Tkatches of Persecuted Baptists. BY ELDER GEORGE W. PUREFOY.

II. This sect" did not practise infant bap

1. This is evident from the commission of our Savior. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" &c. Matt.; 19-20. Again; Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that be-lieveth and is baptized shall be saved;" &c. Mark xvi: 15-16.

Infants are incapable of being taught, believing, or observing all things &c. therefore infants are excluded by the com mission from baptism. Whatever is left out of a commission, or a command is nec-

essarily excluded.

A commission to an agent, to employ a man and a woman, for service, is not a commission to employ infants also; this is manifest for two reasons minfants are not mentioned, neither can they render ser-

The fact that believers are specified in the commission, is a prohibition against the baptism of all others, unbelievers and infants.

This principle is recognized in every business transaction. It is only when infant baptism is the subject of controversy that the contrary is affirmed

On the day of Pentecost, "They that gladly received his word were baptized." Acts ii: 41. Had Peter been a Pedobaptist, surely he would have included infants! If he did, Luke who wrote the Acts, would have recorded it !! Only those who "gladly received his word were haptized," consequently no infants were bap

At Samaria, "When they believed, they were baptized, both men and women.' Acts viii : 12. The reason no infants were baptized along with their believing parents, was because Peter and Philip were Bap tist preachers! If they had been Pædo haptist ministers, they would have baptized many infants, and Luke would have said, men, women and children were baptized. Among the thousands that were converted on the day of Pentecost and added to the church, there must have been many parents who had infant children, the same is probable among those men and women, who believed and were baptized at Samaria. The fact that none were baptized, is fatal to infant baptism. If any had been baptized the fact would have been mentioned; for when the large multitude was fed on the five loaves and two fi-hes, it is recorded, that "they that had eaten were about five thousand men, besides women and children." Matt. avi : 21.

As the fact that children eat, was thought worthy of being mentioned in Scripture, how are we to account for the fact that none are recorded as baptized : Simply because none were baptized.

It is impossible to prove that among the household baptisms, any infants were baptized. On the contrary it is evident they were not. As to the household of Cornelius Acts x: 44 "The Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word," those baptized had "received the Holy Ghost,"

The household of Crispus gives no aid to infant baptism; for we are told "many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized." Acts xvii: 8. Of the household of Stephanas it is said "that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." I Cor. xvi: 15.

Of the jailer and his house, it is said They spake unto him the word of the Lord and to all that were in his house. He rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." Acts xvi: 32-34.

Of the house of Lydia it is said, "And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia, and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them, and departed." Acts xvi : 40.

As infants are never called brethren, or comforted by ministers, we are sure the brethren" spoken of here were adult be fievers. There is not one command or example of infant baptism in the New Testament. It has been called for by Baptists, for hundreds of years; but has never been shown. That there is no command or example for the baptism of infants in the New Testament is conceded by learned Predobaptists. Rev. Henry Ward Beecher speaks as follows:

"I concede and I assert, first, that infant baptism is nowhere commanded in the New Testament, Secondly, I affirm that, it is not safe to found it on the prac-

baptized by the apostles, there is and no express mention of any infant." His. In ant Baptism page 1.

Dr. Bond, (Mahodist), says of infant baptism "there is no positive scriptural command for it." Economy of Methodism,page 52.

on Infant Baptism page 11, says - It is a plain case, there is no express precept respecting infant baptism in our sacred

Prof. Moses Stuart says of infant baptism "commands'or plain and certain examples in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find " On Baptism page 101.

Dr. Neander, (Lutheran), in his church History, page 198, says, "It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism. We cannot prove that the apostles ordained infant baptism."

The Methodist Tract No. 188, published at the Conterence office, says, "His (Jesus) silence therefore and the silence of his apostles, are our warrant for the practice of baptizing infants."

An Episcopal Tract, called the Church man's Reasons, page 4, says, "No express mention is made in the New Testament of the baptism of infants. I have no means of proving that these households contained any young children."

The preceeding testimony establishes the identity of the apostolic and Baptist churches in opposition to infant baptism.

"This sect," in church government and discipline, practised as the Baptists do

1. During the apostolic age, the church ds were all separate and distinct bodies, each one independent of all the rest. Each congregation is called a church. "Tell it te the church," i. e. the church or congre gation of which the individual is a member. The apostles "ordained elders in every

church." Acts xiv: 23. Each individual church was to receive members. Rom. xiv: 1, to cast out the wicked I Cor. v: 4, 5, 13. See also II Cor. ii: 7-8, Acts I: 15-23 Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, Annual Conterences

That the church was an independent body is conceded by the ablest church

Geissler V. 1. chap. 3. sec 53, says. 'All the congregations (churches) were independent of one another."

Moshiem stys, "All the churches in those primitive times were independent bodies.' Eccl. His. v. I, page 86.

This is true of the Baptist churches. They are all independent bodies. It is not proper to say the Baptist church of the United States, we should say the Baptist churches of &c.

2. The New Testament churches each exercised discipline for itself.

"If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church."-Matt. xviii: 17. See also I. Cor. v: 13. Acts xiv: 23. 11. Cor. ii: 7-8. Acts i: 15-22. Acts vi: 4-5, also

3. In the apostolic age, ministers and private members acted together in eccl siastical matters. - Acts xv: 4-5-22-23.

In response to your invitation, I send you my view of Elihu briefly stated.

The questions which arise in reference to Elihu, are, 1. Who and what was the man ? 2. What is the thought-material of his discourses ! 3. What is their place in the general argument of the book of Job? 4. Who was their author ?

1. Eliku is introduced with a good deal of ceremony, as if he were a person of importance. Possibly he was of the family of Terah (Buzite,) but his genealogy is not clear. There have been various opinions as to his character: 1. He is regarded as a representaive of the false wisdom of the heathen which persecutes the apostle of God. (So some of the Fathers.) It was a fancy of some that he was identical with Balaam. 2. He is held to be an arrogant philosopher, though not a heathen (by some German rationalists.) 3. Others (chiefly Ger mans) think him a conceited young babbler. 4. He has been supposed to represent Satan. 5. On the other hand he is regarded as a modest, pious worshipper of God, and a man of profound thought. 6. Finally, he has been described as an able man of true piety, but with a good deal of confident self-asser-

This last is the view which I incline to hold. He is not immodest or impertinent, but he is conscious of power, boilthat the cases where it is implied, as in | ing over with ideas, and eager to correct the baptism of whole households, are by must be regards as a grievous religious the book. But Elihu's statement does good neither to eat flesh nor drink wine, other they still persist in their practice, knowledge or to answer vaguely. Any form of no means conclusive and without doubt, error in Job and the three friends. not account for the prosperity of the prosperity o and if there is no other basis for it than | Whether he speaks to the point will ap- | wicked, nor does it explain Job's sufferings

pear presently. tice of the apostles in the baptism of christian families. Therefore I give up that which the following is a shortoutline: 2. Elihu makes four addresses, of that God designs to try Job, to test his which has been injudiciously used as an In the first address (chs. 32,33,) after There is then something more than dis argument for infant baptism. And third- the introduction (ch. 32) in which he cipline involved, which none of the speakly, I assert that the doctrine that as a gives as reasons for entering the debate ers lay hold of. Job comes nearest to it; christian ordinance it is a substitute for that the friends had failed to answer God is preparing him for it in his almost the circumcision of the Jews, is a doctrine Job (11-15) and that he was conscious maddening suffering. Job has apparently that is niterly untenable." In Religious of having truth to utter, (16-22,) he nothing to reply to Elihu, and when

that chastens (19-22) in order to bring them to a perception of right and then bless them, (23-30.)

The second address, (ch. 34.) is occupied with the refutation of Job's positions. Job had maintained his own Dr. Woods of Andover, in his Lectures | righteousness, and declared that God had taken away his right, (5-10.) (Verse 5 is a literal quotation from Job; see 27:2.) The reply of Elihu is, 1. God is incapable of injustice, (11-15.) 2. God's supreme power as a pledge of the justice of his rule, (16-30.) he adds that men should repent humbly, (31-37.)

The third address (ch. 35) continues the refutation. Job, it is said, affirmed that his righ eousness profited him nothing, (1-3 Elihu answers that God is raised above human sin and human welldoing, (5-8,)

but that the reason for the failure of answers to prayer is to be found in the pride and naughtiness of men, (9-16:) The fourth address, (ch. 36-37,) is

formal defence of God 1. God rewards the right, and punishes the wicked, (36:5-7.) 2. His punishments are remedial, (8-22) 3. God in his greatness is unsearchable, (36: 23; 37:24.)

It will be seen that Elihu's points are clearly conceived and well stated; and they are fully in accord with the general teachings of the Bible. We must distinguish between the man's character and his teachings, between his self-assertive introductions, (which are oriental,) and the thought and argument of his discourses. Even in our day, good men are not always diffident.

3. It is equally wrong to regard Elihu's argument as useless on the one hand, or as final on the other. He makes important additions, but he does not give the final solution. The problem of the book of Job is the explanation of the sufferings of Job. All the speakers (Job included, though he uses language which would bear another construction) assume as an indisputable fact the justice and goodness of God, and all contribute some truth toward the understanding of the general fact of suffering. They err in supposing that they have exhausted the subject, but their erroneous opinion is not to affect our judgment respecting the value of the thought of their ad-

The three friends agree in insisting on the connection between suffering and sin. They express a fundamental doccrine of Scripture, but their application to Job is wrong, and they speak wrongly of God in that they presume that they have fully explained his method of deal ing with men.

Joo points out the limitations to the principle announced by the friends. It is clear that the good sometimes suffer, and that the wicked sometimes prosper. Suffering is not a proof of ungodliness in the sufferer. Job sees that there are deeper depths in the question, but he does not attempt to sound them. The dramatic contrast here presented in the book is very fine. The three friends, untouched by bodily or mental suffering, coolly apply to the case before them the general principle familiar to them as pious men, like a young physician, fresh from text-books who pronounces with security and simplicity on a case which the patient knows to be complicated. The patient has always a certain advantage over the physician. Job is conscious of rectitude, and believes in the power, goodness and justice of God, and his discourses present a remarkable combination of lofty praise of God, descriptions of human life, passionate longing after a comprehension of God's dealings with him, and pious trust in his allwise Creator and Redeemer. Throughout he is groping after a solution which shall bring peace, and is sometimes near it, (for it is spiritual and not scientific,) but he does not distinctly grasp it.

When the four interlocutors have said what they had to say, Elihu appears on the scene, blames both parties in the dis cussion, and proposes to offer a solution. He in fact, in his following argument, brings out several things which had been not at all, or only slightly, referred to by the others. These are the remedial design of suffering, the fact that man has no claim on God, and the fact that man, as a sinner deserves punishment The first of these is mentioned by Eliphaz (ch. 5,) but Elihu first gives it due prominence. The second is insisted on against Job's complaints, and fully. In the Prologue (chs. 1,2) it appears sincerity, for reasons inscrutable to man.

them result. 3 A full statement of the argument re specti g the authorship of Elihu's addresses would require too much space. I will only say that I do not think that the peculiarities of language, style and thought require as to suppose a second poet. These addresses (supposing some dramatic ability in the writer) were probably written, with the rest of the book of Job, by some unknown person who lived about the time of Solomon. C. H. Toy.

> DEAR RECORDER :- I desire to say : few words on the very important subject of Temperance.

> "Intemperance is a prevalent evil Let us see what Divine Inspiration says on the subject. I give some quotations, if the readers of the RECORDER will please examine, Genesis ix: 20-22, Isaiah xxviii: ,-"But they also have erred through wine and through strong drink, are out of the way, the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine they are out of the way through strong drink, they err in vision they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean."

Urimes and abuses of every kind follow in train of drunkeness. When the rulers of a people are addicted to this sin, they will pervert truth and righteousness, and the just judgments of God.

See Isaiati lvi: 12, Daniel v: 1-4, I Corinthians xi: 21. (Intoxicating drinks are adapted to deceive and injure.) Provxxv: 27, Hosea iv: 11.

INTEMPERANCE FORBIDDEN. Deuteronomy xxi: 20-21, Prov. xxiii: to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any 20-31, Isaiah v: 11-22, Isaiah xxvii: 1, thing whereby thy brother stumbleth or Romans xiii: 12-13, I Cor. vi: 10, Gal- offendeth, or is made weak. 5. The ex ations v: 19-21. Eph. v: 18. (The ample of the strong, even in things which wisdom of avoiding intoxicating drink to them may be lawful, may destroy the and the tempter and temptation to it, weak, and are therefore inexpedient Daniel i: 8 12 15 and 16 verses, Luke wrong and sinful. 6. The use of intoxi: 15, Romans xiv: 21, I Cor. vii: I Cor. | icating drink as a beverage by those who v: 11, I Thes. v: 22, (abstain from may have self government, enough not every appearance of evil.)

Priests, Nazarites and civil rulers especially forbidden to use iutoxicating drinks. Leviticus x: 8-9, Numbers vi : 1-4. Proverbs xxxi: 4.

or indirect example to influence any one to drink or do anything that is wrong, Jeroboam the son of Nebat caused Israel to sin and was punished.

yes it exposes to the wrath of God to The influence of example is powerful, tempt one to drink, see Habakkuk ii : 5 | and reaches far for good or evil, and a 8 verse of the same chapter.

thing if it does any one harm, Romans makes the influence more powerful and, xiv: 13-21, I Cor. viii: 9, to the It will avail nothing to plead that the end of the chapter. Here the broad principle is laid down that even an in- of example, are voluntary agents and go nocent thing in one who is strong, may become harm to another who is weak | thes this matter, with unalterable decisand in all such cases the strong should jion. They are weak, they are destroyed abandon every such thing for the sake of by the example of the stronger brethren. the weak. The most moderate use of intoxicating drink as a beverage in any that those who are destroyed acted vol form by men who are strong and can untarily. Neither would it avail any govern themselves, does induce others to thing for the strong to plead, that they drink and consequently to fall into do not know that their practices have drunkeness; therefore it is the duty of the ever produced the unhappy effects asstrong to deny themselves in such cases cribed to them. They may have profor the sake of the weak-this is Paul's | duced these effects in more instances than doctrine and should lead every self-gov- one, though they may not have come to erned sober man to abandon the use of their knowledge, and may not until the

intoxicating drinks.

But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest the u not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom CHRIST DIED.

The principle is here fully recognized

for his own advantage, by which his neighbor would be injured, this is a prin- | effects upon their brethren and associates ciple even of the law of nature, and as such, is sufficiently manifest from the doctrine its obligation is fully acknowledged, by all whose minds have received proper moral culture, and in religion its obligations is by so much the stronger, as the ever be certain, that their conduct will interests which are at stake are more im- not produce the effects which they are so portant. Christianity goes further than | well calculated to produce. On the conthe law of nature. Hear the Apostle in trary it is certain that it may produce the connection of this passage of Scrip- them, there is a high probability that it ture we have quoted above, Let us there- will produce them. And if a fellowbefore not judge one another, any more. ing is not destroyed by it, it is not to But judge ye rather that no man put a them, but under God, to other counteractthe third (which is also a doctrine of the New Testament) gives the broadest ex planation of suffering which is offered in thy meat for whom Christ died. It is bleth, or is oftended, or is made weak. crimnal disregard of the best interests of es the pupil distrist—the very worst tesson that In the next chapter the apostle continues, we then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not be in the least will tribe with the bear the infirmities of the weak, and not olence. They, rather than deny them-to please ourselves, let every one please selves in the least, will trifle with the to please ourselves, let every one please selves in the least, will trifle with the instinct and that of unconscious instance, to his neighbor for good to edification, and safety of one for whom Christ died. This scrapulon takeness in all his schoolroom relanot to evil and ruin. For even Christ reasoning is applicable to intoxicating pleased not himself, but as it is written, the reproaches of them that reproached thee have fallen upon me. To the same Hence it applies with great force to the reterence to the reter Herald, Va., Feb. 8th, 1872.

Bishop Burnet, an Episcopalian, says, "There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants," Exposition of 39 Articles.

Dr. Wall, an Episcopalian, says "Among all the persons that are recorded as all the persons that the persons that the persons that the persons that are recorded as all the persons that the persons the persons that the persons that the persons that the persons t

that are weak. For if any man see thes him, who is weak be emboldened to eat in the whirlpool of drankeness. those things, which are offered to idols, and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died. Stational et

"Wherefore if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat not flesh while the world standeth," and again in the x. chap ter of I Corinthians, "all things are lawful to me but not expedient. All things are lawful for me but all things edify not; let no man seek his own, but anothers good." Now from these scripture texts I remark. 1st. That the meat here alluded to was meat offered to idols and that the eating of it was in the abstract a matter of indifference. 2. That these whose understandings were properly enlightened, and who were well grounded in the faith might eat it without viola ting any principles of christianity, in the abstract or without sustaining any injury to thomselves.

Neither does wine and strong drink, but how may it endanger thy brother to much more, to see the sit at strong drink, in the grog shop, and if he see the a thy cups, shall the not be emboldened to drink to excess ? 3. That they however could not cat this meat without caus bring upon themselves and their country | ing others who were less enlightened and whose faith and consciences were weak to confound their eating with the worship of idols and thus to fall into condemnation, and be destroyed. 4 erbs xx: 1 and xxiii: 21 and 29-35 This principle applies not only to eating verses of the same chapter; Jeremiah meat, but to drinking wine, or any thing Romans xiv: 21. It is good neither

to injure themselves does induce others who are weak and cannot resist the deleterious influence of intoxicating spirits upon their appetites to stumble and to Sunday schools. fall, and should therefore be avoided, by It is wrong and sinful by direct effort the strong. I Cor. viii: 13. Therefore if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth. 7. A man is accountable for his actions according to the effects which they pro-I Kings xiv: 7-16 and other places for | duce, not only as they are brought to it: 14, especially is it wrong and sinful, as others are influenced by his examples, 15 16, (reader turn to this, and read and man is accountable for all the effects of meditate, Amos ii: 12-16, also examine his example whenever its influence goes on the side of evil. Respectability of It is good to abstain from an innocent | character avails nothing here; it only persons, influenced to evil by the power beyond the example set them. Paul set-

It will therefore be no apology to say secrets of hearts shall be revealed before The Bible principle of Temperance the judfiment seat of Christ. And if their conduct has not actually and directly produced these destructive effects upon the weak, in any instance, yet let it be remembered that it is not so much the actual or direct effect of their conduct as its tendency that is the proper subject that no man has a right to do any thing of their attention. That their conduct is calculated to produce very unhappy contained in the Scripture under consid-

Now it is impossible, that they should

then an example which they, in attemptwho hast knowledge set at meat, in an ing to follow will lose all self controlidol's temple, shall not the conscience of and not be able to stop until they perish

(The account of the young man who in imitation of others in pleasure trips with his lover, upon the Niagara being unguarded suffered his kiff to go beyond the reach of recovering, applicable to this subject as an illustrational a talket of sail

The weak being influenced by the example of the strong who can themselves drink and keep their reason and respectability and standing in the world and even in the church, are induced to drink, their appetites gradually gain the mastery over reason, and the poor victim is hurried on in spite of every effort within himself until he fills a drunkard's grave and endures the awful destruction declared in God's word to be their portion beyond the grave. Now according to the principle laid down in the passages quoted the guilt of this evil lies at the door of professors of religion and others, who set them examples of drunkenness. But such justify themselves and say they dont get drunk, and if others do it is their own look out. But their examples may produce these awful effects upon their weak brethren and associates, and their drinkng can therefore be no longer innocent.

Can a serious christian drink and oppose the temperance cause in the face of all the rain which he sees moderate drinking produce all around him-can he speak against the principle of total abstinance when every drunkard and every lover of disturbance in society will say that is exactly my opinion ? Every one who opposes the temperance cause, does oncourage drunkenness to some extent, and whatever he may say or do here, the guilt of his offending depends and at his foor lies the guilt of destroying many souls for whom Christ died: such are my convictions after giving the subject a fair and candid investigation.

May all the powers of Deity combined with humanity aid us as a sin stricken world to become a temperate people.

The American Sunday School Union seems to have put the Devil to organizing

Mr. M. A. Wurtz, Secretary of that body, sends us the following for publication:

Blowing for the Settlement." "I organized the first Sunday school in this county and ran it myself," said a shrewd but dis sipated Wisconsin lawyer. "A few of us Americans came here early. We wanted to get in deinstance, the case of Balaam, Revelations bear by direct control upon others, but out. So I said, 'A Sunday-school will draw the folks we want. It will be the best and cheapest way to blow for the settlement.' They all agreed to it. There wasn't a soul et us that pretended to have a grain of plety. So they pitched upon me to carry out the plan. I did it, sending to Mr. Rice of the American Sunday Schoool Union for a library, and ran the school all summer. It did the blowing for us speindidly. Several christian families came in, and as they had a better stock of piety, I handed the Sunday-school over to them. It was a grand thing for us. We secured a good moral settlement. In fact, sir, it got to be so pious that I couldn't live there

We favor Bible-schools when taught by those who love the gospel; but we cannot commend any schools taught by dissipated Wisconsin lawyers, for the avowed purpose of humbugging immigrants.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST. Elder Haynes, a member: of Salem church in Wilkes Co., charged that Bro. J. W. Fets of the same church, had undermined him and toldfaisehoods. The two brethren had an interview, but failed to settle the difficulty. The church met and organized, after which Haynes came in Fets was not present. The Moderator asked Haynes it ne was in fellowship. He said his silence was enough. The church proceeded with the regular business. Haynes asked for a letter. The church thought that the difficulty was settled between himsand Fees, and granted the letter. But the next day finding out that the matter had not been settied, a special conference was called, and the order granting a letter to Haynes was rescinded, and the letter called in or demanded by the clerk, Fets was advised to go and see Haynes, taking two or three brethren with him. But Haynes went to Oak Forest church and joined on the letter after it had been demanded by Salem church. Haynes had insulted the three brethren that went to him to try to settle the matter. . The church had sent for Haynes, but he refused to hear the church. Whereupon he (Haynes) was excluded and Oak Forest church informed of it that they were holding Haynes on a dead letter, Oak Forest still holds him. So Salem church has withdrawn fellowship from Oak Forest. We ask you to publish this for the good of Christ's cause and for the benefit of Salem church. Done by order of the church.

L. L. STONE, Ch. Clerk.

The fundamental prequisite therefore, in all teaching, is that the teacher should gain the connence of the taught. Paradoxical as it may seem, the surest way to gain this confidence is to be always ready frankly and freely to admit ig-norance whenever the teacher is conscious that

Porthe Bibliod Meconler Will "W" point out what explanation he desires in reference to the consistency of election with free will?