, the violators of good faith, and honorable breeding? Surely they would. There may be a shade of difference in the case of the Professors and Teachers in literary Institutions, because these are *paid* to be faithful to the trust committed to their care. Hence I fear that *double dealing* is not infrequently practised. Thus doubly bound, how can they, how dare they, tamper with the religious preferences of their pupils—seek by every possible means to convert them to their party? It seems to me, that those who act thus are laboring under great moral obtuseness, or sadly deficient in religious principle.

But, Mr. Editor, I have been treating the matter in the most favorable light in which it can be presented to the mind of an impartial reader, and even under this aspect, the system of proselytism is abhorrent to every honorable sensibility of the soul; in what light then must it appear, when conducted under the deceitful guise of a general catholicity—when sanctioned and pursued in those institutions which are professedly literary, and neutral in religious faith? As already stated, language is incapable of giving to such conduct its appropriate character.

"O false-betraying, cursed Bigotry! Cursed in heaven, but cursed more in hell, Where millions curse thee, and must ever curse!"

Religions most abhorred! perdition's most favored! God's most abandoned! hell's most damned!"

Those who can sell themselves to such a work are dyed in the wool of "Bigotry," as in their own estimation "most rational, most scriptural, most sacred;" but who, with regard to all others

"With mortal heresy denouncing all Who in their arguments could see no force."

They are the tools of "a party," the decoy birds of "a creed," who in order to accomplish their ends, will resort to any and every subterfuge that ingenuity or meanness can suggest.

I have said, that educational proselytism is the *betrayer of a sacred trust*. When parents and guardians place their children under the temporary guardianship of instructors, they do it for a specific and acknowledged object, viz: their *literary* education. The patrons of the Institute

engage to defray the expenses of education, while the officers obligate themselves to guard the moral purity, and seek to effect the intellectual finish of those committed to their charge. Such are the mutual obligations of the parties contracting. In committing their children to the care of the officers of such institutions, parents and guardians transfer, for the time being, their authority to the officers, who, in their turn, assume the obligation to watch over, and the right to control their pupils. They become, in fact, the *representatives* of the absent ones. What higher, more sacred trust can be confided to mortals than this? And he it remembered, that this trust is consecrated with the distinct knowledge of the religious opinions, and church connections of the confiding parties; and the pledged neutrality of those unto whom the trust is confided. In such a case, every honorable and Christian principle that glows within the human soul, is pledged to those who have placed their children under the supervision of said preceptors. Honor and religion alike bind them to guard and guide the subjects of their charge. He who betrays such a trust, is guilty of the highest infidelity, and is unworthy of the respect and confidence of his fellow men. He is a traitor, and deserves a traitor's doom.

There is in the conduct of educational proselyters a liteness of soul, and meanness of spirit, that is almost without a parallel. The age at which children and youths are sent to school and colleges, is the most impressive in the whole range of human existence. Removed from the restraints and associations of home, they are brought into strange connections and under new influences. They feel their isolation, and their minds and hearts are susceptible of the strongest impressions, and warmest emotions of gratitude. Kindness shown to, and interest manifested in them, call forth the glowing, gushing affection of their hearts. Under such circumstances, away from the mother's bosom, and the father's arms, it is natural for them to look up to their preceptors; and, if their looks are met with affection and sympathy, their grateful trusting natures become like wax in the burning sun, prepared to receive whatever impressions are sought to be made upon them. Unsuspecting and confiding, they are liable to the grossest imposition of unprincipled traitors. That this is true is proven from the fact, that many Protestant children, having under the tuition of Papists, been induced to gain down the damnable monstrosities of popery; while those of Methodist and Presbyterian parents, have, under educational infidelity, imbibed and cherished that fgment of popery, *apostolic succession*, and its corollaries, *confirmation* and *ecclesiastical efficiency*; or, the equally absurd, and far more ridiculous notion, of *unconditional surrender* and *unconditional submission*. To serve his cause, they have been made at the sacrifice of honor and Christian fidelity; and, when made, are often gloried in as the trophies of truth and religion. To what depths of ignominy will the spirit of bigotry and proselytism reduce the children of men! I had rather "be a dog and bay the moon," than subject my soul to such ignominy. Let those who can descend so low in the scale of human existence, "glory in their shame."

He who would such a trust betray, Pervert the faith, or draw away Those placed beneath his care; Would, did occasion serve his end, Both honor and religion rend To serve his base career.

Virginia. EPISTOLETS.

For the N. C. Christian Advocate.

### REASON.

Reason is one of the leading faculties distinguishing rational from irrational beings. By it we are enabled to examine, compare and estimate the value and utility of things for time and eternity. The great Creator, after endowing man with this noble faculty, has condescended to call upon him to exercise it on the all important subject of his soul's salvation.

What good reason canst thou give, oh man, for continuing irreligious? Is there anything connected with the Christian religion to impair thy mind, or diminish permanent happiness? Is there a God whose penetrating eye is constantly scanning every secret thought, and imagining of the heart? and must we all give an account to him therefore in a coming day? Is there a heaven of endless happiness, a here of interminable woe? Must one of these places be our eternal abode, to be determined by a holy or unholy life? If so, what saith reason? does it not dictate that we should "first seek the kingdom of God, and his righteousness?"

Could we but draw aside the veil, and roll up eternity to view. Could we glance into the dolorous regions of eternal night, while surging waves of liquid fire are angrily dashing themselves against the sides of the pit, where the distorted features and hideous groans of the unhappy inmates could be seen and heard in this most frightful aspect, every woe bearing an unbroken sound of woe and lamentation; and then turn and take a view of the pearly gates, the golden streets, the glittering walls, the spacious mansions, and lofty thrones of the heavenly world; with the order, beauty, and happiness of its inhabitants, hear the melody of their songs of praise, would not reason teach that we immediately press to the arms of an inviting Saviour and have our polluted souls washed and purified; cheerfully sacrificing every earthly prospect for the hope of an inheritance that sun bright land. Are these mere visionary reflections? no verily. But contain truthful realities that must be shortly experienced by all the inhabitants of earth.

Permit me, then, gentle reader, to admonish you to make sure work for eternity. J. W. Jefferson, N. C., Oct. 1, 1857.

### Selectious.

From the Pacific Methodist. The Gospel Baptism—Its True Mode.

Many have supposed that baptism originated with John, but this is a great mistake. Baptism was divinely instituted in the time of Moses. John was however sent on a special mission to baptize the Jews with the baptism of repentance, to prepare them for the coming of Christ. But St. Paul says (Heb. ix. 10), there were in the Mosaic ritual 'divers baptisms.' In our common version of the Bible, it is 'divers washings,' but in the original it is 'baptisms—baptisms.' These 'divers baptisms,' were those purifications which were almost daily performed by the Jews. Yet they were shadows of good things to come; and were baptisms, St. Paul being judge. But besides those frequent baptisms, there are on record three distinct and remarkable instances of baptisms, to which I must call your special attention. Notwithstanding these are not, in the Old Testament, called baptisms, yet, as they are so called by the Apostle, who spoke as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, we are fully authorized to call them baptisms.

I. The first is the baptism of the Israelites unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and is thus referred to by St. Paul, as a type of our baptism unto Christ: 'MOREOVER, brethren I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud and in the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. We cannot, therefore deny that the Israelites were baptized. Nor can we deny that this was typical of Christian or Gospel baptism; for the Apostle adds, (verse 6.) 'Now these things were our EXAMPLES,' or types. It is, therefore, plain, that they were both baptized, and that their baptism was typical of ours. It only remains to ascertain how they were baptized; for that is now our principal subject of inquiry. And first I may safely affirm that they were not immersed, for Moses expressly says, that they 'walked on dry land in the midst of the sea.' Ex. xv. 22. 'It was dry land' immersion; which, I suppose, none of our baptisms would receive. Such a case, in our day, even if the Baptists themselves, would be set down as *no immersion at all*. Well then, here is baptism *without immersion*. The Egyptians were immersed, for the waters covered them, and they sank like lead in the waters. Ex. xv. 10; but Paul does not say that the Egyptians were baptized. Surely, if Paul intended to teach immersion in this case, he took the wrong subjects. But he says also, that they were baptized in the cloud, as well as in the sea. We cannot see how they could be dipped in the cloud, for it was above them. So that here also, we see no chance for immersion.

That they were baptized by affusion we have plain testimony in the 77th Psalm: 'Thou hast with thine arm redeemed thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph; the waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee; they were afraid; the depths also were troubled. THE CLOUDS POURED OUT WATER, the skies sent forth a sound.—' Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters; Thou leadest thy people like a flock, by the hand of Moses and Aaron.' That the Psalmist in this passage, speaks of the same event as that mentioned by St. Paul, is too plain to admit of a doubt; and this passage clearly settles the question of mode in this baptism. St. Paul says, this was baptism; (1 Cor. x. 1, 2), the Psalmist says it was by pouring; the clouds POURED OUT WATER.

This is a clear, mathematical demonstration of affusion. Neither in the clouds nor in the sea were they thoroughly wet, for they walked on 'dry ground.' They were probably sprinkled by the spray of the sea, as it was agitated by a strong east wind, and 'the clouds poured out' water enough to baptize them. We will therefore set this down as the FIRST DEMONSTRATION, THAT AFFUSION IS THE Scriptural mode of baptism.

II. Another and more circumstantial baptism of the Old Testament, is that which took place at Mount Sinai, when all the people were specially brought unto covenant with God by the ministry of Moses. This transaction is thus noticed by the inspired Apostle: Heb. ix. 15, to 25th inclusive: 'For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with WATER, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and SPRINKLED, both the book and ALL THE PEOPLE, saying, this is the blood of the Testament that God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law, purged, (purified, baptized,) with blood; and without shedding of

blood is no remission. It was, therefore, necessary that the PATTERNS of things in the heavens should be purified (baptized,) with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the FIGURES OF THE TRUE, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.' It would be entirely superfluous, to say that the Mosaic transaction, mentioned in the above quotation was typical of similar transactions under the Gospel of Christ. The Apostle has been so full and particular in his expressions, that it seems impossible to understand him in any other sense; and our minds are naturally transported from the solemn and imposing scenes of Mount Sinai, where all the vast multitude of Israel are hanging, and in a breathless silence, upon the lips of their great Lawgiver, until he has spoken every precept, and the people all cry out and say, 'All that the Lord hath commanded us, will we do and obey.' And then Moses 'SPRINKLED BOTH THE BOOK AND ALL THE PEOPLE,' and thus seals the covenant, that still more glorious event, at Jerusalem, when Peter stood up with the eleven, and proclaimed a free and full salvation through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the people cried out and said, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do? And he said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Then they that gladly received his word were BAPTIZED; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.' The coincidence is so striking, that we cannot avoid noticing it. See the great Lawgiver at the head of his typical Church, bringing them into covenant with God by SPRINKLING WATER and blood upon them. Peter brings them into the Gospel covenant, the antitype of the law by baptism; one is the type of the other. The type was sprinkling so was the antitype, or it was not a fulfillment of the type; this is as true as God is true. The blood of 'calves and goats' prefigured the blood of Christ, by which our souls

of this chapter, and the water prefigured our water baptism. Here also, in this great and most solemn act of initiation into the covenant of God by Moses, the people were SPRINKLED in the typical Church, therefore, they are also sprinkled in the true Church; this conclusion cannot possibly be avoided.—This is my SECOND DEMONSTRATION OF AFFUSION.

III. The third testimony that I shall take from the Old Testament, is the use of the Water of Purification, particularly described in the 15th chapter of Numbers. It is declared to be 'a purification for sin,' verse 9; and in verse 18, and 20, it is expressly said, that it shall be SPRINKLED upon the unclean, and the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, shall be cut off from the congregation of the Lord; because the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him.' In the 13th and 14th verses of the 9th chapter of Hebrews, the Apostle applies this very law to our Gospel purifications. His words are, 'For, if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.' He tells us also, that the priests who sprinkled the people, served unto the EXAMPLE AND SHADOW of heavenly things. Heb. vii. 5.—There can, therefore, be no controversy about the application of this law of purification for sin to our Gospel rites or usages. But there is no practice or law in the Gospel to which this law of purification can apply, but the law of baptism. This purification was, by divine command, performed by SPRINKLING, therefore BAPTISM SHOULD BE PERFORMED BY SPRINKLING. You will please to remember, this is one of those Divers Baptisms mentioned by Paul. Heb. ix. 10, already quoted. This is baptism, and it is sprinkling, there is no dodging it. This is my THIRD DEMONSTRATION.

A Dangerous form of Infidelity.

Error is hydra-headed. When one head is destroyed by the 'sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,' another, in a little different form, springs up in its place. So has it ever been, so will it be, till Christ shall take to him his great power and reign. Hence one duty of the church is to be on the alert, watching its development and shaping her warfare accordingly. Perhaps there is no more dangerous form of infidelity now threatening the truth, than that which comes to us—chiefly through German critics—in attacks more or less covert, upon the inspiration of the divine word. To weaken, if not utterly uproot the confidence

of men in the authority of the Bible, seems to be the great aim of the enemy. And this he attempts by suggesting new theories of inspiration—theories differing and even contradictory among themselves, but all agreeing in the effort to reduce to the lowest possible point the very idea of inspiration. Paul's word, 'God-inspired,' 2 Tim. 8: 16, is made to mean a little more than the afflatus of the poet, or the dream of the enthusiast. Against this deadly error we would utter a note of warning.

The Bible, as the rule of faith and the guide of life, is valuable only as we place implicit confidence in it as the true word of the living God. Once unsettled the trust of the mind in it as His utterance to us, though in human language, and you have destroyed the foundations of all faith, and thrown the race out upon a storm-swept ocean, without chart, compass, or polestar.—For if the foundations be destroyed, what can even the righteous do? Though the subject is a large one, and not without its difficulties, there are a few points which, if unalterably established in the mind, will free us from doubt and danger. The great question is this: Were the writers of the book we call the Bible divinely and unerringly guided in what they wrote; and is this book therefore an infallible guide to us? In answer, note the following points: 1. God promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

Christ promised this guidance to those whom he called as prophets.—Thus to Moses and Aaron he said, 'I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.' Exod. 4: 15. See also Deut. 18: 20. Such language is frequent throughout the Old Testament. 2. The prophets claimed that what they uttered were God's words. 'Hear ye, and give ear; be not proud; for the Lord hath spoken.' Jer. 13: 15. So in hundreds of instances. 3. Christ and the New Testament writers appeal to the Old Testament as inspired of God: 'Have you not read that which was spoken unto you by God?' Matt. 22: 31. 'It is written' was enough to carry undoubting conviction to their hearts. Of the more than four hundred references in the New Testament to the authority of the Old, we refer to only two, and they are conclusive; namely, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and 2 Peter 1: 21.

earth and hell, men and devils: 'Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died.' Now the laboring conscience, that rolled and tossed upon the waves of a thousand fears, may drop anchor, and ride quiet in the pacific sea of a pardoned state. Flavel's Gospel Feast.

Novel Reading Dangerous.

Novel reading is not only dangerous, and acts on the mind as evil spirits do on the body, but it is also a waste of precious time, for which God will require a strict account. Dr. Hawes gives it as his opinion, that 'no habitual reader of novels can love the Bible, or any other book that demands thought, or inculcates the serious duties of life.' They become disgusted with the plainness and simplicity of truth, and require and search for something new and exciting to the imagination.

But, again; the taste for novel reading when once acquired, is hard to get rid of. Take an example: 'A young lady who had indulged for some time in the habit of novel reading, on becoming pious, found, to her sorrow, that her imagination had become so fascinated, and her taste so vitiated by this pernicious reading, that she could not fix on anything permanently.' 'I could not make any earthly sacrifice,' said she, 'could I thirst for the Bible, as I have after the novels. The greatest daily cross I am now compelled to take up, is to pass a novel without reading it. I would urge it as a fatal warning to all my sex, to beware of this fatal rock. Beware of wasting not only days, but nights; in making yourselves fools all the rest of your life, if not absolutely wretched.'

But, again: It sometimes leads even to insanity. A physician in Massachusetts says: 'I have seen a young lady with her table loaded with volumes of fictitious trash, day after day and night after night poring over highly wrought scenes, and skillfully-portrayed pictures of romance, until her cheeks grew pale, her eyes became cold and restless, and her mind wandered, and was lost. The light of intelligence passed behind a cloud, her soul was forever benighted; she became insane, incurably insane, from reading novels.'

Dr. Wayland says: 'He who meditates with pleasure upon pictures of pollution and crime, whether originating with himself or with others, renders it evident that nothing but opposing circumstances prevents him from being himself an actor in the crimes which he loves. Let the imagination, then, be most carefully guarded, if we wish to escape temptation, and preserve the purity of the heart.'

Hannah More says: 'The constant familiarity with works of fiction, even with such as are unexceptionable in themselves, relaxes the mind, that wants hardening; dissolves the heart, that wants fortifying; stirs the imagination, which wants quieting; irritates the passions, which want calming; and, above all, disinculcates and disqualifies for active virtues and for spiritual exercises. The habitual indulgence in such reading is a silent, mining mischief.'—(Episcopal Recorder.)

God's Blessing on the Dance.

Elizabeth, who had been taught better things, was arrayed in the garb of fashion, and ready for the amusement of the ball room. As she stood at the glass, placing the last rose amid her clustered locks, she hastily turned round and said to me: 'Why, what makes you look so sad? What is the matter? Come, do not be sad any more. Put this rose in my hair and see how pretty it will look? I kissed her cheek; and as I bade her good night, whispered: "Can you ask God's blessing on the dance, Elizabeth?" She gave me a quick, earnest look, and hurried down the steps.

At an earlier hour than usual I heard Elizabeth's voice at the door. I was up stairs; and when I went down to meet her I found she had retired to her room. I followed her thither, wishing to see her a few moments before I slept. She supposed all the family had retired, and her door was unlocked. I entered and found her on her knees before God, her hands uplifted, and her streaming eyes raised to heaven. 'Hear my prayer, O Lord, I beseech thee, and let my prayer come before thee,' was her language!

I returned to her room in about half an hour, and welcomed her home. 'Yes,' said she, 'I have got home.—In that bewildered ball room I danced with the merriest, and laughed with the loudest; but there was an arrow here,' and she laid her hands on her heart. 'God's blessing on the dance!' Those words rang in my ears as every turn. Oh, if God will forgive the past—if he will yet receive me, I will turn my back upon all this gilded folly, and lay upon his altar what I once promised to lay there—my whole heart!

We knelt together and asked God to strengthen the resolution now made in his name. Our prayers have been heard; for, among the group of lovely disciples who keep near their Lord, walking in his footsteps and bearing his cross, few are more humble, meek, modest, consistent, and devoted, than the once gay and thoughtless Elizabeth G.

THE JAIL.—It affords us pleasure to state the jail of Craven county is without a tenant. We desire to rent a room in that commodious building for our printing office. But, joking aside, this speaks well for the morals of Craven county, and we sincerely hope she can always boast of as much.—Newbern Express.

### A Hint to Mothers.

The most common cause of a high shoulder is to be found in the abominable practice of undressing girls' necks as low as the dress will permit. Instead of the shoulder straps of their dress being, as they should be, fairly above the shoulder, they often—indeed most commonly—either only skirt the extreme end, and rest on the rounded part of the deltoid muscles, or are actually far down on the arms; in consequence of which, the dress having little or no suspension on the shoulder, is constantly dropping, and the girl is save her clothes dropping down, or at least, to keep them in place, is constantly hitching up the shoulder from which the shoulder-strap most easily slips, and thus the elevating muscles becoming stronger on that side, pull the shoulder up, and produce a very ugly appearance. But the mischief does not stop here; for, though there really is no disease of the spine, yet this constant hitching up of the shoulder causes the head and neck to be thrown to the other side, whilst the chest is thrown out the same side, and thus a lateral curvature of the spine is produced, and a girl's figure is spoiled for the simple purpose of uncovering her neck and shoulders as far as possible, which, as well for decency as for the preservation of the child's health, ought to be covered. Many parents have thus been the cause of their daughters' distortion, if not of more serious consequences; and therefore, in growing girls who have the least disposition to slip their shoulder out of their dress, most especial care should be taken to prevent the possibility of keeping up this habit, by having the dress made so high that it cannot slip down, and then the sensation of the slipping being lost, the child no longer continues to hitch up her shoulder, and by a little attention to her proper carriage, the mischief, if not of long standing, may be got rid of.

### A Lesson.

Charles Lamb—who has not heard of 'gentle Charles?'—was much addicted to the vice of ye. Hear his solemn warning; heed it up, he can:

'The waters have gone over me.—But out of the black depths, could I be heard I would not see me.—It shows who have but set a foot in the perilous floor. Could the youth to whom the flavor of his first wine is delicious as the opening scenes of life, or the entering of some newly discovered paradise, look into my desolation, and be made to understand what a dreary thing it is when a man shall feel himself going down a precipice with open eyes and passive will—to see his destruction and have no power to stop it, and yet feel it all the way emanating from himself; to see all goodness emptied out of him, and yet not be able to forget a time when it was not otherwise; to bear about the piteous spectacle of his own ruin; could he see my fevered eye, feverish with last night's drinking, and feverishly looking for the night's repetition of the folly; could he but feel the body of the death out of which I cry hourly, with feeble outcry, to be delivered—it were enough to make him dash the sparkling beverage to the earth in all the pride of its mantling temptation.

'Oh, if a wish could transport me back to those days of youth, when a draught from the neat, clear spring could slake my heat which summer suns and youthful exercise had power to stir up in my blood, how gladly would I turn back to the element, the drink of my childhood, and of childlike heroism!'

### Apostolic Succession.

'Nothing in history can be more hopeless than the effort to make out the actual spiritual descent of Bishop White, or Hobart, as prelatial high-ops, in a direct, unobscured line from the college of the apostles, or from any one of the apostles; and nothing that assumes to be a grave matter is more ridiculous or contemptible, than the attempt, with a grave face, to exhibit such a demonstration. There is not a pecuniary claim of the smallest possible value, or a claim of any other kind that could be defended on that ground before a Court of Quarter Sessions; not a title to an heirloom, or to a right of common, or to an acre of land, that could be maintained for a moment on such an argument, and no sensible man would for a moment regard any pretended right of the slightest value that did not rest on a better foundation.

'It is a most marvelous thing that sensible men persist in asserting their belief in any such ascertainable pedigree, or in its worth, even if it could be ascertained. Where, in all the New Testament, is there the slightest hint that the validity of the ministry depends on the fact of such an ascertainable descent, or that a ministry is invalid when such a pedigree cannot be made out? If the New