

# THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

J. J. JAMES, Editor.

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

G. MEREDITH & Co Proprietors

VOLUME XX. NO. 34.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 1855

{WHOLE NO. 1074

## 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.

All letters on business should be directed to G. MEREDITH & Co., Raleigh, N. C.

All letters containing communications, or in any way relating to the editorial department, should be addressed to Rev. J. J. JAMES, or "Editor of the Biblical Recorder."

All communications, to insure attention, must be directed to Raleigh, N. C.—post-paid.

For further particulars see last page.

### THE LAW OF NEWSPAPERS.

1. Subscribers who do not give express notice to the contrary are considered wishing to continue their subscription.

2. If the subscribers order the discontinuance of their papers, the publishers may continue to send them till all cash charges are paid.

3. If subscribers neglect or refuse to take their papers from the office to which they are directed, they are held responsible until they have settled their bill, and order their paper discontinued.

4. If subscribers remove to other places without informing the publisher, and the paper is sent to the former direction, they are held responsible.

5. The courts have decided that refusing to take a paper or periodical from the office, or removing and leaving it uncalled for, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

### An Address on the Scripture Mode of Christian Baptism.

BY J. M. MORROW.

He has a short paragraph about the Phillipian jailor and his household, but it is so meager that it is harmless. The only remark worthy of notice is this: he says, "And if we were to read the narrative over a thousand times, the idea of immersion would never enter our minds from anything that is there said." From what I have learned of Mr. M., by reading his pamphlet, I can readily admit the truth of this assertion—ideas are strangers to some minds; especially when they ignore the words conveying them. He seems to entertain the idea that it was impossible to pour, or sprinkle water upon Paul, while sitting, or lying down. He speaks as though a recumbent, or sitting posture was indispensable to immersion; but to sprinkle, or pour water upon him in either of these positions was impossible; he must stand up in order to receive the holy sprinkling—is this an idea, Mr. Morrow, or not?

He has a paragraph concerning the baptism of Cornelius and his household, but it is so profoundly destitute of ideas, that it would be about as easy to reach the water in Jacob's well with a tin-cup, as to descend to the place profound where his ideas are deposited—they are too harmless to require exposure.

He next calls up the case of the three thousand, and as the paragraph is long, I can only quote so much of it as will present him fairly.

"Here we are informed that Peter commenced preaching at nine o'clock, and his sermon must have occupied at least one hour, for a considerable discourse is recorded, and then the Evangelist tells us, that 'with many other words did he testify and exhort.' And the designation of the persons to be baptized, and making arrangements for immersion, must at least have taken two hours more. For the only place where immersion could have been performed, which was accessible, was the Pool of Siloam, three-quarters of a mile from the Temple. \* \* \* It must at least have been twelve o'clock when they arrived at the place, and were prepared for immersion. And it will be remembered, that the Jewish day closed at six o'clock, so that they had but six hours for the performance of the three thousand baptisms, by twelve Apostles; and that there were but twelve, the Evangelist is particular to mention. [Acts 2: 14.] Now, if each of these twelve Apostles baptized one every two minutes and a half, they would have baptized only little over the half the number."

With one single exception, I will allow Mr. Morrow all he asks for, and show clearly that the three thousand could have been baptized in two thousand and five minutes. The Rev. Henry Toler baptized 101 persons in something over 35 minutes. I baptized 22 in the Tombigbee last fall, was timed by a Presbyterian lady, and though I was unusually deliberate, she informed me that I was just ten minutes in performing the rite. I can easily immerse at the rate of two and a half per minute—this I say from an experience of more than forty years. There is not an experienced baptizer in the land who will not testify, that two persons per minute can be easily and deliberately immersed. Let this be admitted, then divide 3,000 by 12, and each administrator will have 250 to immerse, which he can do in 125 minutes—2 hours and 5 minutes—and have three hours and fifty-five minutes before six to spend in a grand convocation of thanksgiving to God for so great a grace.

Here I might safely leave the matter, but M. has so grossly misstated many facts in the case, that I shall not feel that I have discharged my duty, to pass them without exposing his errors. It is positively stated by Luke in Acts 1: 15, that the number of the disciples present in Jerusalem was a hundred and twenty at that time, which could not have been long before Pentecost; but whether they were present at Pentecost or not, M. has asserted that which is not deducible from Acts 2: 14, the passage to which he refers. He says: "and that there were but twelve (present) the evangelist is particular to mention." Now the Evangelist mentions no such thing. He says: "Peter standing up with the eleven lifted up his voice." It is simply stated here, that these twelve, having been chosen as the public witnesses for Christ, stood up together as such, while Peter spoke; but it is not inferable from this fact, that the one hundred and eight other disciples were absent, especially on such an occasion. M. has certainly borne false witness, in this instance, and what makes it worse, has attempted to make Luke a party in the crime.

He states also, that "Bethesda lay within the precincts of the Temple." Now this is contrary to the statements of all the writers upon the subject, which I have read, and falsifies every map of Jerusalem, which I have seen. [See com. Com., Map of the plan of the city, figure 11, and other maps.] The only importance which I attach to the matter is, its want of truth; and to show the desperate shifts to which the advocates of pedism will resort, to maintain their unscriptural position.

He further tells us, that "the only place

where immersion could have been performed was the Pool of Siloam. Now, to say nothing of the Pool of Bethesda, there was on the west side of the city, the Dragon fountain, the upper and lower fountains of Gihon, and the Pool of Bethesda, where quite an abundance of water for the occasion might have been obtained. The Pool of Siloam, however, was sufficient, being, as Maudrell says, "an hundred and twenty paces long, forty broad, and at least eight deep." But Mr. M. and his endorsers may be effectually put to the blush for such a shameful deviation from recorded facts, I beg leave to refer the reader to a Bible Geography, published by the American Sunday School Union. On the 62d page of that work he will find an article headed: "The wells, reservoirs, and fountains of the City," in which the following bodies and fountains of water are described, with their several locations: "Almost every house in the city has its cisterns—lasting all the year." "There are also large uncovered reservoirs in, and near the city. Two of these are situated in the upper part of the valley Ben Hinnon. The first measures over three hundred feet in length, and two hundred in breadth, average depth fifteen feet." "The lower pool is over five hundred feet long, three hundred and fifty feet broad, and forty feet deep." "The Pool of Hezekiah, inside of the city walls, of great antiquity, is supplied from the upper pool." The Pool of Bethesda, and the Pool of Bethesda, these, besides Siloam and the living fountains, surely would supply quantity sufficient of water for the occasion. What apology can our author offer to palliate his erroneous statements, in the face of these facts?

A single other remark, and I will dismiss this part of my subject. M. presumes that the Jews were so hostile to the Christians, that they would not suffer them to immerse in the public pools; but M. must recollect that pedism was not known then, and as the Jews were accustomed to the bath, it never entered into their heads to persecute the saints merely because they immersed, as the advocates of pedism have done from his origin.

Can any Pedobaptist be so blind as not to perceive, that all they say against immersing the three thousand in a day, reflects with threefold force against their own system? Let a Baptist take his formula, and a Presbyterian, Methodist his, and the Baptist can easily immerse from five to ten, while either of the others can sprinkle one; and he will immerse from ten to twenty, while an Episcopalian with his formula, can cross, or sprinkle a single babe. Such attempts to evade the plain teaching of the Bible, favors infidelity, and wholly adverse to the spirit of christianity.

Our author next proceeds "to enquire what can be learned of the mode of baptism from what is to be signified by it?" Now, I ask if this setting at naught the verbiage and plain teaching of the inspired oracles, is anything less than "rejecting the council of God?" God has given us his will and law in plain words, and we reject his will, and construe his law, "according to our preconceived opinions." Is this "believing the testimony which God has given?"

All admit that baptism with water derives its entire efficacy from its emblematical character, while none deny that it, also, signifies *purity of heart*. But while immersionists regard baptism as a recognition of the death, burial, and resurrection of our Saviour as the *procuring cause* of inward purity; we regard the ordinance as a recognition of the divine agency of God's spirit upon our hearts, "working salvation."

The efficacy of baptism, what does our author mean by this? This is shaped up just as a Pedobaptist would have expressed himself in the fifteenth century, when baptismal salvation was in power and general credit. There is no efficacy in baptism, only as an *act of obedience to Christ*. Baptists do not contend for the ordinance because it *symbolizes any thing*, but simply because the Lord has commanded it—we esteem it as the response of a good conscience to a divine command. The fact that it symbolizes the burial and resurrection of Christ, would impart no efficacy to it, in the absence of a divine commandment for its observance. M. has misrepresented the Baptists by intimating that they teach an inherent efficacy in baptism,—Pedobaptists do this, but Baptists never.

Baptists do not teach that baptism symbolizes 'purity of heart.' If a person is dead to sin, and alive to Christ, the fact may be 'signified' by baptism; but the principle thing symbolized by baptism is the *death* of the person to sin, and resurrection to a new life. No where in the New Testament does baptism symbolize the work of the spirit.

"We object to the theory that baptism is to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of our Saviour, as the procuring cause of inward purity." Because we regard it as having no solid foundation in the Scriptures. We are aware, however, that by a singular construction of the passages in Romans and Colossians, which we have already examined as teaching the mode of baptism, this view of the design, also, is supposed to be taught."

There are two fallacies in the above paragraph. He quotes from a reply of Professor Ripley, as inserted by the Baptist Editor of Comprehensive Commentary, vol. 5, page 429, thus: "This is a token of our recognizing Christ's death, and burial, and resurrection on account of sin." He acknowledges, in a footnote, that "some immersionists now contend (as if Prof. Ripley was not a living minister) that baptism is only to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ; still as he finds this in the Bap. Ed. of the Commentary, and thinks he can use it, he employs it through the whole of his discourse, as a full expression of Baptist doctrine, as to the design of baptism. The fallacy does not stop here. Prof. Ripley says: 'This is a token of our recognizing Christ's death, &c.' The language of Dr. Ripley refers exclusively to the *faith* of the person baptized, in the efficacy of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, as the ground of his hope. M., however, does not scruple to change the verbiage of the quotation as suits him, using the phrase—'token of Christ's death,—' to represent the death of Christ, &c. Now let the Baptist doctrine be what it may, this unfair, not to say dishonest, use of a quotation, exposes our author to the severest animadver-

sions upon his moral integrity, and, by consequence, annihilates all his arguments and conclusions based upon such false premises. No Baptist will deny that the faith which would entitle a person to baptism, must recognize the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, as well as his life; but no Baptist would maintain that baptism was a symbol of all these. The Scriptures represent baptism as figurative of the *burial and resurrection* of Christ, and so Baptists teach. We teach also, that the Eucharist represents the bloody scene of the cross, and in the two ordinances, the whole work of redemption is figured forth.

In the same article of Dr. Ripley, this sentiment is expressed: "The idea of purity is, by no means, and never to be overlooked; in connection with that, however, baptism is to be regarded as reminding us of the manner in which purity is to be obtained, namely, through the death and resurrection of Christ."

M. only quotes this passage from where the double quotation marks are; leaving out the preceding, so essential to the meaning; and assumes that the Baptists regard baptism as a symbol of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; as a "procuring cause, only, of inward purity." Such miserable garbling is unworthy of a christian minister.

Having answered all that has any pretensions to argumentation, on the texts in Rom. and Col., from the pen of M., in my response to what he formerly said upon those passages, I might dismiss them here, and simply quote up to him a few Pedobaptist authors. I will, however, briefly notice what he says on Col. 2: 11. After quoting the verse, he adds: "There is evidently an allusion here, and also in the passage from Romans, to the death of sin, and the cleansing of the heart by the power of the Holy Ghost, which is signified by the circumcision of Christ, (or baptism)."

Here, again, he interpolates the Scripture, by inserting—baptism—in the place of—the circumcision of Christ. Had he said that he supposed the circumcision of Christ meant baptism, it would have been regarded as an expression of his opinion only; but that his readers would have seen that it was not scripture, and his aim would be lost; hence, he makes no distinction between what he quotes and what he says, except a parenthesis. M. may be able to sustain his own conscience for taking such liberties with the Scriptures, but he cannot, when detected, escape the censures of his honest readers.

In the passage referred to, the Apostle says: "ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands." M. says the circumcision is baptism, which is performed by human hands. The Apostle continues: "in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." M. says all this is done by baptism—ritanism in his creed. Verily, this is baptismal regeneration unmasked.—All this our author has said, with Rom. 2: 28, 29, before his eyes, where the Apostle declares that outward circumcision is not the characteristic of a gospel Jew; but he is a Jew, that is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart." Baptism follows the circumcision of Christ, in the passage in Colossians, and so it does in Baptist practice,—the circumcised, or renewed heart, always precedes in Baptist economy, the rite of baptism. I will here quote an extract or two from Macknight, a distinguished Presbyterian divine and commentator, on the passage in Rom. 6: 3, 4, in part:

"Have been baptized into his death,—in our baptism, have been represented, emblematically, as put to death with him. Hence, it is said in verse 4, we have been buried together with him by baptism into his death; and verse 5, planted together in the likeness of his death, also of his resurrection; and verse 8, though we have died with Christ. See Rom. 7: 4, note 2. From all which, it appears, that baptism—the rite of initiation into the Christian Church—is an emblematical representation of our union with Christ, as members of his body, and of the malignity of sin in bringing death upon Christ, (ver. 10.) and upon all mankind, and of the efficacy of Christ's death in procuring for all the resurrection from the dead."

"Verse 4.—Buried together with him by baptism. Christ's baptism was not the baptism of repentance, for he never committed any sin; but he submitted to be baptized, that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection. In like manner, the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial, and resurrection. (See Col. 2: 12, note 1.) Perhaps, also, it is a commemoration of Christ's baptism."

On the 5th verse he says: "Have been planted together in the likeness of his death.—The burying of Christ, and of believers, first in the waters of baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is fully enough compared to the planting of seeds in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a revivification to a state of greater perfection."

I have given a part only of the exposition of each of the verses referred to, and must deny myself for the sake of conciseness, the pleasure of quoting from his exposition of Col. 2: 12, to which he refers. But this high Presbyterian authority for the interpretation of these passages of Scripture, to which might be added many more, should be sufficient to convince every unprejudiced mind of the high sectarian prejudices of M. and his endorsers, and of their consequent disqualification to teach the theology of the Bible. A short quotation from Adam Clarke's comment on Col. 2: 12 is all that I will offer, at this time, to show that the Baptist interpretation of the passages under consideration is sustained by the best writers and commentators among the Pedobaptist themselves; and that, consequently, M. is in gross error. Clarke says:

"Col. 2: 12. Buried with him by baptism. Alluding to the immersions practiced in the case of adults, wherein the person appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth. His rising again the third day, and their emerging from the water, was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and in them of a total change of life." But Mr. Morrow once more—says:

any of these things. It is often used to signify the cleansing operations of the spirit, purification, &c., but the use of water in any way, as a symbol, is never mentioned in connection with the death, burial and resurrection of any one."

(To be continued.)

### Mr. Frelinghuysen on Prohibition.

At the late New-Jersey State Temperance Convention at New-Brunswick, Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen delivered the following address: Mr. President: I always rejoice in the privilege of meeting a Temperance Association. It brings me near to an enterprise of mercy, that seeks the deliverance of our fellow-men from an evil, among the most afflictive, to all our interests for this world and the world to come.

The Prohibitory Law against all traffic in intoxicating liquors as beverage, has been assailed as unconstitutional, and it behooves temperance men to review the case, and examine foundations upon which it rests.

I propose, therefore, very briefly to urge the arguments which sustain the law; and to show that the Legislature not only hold the authority, but are bound in public duty to prohibit the commerce. They pronounce it to be a nuisance. If this be true, all must agree that it may be lawfully forbidden, and abated.—Whatever impairs the public health or corrupts the public morals, is a nuisance. The oldest law writers on this subject define it in such terms. A few simple illustrations will make it clear. A business, rightful in itself, will become a nuisance should it be misplaced. The location of a butcher's slaughter-house on the street of a town or city thickly settled is a nuisance; it impairs the health and disturbs the comfort of the people. Now, here is a lawful pursuit. We must have butchers and butchers' slaughter-house—and yet even this may be restrained by the act of the Legislature under heavy penalties, if put in a wrong place; and the like law as to the soap-boiler—on the great principle, that the place of such business must yield to the health of the community.

So with card-playing; why, there is no harm in the cards nor the house of them, except the waste of time and thought. But if a man sets up a gaming-table, and draws in the young, and entices men from their homes and families to play for money or its worth, it is a flagrant nuisance, to be put down as a corrupter of the morals. It leads to idleness and vice and profligate manners. It assaults the virtue of any people; and the Legislature as the guardian of the public well should suppress it. And the race-course belongs to the same class.—A man may try the speed of his horse on his farm or on the highway. It is lawful; he may indulge in the amusement without ermination. But should he step a little farther and challenge to a public race, when bets are to be made, or when without that, large numbers are to be gathered, it is a nuisance—a wholesale demoralizer. It tempts industry away from safe and honorable business—it invites the young and unwary to doubtful and corrupting companionship, opens the door and paves the way to all manner of evil. The Legislature from the first forbid it in our own State. At one short period they were prevailed on to repeal the no-license law; but this opened such a floodgate to the influx of dissipation, gambling, intoxication and depravity, that they soon restored the law to our statute book with increased penalties. And if they may subject to heavy penalties persons engaged in this unlawful business, what is there in intoxicating liquor bought to be sold contrary to law, to move the law-makers to any partial legislation exempting this scourge of our race. And if stolen goods may be searched for anywhere, on a magistrate's warrant, after oath made by a credible witness of his belief that they are so concealed, whence can arise any apology for rum thus concealed for unlawful sale. The case of lotteries gives a striking analogy. Our statutes forbid the setting up of lotteries. A lottery is a nuisance, because it entices men to put their earnings to the decisions of chance, and this in itself is corrupting—and because it tempts them to idleness and neglect of all domestic duty, and therefore it is prohibited.—And inasmuch as any attempt to regulate such an enterprise would be vain, the Legislature would eradicate the evil and forbid under penalty the sale of lottery tickets.

It is perceived, therefore, that matters and pursuits rightful in themselves, become nuisances as they injuriously affect health or morals. And this feature of legislative power may be seen in our oldest codes of law, applied also to other kindred cases—indeed, the doctrine may be traced far into past ages of the common law. It is rooted in the first principles of public duty and enlightened conscience.

Now the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage, tried by these great rules, stands at the head of all mischievous trades. We have the experience of more than sixty years, that it has been always regarded as an insidious enemy to public health, purity, and peace. The Legislature for all that time and longer, has been engaged in the fruitless attempt to regulate the business by license to a selected few, by prohibitions against sales by small measures, and by frowns against any sales without license. And the evil has grown stronger, year after year, and has become a monster, almost defying law and public sentiment. More than one hundred groggeries in New-Brunswick, more than seven hundred in Newark, and multiplied all over our own State, corrupting the morals and destroying the health of our people as no other practice, trade, or habit could do, and as all together have never done. Talk of regulation—it laughs at regulation—it fattens upon it. Thirteen of our States have yielded with sad, yet deep convictions to the truth, that no remedy can reach the mischief, but an absolute prohibition of the traffic.—They prohibit all sales of lottery tickets, because such sales would perpetuate lotteries—so they prohibited all sales of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, because, they see and know that any mere regulation will sustain the trade and perpetuate the wasting mischief.

The clause of forfeiture of the liquor sellers to have alarmed some minds, besides counselors who have spoken through the press. A moment's thought will relieve the fear. There is no magic terror in the word. For what is a fine but a forfeiture of so much of a man's property to the State. Suppose that in the law against horse racing, the law-makers had assessed the fine according to the worth of the horse—say, for instance, \$1,000—would it not be taking the property of the transgressor quite as really and substantially as by forfeiting the horse and mares. It is "taking my property," says the objector: and is not every fine taking away your property? Yes, and if it does not arrest the forbidden race or prohibited sale, the law may take your person next, and that, together with your property, put the one on the Public Treasury and the other in the Public Prison—and until the authority of the law is maintained and vindicated.

The true nature and just aim of all sound government is to guard the rights, interests, and morals of the community, watchfully and faithfully. I said the interest of the people, when no direct question of morals can be raised, but only considerations of comfort and well-being.—Hence it is that to kill game, or to fish for shad after a certain day, exposes to a penalty; and in all matters touching the public welfare, the Legislature have the authority and have immemorably exercised it. And all considerations men should give the law their aid and countenance for the sake of a greater good. Granted that the use of wine in itself is a lawful indulgence, yet if its tendency is injurious, if it leads to other excesses, if it opens the way for the poisonous adulteration of wines (as it does most graciously,) and of all exciting liquors—as Paul did in his day so should we. Who would not deny himself to save a friend? to save his country; and who can gravely maintain that the sale of intoxicating liquors is not harmful, and most destructive of health, character, and domestic comfort. I would fetch melancholy arguments from the tears of neglected families—broken-hearted wives and starving children—from the poor-house, the prison, and the graveyard—I would ask, for the sake of human nature, if it be not time to abolish forever this ruinous traffic? And to accomplish it we must stand together—we must raise a pure and lofty standard, and then lead, and not wait to follow public opinion. And this without dread of a little extravagance. A cause that is worthy of a hearty support, will always kindle enthusiasm, and this sometimes be followed by occasional extravagance. If a reformation did not kindle warmth in the bosom, it would be a very strong proof that it had no great merit. I would wish it to glow with an ardent enthusiasm, and prompt to vigorous, unflinching, self-forgetting action. Let the same spirit which animated our forefathers in the struggles of the Revolution, shape our Temperance enterprise. They threw overboard the tea into the ocean, not from any spite against the tea, but for the great doctrine which opened that eventful drama. They thereby declared to the world, and the world perceived with what determination, that they would neither pay the tax nor drink the tea. So may we finally resolve in this purpose of mercy, and seek God's blessing, without which no enterprise can prosper, and with which none can fail.

From the Christian Sun.

### Slavery and Abolitionism.

The abolitionists say that the relation between Master and Servant is sinful. This they affirm without qualification. If so now, it was always so. Then, of course the Apostles winked at the sin in their Epistles and preaching. Admit this and it leads us into infidelity. If the relation was sinful, why did not Paul tell Timothy so when writing to him on the subject of the duty of both Master and Slaves? 1st Tim. VI. 1, 5, "Let as many servants (Greek *Doulos* slaves) as are under the yoke, count their own Masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service because they are beloved and beloved partakers of the benefits (beloved of God and all his faithful followers partakers of all the benefits of the gospel dispensation, but hated by all the abolitionists, and denied all the benefits of the grace of the dispensation of mercy.)

These things teach and exhort. If any man teaches otherwise and consents not to wholesome words even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud knowing nothing, but doing about questions and strifes, of words, whereby envying, strife, railings, evil surmising, prevents disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; from such withdraw thyself."

If the abolitionists do not fill by the measure of the description here given by Paul, I want to know who do? For the very things effected by the contrary teaching described here by Paul, are the very things effected by the abolitionists, and of course must be the men referred to. For by their fruits we are to know them. They have sowed discord among brethren religiously and politically, which thing the Lord hates. Thus we see that a man can own slaves and be "beloved" while an abolitionist that sows in discord in both Church and State is hated. I will now add Adam Clarke's note on the above passage of Scripture to show that I am not alone, in regard to the above meaning of the Apostles. The word *Doulos* here means slaves converted to the christian faith; and the *zeugon*—or yoke is the state of slavery; and by Despotial master, depots we are to understand the Heathen masters of those christianized slaves, such Denominations are commanded to treat their masters with all honor and respect that the name of God, by which they were called, and the doctrine of God, christianity, which they had professed might not be blasphemed; might not be evil spoken of in consequence of their improper conduct. Civil rights are never abolished by any communications from God's Spirit, the civil state which a man was before his conversion, is not altered by that conversion nor does the grace of God absolve him from any claim which either the state or his kingdom may have on him. All these outward things continue unaltered. Verse 2. And they that have believing masters, who have been lately converted as well as themselves, let them

not despise them; supposing themselves to be their equals, because they are not brethren in Christ; and grounded their opinion on this, that in him there is neither male nor female; bond nor free, but all are equal as to their spiritual privileges and state; yet there still continues in the order of God's providence, a great disparity in their station; for the master must even be, in this sense superior to the servants. But rather do them service, obey them the more cheerfully, because they are faithful and beloved faithful to God's grace, beloved by him and his true followers. Partakers of the benefits [joint partakers of the benefits refers to the grace of the gospel, to common salvation of believing masters and slaves. Verse 3. If any man teach otherwise.] It appears that there were teachers of a different kind in the church, a sort of religious levelers, who preached that the converted servant had as much right to his master's service as the master had to his. Teachers of this kind have been in vogue long since the days of Paul and Timothy. I am not as yet convinced that there is sinfulness in the relation, that master and slave stand in to each other until the rules laid down by Christ and his apostles, be transgressed either by the master illtreating his slave, or the slave disobeying the master if not in the thing of slavery but the abuse of the slave. The scriptures are a sufficient rule for both master and slave, and let both remember that they must stand before the judgment seat of the Son of God. If abolitionism were carried into effect what would we see? thousands of human beings destitute of a home starvation while an incumbered train of evils must follow; nearly two thirds would be thrown on the band of the other for maintenance on the free States, for if the masters were to employ them it would be the best plan, then old age and children would be left in a suffering state, the only safe plan is to colonize them when a colony is prepared, or ship them to Liberia and that will have to be very gradual, for it will be a long time before they are capable of self government. Richard Lander says, from the time that he was in Nigritia with Capt. Clapperton to the time of his return was three years, every governor and ruler was assassinated within three years, not one was left alive, and that too, by their own subjects, mostly three hundred says Lander, was in reserve in Badagang to be sacrificed upon the altar of the God of war to favor the intended expedition against the Brother of the Prince of Badagang.

ENOCH HARVEY, Sr.  
McDONALD, Hardin Co., Ohio.

### The Poison Bush.

At a recent Sabbath school anniversary in B., the R. Dr. H. related the following interesting fact: During a visit he made to the Bahama Islands, a shower of rain unexpectedly fell. Such an occurrence is very rare at the Islands except during the rainy season, and is regarded with great dread by the natives, who as rapidly as possible seek the nearest shelter.

On this occasion, a little colored boy was caught in the shower at a distance from home, and having no place to go to for protection, except under a bush that was near. Its foliage, however, was dense enough to keep him from the rain, and he was wet by the water trickling through the leaves. Unfortunately for him the bush was a *poison bush*, and the water falling on the leaves caused the poison to strike into his little limbs, so that in a short time he was dead.

After the shower, he was found and carried to his home. Dr. H. was requested to attend his funeral. The circumstances of his singular death excited the Doctor's curiosity, and he wished to learn something more about the fatal poison bush. An aged negro told him that it grew abundantly upon the island, but that by its side there always grew another bush which was an *antidote*; and that if the little boy had known it and had rubbed himself with the leaves of the healing bush, the poison would have done him no harm.

What an illustration is this of the sad fate of those who have been *poisoned by sin*, and know not how to escape from its dreadful consequences. But for this fatal poison there is a sure remedy, provided by the same God who placed the antidote beside the poison bush.—The cross of Christ is the Tree of Life. Let the suffering and the dying come to that, and they shall be saved, for "its leaves are for the healing of the nations."

N. Y. Evangelist.

### Domestic Happiness.

Ah! what so refreshing, so soothing, so satisfying, as the placid joys of home? See the traveler—does duty call him for a season to leave his beloved circle? The image of his earthly happiness continues vivid in his remembrance; quickens him to diligence; it makes him hail the hour which sees his purpose accomplished, and his face turned towards home; it commences with him as he journeys, and he hears the promise which causes him to hope, "thou shalt know also that thy tabernacle, shall be in peace, and thou shalt visit thy tabernacle, and not sin." O! the joyful reunion of a divided family—the pleasures of a renewed interview and conversation after days of absence!

Behold the man of science; he drops the laborious and painful research, closes his volume, smooths his wrinkled brow, leaves his study, and unbending himself, stoops to the spectacles yields to the wishes, and mingles with the diversions of his children.

Take the man of trade, what reconciles him to the toll of business? What enables him to endure the fatigues and impertinence of customers? What rewards him for so many hours of tedious confinement? By and by, in the season of intercourse, he will behold the desire of his eyes, and the children of his love for whom he resigns his ease; and in their welfare and smiles he will find recompense.

Yonder comes the laborer; he has borne the burden and heat of the day, the descending sun has released him of toil, and he is hastening home to enjoy repose. Half-way down the lane by the side of which stands his cottage, his children run to meet him. One he carries, and one he leads. The companion of his humble life is ready to furnish him with his plain repast—See his toil-worn countenance assume an air of cheerfulness. His hardships are for-