

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

Devoted to Religion, Morality, Literature, Agriculture and General Intelligence.

VOLUME XVII. NO. 36.

RALEIGH, N. C., FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1852.

WHOLE NO. 117

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

A Religious and Literary Paper:
Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$3 00 per annum in advance.
All communications, to insure attention, must be addressed to the Editor, and sent to the Editor of the Recorder, address this office, Thos. W. Tobey.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their subscription. If subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them until cash charges are paid. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they will be held responsible until they have settled their bill, and their papers discontinued. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or periodical from the office, or removing and leaving it uncollected, or, in "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

For the Recorder.

JULY 14th, 1-2 past 9, A. M.

The first day of the Debate, Tuesday 13th, prayer was offered at its opening by Elder Shane after reading Eph. 4th ch. and closed with Galatians 4th and 5th to 11th verse, and prayer by Wm. A. Shaw. The Moderators were Mark Rogers, Esq., Rev. Q. H. Trotman and Jno. B. Colson, Esq. After opening prayer by Wm. A. Shaw, (14th) Rev. Mr. Trotman read the question for Debate—viz:

Immersion is the only Scriptural Mode of Christian Baptism?

Elder Britton affirms. Elder Arnold denies.

Moderators, men and brethren. A great responsibility, I feel, is upon me, and extends also to you, as every one is deeply interested who trusts in Christ, that His prayer should be answered, that "all his people may be one in Him, as He is one with the Father." Compliance with the ordinance of baptism, strictly, we believe is best calculated to secure this. His desired result. As we have repeatedly heard before in this discussion, positive laws are of imperative importance and obligation. Therefore all positive laws should be expressed in the plainest terms, and those most usual, and easiest to be understood. Blackstone says, "all laws should be plain," how much more all positive institutions? The Authority of the Lawgiver in giving a positive law, is itself the highest reason. There is this great difference between a moral and a positive law; the moral law has reasons assigned, to influence man to obey. The positive law alone recognizes the will of the right, the lawgiver, to secure obedience. The Great Christian Lawgiver, after His resurrection, and just in the eve of His ascension, gave the command to His ministers, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16. Again, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Teaching them, &c., Matt. 28: 19-20. I would deeply impress it on your minds that here, is ordained, by Christ, His general law of Baptism. Its terms are easy to be generally understood. To say that the terms are vague and indefinite does honor to Christ. Pedobaptists authors I here cite on positive law. "Dr. Schiller, Positive laws should have plain positive proofs. The Protestant faith is, unjustly, charged with uncertainty." All positive laws admit no degrees of explanation, only the words! This constitutes the trial of our obedience. The precept is, and no more, and no less, and no otherwise. "Bennet," "This approach not to be able to find out the meaning of positive laws!" "Bradley 150, 173 p. on Matt. 28: 19-20." There must be here a plain, natural sense, for an ecclesiastical law, given by a qualified Lawgiver, otherwise Christ would not be a Teacher, but a barbarian. So says Bradbury.

1. Then the Great Lawgiver gave this law of baptism in terms plain, easy to be understood as to its signification, easy to comprehend and define. We shall pursue regular order in our remarks for the sake of fairness. We look not to present as to future effects from this discussion: we long for ultimate union and brotherly love among all the professed disciples of Christ. We invite you to the Facts, as to the Biblical meaning of baptism in the original Greek, in which language, the inspired New Testament was delivered to man. And 1st. Baptizo, the root of which is bapto. Bapto is never applied to Christian baptism. Baptizo is the term universally applied to Christian baptism, or some of its derivatives—but never bapto, its root. Baptizo and its derivatives baptizo for example, are used to express Christian baptism. Baptizo expresses mode, or in other words, the thing itself. Now, if we can ascertain the plain meaning of baptizo, the term used for baptism, that plain meaning establishes the mode. I shall prove that baptizo never means "to sprinkle," "to pour," "to immerse," to dip, to plunge." But I must premise, that this word baptizo is not so translated, in King James' commonly received version. The last letter "o" is merely changed into "e." Hence the word is merely transferred from Greek to English, without defining its meaning by literal translation.

The sole and simple question for our consideration then is: What did baptizo mean in the days of Christ and His apostles? Here to ascertain this, our first appeal must be to Lexicons—they are the Dictionaries of the Greek language. Now the duty of every Lexicographer, on the Greek of the New Testament, most of it written 1800 years ago, is to ascertain the ancient meaning of baptizo. That meaning is never "to pour," "to immerse," "to dip," "to plunge." I have challenged any man to find any ancient Lexicon within the first 1800 years of the Christian Era, which gives "pour" or "sprinkle" as a meaning of baptizo. Until the present century no man dared to fix in such an interpretation of baptizo. 1st. I call you to the Lexicon of the most learned and ancient Lexicographer, Baptizo, mergo, immergo, immo, imo, "I dip," "I immerse," "I also," "I dip," "I immerse," by dipping in a coloring liquid we pour

nor sprinkle here sir. 2. Stephanus, Baptizo, dip, immerse, dye, by dipping. 3. Thesaurus of Robinson as old as 1676, near 200 years back Baptizo, mergo, "I immerse," Lavo, "I wash," "one proper sense or primary meaning,—and one the last, figurative. 4. Schleuser 1734 over 118 years back 1. primary sense "Baptizo" I immerse, "I dip in water" 2. I wash in water. (of course by dipping, as all washing is usually done.) 5. Hazer, baptizo, dip, immerse, dye by immersion, metaphorically, immerse, overwhelmed, but involves the idea of immersion. 6. Parkhurst Lex. baptizo, Wash one's self by immersion, Mark 7: 4. Wash by dipping the hands in water. 7. Donagan, baptizo, immerse, submerge, soak thoroughly. 8. John Jones, baptizo, immerse, dip, plungo. 9. Another, immerse, dip, plungo. 10. Another, immerse, submerge, plungo, sink. 11. Rosenmuller, German Lexicon, baptizo, immerse. 12. Bretschneider, "baptizo, entire immersion, complete immersion, necessary." Pedobaptist Lexicographer. 13. Voss English, immerse, plunge in water, he gives under baptizo. Here are 13 witnesses nearly all Pedobaptist, who testify to the same effect as to the primary and principal meaning of the Greek word baptizo. 14. Groves prim. dip, immerse, plungo. Figurative sense of purity, to overwhelm. The whole mass of the Greek dictionaries are, you see, confessedly, with us. But my opponent may say, "these men may be mistaken." No sir! there is no reason for such a supposition! I go to them for the rest of the meanings of the part of the New Testament that is translated! Why not let them translate into English this anglicized and transferred Greek word baptizo? If the Lexicons are mistaken in the sense, where then shall we go, to solve our doubts? They all say it ought to be translated immerse. That is its meaning. Then, that is its mode, or manner of administration!

But sir, I present you here with another evidence, and one about which my opponent must concede, there is no mistake! The Greeks themselves sir. They still live, they understand their own language too sir, and they still immerse, invariably, for baptism. They never sprinkle, but ridicule "sprinkled" christians! If you ask them how long they have immersed, they reply, "always—there is no other way, in which you can be baptized." From the 1st century till now, immersion for baptism is their constant practice. This one fact, with an unbiased mind, ought to settle this matter forever! But I suppose I must adduce classical scholia and arguments from learned Greek scholars to heap up more testimony. Venema says, "baptizo, immerse the whole man in water." So Jeremiah Patriarch of Constantinople, also. Witsius, "immersion is required," and to show there is no danger in this mode, Witsius refers to the practice of Muscovy (Russia) the extreme of cold climates, saying, "they use it safely in mid-winter!" I will now introduce a standing authority of my opponent, repeatedly cited by him on yesterday, Dr. Wall, in his Hist. of Pedo. says, "the Greeks always have, and do now, practice immersion." I have now presented two irrefragable proofs. 1. From the Lexicons. They all give the English word immerse as the meaning of baptizo. Now immersion expresses one particular action only, sprinkling another—pouring another. All these actions are just as different from one another as "to walk," "to ride," and "to fly" "A man who walks, don't ride, nor does he fly. They are three separate and distinct actions. And so immersion, pouring and sprinkling are separate and distinct actions. Baptizo means "to immerse," raino or rantizo "to sprinkle," cheo "to pour." Why not use these two last words, rantizo to sprinkle, and cheo to pour, to express these actions? But you never find raino, nor cheo, nor rantizo, used in connexion with christian baptism! If Christ had wished, why did he not use raino or cheo, but He used baptizo.

2. The proof from the Greek language and the present practice of the modern Greeks, like their earliest and only practice—viz: immersion. These proofs settle the mode.

I now cite you to one of the most celebrated Pedobaptist Professors in the United States, Stuart of Andover, called by some, the American apostle. "Baptizo, dip immerse, plunge. Where sprinkling or pouring occurs in the English translation, the Greek word baptizo is never used!" "This is not a far fetched inference." The etymology of the word shows us that primarily and invariably baptizo means immersion!" This authority sir, is not a modern Pedobaptist Lexicon foisting in an entirely new and different meaning, so as to make it suit their peculiar views! I have showed by 14 Lexicons, that baptizo here it means to wash, it is not by sprinkling or pouring a few drops, but dipping, immersing in water, to effect washing by immersion. I repeat no man, can show any Lexicon within the first 1800 years after Christ, that gives baptizo the definition "to pour" or "to sprinkle!" Doubtless he (A.) will appeal to Liddell and Scott, one of the latest modern Lexicons to help him, in vain! They define baptizo, dip, dip under, bathe, wet, soak, steep and have foisted in "pour." I have been credibly informed that Liddell and Scott have been called on to assign the reason of their departure from the established and ancient Lexicons, and that they say, they will correct the next edition, take it back, to save their credit for scholarship! We have now ascertained the fact of a *Diplois* as to its manner of administration. Let me have an argument upon it. Here is a minister in the county of Northampton, indicted by a man, for baptizing his companion. It is proved in evidence that he sprinkled or poured water on this man's wife. Now I contend that no would convict a jury of 12 men could be found, who would convict this minister, of the offence charged! Because, the only appeal could be to the Lexicons, and the Lexicons would clear him of the offence alleged in the bill of indictment! The appeal would be not to denominational persons, but to the common sense of North Carolina citizens. They could decide by the Lexicons, that one baptism could not be done in three ways, and they would follow the weight of testimony!

Christian baptism is immersion in a liquid, water. The word expresses the action. Dipping, immersion, or plunging in water, is very different from sprinkling or pouring. Go to the Bible. You can't find it translated in the New Testament, where baptizo is made to mean sprinkle or pour. They are never correspondent in the translation we all use every day. Why did not the Pedobaptists then translate baptizo, to sprinkle or to pour? They would not translate

it, as they ought, "immerse." They knew sir, that the *fraud* would be too well known—the whole learned world would have exposed them, had they translated baptizo to sprinkle or pour! Again, if they translated baptizo rightly, "to immerse," then "their craft would be in danger!" All would be over with them, sir; all would be Baptists! I know there are many members in the Methodist church, who are anxious to have a New Version! Mr. Wesley sir, translated the New Testament. Why may not others? Have they not seen Mr. Wesley's version? We say to our opponents, wash your own hands first. The effect of a New Translation would be highly salutary sir! The United States ought to have it. It would bring us together as christians. We should walk together in the primitive ordinances of the Most High.

Now my opponent in order to establish the negative, if possible, must resort to far fetched inferences. For example—he will tell us that the terms or words sprinkle or pour are often used in Holy Scripture, in the Old and New Testament. But I demand sir, is baptizo ever translated "to sprinkle" or "to pour," in any part of the Bible! No! *cheo* is to pour, *rantizo* to sprinkle. I assert, that no such religious rite as sprinkling or pouring common water, *unmixed* can be shown from the Scriptures! No such religious rite ever was ordained! I know a passage can be found in the Old Testament, "So shall he sprinkle many nations." But this is Hebrew, not Greek. The Hebrew Lexicon defines the Hebrew word there used, "to cause to leap for joy," "to cause to exert," "to cause many nations to rejoice in himself," "so shall he astonish many nations." Glory to His name, He has rejoiced and astonished many nations, and will astonish many more. But this passage has no sort of reference to baptism, literal or figurative. He must seek some other refuge.

Hence, he will say, "the mode of baptism, makes no difference!" I recall you to the Pedobaptist testimony I read just now—"no less," "no more," "no otherwise." Who are we, worms of yesterday, to presume to dictate to God! Who dare set aside a positive christian law, instead of submitting to the authority of the Most High! rebel against our heavenly Master! But as time allows, I will give a large field to our friend on the other side. Here our Greek scholia from classic writers who use the Greek word baptizo in the age, or near it, of the New Testament era. They mean by baptizo, immerse, plunge, dip, put under water. Lucian in Timon the Man hater, baptizing him, till he would rise no more." Plutarch, "Plunging himself (baptizing) himself into a lake." Dost sink (baptizo), scarcely sink (baptizo.) Polybius another Greek writer baptized in water up to his breast—immersed or baptized up to his wrist—also immersed (baptizo) up to his finger. So the learned John Selden says, "the modern parson baptizs his fingers, rather than the child, in sprinkling." Plutarch in the Life of Theseus says "O bladder that mayest be dipped, but not fated to sink!" (Gr. baptizo.) Josephus says our ship was immersed, (baptized) in the Adrian Sea." There is no sprinkling nor pouring signified in any of these instances where baptizo and its derivatives are used, just as in the Greek Testament sense. The 3 actions of immersion, pouring, and sprinkling, are three separate and distinct actions. One only of these acts can be right. I will agree never to immerse another person, if he can convince me that sprinkling or pouring is valid or right? If he consents, I will make the bargain with him, if he will be equally candid, on conviction. Then sir, we should think alike, practice alike, and feel alike, on this all important subject.

A. Moderators and Brethren. I admit the importance of this subject, with my brother, but do not attach so much importance to it as he. St. Paul thanked God, even that he did not come to baptize—but to preach the Gospel, Christ sent him. In its place, baptism is an ordinance to be revered, and should be observed with due regard to the lawgiver, I urge it on my church to go and submit to it, and bring their offspring. He says "a positive law should be plain, and easily understood, by all men." I take this ground, that if he show me a positive law in support of his position, clearly understood, I wont make another speech! The question is not whether baptizo means dyeing, drowning or overwhelming; but the question is, Is it the only meaning of the term? He urges us "to go to the Bible!" I hoped that he would have confined himself to the Bible, in this discussion. But he did not read one extract from the Bible yesterday! He has produced one scripture quotation, this morning! Positive law—yes, good positive law! Let us see it!—stand on the defensive, and call on him, here, to produce one positive proof that immersion is the only mode! He has not furnished one solitary proof!

I dont controvert the classical interpretation of the word. As to the scriptural application of the word, I do. He cant produce one case of immersion from the Holy scriptures! But the theology of the Baptist church says so. He's one of them! I contend immersion is not the only scriptural meaning of the word. Has he given you one argument to prove it the only meaning? I call him to do it, if he can.

He says "he will give me a wide field!" "Not at all sir. I can grasp it all, at once, in my hand! I call on you to bear me out in my assertion, did I read one word which said, it only meant immerse? Did he show it in this good old Book, one sentence out of it! If I am wrong speak! In a speech of an hour long, I looked for a strong effort—but no—he will not have so much time here after. But he went into Lexicons! told us of the opinions of men, and of the custom and practice of the Greek church! No sir! We stand on the Bible, till we're swept down by the hand of death! He talks of Mr. Wesley's translations of the New Testament. But was it adopted by church action, or was it circulated in foreign or home missions? They know the good old Bible dont contain them! When the American Bible Society was formed, the Baptist were with us. The principle of that Society was to give the Bible to the world, without out of our comment. But the Baptists wanted their missionary operations under their own control! I dont object, perhaps they were right. But they applied to the American Bible Society to translate baptizo, but they were voted down by a large majority. They then went off, and formed the American and Foreign Bible Society. They've even been making efforts to get money to translate the Bible, in my field of labor! A gentleman asked me, what I thought of it? I replied, I thought, they transcended their du-

ty—that they would render the Bible weak in the faith of men. He said, he thought so too! Is the object to make it plain? But, he says, it is plain and positive already! Then why not let it stay so? By a multitude of words, they darken counsel. Mr. Wesley did translate the New Testament, it is true. But it was not a general church movement. It is not so with the present Baptist movement. They mean to carry it out in all its bearings!

But he says it means only to immerse, not to sprinkle nor pour. I was just about to—But I wont—when he puts his finger on it, its not there. If it is so plain, why did he let it stay shut up, in an hours speech! I'd open it above board! positive command! I call for it, in so many words, not his own wayward construction! To settle the truth of his proposition, he must show the positive command. I shall now propose to show he cannot, although the burden of proof rests on him. He says, "he'd quit immersion; if I'd convince him," I replied to him, in old brother Skidmore's language, "I can convince you, but I cant convince you."

"Convince a man against his will &c." The Bible says, not a word of it. He says, immersion is the only mode! I go further, he cant prove a solitary case of immersion! 1. I call you to Liddell and Scott. Baptizo to pour upon, drench &c. My opponent says, some one says, this Lexicographer has recanted—that he draws back, like a tarpan in his stall, and says "he'll translate it immerse, next time!" says he'll "do better!" so much for that. 2. Schrevelius' Lexicon, Mergo, lavo, lavo, he is an ancient and able Lexicographer. Lavo means "to sprinkle," Elder Britton it means "to wash," not sprinkle! Elder A. Ainsworth says it means, sprinkle. Here are two learned and excellent men. I dont know whether they are Methodists or Baptists—I want their testimony. 3. Groves Lexicon. I know my opponent says baptizo the derivative from Bapto is generally used. But does it mean more than the original root? I contend for baptizo. It means "to sprinkle, to steep, to dye, stain, color." One case, where the word means to sprinkle, sustains me. He's bound to prove the word means only immersion!

(To be Continued.)

Sketches and Recollections of British Preachers.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE LIFE OF CHATTERTON," "PEN AND INK SKETCHES," ETC., ETC.

REV. THOMAS RAFFLES, LL. D., D. D., OF LIVERPOOL.

Who has not read with tearful eye the bright, brief history of the Rev. Thomas Spencer—a young man, whose eloquence, it is said, was of almost seraphic order? Many years ago, when in the zenith of his popularity, he was drowned in the Mersey, and the calamitous event produced a profound impression in the mercantile metropolis of the north of England. The biographer of Spencer was Mr. now Dr. Raffles, and the historian of the young divine became his pulpit successor.

Liverpool possesses within her precincts two of the most celebrated preachers of Britain—in the Church of England, Hugh McNeill stands preeminent; and among Independents, few are more highly estimated than Thomas Raffles. The places where these eminent men officiate are very near each other. On some future occasion we may take Mr. Neill for a subject; at present we beg the reader to accompany us to St. George's Chapel, for the purpose of hearing Raffles.

"All had the power of Jesus' name, And sang prophetic fall!" "Bring forth the royal children." And crown him Lord of all!"

thunders from the organ, as with slow, majestic step, Dr. Raffles ascends the pulpit stairs. We say majestic, for his mounts as we may imagine a crowned king treads the dais on which stands his throne. Yet there is no pride even in Dr. Raffles' manner; for we happen to know enough of the man to be certain that such a weakness is his mortal abhorrence. We have frequently met him in places where proud habits could not escape undetected, and we unsatisfactorily declare that the worthy Doctor is one of the most affable, unassuming, and delightful of companions; good nature sparkles in his clear, large, blue eyes, and plays about his mouth, and is imprinted in every line of his countenance. But in the pulpit, solemnity banishes any thing and every thing save a consciousness of the great mission of the preacher. We feel assured that when Dr. Raffles enters the sacred desk he leaves the world behind him, and stands only as the minister of mercy between a sinful God and sinful man. Some of the most impressive occupants of the pulpit are the married men in the parlor. And why not?

Dr. Raffles opens the hymn-book, and commences the service. We are at once struck with the beauty of his reading. Every word has its due emphasis, every line its becoming intonation, and the effect produced is profound. But then Dr. Raffles is a poet himself, and consequently avoids the common error of marring fine stanzas by slovenly recitation. "Once upon a time," we ourselves perpetrated a hymn to be sung on a special occasion, but, to our inexpressible chagrin, the person who "gave it out" completely murdered it by his reading. Who forgets Biddy Fudge's agony at having verses misprinted, so that the compositor substituted for "freshly blown roses" an allusion to nasal organs? The vexation of Moore's heroine could scarcely have exceeded mine.

Let us describe Dr. Raffles' person before we proceed farther. If the worthy gentleman has studied much, and we believe he has done so, it proves that a student's face does not always indicate what Shakespeare calls "the pale cast of thought," for the physiognomy of our reverend friend exhibits all the indications of a ruddy and vigorous health. The cheeks are as soft as those of a young farmer fresh from the fields. Blue, large, and clear as the eyes; not, it may be, so bright as of yore, and those unmistakable symptoms of approaching age, crow's feet, are discernible at the angles. There is a comfortable and somewhat of a jovial expression on the countenance of the Doctor; the world appears to have dealt gently with him, and we believe such has indeed been the case. He is of the medium stature, and neither stout, for he possesses a respectable degree of rotundity, nor unbecomingly thin, a gentleman who has remarkably comfortable easy-chairs, in the snugness of studies, and large and certain incomes.

Dr. Raffles reads Scripture no less admirably than he does hymns. On the present occasion, he selects that splendid portion of holy writ in which is related Paul's defence before Agrippa. We had read that chapter hundreds of times, but were never fully impressed with its marvellous beauty before we heard the speech of Paul delivered by Dr. Raffles. There was a sailing so far as the pulpit could admit, of the action to the world. For instance: When the reverend gentleman read that part of the apostle's speech in which he wishes that he before whom he was pleading was like him in every respect—"save these bonds," Dr. Raffles placed his right hand on his left wrist; thus, without the slightest quavery of action, indicating the manacles.—We are aware that many excellent people denounce such tricks, believing them to be what they term "theatrical." From such we differ altogether. Manner as well as matter has its influence; and if pulpit action does not degenerate into grimaces of the grotesque, certain are we that it will operate as a gentle and attractive persuasive to piety, especially as it regards the young.

We have frequently heard Dr. Raffles described as a "grand" preacher; that he is a deeply impressive pulpit orator we admit, but the term "grand" does not exactly chime in with our notions. He owes his popularity more, we imagine, to his faculty of decorating his subjects than to the enunciation of any new principles connected with them. His manner is as attractive as his matter, and it is wonderful how elocution, like charity, will veil defects of thinking. A truly great preacher and a profound thinker once said in our hearing, "Raffles, sir? Raffles, sir! his sermons are like gold leaf; they give to a bar of lead the appearance of a solid ingot of the precious metal, whereas but a thin layer covers the base material." We do not altogether agree with the satire, because we feel assured that if the discourses of Raffles are not all gold, they contain a very fair admixture of the auriferous article.

Dr. Raffles is especially effective when he preaches on the solemn realities of death and eternity. No one, not even the most stony-hearted hearer, can sit unmoved, we imagine, whilst he dwells on these momentous themes. Well do we remember the effect he produced when, many years since, he was preaching at the Tabernacle, in the city of Bristol. He had been dwelling on the uncertainty of life, and the necessity of a preparation for the eternal state.—Foreboding he insisted on the brevity of human existence, and the perils which attended every mortal path. At length, after a most stirring passage, he suddenly paused and then, with an effect we never shall forget, quoted the stanza:

"Infinite joy or endless woe Attends on every breath; And yet, how unconcerned we go Upon the brink of death!"

The fine point, if we may so speak, made by Dr. Raffles, was in the utterance of the word "yet." The marvel of human indifference and mortal carelessness, as evinced in heedlessness of the uncertain next moment, was never more fully illustrated. A whole sermon from the most eloquent tongue could not more deeply have impressed us.

The sermons of Dr. Raffles are usually short, seldom exceeding thirty or thirty five minutes in their delivery; and in so limiting himself we think he acts wisely. Seldom is any salutary effect produced by long, wearisome discourses, sermons whose texts are forgotten before they "tenthly" arrived at.

Dr. Raffles, is, as he deserves to be, a great favorite in the city of his ministry, both among the members of the Established Church, his own body, or the inhabitants of the town generally. His congregation is wealthy, and we understand that he himself is not stinted of this world's good things. He is one, however, who deserves case of position, for he is exceedingly charitable, and many a poor, hard-working brother minister has reason to bless his bounty. As a scientific man, he stands high; the attainments of the philosopher add to the eminence of the Christian. They are shallow thinkers who suppose that religion and physical science are not each the leveler for the connection with the other.

Most men have their hobbies. We know one gentleman whose exceeding delight it is to collect walking-sticks. Tablaeh, the celebrated singer, has a passion for organizing snuff-boxes. Dr. Raffles is famous as an autograph collector; and it is said that he possesses one of the finest assemblages of the handwritings of illustrious men and women extant, especially of divines. With him, however, as a curiosity hunter, we have nothing to do; and so will conclude by the simple remark that we believe there is no minister in all England more worthy than himself to be the successor of the eloquent Thomas Spencer.

Inconsistencies of Baptists.

The Nashville "Christian Advocate," (Methodist), attempts to point out what it regards as glaring inconsistencies, on the part of Baptists, and asks to have them explained. We will endeavour to do it, for the benefit of our readers and theirs. The first is:

"They (the Baptists) publish to the world that Pedobaptist denominations are neither churches of God, nor scriptural organizations, and yet invite their ministers to preach in their pulpits! If Pedobaptist denominations are neither churches of God, nor scriptural organizations, where did her ministers receive authority to preach! They surely would not be guilty of inviting men into their pulpits who had never been licensed by a Christian church, or over a scriptural organization. And yet such is the fact."

And what inconsistency is here, pray? If a church invites a man to preach a sermon, is not the invitation, itself, a license to preach that sermon? Each church, being an independent body, has the sole right to elect, call, appoint, and license its own preachers. An invitation from a church, to a man, to preach a sermon is a license to preach that sermon. If it choose, afterwards, to give him a general license to preach, whenever he can get hearers, it can do so; but such license has no force, nor obligation in, or over, any other church.

One contemporary will see, therefore, that his fancied inconsistency is a mere mistake of his own, by mixing and confounding Baptist with Methodist principles. He proceeds—

"As Pedobaptist denominations are not churches of God, not even scriptural organizations, their ministers are not authorized to administer the ordinance of baptism. This they have repeated time and again, that the members of Pedobaptist churches were unbaptized; yet they do take some of their members into the Baptist church without re-baptism! Is not this admitting the validity of their baptism?"

Of course it is. And why? The doctrine of Baptists is, not that baptism derives its validity from the administrator; but from being truly administered to a true and professed believer, on profession of faith. The essence of baptism is this: the burial of a believer in water, in token of his repentance and faith in Christ. Whoever has in good faith, been thus baptized, is truly baptized, and needs no repetition of the act.

The third difficulty which the writer finds in the practices of Baptists, is:—

"They tell us that the reason we are not admitted to their communion table is that we have not been immersed. Yet there are numbers in our church who have been immersed, and who cannot gain admission to their communion! Why is it? Will they tell us that the ordinances had not been performed by a proper administrator? Then why did you receive members baptized by these very administrators into your church without re-baptizing them?"

Again: There are members in our church who were baptized by your own hands, against whom no charge of immorality has been found, and who are not permitted to approach your table! Is it because they had not been immersed? No! Was it for want of a proper administrator? It was not, yourselves being judges. Do enlighten us, for we acknowledge our need of instruction."

Well, here is some instruction for you. It is true, that we say you cannot be admitted to our communion till you have been baptized, but we have never said, that all who have been immersed can be admitted. Ours is not a religion of forms, but of faith. Believers' baptism is a part of our faith. It has its place in the Christian system. It must be believed in, as well as practiced. Believers' baptism is a doctrine, as well as a practice, in Baptist churches. It is as much the duty of a Christian to honor his Lord by receiving his word in respect to baptism, as in respect to the Lord's Supper, or repentance, or any other doctrine, or duty.

We do not say to candidates for admission to our churches, you may follow your own notions about baptism,—you may be sprinkled, or poured, or baptized,—you may be satisfied with what was done for you in infancy, or you may follow your Saviour's example in baptism, just as you like. No; we say to them, "if you do not receive the faith, and follow the example of Jesus Christ in Baptism, as in other parts of faith and practice, you cannot enter our churches." Is there any inconsistency here?

We hope that the inquirers of our contemporary are sufficiently answered. If not, we will try to make these points plainer still; provided he copies the explanations which he has called out.—Western Watchman.

I did not give Enough for my Bible.

A Bible distributor in Germany called upon a blacksmith and urged him to buy a Bible.—Being ignorant of the value of the precious volume, he refused to part with his money to obtain it. It was then offered to him gratuitously, but he declined to receive it upon such terms. A compromise was at length effected by his agreeing to give a fire-shovel for the book. After the labors of the day were over, curiosity prompted him to look into the book which he had purchased; and as he read, his heart was opened, and the character of God was revealed to him. The depravity of his nature, the worth of his soul, his need of a Saviour, the preciousness of Christ, were deeply felt; he was melted to tears; and as he wiped from his cheek the falling drops, he said to himself, "I did not give enough for my Bible." Early in the morning he went into his shop, finished a pair of tongs, went in search of the Bible distributor, and, finding him said, "My dear sir, please accept a pair of tongs with the shovel, I did not give enough for my Bible."

Minister's Salaries.

One of the worst evils, on the whole, in the relation between pastor and people, is the failure to secure for him pecuniary independence, when the people are able to do so. One can hardly understand how any one should fail to see the truth on this subject, or to practice it, did we not see so many lamentable examples to the contrary. The law anxiously provides for the independence of the judiciary by giving the judges an adequate salary, and forbidding it to be diminished during the term for which they are commissioned. Our organic law, both in Scripture and the Constitution, is no less particular as to the clergy. They are to be kept free from worldly care and anxiety. As a general rule, they are not so kept. They are dejected by pecuniary responsibilities they cannot meet, or by sacrifices they ought not to make. Their families are often perplexed beyond measure, even to provide for the necessities of life, while very few are able to purchase the books that are the very tools with which they work. They feel their minds dwarfing, and sigh for mental food, but do not deem it honest to go in debt even for what seems indispensable to their preparation for the pulpit. Worn out by long continued labor, they are blamed if they take a summer journey. The temptation to be too complaisant to the rich, frets the honest hearted minister, and perhaps leads him to the opposite extreme of discourtesy. Worse than all, perhaps he begins to cherish hard feelings towards his flock. Here are people, he feels, who are perfectly able, without distressing themselves, to take the mountain weight of pecuniary responsibility off his heart, and they will not so much as touch it with one of their fingers. Must he not be almost superhuman, if with such feelings, he can with gentle tenderness, fulfill his pastoral duties? It is most difficult to school his heart to love for the brethren, who he sometimes says bitterly within him, are starving his family, and to kind feeling for those who, he thinks, do not sympathize with the severest troubles of his lot. The prayers of his flock for him sometimes sound like mockery; and their professions of love to him, and to the cause of Christ, send a pang to his heart. Gladly would he engage in any other pursuit, which would support his family, but he

is bound to his flock, and to the cause of Christ, and to the principles of his denomination. He proceeds—

And what inconsistency is here, pray? If a church invites a man to preach a sermon, is not the invitation, itself, a license to preach that sermon? Each church, being an independent body, has the sole right to elect, call, appoint, and license its own preachers. An invitation from a church, to a man, to preach a sermon is a license to preach that sermon. If it choose, afterwards, to give him a general license to preach, whenever he can get hearers, it can do so; but such license has no force, nor obligation in, or over, any other church.

One contemporary will see, therefore, that his fancied inconsistency is a mere mistake of his own, by mixing and confounding Baptist with Methodist principles. He proceeds—

And what inconsistency is here, pray? If a church invites a man to preach a sermon, is not the invitation, itself, a license to preach that sermon? Each church, being an independent body, has the sole right to elect, call, appoint, and license its own preachers. An invitation from a church, to a man, to preach a sermon is a license to preach that sermon. If it choose, afterwards, to give him a general license to preach, whenever he can get hearers, it can do so; but such license has no force, nor obligation in, or over, any other church.

One contemporary will see, therefore, that his fancied inconsistency is a mere mistake of his own, by mixing and confounding Baptist with Methodist principles. He proceeds—

And what inconsistency is here, pray? If a church invites a man to preach a sermon, is not the invitation, itself, a license to preach that sermon? Each church, being an independent body, has the sole right to elect, call, appoint, and license its own preachers. An invitation from a church, to a man, to preach a sermon is a license to preach that sermon. If it choose, afterwards, to give him a general license to preach, whenever he can get hearers, it can do so; but such license has no force, nor obligation in, or over, any other church.

One contemporary will see, therefore, that his fancied inconsistency is a mere mistake of his own, by mixing and confounding Baptist with Methodist principles. He proceeds—

And what inconsistency is here, pray? If a church invites a man to preach a sermon, is not the invitation, itself, a license to preach that sermon? Each church, being an independent body, has the sole right to elect, call, appoint, and license its own preachers. An invitation from a church, to a man, to preach a sermon is a license to preach that sermon. If it choose, afterwards, to give him a general license to preach, whenever he can get hearers, it can do so; but such license has no force, nor obligation in, or over, any other church.

One contemporary will see, therefore, that his fancied inconsistency is a mere mistake of his own, by mixing and confounding Baptist with Methodist principles. He proceeds—

And what inconsistency is here, pray? If a church invites a man to preach a sermon, is not the invitation, itself, a license to preach that sermon? Each church, being an independent body, has the sole right to elect, call, appoint, and license its own preachers. An invitation from a church, to a man, to preach a sermon is a license to preach that sermon. If it choose, afterwards, to give him a general license to preach, whenever he can get hearers, it can do so; but such license has no force, nor obligation in, or over, any other church.