

THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

J. J. JAMES, Editor.

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

J. J. JAMES & Co., Proprietors

VOLUME XX. NO. 48.

RALEIGH, N. C., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1855.

WHOLE NO. 118

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 J. J. James & 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 carrying it uncalled for, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

For the Recorder.

DEAR BRO. EDITOR:—Having seen so great a predilection in some of our Baptists to ecclesiastical supremacy, which I regard as a departure from the old ancient landmarks of our forefathers, I have been induced to send you the following thoughts on Church Government, or the apostolic mode of church discipline.

1. Then all church power, i. e., the power which Jesus Christ has delegated to her for administering her laws, resides in the Church itself. Of course all church questions are to be determined by the church, or the voice of the majority, independent of any control or prohibition, either of church officers or council. This is a point for which our Fathers earnestly contended, against both prelates and presbyterians. It is the great point now in debate concerning both a civil and religious office, whether the power of government is conferred by the people on the officers, or whether the privileges are conferred to the people by the rulers. Most denominations of christians hold that church power originally belonged to an imaginary body called the church universal, or to the superior officers of the church, and is thence dispersed to others; so that particular congregations or churches are formed under them, and receive all power to act from this superior authority. We as Baptists claim to be a christian commonwealth, we hold no human founder. There is no one living or dead, on whose opinions we confide as that of Calvin for the Presbyterians, Wesley for the Methodists, or Luther for the Lutherans. We claim as our only head Christ the Lord.

2ndly. That all church questions are to be determined in the church itself by the voice or vote of the brotherhood according to our Fathers, Williams, Baxter, Owens, Hooker and Cotton, all Congregationalists. The province of the church officers is to preside and to execute, but for any of them within called prelates or Elders, or preachers, or deacons, or committees to claim the prerogative of acting for the church as a matter of right, is usurpation.

And for the brotherhood to give it up to their rulers as a matter of convenience, or to save themselves the labor and responsibility of self-government, is a dissertation of duty. Our Fathers held that the Lord Jesus Christ has laid upon the church the duty of watching over her own members, of administering discipline, and of choosing and removing their officers as an important exercise of christian graces, and a discretionary means of sanctification. As we have said before, we have no superior but the Lord Jesus Christ. We profess to be constituted under his laws, and subject to no other authoritative control than his. Every church is complete in itself, and has all the authority which can reside in any organized body of believers; and is competent to perform all church acts, without warrant from any superior church authority. The whole authority residing in the church, and being placed there by Jesus Christ, it follows of course that no other earthly tribunal is competent to reverse the determination of the church, and any authoritative decrees of a Bishop, or prelate, or presbytery, committee or council, purporting to control or revise the acts of the church, are acts of usurpation and merely void.

3rd. The largeness of the church gives no additional authority; it is still a church, and nothing more, whether it embraces the occupants of "an upper chamber," or the professed believers of a city, a province, or an empire.

The only church which our Lord has appointed or recognized as an organized corporation, possessing church power are all an equality; and according to the principles of the Baptists, all councils, convocations, presbyteries, classes, conferences, synods, or whatever they may be called, composed of delegates from many churches, whether they are officers or private, have no authority, but are advisory councils.

In cases of discipline, they may be sought for from other churches in the above sense. The power of censure still remains in the particular church, and whatever the ecclesiastical council may determine, their acts have no force until adopted by the church, and of course the church may adopt them or not, according to her own judgment.

This is grounded on Matthew 18: 17, "and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; and if he will not hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican." We as Baptists think this a divine warrant for making the voice of the church decisive in all cases. We regard all rehearsals before councils only aids to the church to come to proper determination; and all appeals, properly so called, carrying the final act away from the church to some other body, are but human devices to improve the institution of Christ.

So far as the reason of the thing is concerned, we approve of the Scripture plan; for it is more likely that cases will be determined right by a man's neighbors, than by strangers; that the advice of other churches is the best safeguard against error; that if we carry a case ever so far by appeals, the farther we carry it, the less practicable it is to make the tribunal, whatever it be, liable to err, and its errors cannot be corrected this side the judgment seat.

While the evil consequences of the error to an individual or a church are more likely to be remedied, if the decision of the church is final, we think that, so far as experience and observation go to prove anything, are as safe here as under any other government, and as likely to receive the protecting care of his Master, if he lives as he ought. And, moreover, no authoritative act could make us close our eyes to the grievous wrongs of compelling a whole to walk in fellowship with a man whom they conscientiously believe to have been convicted, on sufficient evidence of crime which rendered him unworthy of the communion of saints.

But what settles the question in our view, is that power of the church itself, to choose its officers and execute discipline is a delegated power derived from the authority of Christ, and consequently they have no right to delegate their power and transfer their responsibility to others.

The truth is, a particular Church is the highest tribunal, before whom the party may be brought, and if difficulties arise in the proceedings, the council may be called for from other churches to clear the truth; but the power, of course, rests still in the church, where Christ pleased it.

She, the church, is so far subject to the union of churches, that she is bound, in cases of doubt and difficulty, to crave the council, and if it be according to God, to follow it; and if she shall err from the rule, and continue obstinate therein, they have the right to renounce the right hand of fellowship with her.

The obligation of churches to perform the various acts of fellowship arising from the relation to each other and to their common Lord, it does not arise from any express agreement to be in fellowship; nor does it depend on the more or less complete coincidence in our views and practice; but on the simple fact that they are churches of Christ. As such they have a common interest, are pursuing a common object, possess a common character, serve a common Lord, and live in a common hope. And their relations are such, that each is deeply interested in the welfare of the other. If one suffer by delusion, error, iniquity, or persecution, all suffer, for the cause suffers.

In conclusion, I would refer you to Paul in proof of what I have written. If he had no authority over Peter, yet when he saw him not walking right, he publicly rebuked him before all the church; so churches have no more authority over one another than Paul had over Peter; yet, as one apostle has a right to admonish another, so one church has a right to admonish one another, and that without usurpation.

W. R. JOHNSON.

For the Recorder.

BROTHER JAMES:—In compliance with your request which came to my notice a few days ago in your most excellent paper, I will proceed to give you for publication some of the success of the protracted meetings which I had the pleasure to attend. Commencing with the Church at Colerain, Bertie county, N. C., Tuesday after the fourth Lord's day in August—it being the fourth day of the meeting, the Church renewed their efforts; it was protracted through the week. The Lord blessed his truth in awakening and in the conversion of many souls. On Sabbath morning it was my pleasure to baptize in the Chowan twenty-eight willing subjects upon a profession of faith in Christ. Ministers in attendance—Elder John Nowell, Pastor; Bro. Williams, and our much esteemed brother Elder James Delk, a day or two.

A protracted meeting held with the Church at Mt. Carmel, Northampton county, N. C., commencing on Saturday before the fourth Sabbath in September, when the Lord again blessed his truth. At the close of the meeting I had the pleasure of baptizing eighteen upon a profession of faith in Christ. Ministers in attendance—Elder John N. Hoggard, Pastor, and Elder John B. Webb.

A protracted meeting with the Church at Corinth, in Northampton county, N. C., Nineten baptized by Elder J. B. Webb. There we had the pleasure of meeting and hearing the Gospel preached in its fullness, by our brother Elder Q. H. Trotman.

Yours in gospel bonds,

R. W. DELBRIDGE.

DEAD THEATER ACTORS.—It is surprising, the amount of praise and the number of friends which distinguished stage performers receive and enjoy. It seems impossible to show them enough attention while living, but when dead or dying, how they are deserted! One of the leading New York journals says, that when the projector and builder of the Broadway Theater died, religious people, and not thespians or stage actors, attended his funeral. At another New York paper, in a notice of the death of T. G. Booth, a great comedian, at Toronto, Canada, August 18th, says, that his remains were brought for interment to New York city, his birthplace, and that at the performances of his funeral ceremonies, there was almost utter absence of all members or admirers of the theatrical profession. Strange, yet how true the adage, "The world will love life and forsake in death!"

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE LIFE.—Earth is only a lodging place for the Christian; his home is in heaven. This world is but a shadow, the other world a substance. So John Owen the profound theologian and humble Christian felt in his last hours, for it is related of him that when he was on his dying bed, awaiting his speedy dissolution, he dictated a short letter to a friend. The amanuensis had written, "I am yet in the land of the living." He at once arrested him, saying, "Stop, after that write, I am yet in the land of the living, but hope soon to be in the land of the living."

SALUTE OF MISSIONARIES.—The Rev. A. D. Phillips and lady of the State of Georgia, and Mr. J. P. Beaumont, of Alabama, have been in this city for a few days past, arranging for their departure as missionaries to Africa. They are destined to Yoruba, and will be associated there with Rev. Messrs. Bowen and Clark, under the direction of the Southern Baptist Convention. Interesting services took place in connection with the regular concert, on last Sunday evening, at the first Baptist Church, (Dr. Cone's) when they were especially commended to God by prayer, addresses being made to the congregation by Rev. J. S. Beecher, the renowned missionary from Barnab, and Rev. James B. Taylor, Corresponding Secretary of the Southern Baptist Convention. A Karen convert was also present, and addressed a few words to the assembly.

The missionaries to Africa, called yesterday by the bark Mendel, for Lagos, whence they will pass by way of Abbeokuta, to Ibadan, the station they are to occupy, 150 miles from the coast.—N. Y. Examiner.

From the Index.

The Preaching of Funeral Sermons Unscriptural and Evil in its Tendency.

I am aware that the heading of this article contains a somewhat startling announcement. Many will be surprised to see it, while others will ponder and reflect seriously on the subject. The truth is, whole communities may be so far led astray by popular error and excitement as scarcely to perceive the truth when plainly presented. There is, in many localities, a perfect mania on the subject of Funeral Sermons. I have many objections to the practice, though I have sometimes been guilty of the inconsistency of doing what my own conscience does not heartily approve.

The first objection is, that it is unscriptural. In vain have I searched the Old and New Testament for evidence to support the long and dearly cherished custom. With this confession, many, no doubt, will be astounded. Is it possible that so many good men of all persuasions have so long practiced that which is not authorized by the Scriptures? Is it possible that the Baptists, who claim to be governed exclusively by the word of God, have so long practiced it without authority from the Divine Record? These things are so, and yet I cannot account for it. The fact that the Bible nowhere authorizes the custom should be a sufficient reason for its discontinuance, at least among Baptists.

The second, and a very important objection, is, that it is a relic of Popery. I am not for condemning indiscriminately every thing sanctioned by the Pope. If we have not the Divine sanction for it, we have sufficient reason for its rejection. This relic should not have been continued—should never have been brought out of Rome. It was a regulation in the church of Rome to celebrate mass for the dead, which is to go through the representation of the passions of Christ, to offer up prayers for the dead. The Romish idea is, that there are many sins committed by the saints of too trivial a character to deserve eternal punishment. Hence the place of purgatory, or a place of purifying was established, in which they might expiate their offenses. The priest-hood claims the power, by the ceremony of mass, to release the soul from its purgatorial prison. Thus the priest makes merchandise of souls. There is no difficulty in releasing the soul, if by a surviving friend the "one thing needful" is placed in the hands of the priest. But now what connection, some of our good brethren will ask, has purgatory with the simple act of preaching Funeral Sermons in memory of the dead. Disguise the subject as you may, apologise for it as best you can, and there is in the mind of many, a latent idea that the soul will not be quite so well off if the funeral is not preached. The widow speaks to her Pastor on his visit, and says, I wish you would preach my husband's funeral. It seems that I cannot be satisfied if I do not have it preached. Why not satisfied? Is it an imperative duty enjoined by the Scriptures? No. What then? We have but one alternative, and that is some undefinable good that is to result to the departed spirit. The unlettered negro approaches his pastor and says, I wish you would give out an appointment on such a Sabbath for brother Jordan, or brother Charles, or brother Gabriel, or brother Some-body-else, for a funeral occasion. I want my child's funeral preached. The pastor asks him why he wants it preached. The servant responds that he thinks it right. He does not know what good it will do, but he feels that he cannot be satisfied if it is not done. You may see, as I think I have seen all the time in the black man's countenance, that he expects some good to result to the child. The pastor further asks,—Do you not think your child is gone to heaven? If so, what good can the sermon do the child? Oh, says the servant, it will benefit the living. Benefit the living, responds the pastor, do not all gospel sermons benefit the living? Yes; but says the servant, the funeral will draw out a much larger number of people. The object is then to draw out the people in great numbers. This leads me to notice another objection to Funeral Sermons, that is, it leads persons to disparage the ordinary means of grace, to look for all the good from those extraordinary gatherings called funeral occasions. It seems, that one object had in view, is to create an artificial stimulus to induce people to go to church, which the ordinary means does not produce. It creates itching ears—a perpetual desire for something new—vain curiosity, an insatiable restlessness and craving for that excitement which these occasions usually afford.—The humble pastor who is faithful and punctual to his appointments, and of equal ability to, if not in many cases superior to those who are constantly engaged in preaching funeral sermons, has often to preach to empty walls, for no other reason than that there is a funeral to be preached in the neighborhood, at a church, too; it may be of another persuasion. The writer of this essay knows a minister who preached to a church located in a community noted for funeral sermons in the churches round him. He has frequently been pained to meet his own members returning from the Methodist church, after closing a very laborious and earnest discourse to the empty benches.—He, with many of his brethren, think that, in this case, funeral sermons or occasions, are mere "clap-trap," if you will suffer the expression. The writer heard a good preacher once make use of this very truthful remark, "The Methodists can surely get up more extra occasions to draw off the Baptist congregations than any people in the world." If the funeral sermon is to excite curiosity, to draw out the people, I think they are of very questionable propriety. I am led to the belief that the object is to draw out a crowd for two reasons: First, They never fail to attract a crowd.—Second, They are very frequently appointed, when it is known they will seriously affect, if not break up the congregation of others; if ministers wish to benefit the people, and secure a permanently good congregation, let them preach Jesus Christ and him crucified—let them not labor so much to create artificial excitement. This never produces permanent results. Cultivate in the people a reverence for those sublime truths taught by Christ and his Apostles—get the people to love those truths, and you will need no extra stimulus to get the people together.

Another objection is, that they usually stand

in the way of other sermons, which are always necessary for the advancement of Christ's Kingdom. The pastor prepares his mind to instruct his congregation on some important topics, which is necessary for their edification—their improvement and their progress in the divine life, when behold some friend wishes, on that day, a funeral to be preached! The pastor cannot well refuse, yet it disconcerts all his arrangements, and perhaps no one even gratified, beyond the immediate family of the deceased.

4. My next objection is, that funeral sermons usually are productive of no good. This would seem to be begging the question, but let us examine. I have been a somewhat close observer for several years—have heard many experiences, have baptized many, but never have heard the first experience date at a funeral discourse; but have heard many experiences that were dated at sermons delivered on ordinary occasions. This is quite remarkable, when we consider the great number of funeral sermons we are accustomed to hear in all the churches, and the great excitement produced at them. This all goes to prove that it is not of God, and he will not give it the seal of his approbation. The feeling attending those occasions is not the feeling of contrition for sins. Those sobs and cries come not from heart-broken, on account of sins, but it is mere sympathy—a mere animal excitement, that ends not in any permanently good results.

The example is injurious, particularly to the black population. Among them, it is a perfect mania. In some localities, they can't be induced to attend an ordinary meeting, not even if the ablest minister is to preach, but will walk fifteen or twenty miles to hear a negro preacher deliver a senseless harangue in the name of a funeral sermon. The poor negro is excited, as the case may be, but I fear the most of it is delusion. The preaching of funerals among the blacks, is a great nuisance. All can see this, and yet it never can be cured, until a reformation commences among the whites.

With these evils before us, it is strange that our ministers have not long since given it up. There are, I imagine, but few ministers that differ materially with me on this subject, for I have often heard their expressions; but yet there is but little reformation. It may originate from two causes: 1st. Ministers are asked by the bereaved, to preach the funerals of their friends, and they dislike to hurt their feelings. 2d. It is a source of some pecuniary gain—some ministers receive large fees. One minister told me, on a certain occasion, that if it had not been for his funeral fees, he could not have supported his family. I live on a small salary, but have never received a cent for preaching funerals, but have refused it when offered. The churches ought so far to relieve the wants of their pastors, as to render the extra fees unnecessary.

In the maintenance of these views, I may be asked, what sort of service I would have performed on the death of an individual. I would say, let the minister or some official active member of the church be called upon to deliver an exhortation, sing a song, and offer up prayer for the consolation and warning of the living. There is no need of delivering an eulogy on the dead; for if he does not deserve it, it has a bad influence—if he does deserve it, the people all know it. The last thing that is said about the dead, is generally best. When a funeral of a loose professor is preached, if he is extolled above measure, it gives the world false views of christian character. If he is a wicked man, and the minister says much in his favor, he will be subject to the charge of dissembling; if he paints out his true character, the friends will take offence.

Taking all the circumstances under consideration, I am fully persuaded that the Christian world would be much better off, if they would dispense with preaching funeral sermons. I have ventured thus to give my views upon an important subject. Thus have I endeavored to combat a popular error. Much more might be said. I invite your intelligent, your well informed correspondents to give their views on this subject.

Hamilton, Ga.

INQUIRER.

A very Important Query—Again.

How should Pedobaptists and Campbellites be received into Baptist churches? We sent the above to the Herald a few weeks since, and begged the views of its editor and correspondents. Those views have not been given. We repeat the request. Our reason for doing so is, that in some sections of our state our brethren are in great trouble, as to what course they ought to pursue towards applicants from other denominations. I see from the Western Recorder that numerous additions are being made to the Baptist churches in Kentucky from the Campbellites. Will one of the editors of the Recorder tell us how they are received?

November, 1855.

When, a few weeks ago, we gave the above query a place in the Herald, we were about to leave for the Dover Association, and could not conveniently respond to it. Moreover, having on a previous occasion, but a few years ago, answered a similar query, we deemed it less necessary to recur to the subject again. We presumed, too, that some of our brethren, in whose churches such cases have occurred, would respond to the inquiry, and inform "Inquirer" what course they had adopted when such persons had applied for membership.

Our churches being independent bodies, and our associations having specified no definite course in reference to such cases, we presume such applications, have been decided each on its own merits, on different grounds, and in diverse ways. As far as we can learn, there has been no uniformity, in reference to this matter, either in our own or other states. Any opinion we could give, or any suggestion we may make in response to such an enquiry, is only an individual one, and will be heeded only so far as it accords with the views of our readers.

The above remarks have been made in reference to the admission of Reformers; as to the reception of Pedobaptists, there ought to be no difficulty, nor want of uniformity. Unbaptized, in our estimation, we cannot receive them unless they consent to be immersed.—Baptism with us being a pre-requisite to membership, and deeming nothing else but immer-

sion on a personal profession of faith, as a scriptural baptism, unless they give us a reason for the hope that is in them, and have a well grounded assurance that they have passed from death unto life, we can neither receive nor baptize them. We ought at least to examine every applicant on this important point, and ascertain the fact that they are believers or regenerated persons.

This is more necessary as the conditions on which individuals are admitted to membership, vary in the Pedobaptist denominations. One great mission of the Baptists has been for the last three hundred years to assert the great cardinal, vital truth, that none but converted persons are entitled to membership in the church. That neither baptism, confirmation, nor any other rite, is valid ground for admitting to membership, without the new birth. The Congregational, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed Churches, in this country, admit and act on this scriptural doctrine. Individuals coming from those churches, might be received without question—though we think that an enquiry may with propriety be made. Other churches have to some extent adopted this view, but not thoroughly. The Episcopal has two divisions, High and Low Churchmen—the latter evangelical, the former resting on baptismal regeneration. The German Reformed has recently manifested a tendency to place an undue reliance on the efficacy of ordinances. The Lutheran church has two parties—evangelical and anti-evangelical. The Methodist Church occupies an anomalous position. In some respects orthodox and evangelical—in actual practice, loose and disjointed. Admitting seekers on trial, avowedly not converted persons, and at the end of a few months, still frequently as seekers admitting them into full membership. Not unusually is the remark made in their obituary notices, that A. B. was converted after being a member of the church, for one or more years. Some of their preachers, invite persons to the communion table not even seekers or penitent, on the plea that it may perchance result in their conversion. This church, according to their own showing, comprises within its membership converted and unconverted persons; and in their case and in the others enumerated, duty and expediency alike require an examination of all applicants, prior to reception.

There is much greater difficulty in the second case—the receiving of applicants from the Reformers. In two points, both generally lacking in Pedobaptists, we concur—baptism, or immersion in water, in or into the name of Father, Son, and Spirit, on a profession of faith; but we differ radically as to the design, or end to be accomplished by baptism, and the prerequisites in the subject. That individual alone, in our view, is entitled to baptism, who has been the recipient of that faith which worketh by love and purifieth the heart, who has felt a godly sorrow for sin, repented and brought forth fruits meet for repentance; a penitent believer, who humbly trusts that he has passed from death unto life, and now desires to follow his Saviour, take his yoke upon him and obey his command—that as Christ arose from his watery tomb he may also arise to a newness of life. Baptism with us is, therefore, not a saving act—has not any pardoning, justifying, or sanctifying efficacy. It is a declaratory act of our love for trust in, and allegiance to our Lord and Master. The Reformers maintain, that through this medium remission of sin is obtained, the Holy Spirit imparted, and the subject is pardoned, justified, and sanctified; and that applicants are entitled to baptism on making the good confession, that Jesus is the Christ, and reformation of life and heart.

Three things are, in our estimation requisite to constitute a valid baptism—a fitting subject, a qualified administrator, and compliance with the rite enjoined, immersion. A believer, or converted man, in the ordinary acceptance of the term, is alone a proper subject. A duly qualified administrator must himself have been immersed on a profession of his faith in Christ a regenerated man. As to the rite enjoined, both Baptists and Reformers agree.

Most of the early preachers in the ranks of the Reformers in this state, had been Baptist ministers. Of course they were valid administrators. We presume their converts were generally converted men prior to their baptism. If not, they were baptized first, and professed to be converted by the institution, or not converted at all, we could not look upon them as authorized administrators. We presume there will be little difficulty on this point, but rather in the first position, a fitting, or scriptural subject of baptism. There is great discrepancy in the preaching and views of the Reformers. Some of them strenuously insist on reformation as well as faith, previous to baptism. Others at the close of a discourse, invite any one present to come forward, make the good confession, and be baptized; of course, there is no time given for reformation, or change of heart, when the individual is straightway hurried off to the baptismal waters. It is then only, as Mr. C. would say, a change of relation, or state. We believe most firmly and conscientiously, that if a man does not experience a change of heart, or is not converted before he descends into the water, he will not experience a change or become converted in or by his baptism. There may be a change of state from an alien to a citizen as far as church membership is concerned. We have no doubt the Reformers are equally as conscientious in their belief that baptism will effect the remission of sin. In receiving applicants into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into our fellowship, we must be governed by our views, not by theirs. If not believers or converted persons when baptized we cannot recognize them as fitting subjects for that ordinance, and therefore must regard them as still unbaptized. If we receive them on the ground that they were believers, had obtained the pardon of their sins, and deem their baptism valid, and cordially receive them into