

# BIBLICAL RECORDER.

THE ORGAN OF THE NORTH CAROLINA BAPTISTS—DEVOTED TO BIBLE RELIGION, EDUCATION, LITERATURE AND GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Volume 58.

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 1893.

Number 38.

## The Biblical Recorder.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY.

OFFICE:

118 (up stairs) Fayetteville Street, Raleigh, N. C.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

One copy, one year.....\$ 3.00  
One copy, six months..... 1.00  
Clubs of ten (copy extra to sender)..... 20.00

Anonymous communications will always find their way to the waste basket. No exceptions.

In sending letters of business, it is absolutely necessary that you give your postoffice address in full. The date on the label of your paper indicates when your subscription expires, and also serves as a receipt for your money.

Obituaries, sixty words long, are inserted free of charge. When they exceed this length, one cent for each word must be paid in advance.

When writing to have your paper changed, please state the postoffice at which you receive the paper, as well as the one to which you wish it changed.

Remittances must be sent by Registered Letter, Postoffice Order, Postal Note, Express or Draft, payable to the order of the Publisher. Do not send stamps.

### Morgan Edwards and the Regulators.

I read with much interest Dr. Whitsitt's article in last week's RECORDER on the battle of Alamance Creek between the Regulators and Gov. Tryon's forces, fought May 16, 1771.

In that article, the Doctor says many good things of Morgan Edwards which I heartily endorse; but he makes some disparaging statements concerning the great Baptist historian, which to my mind remain to be proved.

It is true that Edwards was honestly devoted to the land that gave him birth, for he was born in the principality of Wales; and because of this devotion, he was called a Tory. He made no war upon the Regulators, however, as did Cols. Richard Caswell, John Ashe, Needham Bryan, and others, whose memory North Carolinians delight to honor.

Dr. William Rogers, who succeeded Morgan Edwards in the pastorate of the First Baptist church of Philadelphia, preached the latter's funeral sermon, Feb. 23, 1795, in which he said of Edwards: "He also met with dishonor; but he complained not much of this, as it was occasioned by his strong attachment to the Royal Family of Great Britain, in the beginning of the American war; which fixed on him the name of a Tory; this I should have omitted mentioning, had not the deceased expressly enjoined it upon me. For any person to have been so marked out in those days, was enough to bring on political opposition and destruction of property; all of which took place with respect to Mr. Edwards, though he never harbored the thought of doing the least injury to the United States by abetting the cause of our enemies."—*Benedict's History of the Baptists*, Vol. II, p. 295.

As to the seemingly contradictory resolutions on page 14 of the North Carolina Baptist Almanac, I would say, by way of explanation, that the first resolution requiring union with the Regulators as a condition of membership was passed by a local church (Haw River) in the midst of the excited and oppressed populace, and that the second resolution forbidding taking up arms against the civil authority was passed by an Association (Sandy Creek) that, at that date, extended over parts of three States, North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia.

Edwards did speak of North Carolina as "a poor and unhappy Province, whose superiors make complaints of the people, and the people of their superiors; which complaints, if just, show the body politic to be like that of Israel in the time of Isaiah," &c.

If there is any truth in history, every word of the above was distressingly and unquestionably true; and the statement contains no evidence of the author's unreasonable prejudice against the State, or his unreliability as a historian.

The following extract from Edwards' History shows that our oppressed people had his profound sympathy instead of his unreasonable prejudice, and it further shows that Baptists were prominent in the opposition measures against the recklessness, injustice and oppression of Tryon's administration. The extract is from Vol. II, page 43, of *Benedict's History*, and relates to Sandy Creek church:

"Very remarkable things (said Morgan Edwards in 1775) may be said of this church, worthy a place in Gillis's book, and inferior to no instance he gives of the modern success of the gospel in different parts of the world. It began with sixteen souls, and in a short time increased to 606, spreading its branches to Deep River and Abbott's Creek, which branches are gone to other provinces, and most of the members of this church have followed them; inasmuch that in seventeen years it is reduced from 606 to 14 souls. The cause of this dispersion was the abuse of power which too much prevailed in the province, and caused the inhabitants at last to rise up in arms and fight for their privileges; but being routed May 16th, 1771, they despaired of seeing better times, and therefore quitted the province. It is said that 1,500 families departed since the battle of Alamance, and, to my knowledge, a great many more are only waiting to dispose of their plantations, in order to follow them. This is to me an argument, that their grievances were real, and their oppression great, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary." (The italics are mine in the last sentence.)

It seems to me an easy matter to account for Edwards' statement that out of 4,000 Regulators he found only seven Baptists, without impeaching the historian's veracity or fair-mindedness. In the first place, many of the Baptists, as well as others, left the sections in which the battle was fought soon after the engagement. Secondly, it is a reasonable supposition that, at the time of Edwards' visit (1773), the defeated Regulators were not very forward to inform him or any other stranger of their connection with a movement that had (as they supposed) resulted so disastrously.

Dr. Whitsitt says that "Captain Merrill, the Baptist officer who was hanged for his part in the earliest battle of the Revolution, has endured the obloquy heaped upon him by the Rev. Morgan Edwards quite long enough." It may be that the Doctor has proof that Edwards has heaped obloquy upon the unfortunate Merrill. If he has, I would like to see it. I confess that I have never seen anything from Edwards that sustains the charge.

Edwards does say this of Merrill: "One of the seven Baptists, by the name of Merrill, was executed; and he, at the point of death, did not justify his conduct, but bitterly condemned it; and blamed two men (of very different religion) for deceiving him into the rebellion. \* \* \* The man bore an excellent character, inasmuch that one of his enemies was heard to say that if all went to the gallows with Capt. Merrill's character, hanging would be an honorable death."

Indeed Merrill's speech at the gallows heaped more obloquy upon him than anything that Edwards ever said of him. I give only a part of the speech:

"I stand here exposed to the world as a criminal. My life will soon be a change. God is my comforter and supporter. I am condemned to die for opposing government. All you that are present, take warning by my miserable end, when I shall be hung up as a spectacle before you. My first seducers were Hunter and Gelaspie. They had often solicited me, telling that a settlement only was contended for with regard to public officers, who, they said, had oppressed the people; and that unless these measures were taken, there would be no remedy or redress hereafter. Thus they pressed me on by assuring me the disputes (as they called them) then existing might be settled without shedding of blood. I considered this unhappy affair, and thought, possibly, the contentions in the country might be brought to some determination, without injury to any; and in this mind I joined the Regulation. \* \* \* I received, by the grace of God, a change fifteen years ago; but have, since that time been a backslider; yet Providence, in which is my chief security, has been pleased to give me comfort under evils in my last hour; and although the halter is now round my neck, believe me, I would not change stations with any man on the ground. All you who think you stand, take heed lest ye fall. I would be glad to say a few more words before I die. In a few moments I shall leave a widow and ten children. I entreat that no reflection be cast upon them on my account; and, if possible, shall deem it as a bounty, should you, gentlemen, petition the Governor and Council, that some part of my estate may be spared for the widow and the fatherless; it will be an act of charity, for I have forfeited the whole, by the laws of God and man."—*Benedict's History*, pp. 116-118.

The truth is, that thousands of Regulators—for they abounded from the sea shore to the mountains) went into the movement with the expectation of having their grievous wrongs redressed without resort to hostile measures. It was with this expectation that Merrill became a Regulator, and could the unfortunate patriot come back to life and see the outcome of that battle on Alamance creek, he would retract every word of his speech that is condemnatory of the part he acted in that memorable battle.

In conclusion, let me say that I shrink from controversy, especially with my own brethren. I love Dr. Whitsitt, and would esteem it a privilege to sit at his feet and learn, but I think that he has cast unmerited obloquy upon the good name of Morgan Edwards, whose distinguished services to the American Baptists should forever shield him from unjust criticism.

JOHN T. ALBRITTON.

Mt. Olive, N. C.

### Dabbling or Digging.

A recent number of *The Biblical World* has a strong plea for more comprehensive and careful study of the Bible. It says with truth, "We may examine the pupils who for years have frequented the Sunday schools, in which the Bible forms the chief subject of consideration, from which, in most cases, they come forth with an ignorance of the most common facts and the simplest truths that is astounding. Or we may reach higher and investigate the work of the multitude of colleges scattered throughout the land, called and represented to be Christian colleges, in which so little of the truth of Christianity is taught—and that little so poorly taught—as to make the 'Christian,' as thus applied, in very truth a misnomer." In short, there is plenty of dabbling with the Bible in these days, but not much downright digging in it. One of the most hopeful signs of the times, however, is the growing dissatisfaction at the dabbling.

### Answer to Interrogatories of James K. Blalock.

The first interrogatory is this: "If an ordained Free Will Antimission, or Campbellite Baptist preacher, be received into the fellowship of a Baptist church in North Carolina, should he be ordained by our own brethren before becoming pastor of a Baptist church?"

I think the proper answer to this question depends on something precedent to it; that is, should a person be received into a Baptist church from any of said organizations on the baptism received in the societies from which he came. If the ministers of the societies from which he came had the scriptural authority to baptize, then it follows as a logical sequence that they had the equal right to ordain; and if they had no right to perform one act, neither had they the right to perform the other. And their right, in both cases, depends upon whether the organizations to which they belong are proper New Testament churches. Without entering largely into the discussion of this question, it will suffice to notice the attitude of Baptist churches towards the parties in question.

As to the Free Will Baptists, I do not know the attitude held generally by Baptists toward people of this sect, for I have never been thrown in contact with them, and I have very little written information about them. It is stated in Brown's Enc. Rel. Knowledge by one of their leading ministers that they were organized in the United States in 1780, and their existence is carried no farther back. Their church polity and doctrines differ very widely from the church polity and doctrines held and practiced by Baptists. It is true that they immerse on a profession of faith, but that does not, in my view of the fitness of things, cure all other ills. In our invitation to the Lord's Supper, to those of the same faith and order, it seems to me they are necessarily excluded. If so, then their organization cannot be regarded as a proper gospel church. This being the case, it seems to me improper to recognize as valid the ordinances as administered by them.

As to the Campbellite organization, their case is very plain to my mind. Apart from the doctrinal views which they hold contrary to those held by Baptists from time immemorial, or from the days of the apostles, their sect had its origin from persons excluded from Baptist churches for holding and teaching views contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures as understood and taught by the great body of Baptist churches. To accept the ordinances as administered by them would be an acknowledgment that their societies are proper New Testament churches. This would open to them the door of communion with us, else place us in a very awkward position.

The safest way is to require all persons desiring to unite with Baptist churches from these sects to relate their experience of grace, and baptize them just like any other persons, and if one of their preachers wish to unite with us, treat him in the same way, and then if he wants to preach, let him preach, and if a Baptist church wants him as pastor, ordain him, if found worthy, just like we do in ordinary cases. And it seems to me that any preacher uniting with a Baptist church from either of these sects, with proper views of a New Testament church and New Testament doctrine, would not be satisfied with less than this.

As to the Antimission or Antinomian Baptists, their case is quite different from the other two. I regard their societies as New Testament churches, though very remiss in duty; they have the ordinances as delivered by the apostles, and they preach a great deal of gospel truth, though I regard them as too contracted in their views. For these reasons, briefly stated, I think the ordinances as administered by them, including ordination, are entitled to respect.

2. Without formally stating the query, I do not see how a Baptist preacher can become pastor of a Free Will Baptist church. He might preach the gospel to them, (no doubt but they need it,) but I do not see how he can consistently be pastor. Being pastor embraces more than preaching; it includes the administration of the ordinances, and I think it entirely improper for a Baptist preacher to administer the ordinances of the gospel for any church other than a regular Baptist church. A Baptist preacher who becomes pastor of a Free Will Baptist church, and persists in such conduct, I think puts himself in a position for Baptists to withdraw fellowship from him. If the Free Will Baptists want a Baptist pastor, the way is open. Let them relate their christian experience and be baptized by a regular Baptist preacher, and be organized into a Baptist church.

Some who are called Baptists are becoming too mongrel. The great trouble with the Jews were their mixing with and imitating surrounding nations. Let us beware; a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.

J. J. LANSDALE.

### ANSWERS TO J. K. BLALOCK'S QUERIES.

Answer to the first: He should first be baptized, and then ordained.

Answer to the second: No. Respectfully, JNO. T. ALBRITTON. March 13, 1893.

We should blush to ask God for greater blessings while we are refusing to thank him for those we already have, or for broader opportunities, while we are failing to embrace those already given.—*Selected.*

### Our Boys and Girls.

Many Christian parents are often perplexed by the difficulties of training a family of children, especially of directing them in the matter of amusements, and of shielding them from dangers to be met with in modern social life. A letter was lately published in the *London Christianian* from "An Anxious Mother," stating her difficulties and asking for advice. A number of replies were received, some of which are here submitted, in whole or in part. It is interesting to see how these fathers and mothers, while using all precautions and helps which parental love and wisdom suggest, feel deeply the importance of enlisting the power of divine grace in their efforts to secure the end in view.

"A Thankful Father" writes: "I have adopted the same plan with my boys as with the girls, and have always kept them away from scenes of dancing, acting, and, indeed, from Christmas parties altogether, feeling sure that such associations were not compatible with bringing them up in 'the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' The results have been most happy, my whole family of four sons and two daughters being brought to the Lord in their youth; they are now connected with the Christian church, and mostly engaged in happy service for the Master.

I should like, however, to add that, while not allowing them to choose their own amusements, I have endeavored to make home the happiest place on earth for them; and although I could not sanction football, cricket, and rowing clubs, on account of their associations, yet I encouraged all these exercises amongst my children and their young friends, at a good deal more expense in one way, but perhaps at less if all were taken into account. Good, bright singing and music, with carefully selected but readable books and periodicals always at hand, have also contributed to the end in view."

"A Happy Mother" writes: "We prayed that our children might be the Lord's, and we expected they would be, and therefore trained them for that service into which we believed he would call them. We did not consider worldly amusements would fit them for this. Charades we thought would only give them a taste for the theatre, dancing for all the vanities and follies of the world. We thought that if we took them to the edge of the precipice, and told them not to fall over, they most likely would fall, and so we had better keep them from the precipice. We also avoided all parties as they are generally understood. We guarded them, so far as we could, from worldly literature, associations, occupations, and pleasures. On the other hand, we put before them the chief end of man—to glorify God and enjoy him forever; and endeavored, by precept and practice, to show them the pleasure of caring for others, the joys of God's service, the rich treasures in his Word, and the satisfying portion in himself. We were careful also to make their home life bright and interesting, giving as many smiles and kind words as possible, that they might never connect gloom and sadness with separation to the service of God. We gave them to God, and he accepted them; in early life they were the subjects of his converting grace, and all are now earnestly engaged in his service. We sought for them 'first the kingdom,' and he has not been unmindful of his promise."

Another correspondent, "A Thankful Mother," who has brought up a large family of boys, all of whom have grown up Christian believers, speaks of her husband's endeavors to guide and interest them by taking them on excursions and entering into their pleasures. Another correspondent urges the provision of suitable "hobbies," and that parents should make themselves one with their children, thus encouraging their love and confidence. Yet another "Grateful Mother" says: "My husband and I were believers when we were married. As the Lord gave us children, we gave them back to him. As soon as they could understand, we taught them their need of a Saviour, and set before them the blessedness of a life spent for Jesus and eternity. We aimed also, both by precept and by example, to teach them that to live for God was one thing, and to live for the world quite another. To the praise and glory of God I can say that in the case of each, before they were fourteen years of age, all seven gave evidence of being born again. As to Christmas parties, etc., they are as numerous with us as in any other locality; but we have had no trouble with our children on that point. They never seemed to care for such things. If, however, as has sometimes been the case, they have expressed a wish to go somewhere or do something which, as parents, we were not quite certain was right, we never considered it wise sternly to refuse them permission, but we have reasoned with them, and if after all they did not seem satisfied, I have gone to the mercy-seat and told the Lord, and left it with him. Invariably they would seek me out afterwards, and say, 'Mother, I think I won't go now.' We have entered into their troubles and helped them; also made the home bright and cheerful with music and sacred song. One dear girl departed to be with Christ at twenty-two, and a beloved son at twenty-four years of age, leaving behind them glorious testimonies to the power of Christ to save and keep; and this fills our souls with adoring praise to God."

Other correspondents make useful suggestions. A mother of six, three of them boys, who in youth professed themselves on the

Lord's side, writes: "Our children were devoted to the Lord from their birth, trained for him, and taught, to the best of our ability, by precept and example in the home, that religion was a reality, salvation through Christ the only source of real joy, and obedience better than sacrifice. I always felt it was mockery to pray for our children to be delivered from temptation, if we knowingly placed them therein; therefore we never allowed them to go to any entertainments or parties which were even doubtful, teaching them that there was no real pleasure in going where anything was said or done likely to grieve our Saviour King, or if he could not go with us. At the same time, it was our endeavor to make home as bright and lively as possible, and to allow the young people to do everything we could that was a healthy recreation, or combined instruction with amusement."

"A father" writes: "Though the question is asked in regard to 'Our Boys,' I would rather put it 'Our Children.' The temptations and the difficulties for boys may be different in character and degree from those affecting girls; yet the principles involved in every case are the same, whether approached from the child's or from the parent's point of view. What is the duty of the parent in any doubtful case? What is the duty of the child? If we can arrive at an answer to these questions, as in the sight of God, I believe we shall also, if we seek always to be guided by him, find the path will be made clear, and that blessing will follow."

"What is the parents' duty? It is clearly to bring up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Not merely in a general and indefinite way, but by making this the first and absolute end and aim before us, by prayer, by faith, by precept, by example. Two instances in the word of God have always been to us, the one a guide, the other a beacon, in steering through these troubled seas.—Abraham, 'I know him, that he will command his children, and his household after him,' (Gen. 18: 19); and Eli, who 'restrained them not,' (1 Sam. 3: 18). I believe the divine law is responsibility on the parents' side, with the right to command. The child's duty is as clearly to obey. But if they do not obey? Here a most difficult problem comes in. It is certain, command and obedience must be no spasmodic things, but the result of early training and continued habit, as in the sight of God. With this I believe in dependence on God's power that the result will be gained and the control be effective. At least, in our experience, we have thankfully to say 'Ebenzer' after a married life of nearly twenty-nine years. We have often been brought to an end of self, and yet this word has been made true. We have always endeavored to make our home as bright and happy as we could, whilst we have set our faces against the theatre, dancing, and questionable amusements, explaining that, though perhaps some might be engaged in by others, and arguments be put forwards for them, we were convinced that their tendency was to draw the soul away from Christ, and to entangle it in the world; and therefore we did not allow them in our family and our household. I ought perhaps to say, with great thankfulness to God for his mercy to us, that all our children, ten of whom are living, early gave their hearts to him, and that active Christian work, suitable to their ages and powers, has filled many an hour which otherwise would have been open for the claims of the world, and in this way lessened the questions that have from time to time arisen amongst the children on these subjects. As we can say 'Hitherto,' so I believe we shall find it true 'unto the end.'—*Christian Secretary.*

### No Sabbath.

Horace Greeley, when traveling in Switzerland some years before his death, wrote the following:

"I could wish you might stand an hour with me, on Sunday morning, in the labor market, in Geneva, and see the troops of dull, tired and saddened looking laborers, unwashed from the grime and sweat of one week's work of seven days, trudging off sluggishly and wearily, like dumb, driven cattle, to the work of the next week of seven days. 'Are these slaves?' you ask. Slaves! Bless you, no. These are free men. These are voters and citizens in a land of universal suffrage, under the freest government on earth, with an advanced and liberal constitution of the latest French invention, and with the modern improvements. No blue laws here. They once had blue laws in Geneva, but they have laughed them down long ago. This which you see is liberty—complete, untrammelled, personal liberty. Every one of these free citizens has a right, a proud, irrevocable right to work on Sunday if he chooses, and that is what it ends in for him, and that is what it will end in for you if you choose to make the costly experiment. The workman who may work on Sunday, has got to work on Sunday when work is wanted. The right to work for each, depends upon the law of rest for all. Think of it, think twice, think of it again, then say if you will barter away your birth-right, the American Sabbath, the universal privilege of rich and poor, for this miserable French delusion, this continental holiday, through which half of the people have to toil that the other half may frolic.—*Selected.*

Life is made up of little things.