

Special Notice.

The Publisher of the Recorder has now sent accounts to all those indebted for more than one year for the paper. We hope these bills will be promptly paid. Our readers will recollect the terms. If payment is made in advance, the price of the paper is two dollars per year...

Baptism.

On Saturday last, the ordinance of baptism was administered by Rev. Thomas W. Tobey, Pastor of the Raleigh Baptist Church. Eighteen persons—six males and twelve females—were immersed.

Creed of a Denomination sometimes known as an Anti-Creed Denomination.

The following Creed which we have received from an esteemed brother, is one adopted by many members of a Denomination which some are pleased to call an Anti-Creed Denomination. Our readers may be pleased to have an opportunity of becoming acquainted with it.

- 1. "That God is the rightful arbiter of the universe; the source and fountain of all good.
2. "That all men have sinned and come short of the glory of God.
3. "That with God there is forgiveness; but that sincere repentance and reformation are indispensable to the forgiveness of sins.
4. "That man is constituted a fair moral agent and made capable of obeying the gospel.
5. "That through the agency of the Holy Spirit souls in the use of means are converted, regenerated and made new creatures.
6. "That Christ was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification, that through his example, doctrine, death and resurrection, and intercession, he has made salvation possible to every one, and is the only Saviour of lost sinners.
7. "That Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances to be observed by all true believers; and that baptism is the immersing of the candidate in water in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.
8. "That a life of watchfulness and prayer, only will keep Christians from falling—enable them to live in a justified state and ultimately receive to them the crown of eternal life.
9. "That there will be a resurrection of both the just and unjust.
10. "That God has ordained Jesus Christ judge, &c., &c.

Some Presbyterian preachers are quoting Judson and another distinguished Baptist minister, as saying that the Baptists are wrong in quoting the 6th of Romans as favoring immersion. Is this so or not? It is strange that good men will tell untruths...

"Baptism is by the Apostle Paul repeatedly compared to a burial. In one passage believers are said to be buried with Christ by baptism, and in another, to be buried with him in baptism, and to be therein risen with him."

"Whether baptism in these passages denotes external or spiritual baptism, it is evident that the figure derives all its propriety and beauty from some implied resemblance between the external rite and a burial; nor can it be imagined that the Apostle would have ever compared baptism of any kind to a burial, had there been no such resemblance."

"When we are said to be spiritually circumcised in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, there is an evident allusion to the nature of the external rite of circumcision; and the propriety of the figure depends solely on the resemblance which can be traced, between the external rite and the spiritual operation."

"When Paul was exhorted to be baptized, and to wash away his sins, there was an evident allusion to the use of water, in the ordinance of baptism; and had there been no application of water on which to ground such an allusion, we may be certain that we should never have heard of washing away sins in baptism."

"Accordingly, none are ever said to be washed in circumcision, because there is no resemblance between that rite and washing. So also, though we are said, in a spiritual sense, to be crucified with Christ, we are not said to be crucified with him in baptism or circumcision, because there is no resemblance between those rites and crucifixion."

"Nor are we ever said to be buried in circumcision, or to be buried in baptism, because there is no resemblance between those rites and burial; because there is nothing like a burial or a resurrection in the rite of circumcision."

"For the same reason, we may rest assured, that if baptism had consisted in sprinkling or pouring, or any partial application of water whatever, though we might possibly have heard of being washed in baptism, we should never have heard of being buried in baptism; for there being no resemblance, between such applications of water and a burial, there could have been no propriety in representing baptism under such a figure."

"But there is a confessed resemblance between immersion and a burial; and since the phrase, buried in baptism, is sanctioned by the highest authority, even divine inspiration, we have irrefragable proof, that baptism consists not in sprinkling or pouring, but in immersion."

"We wish that our brother had given the names of the other authors, who say that the Baptists are wrong in quoting the 6th of Romans, as favoring immersion. We have a distinct recollection of having read in the writings of some Pedobaptist author, an attempt to show that the chapter referred to, does not favor the views of the Baptists, but we believe that among Baptist writers, there is a great degree of unanimity in regard to the meaning of the Apostle. We consider it perfectly clear, that 'buried with Christ by baptism' must refer to immersion, and to nothing else."

"Carson makes the following reply to an opponent, who made a statement somewhat similar to that of the Presbyterian ministers referred to in the query of our brother. Hear him.

"In the same way he makes us strangle one another on Rom. vi. 1. Some Baptists, it seems, do not perceive the force of the argument which others ground on this passage. Well, is this a difference as to the meaning of the word? At the very worst, it is only the loss of a single argument—an argument, however, which I would hold, were an angel to report it. Must a cause fall, if all its supporters do not support it with all the same arguments?"

We believe that the following explanation of the part of the chapter referred to, which speaks of baptism, is the one generally received by the Baptists.

"Examination of Rom. vi. 3.—The apostle Paul, having strongly and fully stated salvation to the guiltiest of men, through grace reigning through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord, anticipates, in the beginning of the sixth chapter of his epistle to the Romans, the objection that in every age has been made to his doctrine: 'Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?' He refutes this objection by the fact, that from our union with Christ by faith, we have died along with him. And that we have died along with Christ, he proves from our baptism. 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?'"

"Therefore we are buried with him, by baptism, into death.' As in Christ's death, we have died with him; so in baptism, we are figuratively put into the grave along with him. Words cannot more plainly teach anything than these words declare, that in baptism we are buried with Christ. Baptism, then, must not only contain a likeness to burial, but that likeness is emblematical. There may be resemblance between two objects, and to exhibit that likeness in words is a beauty in language. But if the likeness is merely accidental, it is only a figure of speech, and can teach nothing. To found an argument on such ground, would be the extravagance of fanaticism. Homer compares the falling of his heroes headlong from their chariots, to the diving of water-fowl. But this resemblance is merely accidental, and the victor had no intention of giving an emblem of diving; nor could any argument be grounded on the likeness. When an argument does ground on the likeness, it is not in the water; and there would be as good a likeness in this to Christ's burial, even as in baptism. But the likeness is only accidental, not emblematical. No argument could be drawn from this, to prove a dying with Christ. This would be a metaphor. But baptism is not a figure of speech; it is an emblematical action. The likeness is intentional, and the action performed is symbolical. Were it not so, the apostle might as legitimately argue from bath as from baptism. This distinction is self-evident, and we shall find that it is of decisive importance. From not understanding it, some have said that we have as good a right to be buried in the meaning of baptism, something corresponding to planting, as to burial. Planting is a metaphor; there must then be a likeness, but no emblematical import."

"That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Here we see that baptism is an emblem also of the new life of the Christian. He dies with Christ to sin; he rises with him to a new life of holiness. There must, then, be something in baptism, that is calculated to be an emblem of a resurrection, as well as of a burial. Immersion is the only mode that answers both; and immersion is the only mode that can do so. For if we were to be buried in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. In our baptism, then, we are emblematically laid in the grave with Christ, and we are also emblematically risen with him. It is designed to point to our own resurrection, as well as the resurrection of Christ. In baptism, we profess our faith in the one as past, and in the other as future. What simplicity, what beauty, what edification is contained in this ordinance! How have all these been overruled by the traditions of men! How clearly does the ordinance present the true state of the soul! How admirably is it calculated to recall the mind to a view of the ground of hope, that is calculated to silence unbelief! How is it that a vile sinner can escape the wrath of God, and obtain eternal life? How is it that Christ's work is available for him? Why, when Christ paid our debt, we ourselves have paid our debt, for we are one with Christ. We have died with Christ, and have risen with Christ; Christ's death is our death; Christ's burial is our burial; Christ's resurrection is our resurrection; Christ's sitting in heavenly places, is our sitting in heavenly places."

Remington thus expresses his opinion. "I consider that a careful examination of this passage establishes the following. 1. That baptism is here used as a metaphor, by which to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. 2. Of the Christian's death to sin, and resurrection to spiritual life. Observe that the Apostle uses the phrases, 'Buried with him by baptism,' and 'buried with him in baptism,' referring to the act of baptism, and the other to the state of the baptized. It is plain that sprinkling cannot answer this figure, and nothing short of, nothing but immersion is intended by it."

Hear what Dr. Fuller of Baltimore says, respecting the passage in question. "Observe, the apostle expressly says that we are buried by baptism and in baptism." He also calls it a planting. He then adds, that in baptism there is not only a burying, but a rising. The pretence that a spiritual burial is here meant conflicts directly with the very word of God. That word says, 'by' and 'in' the act of baptism the subject is buried. The apostle had before spoken of the inward change (see context); he here speaks of the external baptismal profession of Christ."

"As for what is sometimes said about the ancient mode of burying, and the assertion that Christ was not buried, it can hardly think our brethren serious when they write such things. The idea is simply a being covered and hidden. The manner is nothing. As to Christ's burial, the apostle says: 'Christ was buried and rose again on the third day.' And Jesus, referring to his burial, employs the very idea of the passage before us, 'For as Jesus was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.' Matt. xii. 40."

"Bloomfield.—There is here (Rom. vi. 4) plainly reference to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion, and I agree with Knapp and Rosenmuller that there is reason to regard it should have been abandoned in most Christian churches, especially as it has no evident reference to the mystic sense of baptism."

"Rosenmuller, (on the passage).—Immersion in the water of baptism, and coming forth out of it, is a symbol of a person's renouncing his former life, and, on the contrary, beginning a new one. The learned have rightly reminded us that on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of immersion ought to have been retained in the Christian Church."

"Dr. Knapp, an eminent and pious German divine, whose works are recommended by Dr. Woods, speaking of the passage in question, says: 'We are, like Christ, buried as dead persons by baptism, and should rise, like him, to a new life. The image is taken here from baptized persons, as they were immersed (buried), and as they emerged (rose again).'"

"John Wesley, on Rom. vi. 4.—'Buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.'"

"Rosenmuller, on Rom. vi. 4, author of a commentary on the New Testament, and more than forty other learned works.—'It being so expressly declared here, Rom. vi. 4, and Coloss. ii. 12, that we are buried with Christ in baptism by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by being buried with him; and this immersion being so expressly observed in the thirteenth century, and approved by our Church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the author of this institution, or any license from any council of the Church, being that the Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the change, the latter; we were to be buried with him in a certain degree of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in case of the Clinic, or in present danger of death.'"

"Lastly, Archbishop Tillotson.—'Anciently those who were baptized put off their garments, which signified the putting off the body of sin, and were immersed and buried in water, to represent their death to sin; and then they came up out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life. And so these customs the apostle alludes when he says: 'How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism.' Vol. 1, p. 68."

"Chrysostom proves the resurrection from the apostolic mode of baptism. 'Our being baptized and immersed in the water, and our rising again out of it, is a symbol of our descending into hell or the grave, and of our returning from them.' Chrys. Hom. ii. 1, p. 68."

"Indeed, only try sprinkling or pouring in these passages, and how will it sound? 'Know ye not that so many of us as were poured into Jesus Christ were poured into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by pouring into him.' Or let us try 'sprinkled.' 'Know ye not that so many of us as were sprinkled into Jesus Christ were sprinkled into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by sprinkling into his death?' It is certain, then, this verse requires immersion. But note, the Apostle here declares that all who are baptized are so buried."

Baptist Noel thus writes. "Know ye not that when men are baptized, they are by vow, covenant, and profession, laid into the belief of a crucified Saviour, who died for sin to save us from it; and do profess that, repented of, by which we renounce it, as dead to it for ever? We come to therefore in our baptism, we are laid under the water, as signifying our covenant profession; that as he was buried for sin, we are dead and buried to sin; that as the glorious power of God raised him from the dead, so we should rise up to live to him in newness and grace of life. —Baptist."

"Who had been baptized into the name and religion of Jesus had received the sign and made the profession of communion with him; and conformity to him in his death, that in virtue of his dying for their sins, they should die to all sin. This profession was equivalent to being buried with Christ, as dead with him. The baptism of a converted Jew or Gentile was a professed manifestation of his death to sin and he was a professed introduction to his walking in newness of life. —Scott."

"We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation; in the act of descending under the water of baptism to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending to emerge into a second, or new life. —Chalmers."

"The act of baptism denotes a dedication to the service of him in whose name we are baptized. One of its designs is to dedicate or consecrate us to the service of Christ. Thus (1 Cor., x. 2) the Israelites are said to have been baptized unto Moses, &c., they became consecrated, or dedicated, unto God as their leader and law-giver. In the place before us, the argument of the apostle is evidently drawn from the supposition that we have been solemnly consecrated by baptism to the service of Christ. By the solemn profession made at our baptism we had become dedicated to, as Christ was dead to the living world around him when he was buried; as he rose from death, so we, being made dead to sin and the world by that religion whose profession is expressed by baptism, should rise to a new life, a life of holiness. —Barnes."

"To be baptized unto Christ (in Christum) is beyond doubt to be baptized unto the one who should profess his communion with Christ; that each by that baptism, as by a sign and testimony, should avow that he had believed in Christ. —Vitranga, Obs. Sac., iii., 22, 822."

"The sense is, as many of us have devoted ourselves to Christ by baptism. —Stuart."

"As the man by which a union takes place with Christ is faith, and the mean of professing that faith, of sealing our union with Christ, is baptism, Paul employs the expression, 'to be baptized unto Christ,' as equivalent to this, 'to be united to Christ.' To be baptized unto Christ in the style of Paul does not denote a simple external profession of the religion of the Gospel, but the act of heart by which one accepts that religion, an act of which submission to the rite of baptism was the public and ordained expression. In all this passage, as in Gal. iii., baptism is taken for the profession of a Gospel, an act of which the ceremony was the prescribed token. —Hodge, French Translation."

From this passage it is plain that believers alone ought to be baptized: 1. Because the baptized are said to be consecrated to Christ by baptism, which is an act of faith. 2. Because the baptized die to sin and rise to a new life, which none but true believers can do. As the baptized are said to die and rise again, the passage can not mean that baptism is merely emblematical of what they ought to do. Its expressing what they ought to do would not prove that they did it. Either, then, the baptized persons are taken and rise again in a spiritual sense in baptism, and then they are true believers, or else they died and rose again professedly, and then they were professed believers. Either sense proves that, according to this text, none but true believers ought to offer themselves for baptism, and none but those who make a credible profession of faith ought to be received to baptism."

If any one wishes more upon this subject, we will give hereafter the views of Peggily, Jewett, Turney, and a host of others. We think that enough has been said respecting the matter.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.—The January number of Leonard Scott and Co.'s reprint of this Review has been issued. The original work is now in the hands of J. Chapman, Esq., of London. The price of the reprint is Three Dollars per year.

PASTOR'S HAND-BOOK.—Lewis Colby, Esq., of New York, has published a small work bearing the above title which we take pleasure in recommending to the ministers of the gospel who may read our paper. It comprises selections from Scripture arranged for the various occasions of official duty together with select formulas for marriage, and rules of order for churches Ecclesiastical and other assemblies. Every minister should own and use the book. W. L. Pomeroy has the work for sale.

PRINCE GROVE CHURCH.—Three dollars have been received from the members of this church for the N. C. Baptist Mission House.

Also from David Wells three dollars, and from sister S. Long five dollars.—for the same purpose.

Missionary Intelligence.

Dr. Dawson writes, under date of Rangoon, Nov. 13, that the first of June to the end of October, 6,134, applicants had been aided at the dispensary. Occasion is taken to impart religious instruction to all who will listen. Some disputes, some ask respectful questions, some assent, a few stop their ears. The following extracts from his letter will be read with interest:

A VISIT OF MR. AND MRS. VINTON. A few days ago Mr. and Mrs. Vinton left this place to return to Maulana. Their coming here neither excited opposition nor suspicion, and no question was asked. The fact is deserving of notice, as an evidence of the public feeling towards missionaries (that how reigns in this section of Burma). Our God hath wrought marvelous things for his own cause, for which we cannot repress our gratitude. The arrival of our friends was hailed with peculiar gratification. They spent between two and three weeks with us, seeing and hearing for themselves what the Lord is doing in his providence for the spiritual welfare of this long abandoned heathen city. In less than a week the report of their arrival spread through the Karen jungles with a speed that would have done credit to more civilized countries. The Karen Christians flocked to the mission house in great numbers, to look once more upon the face of their teacher, to hear his voice, to receive his counsel, and in their own tongue to unite with him in prayer. Anxious were their inquiries, whether Mr. Vinton intended to settle here permanently, to open a school and visit their churches.

Is Immersion by an unbaptized Minister Valid Baptism?

The following article written by our lamented brother, Meredith, a number of years ago, has been found among his papers. Thinking it will prove highly interesting to many of the readers of the Recorder, we now publish it. The article appears to be a reply to one written in the Christian Index.

QUERY.—Should those persons who have been immersed on a profession of their faith, by Pedobaptist administrators, be rebaptized before they be admitted to fellowship in a Baptist church—Christian Index.

On account of the manner in which this enquiry has been stated, it seems to admit of a doubt whether it relates to the validity of the rite in the case supposed, or to the proper subject of church fellowship. But as it has been taken for granted both by yourself and brother M., that the allusion is exclusively to the validity of the ordinance, I shall take the liberty to do the same. The question before us is therefore neither more nor less than this,—Is the ordinance of Baptism valid when administered by a person who has not been immersed?

To this question, thus stated, it seems to me the answer must be plain, from a slight attention to the following considerations.

What are the essentials of a lawful and valid Baptism? Evidently the prescribed act, performed upon a properly qualified subject, by a properly authorized administrator, and in the name of the sacred Trinity. If all these indispensable constituents be present, the ceremony will be valid, but if any of them be absent it will be altogether null. For example if the act be wanting, there can be no Baptism, because the identical operation which constitutes the substance of the ordinance and gives name and character to the whole proceeding is left out.—It is on this ground that Baptists call in question the validity of the sacrament, when the act of aspersion or effusion is substituted for an act of immersion.—So also if the person receiving the ordinance be a Jew or a Greek, or a Heathen, or an Infidel, or any other than a professed and supposed believer in Christ, although every other requisite be present, the subject will be defective and of course the sacrament will be invalid. It is on this ground that Baptists withhold their assent from the rite when administered to infants. In like manner also if the ceremony be performed in the name of Mahomet, or of Moses, or of Paul, or of any other person or party than the Holy Trinity, it can be of no avail, because the great and distinguishing peculiarity of Christian Baptism is laid aside. And on the same principle, although there may be nothing objectionable in the act, the subject, or the name invoked, yet if the rite should be solemnized by a Mohometan, a Jewish Rabbi, a Heathen Priest, or even a common unbeliever, it would necessarily be invalid,—and that for the obvious reason, that a properly authorized administrator would be wanting. All this is so plain it appears to me that nothing further is necessary to secure the concurrence of every person at all acquainted with the subject.

We inquire in the second place, what are the qualifications necessary to constitute a properly authorized administrator? It is necessary for our present purpose to answer this question only so far as to say that he must have been baptized himself. That a person who has been regularly baptized, and who adds to this all other necessary qualifications is authorized to administer the ordinance, the Scriptures abundantly testify. And if it should be supposed that a person may be qualified and yet lack baptism, the proof must be produced before the supposition can be sustained or admitted. Accordingly all denominations of christians who practice Baptism at all, so far as I know, proceed upon the principle that a person who has not submitted to the ordinance himself, is wholly incompetent to administer it to others. I will only add that if Baptism be not an indispensable qualification for the administration of that sacrament, it is folly to contend that that is an institution designed exclusively for the christian church; for if it may be received of one who has never been baptized, it must be received of one of course who has never been visibly connected with a body of active believers. All this, I think, is too obvious to need further argument.

I now come to enquire in the third place, whether our Pedobaptist brethren have been baptized. If they have, then aspersion or effusion is baptism, and our distinctive sentiments as Baptists must be abandoned. If they have not, they are destitute of an indispensable qualification for the administration of the ordinance of Baptism, and of course that ordinance, when administered by them, must be null and void. This may be considered as saying a great deal, but it is certainly saying no more than we are compelled to say if we would be consistent, so long as we retain our present opinions respecting the necessity of an act of immersion in the Baptismal sacrament. I must therefore think that the proposed query has been clearly and conclusively answered in the affirmative.

With your permission my good brother, I will now make a few passing remarks upon some of the statements found in your replies.

Your illustrations are not it seems to me quite analogous. If the officiating magistrates in the cases to which you refer, were in the view of the law unqualified to solemnize the rite of marriage, it is proper to ask, why were marriages, solemnized by such functionaries considered legal and valid? Surely this could not have been a matter of course, for the very fact of the incompetency of the officiating agent implied an absolute nullity on the part of the solemnity performed. If therefore a marriage, solemnized by a person legally disqualified, was nevertheless legally valid, this must have been in consequence of a special legislative enactment expressly making it so. Now if there be any enactment in our Scriptures, making the rite of baptism valid, when administered by an unauthorized administrator, then the cases must be considered parallel, and your reasoning must be admitted to be conclusive. But until such legal enactment on the part of the great Legislator of the church can be produced, we must take it for granted that no such provision was made.

Your scriptural quotations my brother, do not appear to me to be more happy than your illustrations. You certainly cannot suppose that the mere facts that Peter commanded the Samaritans to be baptized, and that Paul declared that God had sent him not to baptize, furnish anything like evidence that Baptism is not indispensable on the part of the administrator. But if they do not furnish evidence to this effect, it must be obvious that they can have no effectual bearing on the question in hand.

I certainly cannot agree with you my dear friend in what you have said, respecting the responsibility of the subject in Baptism. That the administrator may sustain the greater responsibility in this case is readily admitted. But if there be anything in the Scriptures or the facts of the case which shows that the subject is not also responsible, or that a person is not under as weighty obligations to see that his

baptism is administered by a qualified functionary as he is to see that it is performed by the proper act, or in the appropriate name, it is evidently important that we should be told what it is.

But if it were even certain that the recipient is free from responsibility in this matter, that circumstance in the nature of things could never atone for a defect in the qualifications of the administrator so as to convert a defective and unauthorized ceremony, into a complete and valid sacrament. It might exonerate the party from the guilt of a willful neglect of the Baptist Institution, on the ground of ignorance, should such ignorance necessarily exist,—but it could never give existence to the fact that he had been baptized, nor could it ever create any material difference between him and a person who had ignorantly disregarded his baptismal obligations altogether.

It strikes me however that ignorance has been supposed, when, in the very nature of the case, it cannot exist. If a given individual apply to a Pedobaptist administrator for baptism by immersion, the very fact that he does so, proves that he has some intelligible views concerning the nature and importance of the act, which valid baptism implies. What then are those views? Does he consider aspersion baptism? Why then does he not consent to be baptized by aspersion? Does he believe that aspersion is not baptism? How then can the fact escape him, that the proposed administrator has never been baptized? The truth is, there is no possible way of extricating such a person from the most palpable inconsistency. The very fact that he applies for immersion proves that, in his own view aspersion is not baptism. The fact that he applies to a Pedobaptist administrator proves that he is willing to admit that aspersion is baptism, unless we suppose him to believe, what no one can believe, that the rite may be lawfully solemnized by a person who has never submitted to it himself. To say the least, there is a contradiction and an incongruity in such proceedings which ought to be clearly and conclusively set forth.

Nor can I wholly concur in the statements made by you, my brother, in your remarks relative to brother M.'s communication. You say in allusion to your previous observation—"The validity of the baptism was made to depend upon the qualifications, views, and impressions of the recipient. To constitute such a baptism as this, the recipient should have a christian experience, right views of the gospel, and a full confidence in the fitness of the administrator." Now my good brother, allow me to ask you, Where is the evidence of all this? Where is the proof that the validity of Baptism, or of any other rite whether religious or civil can depend upon the qualifications, views, and impressions of the recipient? I am aware of no such proof. On the contrary, if this proposition be true, it is difficult to see how we can question the validity of many of our Pedobaptist brethren, even when performed by aspersion. It will not be doubted that those who make a consistent profession of faith in Christ, have a christian experience,—nor will it be doubted that such have generally correct views of the gospel;—nor yet will it be doubted that they have the most unshaken confidence in the fitness of the administrator. Why then is not their baptism "good and valid"? It will not do to say the defect lies in their misapprehension concerning the act, since this cannot be greater, nor in any respect more material than that necessarily implied in the case supposed, respecting the administrator. For surely if a person can have right views of the gospel, and yet make a mistake in relation to the proper qualifications of the administrator, it is difficult to see how his orthodoxy can be consistently questioned, when his error relates to the act. But again, suppose a person possessing the ordinary qualifications for the ordinance, should become convinced of the fitness of a layman, or of a professed unbeliever, or of a Musselman or a Brahmin, and should accordingly submit to the rite at the hands of such,—what would there be in the case, on the principle stated above, which could make his baptism invalid? Should it be that the fault lies in the erroneous views of the candidate respecting the qualifications of the administrator, it is to be borne in mind that both cases suppose erroneous views in this respect, so that the only difference which exists is found in the fact, that the latter case supposes the absence of more qualifications than the former.

You say again, "But if the receiver acts in good faith, and proceeds according to the gospel, then we cannot yet perceive how the bad faith of the administrator nullifies his baptism." It appears here, my brother, that you have made a slight mistake, with regard to the grand turning point of the question before us. The authority of the administrator, in the present case, is to be called in question, not on account of his bad faith, but of his bad baptism, not because he is not a believer, but because he has not been baptized. I am by no means prepared to say that a man's bad faith may not disqualify him for the administration of a religious ordinance;—but I certainly cannot see that there is any bad faith, on the part of most of our Pedobaptist brethren, which could, of itself, disqualify them for such administration. I question the validity of the ordinance, when administered by such, solely on the ground that they have never submitted to it themselves.

For the Recorder.

DEAR BROTHER TOBEY: At the request of the Baptist church at Salem, Lincoln county, N. C., a Presbytery of Elders, consisting of A. Abernathy, R. B. Jones and W. Hill, was called to examine and ordain brother A. J. Cansler, a licentiate of that church, to the ministry. The Presbytery met with the church on Friday the 19th of March. Ordination sermon by Elder A. Abernathy from 2 Timothy 4th chapter, first clause, 2nd verse—"Preach the word." After the sermon, Eld. Abernathy was chosen chairman of the Presbytery. The candidate having answered satisfactorily the questions proposed, Eld. Abernathy offered the ordination prayer, Elder R. B. Jones delivered the charge, and Elder Wade Hill, presented the Bible and extended the right hand of fellowship.

Brother Cansler graduated at Chapel Hill in June 1847, and has talents that will render him useful in the christian ministry. He is located in the midst of a field that greatly needs ministerial labor. We hope that his extensive acquaintance and qualifications will enable him to do much good in the Valley of the Catawba. The Baptist interest in this section is increasing beyond expectation. The field, which the Missionary of the Convention occupies, is large enough for two. Should any of our ministering brethren, in the eastern part of the State wish a pleasant retreat in summer, let them come to the Valley of the Catawba, where they will be welcomed by many kind hearts. The Catawba Springs four miles from Beatties Ford on the Lincolnton road, possess valuable mineral qualities and affords a pleasant retreat for invalids. There the weary traveller can always find a pleasant home and that which renders life agreeable—"kindness."

Should any of our ministering brethren attend the Western Convention this year, we hope they will spend some time with bro. Jones, the missionary in the valley of the Catawba. Yours truly, S. FERRIS. Lincolnton, March 19, 1852.

For the Recorder.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS., March 22, 1852. MY DEAR BROTHER—I have just now received nineteen dollars from Mr. J. J. Biggs (Bro. Colby's check) collected by you for the benefit of Abner Fuller's daughter. I shall be most happy to transmit it, and to forward by you an acknowledgment of the receipt of it, as soon as I can hear from Winslow, to whom I shall send it. It will be an acceptable offering, and many prayers will be offered for God on behalf of the donors. Yours truly, S. S. CURRIE.

Revival Intelligence.

NEW MARKET STREET CHURCH.—Four candidates were baptized by the pastor, Rev. E. Griffith, last Sabbath.

TWELFTH CHURCH, KENSINGTON.—The pastor, Bro. Paulin, baptized two candidates on Sabbath evening last.

GERMAN BAPTIST CHURCH.—Bro. Elderman, of the German Church, baptized five candidates on Sunday evening, two of whom were Roman Catholics. An interesting work is going on in that church.

THIRD BAPTIST CHURCH.—The pastor, S. Remington, will administer the ordinance of baptism next Sabbath morning, after preaching.

FIRST CAMDEN CHURCH.—The pastor, T. R. Taylor, baptized last Sabbath evening three candidates. The religious interest continues.

For the Recorder. Fortune Telling, &c. DEAR BRO. TOBEY:—This is the age of improvement. Astonishing improvements are daily made in the arts and sciences. We boast of our advantages and knowledge over the ancients and heathen nations, yet in many respects we display but little superiority to them.

Superstition and belief in familiar spirits, fortune tellers, &c., prevails to a shameful and alarming extent, in some parts of our country. There are some neighborhoods where nearly all the inhabitants believe in tricking, poisoning by stepping over articles laid for that purpose, &c. I regret that many christians (be it said to their shame) believe in these things, and are in the habit of consulting fortune tellers. This state of things is very much to be regretted for several reasons.

1. Those persons who consult fortune tellers in cases of sickness, to find lost or stolen property, to find out whether or not they will ever marry, to become the butt and ridicule of their less superstitious and better informed neighbors. If they are church members, an unfavorable impression is made against their piety.

2. It is often productive of the greatest evils, contention, discord, disappointment and incredible misery. To illustrate this, I will give a case or two that I come within my own knowledge. Mr. ———— and his wife. He took up the idea that the negro was poisoned or poisoned, sends and consults a fortune teller. She says the negro is poisoned, gives directions and medicine for his cure and for the detection of those who had given the dose, &c. Her statements are believed, her instructions followed—the negro dies—the negro in the neighborhood is suspected of having poisoned the deceased. Great excitement and contention ensued. The negro no doubt died of a fever that was prevailing at that time, and would probably have been cured but for this delusive superstition.

A certain lady was taken sick, and her husband believed she was tricked or poisoned, consulted the same fortune teller, who gave directions, &c., as in the case above. A neighbor and relation was thereby suspicious. Great excitement prevailed, neighbors and relations put at variance perhaps forever. In such a community the negroes who are taken sick, believe that they are poisoned, or in their own language, "hurt." They have no confidence in physicians, however skillful, throw away their medicine, and secretly take medicine from some cunning negro in the neighborhood. Some white people do the same thing.

3. It is sinful. All church members who believe in and consult diviners or fortune tellers should be dealt with and expelled from the church as for every other immoral act. The Bible is plain upon this subject.

Mal. 3: 5. "I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers." Mic. 5: 12. "Thou shalt have no more soothsayers." Deut. 18: 14. "These nations harkened to their observers of times, and to diviners, but the Lord thy God have not suffered thee to do so."

Deut. 18: 10, 12. "There shall not be found among you one that useth divination or a soothsayer with familiar spirits, for all these things are an abomination to the Lord." Lev. 19: 31. "Regard not them that have familiar spirits."

Lev. 20: 6. "And the soul that turneth aside such as have familiar spirits. . . . I will set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people." Jer. 29: 9, 10. "Hearken not to your diviners, your enchanters, your soothsayers. They prophesy unto you."

From these declarations of God's word, it is evident that it is very offensive to him for his people to consult diviners, fortune tellers, &c., for any purpose whatever. Our churches should awake to this subject, and deal with their members who are guilty of consulting fortune tellers.

I should be pleased to hear from the Editor of some of his experienced correspondents upon this subject. Geo. W. PRATT. Mill Hill, March 29th, 1852.

For the Recorder. FRAMINGHAM, MASS., March 22, 1852. MY DEAR BROTHER—I have just now received nineteen dollars from Mr. J. J. Biggs (Bro. Colby's check) collected by you for the benefit of Abner Fuller's daughter. I shall be most happy to transmit it, and to forward by you an acknowledgment of the receipt