

BROAD RIVER ASSOCIATION.—In the Recorder of Nov. 1, 1851, there is an article having reference to the above-mentioned Association. Will the writer of that article please send us his name? We had it at the time, but have lost it.

Convention Debt.

We thank our brother for his manifestation of interest in the Home Mission cause. We have up to the present time, received Thirty-nine Dollars towards the payment of the Convention Debt. Twelve more such letters as brother M. B. has written, will make up the amount pledged by us. Who will send us another? God in his Providence has taken from us the indefatigable Agent of the Convention, Bro. Jones. He rests from his labors and his works follow him. Let us who remain, endeavor by increased activity, to make up for his loss. While we feel an intense interest in the welfare of the heathen, let us not forget those in our own State who are destitute of the preached gospel.

Treatment of a Delinquent Pastor.

In order that the brethren who were present at the Council called by the Salem church, may see that we are not alone in our views of discipline, we copy from an excellent work which every Baptist ought to own—viz: Crowell's Church Member's Manual, page 253, Sect. 6, the following extract, we hope, that our readers will give it a careful perusal.

The pastor, as a member of the church, is subject to its watch and discipline, like any other member, in everything which relates to morals and Christian character. His station entitles him to respect, and to caution in receiving charges against him, as will soon be shown; but not to exemption from general discipline. Even the Apostle Peter, when called to account by the elders of the church in Jerusalem, (Acts 11,) of which church he was a member, claims no official privilege of exemption; but pleads his case before them; by an array of facts and arguments. And the church at Ephesus was praised for having "tried them who say they are Apostles, and are not." Of the same nature is the direction of Paul to the churches in Galatia to proceed at once to the excommunication of their false teachers, who were leading them astray. "I would they were even cut off which trouble you"; 5: 12. And this they were to do in the exercise of their Christian liberty; v. 13.

If the pastor is guilty of a scandalous sin, the church have power to investigate the facts, and exclude him from fellowship. But this is not all that the case requires. For although it is plain that if he is unfit to be a church member he is unworthy to be a minister, yet, as the agency of the presbytery was called in to invest him with the ministerial office, it is equally necessary in order to devert him from it. One church may not undo that which properly required the consent and agency of many churches to do; and if a presbytery, or council, composed of the pastors and elders of other churches, is in any sense necessary to ordain a man to the ministerial office, it is necessary in the same sense, and to the same extent in order to depose him from it. Other churches, also, and their pastors, have a deep interest in the removal from office of one who has sustained so important a relation to them all, as a public teacher of religion. A fundamental law respecting the conferring of office is, that the same power which makes men unmake.

A council should, therefore, be first called; to investigate charges of delinquency against a minister. It is right that every man should be tried by his peers, when charges are brought against him relating to his official character. This sound general principle is peculiarly applicable to a minister of the gospel. And if he deserves to be deposed from the ministry, and expelled from the church, the former step should be first taken; and after he is divested of his official character, the church can proceed, without embarrassment, to his expulsion from fellowship. This course should always be taken, unless a pastor is guilty of scandalous sins, of which there is full proof; in which case the church may expel him without delay, call a council to depose him from the ministry, and thus the melancholy affair is ended. But such an exception to the general rule rarely occurs, if ever.

Some persons, who object to this view, contend that the church to which a man belongs, is the only body by whom he can properly be tried and deposed, or in any way punished, if found guilty.—This they suppose is necessary to the preservation of church independence. But this is clearly an error; for by the same argument they may prove, with equal conclusiveness, that each church must ordain its ministers without the agency or co-operation of other churches, or abandon its independence. The truth is, the calling of a council, or presbytery, to investigate charges against a minister, has nothing to do with the church's independence, nor with its right of discipline over all its members, the pastor included; because the jurisdiction of the council in such cases extends not to the minister's office, nor to his church membership. A council may depose him from the ministry, but have no right to exclude him from the church.

Much injury to religion might be prevented by strictly adhering to this rule, the propriety of which is so obvious. Whatever charges are made against a minister, they lie, first, against his ministerial character. The first question, therefore, is, whether he has forfeited that character. The proper authority to settle this question, is the same that invested him with the office. If the church proceeds first to exclude him from fellowship, he is still a regular and authorized public teacher of religion. This office was given to him not by the church, but by many churches; therefore one church cannot deprive him of it.—This office he holds, not in virtue of being a church member, but in addition to it. As he may be a church member yet not fit to be a minister, so he may be deposed from the ministry though not unfit to be a church member. If the charges against him relate to official improprieties, or irregularities, or to doctrinal errors, the necessity of a council to investigate them, composed in part of ministers, would be obvious to all. If accused of immoralities, it must be remembered that the charge is to be proved before he is deposed. Does not every one see, that the investigation of such a charge could be performed with greater accuracy and thoroughness, and with less injury to the cause of morality and religion, by a council of ministers and elders selected from the churches, than by a single church? Is it any surrender or infringement of church independence, to delay church disciplinary action till such investigation is had? And is it not unwarrantable haste for any church to expel a minister from membership before the judgment of such a council has been obtained?

The investigation before such a council should be thorough, and a full record of all the facts proved should be entered on its minutes, with the names of witnesses; and a copy should be transmitted to the church, who may proceed to an original investigation, if not satisfied with that of the council. If the office is such as to require his exclusion from church fellowship, they can now proceed without embarrassment, in the same way as with any other member.

In receiving charges against a minister, great caution should be used. Against an elder, receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses; if a scriptural rule. As a minister is presumed to have stronger motives and greater advantages for maintaining purity of character than other Christians, it is reasonable that stronger evidence of misconduct should be required. His office, too, exposes him peculiarly to malice and calumny, and the prosperity of religion depends so much on the reputation of its ministers, that the church ought to guard their characters with scrupulous care, and receive charges against them with caution.

Ought a minister who has been silenced and expelled, to preach again, if restored to the church?—It is probable that the interests of religion would be best promoted by his remaining in a private station. At least, in regard to one crime, the rule should be invariable and inflexible. A minister convicted of fornication, while holding the sacred office, should never be allowed, in any circumstances, to assume the functions of the ministry again. If a church is strongly of opinion that one who has been silenced and expelled for an offense of a milder cast, and again restored to fellowship, on repentance, ought to preach, it has the power to license him; and a council, properly convened, may, if it sees fit, ordain him. He is a private member, and without such license and ordination he certainly ought not to preach. A council called for this purpose ought to be large, and should be composed of men of wisdom and experience.

Presents to Colleges.

The following, which we cut from the N. Y. Recorder, gives a pleasing instance of liberality, that we think ought not to be forgotten by the friends of education.

We hope that the patrons of Wake Forest College will manifest their interest in this flourishing institution in a similar manner.

A book presented to the library of a College is placed in a situation where for many years it may benefit the world.

How many valuable works forever lost to the world, because retained in private libraries, had they been presented to some Institution of learning would now be exerting an influence both extensive and beneficial.

AS IT SHOULD BE.

A few weeks since, we spoke of the pleasure which had been afforded us in the examination of a copy of the "Sprachenhalle," and gave our readers a brief description of it. How suitable an abiding-place it has found in this New World is set forth in the following item from the Rochester Democrat. It is a source of gratification to know that the seminary is indebted for this interesting addition to its library to the generosity of our friend and fellow-townsman, H. H. Lamport, Esq., of the firm of Cornish, Lamport & Co., Park Place.

VALUABLE DONATION TO THE LIBRARY OF THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.—H. H. Lamport, Esq., of New York city, has presented to the Seminary a copy of the "Sprachenhalle," or the Lord's Prayer in eight hundred and fourteen languages and dialects. This work, it will be recollected, was prepared with great care and labor at the Imperial printing press in Vienna, for exhibition at the World's Fair in London. It excited so much attention there, as a specimen of printing, and on account of its inherent value for the purposes of comparative philology, that a few copies have been put on sale for public libraries. As a triumph of the art of printing and of philological learning, it is without a parallel in the world. It is believed that this is the third copy that has been received into the United States. It is a matter of gratification to see works of this character accumulating in the new institutions in this city at this early period of their history. We trust that they will be remembered in this way by others, as well as by the donor of this beautiful and valuable work.

Queries.

Is it consistent with good order and discipline for travelling ministers of the Baptist church, to receive the testimony of converts and baptize, without permission, in the bounds of regular established churches?

Has the State Convention of North Carolina a right to vest her Missionaries with higher powers than belong to the Baptist church, so that they can receive and baptize candidates, and compel any branch of the church to receive them?

Another Query.—I send you the above queries, and hope you will answer them, in your next issue, and I should be glad to hear from any of the brethren in answer to the above.

By so doing, you will oblige and instruct many Baptists in YADKIN.

A regularly ordained minister has a right to baptize any person who may give him reason to believe that he has been truly converted. But the responsibility of deciding is very great, and few ministers would wish to bear this responsibility alone. If a faithful minister ever baptizes a person without reference to a church, it is because there are some circumstances connected with the church, which make it undesirable for the new convert to join that church. In such a case the minister should exact from the candidate previous to his baptism a promise to join some church as soon as possible. The authority to baptize, the minister receives, not from the church, but from the commission given by his ascended Master. The vote given by a church on the reception of a candidate, is not a permission to the minister to baptize, but an assurance that the church will receive him into fellowship after his baptism, since they believe him to be a truly converted person. The church ought not to receive a candidate with a certificate that he has been baptized without first hearing his relation of religious experience. If they are not satisfied with this relation, they ought not to receive him into fellowship.

No person can compel a regular Baptist church to receive members into its fellowship. They must be received by a unanimous vote of the members present at the meeting. The Baptist State Convention authorizes no Missionary to preach, to receive candidates, or to baptize. It simply promises to provide for the support of those whom it sends forth, except in those cases where by a strange anomaly it requires them to rely on their field of labor for support. The authority to preach and to baptize is conferred by a higher power.

We expect that the queries are a sort of "thrust in the dark" at somebody, but who that somebody is we know not. The brother who wrote the queries had better state his grievances to the individual and have the matter settled.

Greensboro Female College.

Our thanks are due to the friend who has kindly sent us a copy of the Catalogue of this Institution. During the past year 137 pupils have been in attendance. Its teachers are

Charles F. Deems, President, Professor of Belles Letters and physical science; William C. Doub, Professor of Mathematics and Ancient Languages; Andrew G. Kern, Professor of Music; Miss Eliza A. Graves, Drawing, Painting and French; Miss Elizabeth Sherbrooke, Miss Jane Spear, Miss Mary S. Blake, Assistants in the Literary Department; Miss Augusta M. Hagen, Miss Reinda Dougherty, Miss Anne M. Lyman, Assistants in the Department of Music.

For the Recorder.

Agents of Wake Forest College.

We learn that Mr. John Mitchell a late graduate of this institution, and Rev. Robert B. Jones, now a Missionary of the Board of the Convention, have declined the appointment of Agents tendered them by the Board of Trustees. Mr. Mitchell has gone to the Newton Theological Seminary, and Mr. Jones deems it his duty to yield to the request of the Board in continuing for the present in his very interesting and important field of labor. It is hoped the Board of Trustees will soon have an efficient Agent in the field.—Com.

For the Recorder.

Videns.

"How," asks Videns, "can a person be holy without faith?" I reply by asking, how can a dead man live without breathing? Or more properly, how can a being be created without life; that is, without his exerting life, as necessary to his creation? The answer to Videns' question and mine is the same. It is done in either case by the simple power of God: Omnipotence speaks to the dead—*natural or spiritual*—the sovereign word "Live;" and the dead live: and the faith in the one case, as well as breathing in the other, is not the cause of life, but its acts, effects and evidence. "Is not faith," says Videns, "an essential element of holiness?" The question respects not the elements of holiness, but its cause. "If men," he again asks, "can be holy without faith, can they not be saved without faith? Are not infants, I ask, saved without faith? Or will Videns repel this question, with the benefit of the discovery, which, with some other of our Divines he may have made; (though the mystery of this theological anomaly, has never yet, according to promise been explained to us); that infants may be saved without holiness, or without the redeeming blood of Christ? "All holy beings," says Videns, "must be in a state of salvation; where then is the necessity of faith?" To which I reply that all *sentient* beings must be in a state of life; where then is the necessity for any *growth*, or *development* of their being? And again, all persons who have eyes are in a state to see; where then is the necessity of light? The question of Videns proceeds upon the erroneous supposition that the *simple salvation* of a soul, is the entire and ultimate object of God, in his conversion. But if this were true, why should God, after his conversion, reveal to him any thing more of his character and glory? Why should Paul feel, that it was better to depart and be with Christ, when he was already in a state of salvation? We may be in a state of salvation, while we fall very far short of the enjoyment of the full benefits of that salvation; as a man may be in a state of life, destitute of nearly all the enjoyments of life. "As men are holy," says Videns, "prior to the exercise of faith; indeed prior to the acquisition of the power essential to its exercise, it follows that men please God prior to the exercise of faith. But we are taught that without faith it is impossible to please God." To this W. H. J. replies—*first*, that he has not said that men "are holy prior to the acquisition of the power essential to" the "exercise of faith;" or even that "men are holy prior to the exercise of faith." He has only said that faith is not the cause of their holiness; and that so long as they are *unholy* they cannot believe the gospel. With those who are under circumstances which admit of faith; that is, who *hear* the gospel, and are *naturally* capable of believing, the holiness experienced in *regeneration*, will immediately express itself in faith, as naturally as "new-born babes" desire the mother's milk. So that holiness and faith—under these circumstances—are inseparable. This however no more proves that faith is the cause of holiness, than the child's desire for the mother's breast, proves that this desire is the cause of its existence; or that it *could* desire the breast before it existed. *Secondly*; Videns fails again to distinguish between things, in which there is an important difference, very materially affecting their relative character.

1. He does not distinguish between the different conditions of persons; but applies to all conditions, what belongs to one only; and hence, W. H. J. apprehends, misunderstands the text, "without faith, it is impossible to please God." To understand language, it is necessary to understand clearly its subject; or—speaking in terms more strictly correct—to understand a *predicate*, we must understand its subject. Our Lord says, "I come as a thief." But the subject of which the comparison is predicated, is not the Saviour's moral character, but his unexpected appearance. That we may understand therefore, the language of the Apostle—"without faith it is impossible to please God"—it is necessary that we shall understand, whether it is predicated of all characters and conditions of men *universally*; or only of persons of some peculiar characters and conditions. Does Videns suppose that those to whom faith is *naturally* or *incidentally* possible—as to infants—idiot's—and heathen—cannot be saved without faith? Or does he think that the language of the Commission too, "*he that believeth not, shall be damned*," is universal, and applicable to all characters and conditions? He who is *capable* of worshipping God, and to whom he has been made known, cannot please him without faith; and of such persons the Apostle must be supposed to speak.

2. And therefore *secondly*; Videns does not distinguish between faith, as contradistinguished from a *want* of faith, in a holy character, which is attributable merely to the imbecility and imperfection of the spiritual state, which disqualify the subject for putting forth the more vigorous actions of the divine life, of which, subsequently, it will become capable; or attributable to a *want* of objective light; and faith, as contradistinguished from *positive unbelief*. It is in this latter sense that the Apostle speaks of the impossibility of pleasing God without faith. Under circumstances, in which faith is *possible*, we cannot please God without faith; since the *want* of faith under such circumstances, would be—not a negative state of mind, dependent upon incidental circumstances, and in no wise inconsistent with holy character—but *positive unbelief*, involving a rejection of the truth of God. To say that we cannot be holy without faith, is to beg the question. "To say," that though holy, yet, upon the authority of the Apostle, without faith we cannot please God, is again to beg the question. Since as stated, the Apostle intends to distinguish faith—from a holy state of mind, which does not believe from the impossibility of the case, but from *unbelief*.

3. And therefore *thirdly*; Videns does not distinguish between holiness as stamped upon the moral character by the Spirit of God, as in infants, and holiness, as expressing itself in a conscious intelligent being, by its practical effects; or holiness, as expressive of moral character, and holiness as expressive of moral acts; or between character itself, as formed by holy qualities; and character as formed by holy acts.

4. And therefore *fourthly*; he does not distinguish between faith in principle, and faith in act. I mean by the principle of faith, that disposition of heart, which inclines it to believe when the object of faith is presented; and by the act of faith the heart embracing this object when presented. The principle of faith is in every holy soul. It is the very pulsation of the divine life in the soul. All that is necessary to any holy soul shall embrace Christ, is that he shall know him. But he cannot believe in him, of whom he has not heard. Faith, as described in the 11th chapter of the Hebrews, assumes evidently a very general and comprehensive character, as expressive of nearly every act of piety; and every holy soul, so far as it is obedient to the impulses of

God's Spirit, may, in this general sense, be said to exercise faith.

5. There is a sophistry in the statement of Videns, depending upon the ambiguity of the phrase "*please God*." If Videns means by this phrase, that it is impossible without faith, to be in a state of grace and acceptance with God—W. H. J. says again, that he begs the question; and using the language in a sense different from that of the Apostle, he affirms an entirely different proposition. If on the contrary, he means, as did the Apostle, that without faith, we cannot please God, in respect to the acts of believing his word, and trusting his promises—we reply, that we may be holy, without—in *this sense*—pleasing God.

6. There is a clear and important distinction to be taken, therefore, between *not pleasing* God, and *displeasing* him. We cannot please God, in relation to any particular commandment, which either from nature, or condition we *cannot* obey. For he can only be pleased with obedience to his commandments; and, as, according to the supposition we cannot obey a commandment, we cannot please God by such obedience. But for the same reason, we cannot *displease* him by the *want* of such obedience. For God neither expects or desires any obedience, which he does not give us the power to render.

It may be seen by these observations, with how little discrimination Videns applies the language of the Apostle, to the subject in discussion; and of how little force is the argument which he attempts to found upon it.

"I would like," says Videns, "to ask brother W. H. J. to define the difference between being *unwilling* to do a thing, and having no power to will to do it. He tells us they are very far from being identical propositions, but with great scrupulosity avoids giving us the difference." This is one of the things which Videns ought not to have said. Even were it true, that W. H. J. had not explained the difference between the two phrases, it may well have been supposed, that it was because, he thought the difference too plain to need any explanation, rather than from any "great scrupulosity" in the matter. But unfortunately the fault rests again upon Videns' memory. W. H. J. has explained the difference. He says that a man cannot "command the will itself, which is necessary" to do a "specified action;" (which I presume Videns will admit, is the same thing, as "having no power to will to do it")—when there is not "*in his moral nature, a susceptibility to the influence of motive, in relation to such action.*" On the contrary, a man may be "*unwilling*" to do a thing, and yet be prevailed upon, by the influence of appropriate motive, *simply* to do it. If this does not explain to Videns a difference—which he would have supposed needed no explanation—W. H. J. despairs of being able to satisfy him. With this explanation before him, he ought not at least, to have asserted, that W. H. J. withheld it with "great scrupulosity."

"I had thought," says Videns, "that justification preceded holiness, and that faith preceded justification." So it has been the opinion of Videns, that *men have both faith and justification without holiness*. W. H. J. has certainly, himself "thought" differently; and he hopes, for the interests of piety that our readers will generally think with him. Videns, without a caution, will find himself affiliating with the dreaded Antinomians; and as extremes often meet, this, in fact would not be very surprising. "I think," says Videns, "we may now with justice conclude, that by the phrase, "the power to believe," our brother W. H. J. means repentance! faith! sanctification! and redemption!" W. H. J. means all this, not by *faith*, but by the *power* of faith! By the *power* of faith, means *faith itself!* If, as Videns says, "we may with justice conclude" all this concerning W. H. J., I can only say, that he is certainly, one of the most miserable bolchers that ever pretended to teach others, without knowing anything himself. Whether however, "we may with justice conclude" such things to be true of him, or that Videns does not understand what he is writing, must be submitted to the tribunal of an impartial public. (To be continued.)

*The exclamation marks are added by W. H. J.

For the Recorder.

BURLESON Co., Texas, July 5th, 1852.

REV. D. S. WILLIAMS, DEAR BROTHER:—

I heard through Bro. Cabanis that you had an idea of coming to Texas. I would not feel at liberty to try to induce any minister to leave N. C. who was engaged in the ministry, as I think you are, if he had not already expressed a desire to enter a more destitute field of labor. I know that N. C. has yet many wide and destitute fields that give promise of great usefulness to ministers who will faithfully occupy them. But the destitution of portions of Texas is much greater. After the examinations were over at Independence, wife and myself commenced a tour up the western side of the Brazos River. I had great desire to visit some of the destitute fields I had so often heard of, and hoping at the same time that such a trip might improve wife's health. But she was too weak to undergo the trip we anticipated. The county in which we are now affords an inviting field for an active and devoted minister. There are three churches in this Co., which have only occasional preaching by a missionary living about 50 miles distant. There are other inviting neighborhoods, in which churches might be established, and the present missionary is desirous to have a settled pastor in this Co., not to supply his place, but to aid him in the work. After leaving this Co, there is no other Baptist minister on this side the Brazos; who is engaged in the ministry, for 150 miles. On the East side about 100 miles above this point, labors Bro. N. T. Byars, whose field reaches down to Waco Village. From that village down to Washington, a distance of 125 miles, there is not a Baptist missionary living, except perhaps one. This portion of country includes the field formerly occupied by the late lamented Bro. Mays, who was an active and efficient missionary under the patronage of the Southern Board. His field of labor included Springfield, an important town, and the surrounding country, which is now being settled up by good farmers, many of whom are Baptists.

You are well calculated to supply some of these fields, because you are surrounded with the things of this world and can preach for nothing, until churches are established. These fields must either be supplied with preaching by missionaries, who must look to the Southern Board for support, at least in part, or be supplied by such as yourself, who might live on their farms, and preach and build up churches.

The Baptists in Texas are a willing people to aid in supporting the ministry, but in some of the villages and neighborhoods no churches are organized and hence the first ministerial labor in many places must be, at least in part, gratuitous.

You are a farmer and would like perhaps to hear something on this subject. The crop now growing is very good. The prospect was never known to be better. Corn, pork and beef will be very abundant

and very low. The cotton crop, which has just begun to open, promises well, but fears are entertained that the worm will come, on account of the recent rains. The season is now very fine, and the air is very pure.

The attention of farmers is chiefly turned to making cotton, in this portion of the State, as a production of the soil. The up land will generally produce one bale, (500 lbs) per acre. The bottom lands more. I made some inquiry on this subject of a few respectable and responsible men. The gentleman, at whose house we are now stopping, a kind Baptist, cultivates Brazos bottom. He informed me that as good a crop as he has made, was as follows: Out of 30 acres cotton he gathered 78 bales, and that when it was too late to pick out more, it was thought that there was at least one bale to the acre left on the ground. This is as good a crop, I suppose, as is ever made. Two bales per acre, on the River land is a very good crop. If you should make two bales per acre, your hands just from N. C. could not pick out more than half of it. It will be a difficult matter to hire it picked out, and it more profitable to gather pecans, for which they can get \$2.00 per bushel, and when a full crop, one hand can gather 3 bushels a day. I understand that the pecans and acorns are very abundant this year.

I must not forget to say that much of the country over which I have traveled is most beautiful. Large prairies covered with green grass, the hills rising gradually one above the other, and every hill hundreds of cattle feeding, with a few wild deer interpersed among them. Now and then a beautiful clump of live oak trees covering only a few acres, many of which can be seen at one view, and impress the traveler that these places are intended of Providence for men's residences. Baylor University, the Baptist Institution of Texas, is situated in a small village, in one of these beautiful prairies, in an elevated and healthy portion of country, and is now in a flourishing condition. The College building when seen for 6 or 7 miles before you reach it, will impress you that this is a healthy place to educate your children, and desirable for a summer residence. The Female College, on an opposite Hill, the top of which can be seen from the University, peeping above the live oaks, is ably conducted by Prof. H. Clark with a good corps of assistants. The students of Wake Forest College, N. C. have generally been praised for their manly behavior and their studious habits, and I hope they deserve it; but quite as much can be said for the students of Baylor University. I have been much delighted at the good behavior and christian like deportment manifested at the different churches and school houses at which I have preached. Kind regards to your family. Hope to hear from you at Independence, Texas.

S. G. O'BRYAN.

For the Recorder.

The Reproved Preachers.

Bro. TONEY:—As I am one of the preachers arraigned, for our misdeeds at the bar of public justice, it may perhaps, be no more than a necessary act of justice to myself, and proper expression of respect for public sentiment, if I enter some plea in abatement of the severity of the judgment which has been pronounced upon myself and others, by our good brother AUDENS. You will allow me therefore the privilege of a few remarks, upon the monitorial salutation, with which our brother has been pleased to favor us.

First then, I beg leave to submit to the consideration of our brother, whether, in undertaking to declare of some half-dozen brethren and ministers, that *their communications to the Recorder have done no good; that, they have contributed nothing to elevate his character; that, they are wrangling about nothing; that, they are trying to weaken each other as ministers of Christ;* and more of this kind; he does not assume to himself an office of no small judicial responsibility, and whether, before he ventures to pronounce so heavy a judgment upon so many brethren—some of them at least, of high standing for talent and piety—it ought to have been a well-considered question, whether his own position entitled or required him to exercise so high a censorial duty.

2. In saying that brother "G." charged Bro. Jones with "insincerity;" that W. H. J. "severely rebuked" G.; that the brethren were "trying to weaken each other as the ministers of Christ;" Audens commits himself to very unguarded declarations; which, in justice to these brethren, as well as to the general interest of truth and religion, ought not to have been made. G. did not charge brother Jones with "insincerity." W. H. J. did not severely rebuke G.; nor were the brethren (in speaking my own feelings I am confident I represent them all) trying to weaken each other as ministers of Christ.

3. The brother is entirely too indiscriminate in his censures. The spirit of brother White's and brother Craig's communications, were by no means bad. If our brother Audens will excuse me, I would whisper to him softly (though far from thinking that *his spirit is bad*), that in this respect these brethren have the advantage of himself. They, at least, deserve no such reproof. Their spirit is exemplary; and innocence, and the character of the Recorder, would suffer an injustice in their persons, were they not vindicated from so unprovoked an injury.

4. I regret that brother Audens can see little or no difference in the controversial communications which have appeared from the pens of the impugned brethren. The fact furnishes new evidence of the necessity which exists among us for an exposition of biblical truth, however unsuccessful the brethren in question, may have been in their efforts of this kind.

5. I now express the conviction that our reprover, is some brother, much the junior of nearly all the brethren whom he has arraigned with so much freedom, and upon whom he has passed sentence with so much confidence and apparent satisfaction with his own conduct. If in this opinion I am wrong, let Audens declare himself, and I will make a public acknowledgment of my error. Under a strong conviction however, of the correctness of my impression, I will submit for the consideration of our brother, an apostolic precept, "Rebuke not an Elder, but entreat him as a father."

6. In this connection, truth and justice require me to say, that if such men as Craig and brother White—for no other reason because the subjects which they present so important to discuss, do not happen to suit the impugner, are to be arraigned and arraigned by any untutored tyro, as doing nothing to vary the character of the Recorder, much more in my humble judgment, will very much be calculated to promote the end which Audens has at least—that of raising the reputation of the paper. So much are we ever in danger, in our clarity for the mote that is in our own eye, of forgetting the beam which is in our brother's.

7. Finally, I believe brother Audens is intended well by his communication; and so he is entitled to our thanks. I hope his brethren will do good. It will not be denied—at least, W. H. J., that brethren in controversy, are too frequently reminded of the affecting admonition—"see that ye fall not out of the way"; or of the solemn caution—"if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." I think however the brother is guilty of want of discretion; and in consideration of his kindness to us, I wished to drop a few friendly hints which may serve the purpose of admonition in a future edition of his lectures.

Warrenton, July 25, 1852.

W. H. J.

For the Recorder.

To all whom it may Concern.

In the 33d chapter of Ezekiel, the same doctrine which had been advanced in the 3rd chapter, is repeated and amplified. God's ministers are like sentinels on the walls of Zion, who with the trumpet of the gospel in their hands, are ordered to warn men of their danger, and to guard them against the consequences of their sin. And if through the default of the warning, of spiritual watchman any should perish, he will have to answer for the consequence. We do not pretend to be a dictator to watching every man ought to know his own business best. But there are some facts which should claim the attention of all who profess to be watchmen on the walls of Zion. There is a sword not only coming, but now among the people destroying them by thousands on every hand. Not less than ten thousand of our people perish annually, and many more are cut off from the enjoyments of this life, and from all hopes of seeing the blessings of the life to come. It seems that at this point, every watchman should "cry aloud and spare not;" but strange as it may appear, there are some who have never told their congregations that it was dangerous to handle the sword of intemperance; and though they recognize that "it biteth like a serpent and singeth like an adder," yet they see their members make, and use this devouring sword and never sound the alarm. And after the men of the world have seen the effects of drinking, and have united their influence to stop the progress of this devouring sword, some wicked men cry out against all the means used for saving our country and our fellow men from the ravages of intemperance.

And there are yet in the fellowship of churches, men who are now engaged in drinking and using this sword to the destruction of their neighbourhoods, and to the disgrace and corruption of their churches. And members may drink until they are blind, or they may retail until they have corrupted the whole neighborhood, and the church not notice. There are ministers who are pointed on other evils, and yet countenance their members in drinking. Can they see the sword destroying on every hand and not sound the alarm, and be guiltless! I. P. M.

LITERARY NOTICES.

WHEAT OR CHAFF? By Rev. J. C. Rife. Dober and Brothers, New York.

This book contains six treatises bound together having as their subjects, Wheat or Chaff?—Prove all things—Are you regenerate?—Should a child be trained?—Be not stolid, but be lowly. The book is written in a plain and familiar style, presenting familiar truths in a manner calculated to interest those for whose benefit they are intended. The sentiments are evangelical, and the truths presented timely and forcible. In regard to the second coming of Christ, our author differs from the author in opinion, but no Christian will be displeased with the book taken as a whole. The energetic publishers do good service to the cause of Christ by sending forth from their press books of this character. THE EXPERIENCES OF A BARNISER.—From Cornish, Lamport & Co. we have received a copy of the work, supposed to have been written by Warren, Esq., the author of the celebrated Diary of a Physician. The author originally appeared in the Edinburgh Journal. One wishing to pass away an hour or two in the heat of the day in an agreeable manner will find this book an agreeable work very neatly printed. AVINE'S CYCLOPEDIA OF ANECDOTES.—Lincoln Cyclopedia used this work in supplying its new prepared to furnish the whole work bound in one volume. Our readers will remember the high commendations we bestowed upon it, as was passing through the press. It forms an altogether a valuable addition to one's library. BAPTIST MEMORIAL.—The August number of the work has been received. Dr. Dowling has been the charge of the editorial Department. We have now under the direction of the Proprietors, Hatch, Esq., No. 142 Nassau st., New York, a price one dollar per year.

N. C. UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE.

The August number has been received. We think it one of the best that we have seen. The young gentlemen who write it and publish it, deserve encouragement in their noble undertaking.

The French Tract Society.

This society has been in operation some thirty years, and according to the report made at their anniversary in Paris in April last, some 50,000 tracts were presented calculated to inspire love, produce gratitude to God. The first year they operated, it had only some thirty or forty tracts, and now it has two hundred and ninety. A popular Christian Almanac has been published annually since 1826. The first year only 18,000 copies were printed, and the last year 150,000 were distributed, and 130,000 tracts. The first year the receipts were only \$750, the last year they were over \$4,000. In the past year they have received \$2,000 from the charge of Pastor Lissigal, of Montpellier. The Society has sustained a great loss. It had distributed the last year 60,000 or 70,000 tracts.

The most interesting fact was one which occurred to two ladies, who had been engaged in distributing during a residence in Paris, for ten years, but they were now about to leave. In this time, they had placed tracts