

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER AND SOUTHERN WATCHMAN.

DEVOTED TO RELIGION, MORALITY, LITERATURE, AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE. T. NORTON, Editor.

VOL. V.—NO. 39.

RALEIGH, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1839.

WHOLE NO. 241.

TERMS.
The Recorder & Watchman is published every Saturday, at \$2.50 per annum, if paid within six months or \$3 if paid subsequently to the period.
Any person who will become responsible for six copies, or who will forward the names of six subscribers, shall be entitled to a copy gratis.
No subscription will be received for less than one year, unless paid in advance, and no discontinuance will be allowed until arrears are paid.
Persons wishing to discontinue will be expected to give notice to that effect prior to the commencement of a new year; otherwise they will be considered as responsible for the ensuing twelve months.
All communications except those of agents who act gratuitously, to secure attention, must be post paid.
All remittances regularly made in our address by mail, shall be at our risk.
Advertisements not incompatible with the objects of the Recorder, will be inserted on the usual terms.

THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

"Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ; for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily."—COL. II. 8, 9.

The Gospel of Christ is the principal blessing which God has granted to mankind; and all the dispensations of Providence in former ages were preparatory to its introduction in the fullness of time.

Within a short period, many churches were established in various parts of the world, which boldly professed the despised Gospel, and "gloried in the cross of Christ." Of that number were the Colossians. Christ had been preached to them as the glorious and wonderful person, in whom it pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell, &c. But the apostle perceived them in danger of being subverted in their minds, and, therefore, addressed them in the language of the text, in which he represents the glory of the Gospel, and the rich treasure of Christianity, as consisting principally in the true Deity of the Saviour, &c.

1. The Deity of Christ stamps a peculiar dignity and authority on the revelation of the Gospel; whereas, the denial of it divests it of its chief glory.

2. The Deity of Christ represents the love of God, in the redemption of mankind, as worthy of the highest admiration and praise; whereas, the denial of it must obscure its glory.

3. The Deity of Christ lays a foundation for an adequate atonement for sin; but if it be denied, that important article, the principal support of an awakened sinner's hope, must also be relinquished.

4. The Deity of Christ justifies the high strains of admiration and praise in which his love is celebrated in the New Testament; but the denial of it must render those strains unjustifiable, if not absurd and enthusiastic.

5. The Deity of Christ puts a dignity and glory on his character as our advocate with the Father, and assures us of the prevalence and success of his mediation; whereas, the denial of it must necessarily weaken our confidence and hope in approaching the throne of grace.

6. The Deity of Christ renders our union and fellowship with him a privilege unspeakably valuable and honorable; but the denial of it robs us of our most peculiar treasure.

7. The nature of the Gospel itself, and of that religion which it teaches and inculcates, as from the highest improvements of what has been denominated the law and religion of nature, will be most materially affected by the belief or rejection of the important article of the Deity of Christ.

8. The religion of the Gospel is a holy religion, "a doctrine according to godliness."—Never was the honor of the law of God so clearly manifested, as by the perfect obedience and death of Christ, the Divine Surety.

INFERENCE.—All must admit it, to be a question of the highest importance, what sentiments we entertain of the person of Jesus Christ; whether we ought to honor him as "God manifest in the flesh," or to regard him as a mere man like ourselves. If he is no more than "a man," in paying him the honor which is due only to the eternal God, we cannot be vindicated from the charge of idolatry.

But if he is indeed possessed of true and real divinity, as the Son of God, the denial of it must be an audacious insult to his dignity, and a bold attempt to rob Christianity of its richest treasure.

THE ETERNAL SECURITY OF SAINTS.

Christ never would have left his throne for a cross, without a "sure word of promise" from the Eternal Father, that he should "see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." He never would have redeemed sinners, with His own blood, without a sure warrant from the court of Heaven, that of all that the Father had given Him, he should lose none; but that they should be kept by the power of God, through faith unto everlasting salvation. With "more than twelve legions of angels" at his command, He never would have surrendered Himself to be condemned by mortals, and to be "crucified by wicked hands," had He not known distinctly the everlasting benefits to be accomplished by His death.—He never would have died upon uncertainties. He never would have purchased pardon and restoration for countless millions of rebels against his own government, if after they were restored, they must still be left liable every moment to fall off again from his kingdom; and become his enemies. No;—long before he entered on this errand of reconciliation, it was stipulated in Heaven, that all who should be reclaimed by His mediation, should maintain forever their allegiance to His throne. It was for the joy thus set before Him, that he endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the majesty on high.

In exact accordance with these sentiments, the Saviour, when he appeared in our world, said of himself, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever. And the bread that I will give, is my flesh; which I will give for the life of the world. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life. I give unto them eternal life; neither shall any pluck them out of my hands."

But what mortal or immortal tongue can speak the privilege of believers, in being thus confirmed forever in a state of perfect holiness and union to the Saviour? Oh! could the thought once enter their minds, that possibly, after millions and millions of ages, they might again become the enemies of God!—it would send a thrill of horror through all their ranks! it would silence forever their song of victory! it would throw darkness impetrate over all that Eternity which is before them! it would eclipse all the splendors of the Sun of Righteousness! But fear not, ye redeemed. Your Saviour is Omnipotent. The promise and oath of Jehovah are pledged for your security. The Covenant of redemption, by which ye were given to Christ, before the foundation of the world, as well as the Covenant of Grace, by the acceptance of which ye have bound yourselves to his throne, is an "Everlasting Covenant."—Rev. Austin Dickinson.

QUIETNESS OF SPIRIT.

Quietness is the evenness, the composure, and the rest of the soul, which speaks both the nature and the excellency of the grace of meekness. The greatest comfort and happiness of man is sometimes set forth by quietness. That peace of conscience which Christ has left for a legacy to his disciples, that present sabbatism of the soul, which is an earnest of the rest that remains for the people of God, is called "quietness and assurance for ever," and is promised as the effect of righteousness. So graciously has God been pleased to entwine interests with us, as to enjoin the same thing as a duty, which he proposes and promises as a privilege. Justly may we say that we serve a good Master, whose "yoke is easy;" it is not only easy, but sweet and gracious, so the word signifies; not only tolerable, but amiable and acceptable. Wisdom's ways are not only pleasant, but pleasantness itself, and all her paths are peace. It is the character of the Lord's people, both in respect to holiness and happiness, that however they be branded as the troubleshooters of Israel, they are "the quiet in the land." If every saint be made a spiritual prince, Rev. i. 6, having a dignity above others, and a dominion over himself, surely he is like Seraiah, "a quiet prince." It is a reign with Christ, the transcendent Solomon, under the influence of whose golden sceptre there is "abundance of peace as long as the moon endures," yea, and longer, for "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." Quietness is recommended to us in the Scriptures as a grace which we should be endowed with, and a duty which we should practice. In the midst of all the affronts and injuries that are or can be offered us, we must keep our spirits sedate and undisturbed, and evidence, by a calm and even, and regular behaviour, that they are so. This is quietness. Our Saviour has pronounced the blessing of adoption upon the peace-makers, Matt. v. 9; those that are for peace, as David professes himself to be, Psalm cxx. 7, in opposition to those that delight in war. Now, if charity be for peace-making, surely this "charity begins at home," and is for making peace there in the first place. Peace in our own souls is some conformity to the example of the God of peace, who, though he does not always give peace on this earth, yet evermore "makes peace in his own high places." This some think is the primary intention of that peacemaking on which Christ commands the blessing; it is to have strong and hearty affections to peace, to be peaceably-minded. In a word, quietness of spirit is the soul's stillness and silence from intending provocation to any, or resenting provocation from any with whom we have to do.

THE FAMILY ALTAR.

Who does not feel, on visiting a family where no altar of devotion has been erected, that there is a void, a desolation, a spiritual famine in such a household?—that a principal pillar is wanting to support the fabric of domestic happiness, and to give to it that symmetry of proportion so indispensable to moral beauty? Who does not pity the parents of such a family, and deprecate the influence of neglected duty, on the future character of their offspring? Thrice upon each day, do they suspend their ordinary avocations, to restore exhausted nature to wonted vigor, by partaking of the bounties of Providence; but the hand that is so kindly, and repeatedly extended to supply their wants, is never recognized; no prayer is said, no offering of thanks goes up, no demonstration of gratitude is made. "Mine own hand hath gotten me all these things," is a lesson which is thus inculcated and enforced, in such a family, with a success, O how fatal! Morning and evening witness no gathering to the place of domestic prayer. There is no censor, in which to offer the incense of devotion! no altar, around which to bow! no priest to minister in holy things! He, alas! who should have been the High Priest of his family, is any thing but a spiritual guide. It may be, that he swells the numerical force of the church. But what a contradiction in terms! A prayerless church member! For if he does not pray in his family, it is any thing but charity to infer that he prays in secret. And if he does not pray in secret, any attempt at such a duty in public, is not prayer; it is mockery! Who would ever expect to witness a revival in a church mainly composed of such members? Who

would not rather feel that the curse of God must be upon them? that they would be withered branches, which could but burden and disfigure the trunk to which they were attached?

We have alluded to the influence of family prayer, in forming the character of the young.—We greatly mistake, if there are any ties which twine around the heart, through life, with greater tenacity, than those which are created by early domestic habits and associations. Apply this principle to the subject in question, but what is the inference? But we are not left to mere inference. Thousands now engaged in promoting the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, will testify to the influence of family devotion, to reclaim them from the paths of vice, in holding them back from practices which must have been fatal to their virtue and their happiness.—They look back to the days of their childhood, with pious gratitude to God, that He gave them parents who practically inculcated the duty of prayer. Does it not then become a fearful thing to neglect this duty? What parents will answer in the negative?—Zion's Advocate.

For the Recorder and Watchman.

"ANTIQUITY OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH."

No V.

By the time Laurentious gets into his third number, he seems to have forgotten that he had any positions at all to defend. He says any and every thing that comes to mind, so it is against the Baptists—spices over as usual with some spiteful reflections at his opponent—finds an imaginary contradiction between Broadus and Benedict, and seems to think he has accomplished wonders when he has said a great deal though it has only confused the subject. This and all his other articles may be appropriately described in one short sentence—"Satis loquentis, sapientis parum"—they have abundance of words, but little of reason. Now any one can see that were I to follow him in all his wanderings, transcribe from him largely, and reply to his words minutely, that there would be no end to the controversy. However much then I may feel inclined to retort upon him, and to point out the fallacy of his reasoning on many particulars, I must, in mercy to the patience of our readers, and for the sake of bringing the controversy to a termination, adhere to my original purpose—to show wherein he has failed in supporting certain positions, and hold him to their defence.

But, before proceeding, it is proper to remark that when he has said, "the Baptist church" here and in other places, has been disposed of in a former number; and that the charge of injustice which he here tries to fix upon me has as little foundation as many other things he has rudely said against me. He complains of injustice because I did not transcribe more of his articles—"as the readers of the Recorder have not seen the numbers alluded to"—forgetting it seems that my articles were written for the Conference Journal, the very paper in which his attack was made to which they were offered as a reply! Had Laurentious exercised a little more justice himself, what he has so hastily charged upon me would have been set down to the account of his brother at the head of the Journal: for it is his injustice that caused my articles to appear before readers who had not seen those to which they replied.

As he does not deny that Anabaptist was applied in former times to the people now called Baptists by their enemies, and as it is not "the history of a name but the prevalence of a principle" that I wish to defend, I shall say nothing further on this point at present.

Laurentious has, in truth, but one main tangible position, and that has been disposed of in my first number. In his first series he stated what he thought to be Baptist premises, and then proceeded to state what he thought to be the particulars of their history, to show that they have no church according to their premises. Every point then in the whole discussion rests upon the first position, and has to be tested by Baptist premises; and in trying the success or failure of any statement two things are to be considered: first, whether the statement be true; secondly, if true, whether it comes in collision with Baptist premises so as to show that they have no church and act without authority. It has never been contended by the Baptists, that their name as a sect had any divine authority about it, nor have they laid that stress upon a regular succession that Laurentious attributes to them, and seems to think so indispensable for the safety of their hypothesis. They have only contended that their peculiar principles and practices are of apostolic origin. Aware of this Laurentious in carrying out the premises which he had laid down, refers to principles and practices to support his assertions—"that there was no vestige of a Baptist church for many centuries after the apostles' &c. I have already, I think, refuted many of his statements respecting his authorities, the practice of the church, &c. The point now to be considered is—has he succeeded or failed in publishing to the world that there was no vestige of a Baptist church in the world for many centuries after the days of the Saviour—in holding up the Munster faction as their originators—Germany as their certain birth place—and the sixteenth century the period that witnessed it? This is what he has published to the world—"Do any of my readers any where did she (the Baptist church) arise? I reply, she made her appearance in Germany about the year 1524," &c. His chief authorities to prove this are Robertson and Goodrich. The extracts he gave from these furnished an account of the rustic war—of the fanaticism of Munster and his adherents, and acquainted us with the marvellous fact that they were Anabaptists. When all this is done, and a good deal more like it, he exults over his work thinking he had found the first vestige of a Baptist church among the mad men of Munster. This I considered a mistake, and

proceeded to offer some reasons for dissenting from it.

To enable the reader properly to appreciate the authorities adduced by Laurentious, I stated that they were all enemies of the Baptists, and that they contradicted themselves—or to speak more intelligibly to simple minds—that their several statements did not agree. The first of these is not denied by Laurentious, though he tries to insinuate the contrary. What I meant was, that their religious sentiments were opposed to the Baptists—that their statements were consequently under the influence of an opposing prejudice, and as such that they were entitled to less confidence; and this, I will venture to say, would be the case "before any judicature in the land." If prejudice against the Baptists does not lessen the value of evidence offered upon the subject of their history, then prejudice in their favor does not. If so, Baptist historians are as good authority in this controversy as any others, and if this be granted, I will soon settle the matter in debate between Laurentious and myself. In what I said respecting the discrepancy in the statements of his authors, I am flatly contradicted. This is not strange though after I had been represented as deficient in "probity, honesty," and almost every thing reputable. Now let us look at the facts. As I have lost the second No. of Laurentious' first series, I shall have to rely upon the book of Robertson's for his dates; and I am fortunate enough to have the very one that Laurentious used himself. In his Emperor Charles V. p. 245, he dates the extravagances of Munster "one thousand five hundred and twenty five"—that is, 1525. Goodrich has it 1524. Tomlin says—"the Anabaptists of Germany took their rise in the beginning of the sixteenth century," that is, in the beginning of 1500. Now, I ask, is there not a discrepancy here, and that too between Tomlin and Goodrich respecting the same thing—the rise of the Anabaptists in Germany? But says Laurentious "Bishop Tomlin was not introduced by me to prove the origin of the Anabaptists of Germany, but their settlement in England."—What he wished him to say, and what he actually says may be different. The question now is—has Tomlin stated what I attributed to him? The reader can judge by seeing the whole extract from him: "The Anabaptists of Germany took their rise in the beginning of the sixteenth century; but it does not appear that there was any congregation of Anabaptists in England till the year 1640." Here the rise of the Anabaptists of Germany is distinctly stated, just as I represented, and then the author gives his opinion about the date of their first congregation in England.

Now I attached no importance to the two preceding considerations as arguments; but I thought they were facts that ought to be borne in mind by the reader in estimating the authorities adduced by Laurentious. The chief argument was found in the fact that they contradicted other and better testimony. And, bearing in mind that he had said that there was no vestige of a Baptist church for many centuries after the ascension of Christ, I referred to the 3rd chapter of Matt., which I thought probably might be as good authority with Laurentious as any he had adduced. In this chapter is an account of an individual called John the Baptist, who baptized many people; but as they worshipped Christ and not John, they were called disciples, and afterwards christians. Before they could be baptized they were required to "bring forth fruit meet for repentance." When baptized it was performed "in Jordan."—All this I thought would do for a "vestige" of a Baptist church—particularly when compared with Acts 2: 41. Rom. 6: 4. Col. 2: 12. This being a little unpalatable to Laurentious, he resorts to the usual but exploded quibble about in, and proposes to yield the point if I will show from the New Testament that "infants were positively forbidden the rite of baptism," or that "the primitive christians were called Baptists," or that immersed believers only were admitted to the Lord's supper. Now suppose I were to set to work to comply with his requests, what sort of a controversy should we have? As the above proposals are irrelevant I pass them by at present; but I promise to comply so soon as he shall show 1. That infants were offered to receive the rite of baptism. 2. That the primitive christians were known by the titles belonging to any of the leading denominations of the present day. 3. That any did, in the days of Christ and his apostles, receive the Lord's supper before they were immersed.—and this, if he is willing, shall be the subject of our next controversy. But to return:

Moshien, who cannot be suspected of much attachment to the Baptists, is contradicted by the statements of Laurentious. He (Laurentious) had dated their origin 1524. But Moshien says it "is hidden in the remote depths of antiquity, and is of consequence extremely difficult to be ascertained." Now these statements can never be made to harmonize. What took place in 1524—cannot be said to be "hidden in the remote depths of antiquity." Seeing this, he turns a way like the fox which could not reach the grapes, to express his surprise at those who boast of an origin so hidden as to be extremely difficult to be ascertained; and he would no doubt have us believe that he had rather find his origin in 1729, than covered up in the darkness of antiquity. But although he sees so little to console one in such a hidden antiquity, I fully believe that he would feel no little pleasure could he find such a passage in Moshien respecting the origin of his own church. His key and his paraphrase only transcribe the confusion of his mind, and leave the origin of the Baptists, alias the Anabaptists, still in the depths of antiquity. And as little as Laurentious sees in this to console himself, I can assure him that we enjoy it much, for the very obvious reason that the history of the church in the first ages is a good deal covered with ob-

scurity. Moshien further says—"The Mennonites not only consider themselves as the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously persecuted by the despotic hands of the Romish church, but pretend moreover that they are the purest offspring of those respectable sufferers.—Their adherents on the contrary, represent them as the descendants of those turbulent and ferocious Anabaptists, who in the sixteenth century involved Holland, Switzerland, and Germany in such scenes of blood, perjury, and distress, &c.—After having examined these different accounts of the origin of the Anabaptists with the utmost attention and impartiality, I have found that neither of them can justly be pronounced conformable to strict truth." Now in this it is clear that he did not consent to the claim of the Anabaptists, that they were the "purest offspring" of the Waldenses—this he wished to reserve for his own church; and on the other hand it is equally clear that he did not believe that they descended from the turbulent faction of Germany alluded to. But although he did not allow them to be the "purest offspring" of the Waldenses, he has admitted them to have descended from these "respectable sufferers," as is evident from the following paragraph: "It may be observed then that the Mennonites are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrusians and other ancient sects, who are generally considered as witnesses of the truth in times of general darkness and superstition. Before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries in Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine which the Waldenses &c. maintained: That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which he established on earth, was an assembly of true and real saints; and ought therefore to be inaccessible to the unrighteous, and also exempt from those institutions which human prudence suggests to oppose the progress of iniquity &c. This doctrine is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and discipline of the Mennonites. And it is most certain that the greatest part of these peculiarities were approved by many of those, who, before the dawn of the reformation entertained the doctrine already mentioned."

The drooping spirits of these people who had been dispersed through many countries, and persecuted every where with the greatest severity, were revived when they were informed that Luther and others had attempted with success the reformation of the church." Moshien by MacLaine vol. 2. p. 127-8. Now it is certain from the above that Moshien believed the Mennonites to have descended from the Waldenses:—the leading doctrine of the latter he says is the true source of all the peculiarities in the doctrine &c. of the former; and says they were dispersed in many countries before the dawn of the reformation. Now if the Mennonites are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses and other ancient sects, then it is certain that they did not originate with the fanatics of Munster in the sixteenth century. And this confession of Moshien Laurentious has very wisely passed over in silence in his rejoinder, as will be seen when I come to notice more particularly what he says about our descent from the Waldenses.

Again: To show that Moshien did not believe the Mennonites or Anabaptists originated with the fanatics of Munster, I quoted the following passage: "It is difficult to determine with certainty the particular spot that gave birth to that seditious and pestiferous sect of Anabaptists, whose tumultuous and desperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cause of religion and the civil interests of mankind." Mos. c. 3 Sect. 4th. of Part II. Upon this I remarked that it comes in after Moshien had given his opinion about the antiquity of the regular Baptists. This throws Laurentious again in that unpleasant situation from which he cannot escape without calling my veracity in question. Pretending not to know that by regular Baptists was meant the regular body of Anabaptists whose history Moshien commenced at the beginning of chapter 3rd. he begins his usual work of detraction; and finds a great difference between his Moshien and mine.—Now however that may be, I must inform him that I have Moshien by MacLaine in two vols. and that understanding the phrase "regular Baptists" to mean as intended, the regular body of Anabaptists whose history was begun at the beginning of the 3rd chap. the facts in the history before me are precisely as I stated. The account of the original Anabaptists begins at chapter 3rd and their origin is placed in the depths of antiquity. In the 4th section of the same chapter the author begins his account of the seditious sect whose history is given so minutely in the extracts of Laurentious. Again: To show that he did not mean precisely the same people of whose origin he had spoken at the beginning of chapter 3rd. it was remarked that he called them a "sect." And if the reader will only examine the quotations carefully he will easily see how futile is the reasoning of Laurentious against it.—Moshien designates them as a pestiferous sect of the Anabaptists:—in this he cannot mean the general body of Anabaptists, but only a disorderly faction of them. And the birth place of this disorderly faction he declares to be uncertain.—"Whether this sect arose in Switzerland, Germany, or Holland is still a point of debate." Here again Laurentious finds a difference between our books and though it consists in that little word "first," it is enough to furnish him another opportunity to charge me with an evil "design." Now whenever he may think of my "design," my quotation is equally as recorded in MacLaine's Baltimore edition. And, besides being according to my edition, I think it altogether more according to common sense.—For a sect, it seems to me, can only have one origin. To say "first stone," would imply that it had arisen several times previously. The difference between our books, if real, is very little. And whether the fanatics had one origin or a half dozen, it is the first now under consideration; and that according to the edition of Laurentious, is a matter of debate, whether it were in Germany or some where else.