

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

A Religious and Literary Paper: Published weekly at Raleigh, N. C., at \$2 00 per annum, payable in all cases in advance.

THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS. 1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered willing to continue their subscription.

Notes on the Mode of Baptism.

NUMBER NINE.

The baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, next claims our attention.

The order of the Commission is here strictly observed: 1. Peter preached. 2. "They that gladly received the word were baptized."

3. "They continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread and in prayer."

That the subjects baptized were believers, to the exclusion of infants, there can be no doubt. Some pretend to think there was not water at Jerusalem for the immersion of the three thousand.

The temple contained ten lavens of brass, each of which contained forty baths sufficient for immersion.

When we have "much water" at Eanon, we are told that "much water" is not necessary for immersion.

They heard a Methodist minister, say, "If a boy was to ride my horse down into the creek, and let him drink, and come up out of the water, would any person suppose that my horse had been immersed?"

It is also affirmed that three thousand could not be immersed in one day.

The twelve could do it in eighty-three minutes, (three to a minute).

Rev. J. M. Pendleton informs us in his "Three Reasons," p. 140, that he "saw the venerable Reuben Ross, when more than sixty years of age, baptize sixty-six persons in thirty-three minutes; and there was no indecent haste."

Austin, the monk, sent by Pope Gregory into England in the year 597, consecrated the river Swale, near York, in which he caused ten thousand of his converts to be baptized in one day.

If a Romish monk could have ten thousand immersed in one day at one place, surely twelve apostles could have three thousand immersed in a day!

Baptists immerse faster than Pedobaptists sprinkle for Pedobaptists, first baptize, i. e. immerse their fingers, and then sprinkle the candidate! They perform two acts. Baptists but one!

Philip at Samaria. Acts 8: 5-12. 1. Philip preach. 2. They believed. 3. He "baptized both men and women."

Why was this word left out? Evidently because no infants were baptized. Pedobaptism was then unknown.

Probably this happened in the days of Herod who slew the infants. No, this baptism happened thirty years afterwards!

Probably the writer thought it not necessary, or worth while. No. It is more important that we be informed that children were baptiz-

tized (that is, if they were) than that they eat. When the five thousand were miraculously fed, it is said "men, women and children eat."

A strange city was Samaria if there were no babies there! And stranger still, if any were baptized, and Luke left out the word! The same word is left out in Acts 5 and 14.

Baptism of the Eunuch Acts 8: 35. "See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest."

This is a plain description of the manner that Baptists now practice. Rev. R. Watson, a Methodist, who is one of their most distinguished writers, says, "If the Eunuch was actually immersed, Philip was also immersed, for nothing is said of one, that is not said of the other."

Reader, you can easily judge for yourself whether or not, "nothing is said of one that is not said of the other." It is said of Philip, that he "baptized him," that is the Eunuch, Weak must be the cause that requires such pitiful and shameful maneuvering.

We shall not be inclined to suspect the veracity of Watson and Lape, if we suppose that they wrote in the decline of life, and that their spectacles slipped as they read this passage, and caused them to overlook the words, "and he baptized him?"

If this reasoning be true, it is very easy accounting for the fact that Daniel was not destroyed by the lions, "into the den of lions" only means at, to, or near by the den of lions.

It is also mysterious how the swine that ran violently down into the sea when the devils entered into them, were drowned upon dry land, for evidently they never entered into the water, if into only means at, by, or near to!

It is also mysterious how the swine that ran violently down into the sea when the devils entered into them, were drowned upon dry land, for evidently they never entered into the water, if into only means at, by, or near to!

Baptists are represented by Pedobaptists as teaching that into means immersion. We have heard this repeatedly from the pulpit.

Baptists neither believe, nor teach any such thing. Their argument is, that into takes them into the water, and baptizo or baptize puts them under. Why go into the water, if not to immerse?

We heard a Methodist minister, say, "If a boy was to ride my horse down into the creek, and let him drink, and come up out of the water, would any person suppose that my horse had been immersed?"

Going into the water to drink and to be baptized are very different things. Put the word baptize in the place of the word drink, and people would believe an immersion had occurred.

This same minister went down into the river, and baptized certain persons. Did he sprinkle them? No. He took them down into the water, and baptized, that is, immersed them.

Philip no doubt did the same thing, when he went down into the water with the Eunuch, he baptized, that is, immersed him. The theory and practice of this minister are not in harmony.

Paul's Baptism, Acts 9: 18. It is affirmed that Paul was baptized standing up, and therefore could not have been immersed. This is said because Paul was commanded to "arise and be baptized."

If sprinkling had been the mode, we think it could have been done as well in a sitting as a standing posture. If immersion was the mode, (as it no doubt was), it was necessary for him to arise in order to go to the water.

His baptism was to wash away his sins. "And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins."

Immersion is a fit representation of a figurative washing away of sins.

Paul tells us in Rom. 6: 4, "We are buried with him by baptism." Nothing short of immersion represents a burial. Paul was therefore immersed.

It is confidently asserted by Pedobaptist D. D.'s, that the word used in the original, translated "arise" means to arise and remain, and does not justify the idea of his moving, that therefore he could not have been immersed.

This sophistry is completely demolished by Rev. J. M. Pendleton in his "Three Reasons why I am a Baptist" p. 141.

The participle anastasis is sometimes so translated, but in numerous instances denotes the beginning of a process by which a thing is done.

It is said (Luke 1: 29), "And Mary arose (anastasis)—same word with a feminine termination) in those days, and went into the hill country, &c. Did Mary stand up and go? Does not anastasis here denote the beginning of the process by which she reached the hill country?"

In Luke 15: 18, the prodigal son says, "I will arise (anastasis) and go to my father," &c., and in v. 20, it is said: "And he arose, (anastasis) and came to his father." Did he stand up and go to his father? Was not the anastasis the commencement of the returning movement? He arose and returned to his father.

Now Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles. Is it not reasonable, then, to believe, that when he says (Acts 9: 18), that Saul arose (anastasis), and was baptized, he means by anastasis the beginning of a process necessary to his baptism? He evidently arose that he might be immersed; but no rising up—no anastasis—was necessary, if water was to be poured or sprinkled on him.

His immersion implied the movement indicated by anastasis, while pouring or sprinkling could imply no such movement. In the 39th verse of the same chapter, it is said, "And Peter arose (anastasis) and went with them"—that is, to Joppa. He did not stand up still and go; but he arose as the first thing to be done in getting to Joppa, just as Saul arose as the first thing to be done in getting to a suitable place for immersion."

(To be Continued.)

Are the Practices of the Methodist Church Republican?

One of the singular things in the history of our country is the existence and long continuance of churches whose teachings are so opposed to the spirit of our government.

The following article taken from the S. W. Baptist, is a reply to a piece written by the Methodist minister in Tuskegee. We do believe that those who read it, will not complain of its length, so ably is the subject discussed.

A FRIEND OF TRUTH.

We shall, therefore, confine our remarks to two very simple enquiries. These are:—First—Is the Episcopal feature of the Methodist Church a legitimate subject of newspaper discussion?

Secondly—Is Church polity, as an element in the formation of political character, of sufficient importance to merit the attention of the politician and Statesman?

And let it be distinctly premised here, that it is not the pious, nor even the doctrines of the Methodist Church, that we are now to discuss. No Protestant recognizes the scrupulous piety and the evangelical doctrines of a Fenelon and a Bossuet in mitigation of the tyranny and crimes of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Our remarks will be confined to the isolated topic of episcopacy. The most illustrious names of this or any other age, never converted one error into a truth. And he who expects to shield an error behind the prestige of great and good names, no matter if they are as numerous as the stars of heaven, has sadly mistaken the age in which he lives.

Whatever of charity we owe to men's persons, it is certain we owe none to their errors. He who compromises a principle out of complaisance to any man or set of men, is unworthy to be trusted, either by God or man. But to our first enquiry:—

Is the Episcopal feature of the Methodist Church a legitimate subject of newspaper discussion? Now, we aver that it is, as much so, indeed, as the ecclesiastical polity of any other denomination on earth.

It is a transplant from a foreign to an American soil; and is no more exempted from the ordeal of criticism and serious investigation than any other article of foreign manufacture. That its type is the Episcopal Church of England, the established religion of that realm, we presume its most devoted friends will not question.

It is not sacrilege for an American citizen to question the right of the clergy to rule a constituency numbering a million and a half. But we will not suppose that our Methodist brethren will claim this exemption; and we need not seriously argue it.

We come now to consider the second question proposed—Is Church polity, as an element in the formation of political character, of sufficient importance to merit the attention of the politician and Statesman? We think that it is.

Ever since the days of Constantine, Ecclesiastical power has been invoked by secular princes, as an essential element in the government of their subjects. It is at this day recognized by every despot of Europe, not only as an organic law of his government, but as being essential to enforce his authority.

It cannot be denied, that religion, whether pure and undefiled, or perverted and corrupted, is the most powerful agency which has ever been brought to bear upon human character.

Its unholy and corrupting alliance with every government in Europe is a recognition of the truth. Even the infidel Hobbes defended religion on the ground, that it was an essential auxiliary in the hands of kings to rule their subjects.

Like the devil and his angels, who lost not their power by the fall, religion loses not its power by being corrupted and perverted to the basest of purposes. The most virulent, merciless, and vindictive persecutions which have ever darkened the pages of Church history, have emanated from a corrupt Christianity.

The reason of this is obvious. Religion, based as it is, upon the highest authority in the universe, appeals to and develops the strongest principles and passions of the human soul; and these become correspondingly potent for good or for evil, according to the power that directs them.

When you appeal to a man's religious prejudices, you appeal to the highest principles and motives that can operate upon moral agents. This we say is both objectively and subjectively, a necessary truth.

Now, we boldly and fearlessly take the ground that the Episcopacy of Methodism is anti-Democratic, and anti-Republican—that in so far as its operation is unobstructed by modifying agencies, it is essentially and necessarily in direct antagonism with our free institutions.

We are aware, that in taking this ground, we are subjecting ourselves to much unmerited censure, the censures of those who cannot, or more properly will not, discriminate between persons and principles. We are aware there are those who will regard us as attacking, not a solitary principle in the system of "the largest denomination of Christians in the United States," but as denouncing the entire membership of that denomination as anti-Democratic.

But this has no terrors to us. We shall fearlessly speak what we believe to be the truth, be the consequences what they may. We hope to do so, however, in the spirit of the Gospel.

As words are the signs of ideas, the most obvious method we can pursue in this investigation is, in the first place, to ascertain the meaning of terms. Pursuing this course, we turn to our great national standard—Webster's Dictionary, and find the following definitions of the terms involved in this discussion:

"DEMOCRACY, n. Government by the people; a form of government in which the supreme power is lodged in the hands of the people collectively, or in which the people exercise the powers of legislation."

"REPUBLIC, n. A commonwealth; a state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in the hands of representatives elected by the people," &c.

"EPISCOPACY, n. Literally, oversight, or careful inspection; applied particularly to the government of the Church by bishops or prelates."

"EPISCOPAL, a. Belonging to, or vested in bishops or prelates; 2. governed by bishops."

Now, when we assert that the Episcopal feature of the Methodist organization is anti-Democratic and anti-Republican, we are but asserting what every school boy may know in five minutes by turning to his dictionary—that a form of government in which the supreme power is lodged in the hands of bishops or prelates, the clergy, is in manifest antagonism with that form of government in which such power is lodged in the hands of the people, or of representatives elected by the people.

It were absurd to say that two such principles ever can harmonize. If the bill of rights set forth in the preamble of all our civil constitutions, State and national, asserts a truth, that "all power is inherent in the people," then we maintain that a government in which the people have no voice, practically sets that truth at defiance.

Who compose the annual and quadrennial Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church? Let the Discipline answer:—Q. 3. Who shall attend the yearly conferences? Ans. All travelling preachers in full connection, and those who are to be received in full connection."

p. 23. Again: "Q.uest. Who shall compose the General Conference, and what are the regulations and powers belonging to it? Ans. 1. The General Conference shall be composed of one member for every twenty-one members of each annual Conference, to be appointed either by seniority or choice, at the discretion of such annual Conference; yet so that such representatives shall have traveled at least four full calendar years from the time that they were received on trial by an annual Conference, and in full connection at the time of holding the Conference."

p. 20. And on page 21, in defining the limitations and restrictions of the powers of a General Conference, the following items occur: "3. They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency. 4. They shall not revoke or change the general rules of the United Societies. 5. They shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal, neither shall they do away the privileges of our members of trial before the society, or by a committee, and of an appeal."

Now, observe first, that the annual Conference is composed, ex-officio, of the clergy under appointment of the bishops in that Conference. Even local preachers, no matter what their piety and talents may be, have no voice in its councils. Observe, secondly, that the basis of representation in a General Conference, is not the membership of the Church, but the aforesaid clergy in each State. In neither an annual or general conference, is the voice of a layman or its representative ever heard, unless it be by petition—a right which the most perfect despot will allow his subjects. Observe, thirdly, that this distinct feature of the Methodist church is never to be changed. The General Conference must not "do away episcopacy." It is recognized as an essential, organic law of the system, to do away with which, would dissolve the whole fabric.

That is to say, the recognition of the rights of the people, the private members, to a representation in the annual and general Conferences, would be the death knell of Methodist Episcopacy! The fathers of this Church have taken the special pains to throw around this special feature of Methodism the sanctity and power of an irrevocable decree! Any effort to change it, meets with a stern rebuke—such as was administered by the General Conference in 1828, at which a large and respectable body of ministers were expelled from the body, who subsequently formed the Methodist Protestant Church of the United States. Call you this Republican Democracy? A numerous and respectable body of ministers and laymen, from different parts of the United States, petition the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church so to modify its basis of representation as to permit the voice of its laymen to be heard in its councils, is rebuked and denounced as schismatical and heretical, and a solemn act of exclusion is pronounced against them! And yet there is nothing in Methodist Episcopacy but what harmonizes most beautifully with American Democracy! And when we quote the very language of the illustrious founder of Methodism, John Wesley,—"We are not Republicans, and never intend to be"—and when we attempt to point out the features of Methodist polity which antagonize with the genius of our free institutions, why, we have a "wonderfully creative imagination." De Quincy's Opium Eater never saw such horrid images as come trooping before his fancy. A little medical treatment is the proper remedy for such a distemper! All "poetry" Bro. HAMILL! It would be the most inventive of the poets"—nay, much more inventive than have produced an

"I had," or a "Paradise Lost," we opine, to discover the Democracy of Methodist Episcopacy. What an interesting task that would be for an American citizen to sit down to the serious matter of showing that a government by bishops and clergy was perfectly consistent, nay, synonymous with government by the people—that a representation based upon the clergy was equivalent to a representation based upon the people, the private membership of the Church—that a legislative body in which the voice of the people is never heard, or if heard, is only heeded as a matter of grace, is equivalent to a legislative body in which the people collectively exercise the controlling power!

Again: government is divided into three departments—Legislative, Executive, and Judicial. But in neither of these departments are the private members of the Methodist Episcopal Church represented. They have no power either to make, expound or execute the law. Even if they pronounce the solemn act of exclusion against a member, it is subject to appeal, and may be reversed by the bishop or bishops: and "the word of a bishop is the end of all strife." And that we may not be considered uncharitable in this remark, we make the following extract from the late Bishop Bascomb's "Declaration of the Rights of Man." Let every Methodist read and ponder it well. If he will not hear the word of a bishop, (written to-be sure before he became a bishop, yet not the less authoritative with American readers on that account,) he surely will not be persuaded by an humble Baptist editor. But to the extract:

ART. 6. A government uniting legislative, judicial, and executive powers in the hands of the same men, is an absurdity in theory, and in practice, tyranny. The executive power in every government, should be subordinate to the legislative, and the judicial independent of both. Whenever, therefore, it happens that these three departments of government are in the hands of the same body of men, and these men not the representatives of the people—first making the laws, then executing them, and finally the sole judges of their own acts, there is no liberty; the people are virtually enslaved, and liable to be ruined at any time. In a government, civil or ecclesiastical, where the same men are legislators, administrators, and judges, in relation to all the laws, and every possible application of them, the people, whether well or ill-treated, are in fact slaves; for the only remedy against such a despotism is revolt. No constitution can be presumed a good one, embodying the principles of correct government, which does not sufficiently guard against the chances and possibility of mis-administration. All absolute governments owe their character to the manner in which they are administered, whereas, in a representative government, with proper checks and balances, it is the interest, even of the vicious, to promote the general welfare, by conforming to the laws. The greater the equality established among men by governments, the more virtue and happiness will prevail; for where the voluntary consent of the governed is the basis of government, interest and duty combine to promote the common weal."

Finally, Methodist Episcopacy deprives the membership of that church of the right of choosing their own pastors—a right as dear to the Lord's "freed men" as any with which they are invested in the New Testament. The churches sometimes petition the bishop for some particular person of their choice, but how often are their wishes disregarded. We recollect some year or two since, of reading in one of the regular journals of the M. E. Church, some serious articles against the policy of yielding to this, the most humble method of expressing a wish, in which the ground was taken, if we remember correctly, that if the thing was not stopped, it would virtually "do away with Episcopacy." And yet we are called upon to believe, nay, we are considered very uncharitable and bigoted if we will not believe that a church organization, in which the right of the laity to choose their own pastors—those who are to break to them the bread of eternal life, and who are to be supported by their money, and assisted by their prayers and sympathies—is absolutely denied, is nevertheless, quite consistent with American Democracy!

But says Bro. HAMILL: "John Wesley, the Methodist, Thomas Chalmers, the Presbyterian, and Robert Hall, the Baptist, were good subjects of the English Monarchy." True, they were. They were mindful of the Divine injunction, "fear God and honor the King." But is not Bro. H. aware that the form of Church government recognized by Hall, was as pure a Democracy as that recognized by Baptist Churches, even in the United States—and that it has been mainly through the agencies of such men as Robert Hall, and the Independents of England, that the act of non-conformity was extorted from the British crown—the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's own conscience? And let it never be forgotten that in our struggle for independence, the Baptists and Independents of Great Britain were universally on our side. Dr. Rippon, pastor of a Baptist Church in London, writing to Dr. Baldwin, pastor of a Baptist Church in Boston, during the revolutionary war, says to him, "When the King's armies prevail, there is the cry of mourning, lamentation and woe amongst us; but when the American army prevails, there is the shout of King in our camps." Robert Hall, the father of the distinguished orator, and one of the most eloquent Baptist ministers of his age, was an open and avowed friend of the colonies. The following anecdote of him and Dr. Ryland, is worth relating:

"One evening our conversation turned on the subject of the war with America, previously to the acknowledgment of the independence of the United States. Mr. Hall said, 'Sir, that war was very unpopular, and considered to be very unrighteous by men of trusliery principles. My father, sir, warmly advocated the American cause. When I was a little boy, he took me to the school of Mr. Ryland at Northampton, the father of Dr. Ryland, of Bristol; this Mr. Ryland was very eccentric, and a violent partisan of the Americans; it was in the hottest period of the war, sir, and many persons were very indignant at the conduct of the English government. That war, sir, was considered as a crusade against the liberty of the subject and the rights of man. The first night we arrived at Northampton from Arnsby, the two old gentlemen (my father and Mr. Ryland) talked over American politics until they both became heated on the same side of the question. At length, Mr. Ryland burst forth in this manner: 'Bro. Hall, I will tell you what I would do if I were General Washington.' 'Well,' said my father, 'what would you do?' 'Why, brother Hall, if I were General Washington, I would summon all the American officers; they should form a circle around me, and I would address them, and we would offer a libation in our own blood, and I would order one of them to bring a lance and a

punch-bowl; and he should bleed us all one by one, into this punch-bowl; and I would be the first to kiss my arm; and when the punch-bowl was full, and we had all been blest, I would call upon every man to consecrate himself to the work; dipping his sword into the bowl, and entering into a solemn covenant engagement by oath, one to another, and would never by him that sits upon the throne, and treads forever and ever, that we would never sheath our swords while there was an English soldier in arms remaining in America; and that is what I would do, brother Hall.'"

But we must conclude. Bro. HAMILL seems to consider that it is quite democratic that the Trusteeship and location of Colleges should be placed in the hands of a majority of laymen. Pardon us, Bro. H., if we say this has nothing to do with the subject. We are discussing the power of the bishops and clergy over churches, not Colleges. The privilege of locating a College, or of being a Trustee of a College, has about as much to do with the Episcopal government of your church, as the appointment of a servant to supply your Annual Conference with water. The Methodist E. Church was no more organized to erect colleges, than any other church. The subject of education in that, as in all other denominations, is an appendage, and enters not into its organic features.

Let us not be misunderstood or misrepresented. The question is not whether Bro. Hamill or myself could control the votes of such men as he names in his communication: it is an argumentum ad hominem, a mode of argument usually resorted to for the want of a better; but the question is, whether a civil government organized upon the principles of Methodist Episcopacy, could be called with propriety, a democratic republican government? We say it could not. How far we have proved this, is left to the candid reader.

As to the article to which Bro. H. replies, as copied from the Watchman into our paper, it contained matter proper to be published. It does not follow that editors are considered as endorsing all the sentiments contained in every article copied into their paper. Nor is it incumbent on them to sift and criticize each argument such selections may contain. So far as the article in question, favors an assault upon Methodist Episcopacy at the ballot-box, we repudiate it; for in voting, we never enquire as to what church a man belongs; but whether he is honest and capable, and whether his views upon important political questions correspond with our own. With respect, however, to the position which is the leading idea contained in the article, which we have above discussed, we believe it to be true, and can maintain it.

The Tomb.—No. 2. Death will be swallowed up in victory, when we hear the welcome plaudit, I accept you, O my people! Ye are they that believe in my name. Ye are they that renounce yourselves, and are complete in me. I see no spot or blemish in you! for ye are washed in my blood, and clothed with my righteousness. Renewed by my Spirit, ye have glorified me on earth, and have been faithful unto death. Come receive the kingdom that shall never be removed; wear the crown which fadeth not away; and enjoy pleasure forever more! Oh! is not this cheering to the Christian, is there a soul so deaf to the call of sovereign mercy, as to still persist? Yes, the response re-echoes again and furnishes the reply. Sin, that enormous sythe, which has struck empires from their root, and swept ages and generations into oblivion, shall lie by in perpetual uselessness. Sin will then be done away. All to come is perfect holiness and consummate happiness; the term of whose countenance is eternity.

O Eternity! How are our strongest thoughts lost and overwhelmed in thee! Who can set landmarks, to limit thy dimensions; or find plumbers to fathom thy depths? Arithmeticians have figures to compute all the progressions of time. Astronomers have instruments to calculate the distances of the planets. But what numbers can state, what lines can gauge, the lengths and breadths of eternity? It is higher than heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than punishment what canst thou know? its breadth longer than the earth,—its depth, than that of the sea. None can truly say, after the most prodigious waste of ages, "so much of eternity is gone." For when millions of centuries are elapsed, it is but just commencing; and when millions more have run their ample round, it will be no nearer ending. Yes when ages, numerous as the bloom of Spring, increased by the herbage of summer, both augmented by the leaves of Autumn, and all multiplied by the drops of rain which drown the winter; when these, and ten thousand times ten thousand more,—more than can be represented by any similitude, or imagined by any conception,—when all these are revolved and finished, Eternity will only be beginning!—What a pleasing, yet awful thought is this!—Full of delight, and full of dread. May it alarm our fears, quicken our hopes, and animate all our endeavors. Since we are soon to launch into this endless state, let us give all diligence to secure our entrance into bliss, because there is no alteration in the scenes of futurity. The wheel never turns: all is steadfast and immovable beyond the tomb. The saints always rejoice amidst the smiles of Heaven; their harps are perpetually tuned; their triumphs—admit of no interruption. The ruin of the wicked is irretrievable. The fatal sentence once passed, is never to be repealed!—But all things bear the same eternal aspect forever. (Now we turn to the mint, let all things splendid in the skies expire, all that is amiable in nature be expunged, their light in heaven never admit a pause for sadness. All heaven will recede with the melody of their gratitude, and all eternity re-echo to their tri-