

South Western Baptist.

ELDER SAMUEL HENDERSON, EDITOR.

DEVOTED TO RELIGION, TEMPERANCE, EDUCATION & C

\$2 00 PER ANNUM INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

VOL. 7, NO. 15.

TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA, THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 1855.

50 NO. IN A VOL.

ORIGINAL.

For the South Western Baptist.

Revision.

NO. 3.

Good morning, bro. B., what sort of a Bible is this that you seem to be examining? It looks new, as if it has just been bought.

It is nearly new. I sent to New York for it, and received it by mail. Though the title page does not say so, it is the Revised Edition of the American Bible Society, printed in 1853. The object of the Society was, a few years ago, to bring the text as near as possible to what the Translators left it in 1611. The report of the Society made in 1852, sets forth the nature of the charges made from the ordinary editions. They relate to such as *a* and *an*, *O* and *Oh*, capitals, punctuation, spelling, running titles, parenthesis, and contents of chapters. The Revisers also took the liberty of making some changes in the text where there seemed to be a manifest mistake, or a contradiction, or inconsistency in the oldest and best copies that could be found. They also inserted marginal readings; some of which are quite important and useful. We have no way of knowing, however, which of the marginal readings were made by them, and which by the translators. In this edition you see that in John 3:7, "Ye must be born again"—the margin has for *again*, *from above*. Then it would read, "Ye must be born from above." And I think that is the way it ought to be. Baptist Noel has it so, and the word *another* is generally so translated. In this very ch., 5:31, "He that cometh from above." It must have been a very arduous task, bro. B., to compare several different editions and examine every word closely, to put the Bible in its present condition.

Indeed it was. The Committee were about three years employed in their investigations. It is a pity, however, that they did not go one step further, as the American and Foreign Bible Society, did some years ago, namely, to make all the proper names of the New Testament correspond in spelling with the names in the Old Testament, what propriety can there be in having, in the Old Testament, *Isaiah*, and in the New Testament, *Esai*. The same may be said of *Elijah* and *Elias*, *Jeremiah* and *Jeremy*, and a good many others.

I think so too, bro. B., and I wonder why they did not make those changes? Can you tell me how those differences in the spelling of such proper names originated?

It is owing to the fact that the names in the New Testament are taken from the Greek, and those in the Old Testament from the Hebrew. Take, for example *Judah*, which in the Greek could not end in *h*, as there is no letter in Greek for *h* at the end of a word. Sometimes words take the Latin ending, as *Mercurius*; in English, *Mercury*. If *Mary* were spelled in the Latin and Greek form, it would be *Maria*. It seems to me that *uniformity* in these things is very desirable, especially for the young, and for uneducated persons.

I will thank you now to show me some of the changes and amendments that have been made.

Well, see here, you can read from the Report. In Ruth 3:15, the present copies read, "and she went into the city; but the Hebrew and the Translators have it: 'and he went into the city.'" Again in Cant. 2:7, all the present copies read, "now wake my love, till he please," but the Hebrew and the Translators; till she please; yet in Cant. 3:5, and 8:4, where the Heb. is precisely the same, the translators and all the copies have, "till he please." All these instances have of course, been corrected according to the Hebrew. In Isaiah 1:16, the present copies read, "Wash you," where the translators put "wash ye." This is according to the Hebrew and has been restored. The Report also states that the Hebrew plurals, cherubim, &c., are spelled without the *s*. Here are some specimens of alterations of Contents of Chapters: Gen. 50, "He dieth and is *cheisted*," corrected: "He dieth and is *embalmed*." Matt. 1, "The angel *satisfeth* the *misdeeming* thoughts of Joseph," corrected: "The angel *removeth* the *doubts* of Joseph." I notice quite an alteration in Acts 19. The old way is, "The Holy Ghost is given by Paul's hands." Here it is: "Paul baptizeth certain disciples of John."

Do you think they were baptized a second time? Of course. Verse 5th says: "When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." And they had said that they were baptized "unto John's baptism." Some say that they were not re-baptized; and that Luke was, in that verse, merely stating what Paul said. It is evident, however, that such is not the case. Those who advocated that idea, were probably afraid to admit that these disciples were baptized by Paul. They thought it would show that John's baptism is not the same as Christian Baptism. Hackett says, they were baptized by Paul. It is no where stated that John baptized in the name

of the Lord Jesus. One might say, that if these disciples were baptized by Paul, it would have been stated that they were baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But in Acts 10:48, we read, "And he (Peter) commanded them (Cornelius and others) to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Also, Acts 8:16, says, "They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." And Acts 2:38, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ."

Your reasoning seems very conclusive, bro. B. I see, too, how easy it is to teach a particular doctrine, even by the wording of the contents of a chapter, or by a marginal reading, or a different translation; and this is one great reason why I do not like any meddling with our common version, any more than is absolutely necessary to keep it free from errors of the press. I think the American Bible Society has done a good work in making this revision, and I hope they will keep the text as it now is. I am very much pleased with this edition. It suits right well for family reading. I think I shall get me a copy.

I am much pleased with it myself, bro. A. This revision, however, goes to show, to my mind, the importance of a new version that shall be made independent of previous translations, except so far as they are found to be correct; and such a version, I think we may expect from the American Bible Union.

The difficulties in the way, bro. B., and the liability of making things worse deter me from giving my assent to the measure; and that talk that I had, a few days ago, with our Pastor, has made me more doubtful than ever. He says that it will cause a split in our denomination, and do more harm than good. He thinks they will be sure to have immerse instead of baptize, and that other denominations will call it a sectarian Bible, and will never be favorable to it; that it never can become popular for the pulpit and for schools; that the very men who start of the American and Foreign Bible Society in 1835, in opposition to the American Bible Society, are the leaders in this business, and that they will have their own way all the rest of the world to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Well, bro. A., you know the Scripture says, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." I suppose that as we cannot agree on this point, we must agree to differ. I hope you will not be offended, however, if I tell you that I remind me of a good old sister in the church with whom I was once conversing about having a new version of the Bible. She remarked, with much earnestness, that she had raised her four children by that good old book and she was not willing to have one word of it altered. After some moments of silence, I asked her if her Pastor baptized folks with water. She said, "no, He baptizes them in the water." After being told that, in our version, the form of expression is uniformly, baptize with water, and that with, implies that the water is applied to the person, and not the person put into the water, she immediately agreed that that word ought to be altered. She also admitted that *Easter* ought to be changed to *Pasover*, and *Jesus*, in two places, to *Joshua*, and *Esai* to *Isaiah*, and that a great many other words should be changed, and wondered why they did not correct every word that is known to be wrong, so that no person would be misled or kept in the dark about the true meaning of a word; and yet, after all these admissions, she was afraid of this new version scheme, and would rather let the Bible stay as it is, for she was afraid that when they began to make changes they would not know when to stop. And her husband sitting by, said: "I believe my old o'man is right after all."

That old sister told my feelings exactly. And I believe that women generally come to right conclusions, even though they may not be able to argue as well as men. They seem to have a natural instinct that leads them to decide what is proper without being able to give satisfactory reasons.

Your remark is very true, bro. A., in many respects. It holds good, however, I think, more in regard to the moral quality of actions and the character of men, than any extensive plan for the accomplishment of a great object. They are influenced more by their feelings than by their judgment.

I believe you are right in that remark; and our Pastor says that our version is good enough for the purposes of a Revelation, being really a better translation than the Septuagint, which, he says, was used by the Apostles and other Christians, and that Paul and others made quotations from this Septuagint, though it did not correspond exactly with the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

It is also true, bro. A., that the Apostles were inspired, and that they never made any quotations from the Septuagint that did not give the true sense. Indeed, the Apostles some times

changed the quotations from the Septuagint, always giving the real meaning intended by the Holy Spirit, so that if any one doubted respecting the meaning of a corresponding passage in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, the quotation in the new would always set him right.

Well, I see that there are two sides to every question. I never should have thought of that. It seems then that some of our most reliable men are clearly of the opinion that the Bible ought to be revised, but they are not satisfied that the same society that revises should also judge of the propriety of circulating, but should leave that matter to the denomination at large.

That seems to be the idea, bro. A., and a hair-breadth distinction it is, surely. Suppose, now, that the American Bible Union conclude not to have anything to do with circulating the new version when completed, but to leave that matter to the denomination throughout the United States. It seems to me that, immediately, a circulating society would be found to scatter the new version far and wide; for you know it would be impossible to compel any one church of baptists, or any denomination of Christians to act or not to act in the discrimination of a new translation. I, therefore, conclude that these brethren "make a distinction without a difference." Let us love and prize our "common version," and let us do what we can towards bringing out one more in accordance with the original languages and the wants of the age. As to the Italics in our "common version," I think the safest way is never to leave out any, but to read on as if there were none there, for though some words may be omitted, others cannot, and this new edition is not to be depended on, in this particular, any more than many other editions; and I could mention many passages that ought, according to the principles of the Translators, to have words in Italics that are in the Roman character, and *vice versa*.

I am much obliged to you, bro. B., for your information. I will state another objection, however, that our Pastor mentioned. He said that there is great danger that if any one should undertake to make a new version, of marring the beauty of the Bible by introducing long Roman words instead of good old Saxon terms. He mentioned that some of those who advocate revision, recommend changes that he could not agree to; as in Heb. 1:3, brightness, effulgence, and in 1st Thes. 3:15, for *present*, *anticipate*.

I think, myself, bro. A., that those would be very unhappy changes. It should be borne in mind, however, that one of the requisite qualifications of a good translator is a knowledge of his own language; and we are not to suppose that one who is capable of making a good translation, would be less cautious in respect to altering, unnecessarily, the phraseology of our common version than we would be ourselves, especially when one of the rules for the revisers is to alter the common version as little as possible. We should also remember that not every newspaper contributor is a reviser. I must remark, too, that unless we have a new version, that can be depended upon, there will be no end to new translations of various passages of Scripture. You know that many writers, in establishing a particular doctrine, adopt some other version. Wayland, for instance, frequently, in his Moral Science, quotes from other versions, as suiting his purpose better than the authorized version. I once heard an Episcopal minister say that the version of the Psalms in the Prayer Book frequently gives the sense better than our version does, though, you know it is often asserted that our version is an Episcopal version. Some preachers, too, are fond of choosing to differ from the common version, and we who may be uneducated are unable to tell whether they tell the truth or not. A corrected version would prevent all of that, for we would be able to read for ourselves, and see if those things are so.

I thank you for the idea, bro. B. I don't understand that, though, about the Psalms in the Prayer Book.

If I mistake not that version was made from the Latin Vulgate, and is older than ours. In the 8th Psalm, v.1, our version has "O LORD, our Lord," and that has "O LORD our Governor." Take the 19th Psalm, v.3: "There is neither speech nor language, but there voices are heard among them." Our version says, "There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard" where being in Italics. These examples serve to show that some passages may be preferable to some in our version, though they may not sound so well. I do not think, however, that the Translators can fairly be charged with favoring Episcopacy, for if that was their intention they never would have used the term Bishop, as they did, in 1st Tim. 3d chap.; 1st Peter, 2:25; and Phil. 1:1. The probability is that the term Bishop, was in the older versions, and that our translators merely let it remain as it was. In Acts 20:28,

we find overseers instead of Bishops. This may not have resulted from design; as it is a fact that there is not much uniformity in our version as one would look for. The words Lord and Master are used in the same sense. In the Greek we find *kurios*, sometimes rendered Lord and sometimes Master. It is plain, however, that in Acts 20:28, overseers suits the connection; but it would not have suited so well in 1st Tim. 3:1, to say, "If a man desire the office of an overseer." Bishop is an old English word that means literally overseer, and evidently does not correspond with the term Bishop, as used by the Church of England; and the Translators must have known that; as in Phil. 1:1: "With the Bishops and Deacons." As I mentioned once before, our Translators did not give themselves time for making a thorough revision and new translation. Conant says that if they had taken twenty years, the work would have been much better. I think that it has been the policy of many to keep the public ignorant of the true state of our "common version, and so, to prevent the making of a new one. But in these days, the people will be informed, and they will not allow themselves to be deprived of their rights, either in political or religious matters.

For the South Western Baptist.
Letter from Central Africa.

J JARE, CENTRAL AFRICA, }
May 7, 1855. }

Editor S. W. Baptist:
Dear Brother: I here take pleasure in acknowledging several receipts of your valued paper, interesting by the consideration, if from no other, that it is the only one of a similar kind we have yet received from America. From this you may infer how extremely well our dear brethren love us; what interest they manifest in the spiritual welfare of those whom they have sent into the depths of heathenism, and how eagerly they reciprocate their favors from us so gladly received. I dismiss the subject with the hope that in future we shall be better remembered.

In writing for the benefit of your readers, I shall not promise those who are familiar with the journal anything differing materially from what they have already read. Yet they may content themselves with an old and familiar story, while others, who have not enjoyed the same privileges, shall hear something truthful and important of a land wrapt in mystery, superstition and idolatry. They are cautioned, however, not to expect anything that has not a bearing on the spiritual welfare of this people. I write for Christian readers not for the world. After a lengthy voyage of nearly four months I reached Lagos, a great commercial port of a vast portion of the interior. As it will be unnecessary for me to trouble you or your readers with any account of my wanderings, joltings, difficulties and trials, I shall confine myself to a description of the country lying between Lagos and Ogbomphi, the latter place being nine days journey, or one hundred and fifty miles, from the coast, and three days journey from the Niger. The former place is situated at or near the mouth of the Ogn or Lagos river, and by the circuitous routes of several streams said to be entirely surrounded by water. Though once a great slave mart, it is now under the fostering care of the English, and bids fair with favorable auspices to exert a great and happy influence on the vast regions of the interior. It has now a population of fifteen thousand souls, with two missionary stations numbering an aggregate membership of several hundred. The Chinese and Wesleyan Missionary Societies are the only ones that have yet entered this interesting field. As we are speaking of Africa and how it fain interest our readers, in this scourged and neglected land, let us contemplate for a moment the present and future influence of this city on the benighted regions of the interior. Now she has advantages that few others enjoy both as regards commerce and moral influence. I imagine there has never been need of argument to prove the superior advantages of a sea-port town. Lying at the mouth of the Ogn, a stream suitable for the canoe and small boat trade, it is destined to be the great commercial depot of a large portion of Central African trade. Even now with her varied productions of cotton, corn, rice, potatoes, pepper, ginger, together with many others that might be cultivated, and other gifts which nature has so profusely lavished upon her. Were the facilities afforded for transportation, we might reasonably hope, in the course of a few years, to see an African emporium commanding the respect and attention of the commercial world. You may rest assured it has no mean country for its support. I would venture to assert that the reading portion of mankind have scarce a better or more correct idea of the interior of Africa, than of the fairy land of the "Ten Tribes." I gaze upon the most magnificent prospects with admiration. I contemplate them with feelings of rapture. The distance from Lagos to Abeokuta, the first large town on the route to the interior, is

said to be about sixty miles. The river route balances itself between its advantages and inconveniences. After passing a few miles from Lagos, through one of the most cheerless, dismal, and offensive swamps, by way of a small creek, only a few yards wide, you re-enter the river, and have then, for a few days, an interesting, though monotonous scene, until you leave the river for prospects more inviting. All around you is one unchanging grain from the blade of grass to the tall and majestic cotton, confining your vision to the objects immediately before you. Most of the trees are low, while some in height would compare favorably to American oak and hickory. The cotton, in point of size, surpasses any tree I have ever seen. I omitted to have observed one, through which, four feet from the ground, one or two four horse post-coaches could be driven. From this height its size diminishes rapidly. This tree is frequently seen on the banks of the river, and is not a little relief to the eye of one who, from a sweet association of ideas, reverts back with pleasure to his native land, and the days of his childhood. Hundreds of canoes every week ascend and descend this river, leaving commodities of change and exchange. Occasionally you may land for refreshment at a village, a number of which are seen during a few days travel. And here your life is as safe, as around the fireside of your own houses. Do you believe it? If you become affrighted it will be at the ghosts and visions of your own imagination. The land route is equally pleasant, almost destitute of swamp, and with changing and interesting scenery. It is a little remarkable, that on leaving the river at Lagos, you enter a country, whose appearance, with but little exception, is elevated and prairie like, for two hundred miles to the interior, and perhaps to the desert. The prairie timber is stunted and scrubby, that of the hammock is tall and fine, though differing wholly from our American trees. The Palm, which gives such a charm and interest to African scenery, continues to increase for one hundred and fifty miles in a direct Northerly line. Here I abruptly leave you, and beg your pardon and indulgence until kind Providence shall favor me to add something more interesting to my story.

Your brother in Christ,
W. H. CLARK.

For the South Western Baptist.
METHODISM;

THE STRIKING ANALOGY BETWEEN THE METHODIST CHURCH GOVERNMENT AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
[LETTER NO. FIVE.]

"Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof; mark ye well her bulwarks; consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following."—Psalms.
"I speak as to wise men judge ye what I say."

Bro. Henderson:

As Methodism has never for a moment been connected with the State, in any land; not even for a period as brief as the mad sway of that "most eminent Baptist, Thomas Muncey," or the wild and licentious tyranny, of John Matthias, and John Bocol, of Seyden; and as she has therefore never in a single instance, lent herself to any form of civil government, as an instrument of oppression I may, freely leave to your ready pen, the task of portraying the evils of the union of church and State; and of denouncing with just severity the cruel persecutions, raised from time to time, by church authorities, under the sanction of the State. My only aim will be, to demonstrate the claims of Methodism to republicanism of the highest excellence.

I can cordially endorse all you have to say upon the value of controversy, when conducted fairly, amicably, and in a Christian spirit. I agree with you still further in the strongest condemnation of any Episcopacy, which claims to be a third order in the ministry of divine right, in which alone is vested the right of ordination, and of government in the church, and without which third order, as some sects contend, there were no church at all, even though the incumbents of this third order, falsely called apostolic, were heretical in doctrine, and impious in life; as the Tridontine fathers affirmed, that "a bishop might become a priest of Jupiter, or a priest of Baal, and still be a priest of Jesus Christ." (Camp. Eccles. Lects.) Such assumptions I regard as anti-Christian, and as the very corner-stone of the Papal hierarchy.

Methodists do not claim ordination from a higher source than a Presbyter, called also in the Scriptures a bishop; which latter appellation with us is, by custom only and not by divine appointment, restricted to the designation of him whom we elect to be the *primus inter pares*—first among equals; like the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, who was first among the Associate bishops of Ephesus. In this sort of presidency or moderatorship, involving in a modified sense, what Paul had—"the care of all the churches," there can be nothing in conflict with the qualifications of a bishop, as described in the Bible. Your great Fuller says, "Nor would

the influence of the first missionaries be confined to a single congregation, but by a kind of parental authority, would extend to all the societies that might be raised by means of their labors."—(Bap. Lib. vol. 3, p. 330.) I will make the still bolder admission, that I do not care to claim a place even in a succession of Presbyterial ordinations, running back to apostolic times; for all successions at the hands of men, have come to us through corrupt channels. Give me direct succession from heaven, by the Spirit's call, entitling me to ministerial credentials, and then as a matter of order and expediency merely, let it be acknowledged by the laity, and endorsed by a prayerful imposition of hands of holy brethren.

I do concur with you heartily also, in rejecting the absurd doctrine, that a few drops of water, or even a whole pond of water, can, by the sprinkling or the immersion, either of an infant, or an adult "perform the work uniformly ascribed to the agency of the Holy Spirit." Thus far I suppose we are of one mind.

Your analysis of the elements of a church, is partially correct but may need some emendation. Let us see. What is a church? Ans. "a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness, united to help each other to work out their own salvation."—Secondly; are they competent to govern themselves? Ans. they are, within certain limitations: first, that Christ alone can frame their fundamental laws; and next, that the spirit of God shall choose their ministers or overseers; but these things being done for them by the great Head of the Church, for in these things church government is essentially different from civil government; they may then judge who are called by Christ to the holy office—to bear some sort of rule in the church of God" as Paul saith, "remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God," and may do also whatever else is necessary to good government. Thirdly; has the N. T. inculcated any form of church government? Ans., "the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation," yet they do not supersede the necessity for the legitimate exercise of reason; nor do they go into detail to such an extent, as to make void the functions of associations, conferences, synods and conventions; and in view of the brevity of the Scriptures, the variety of mental character, the fallibility even of good men, and the propriety of securing harmony of action, the common sense of all ages has dictated the necessity of drawing up symbols of faith, called creeds, articles or confessions of faith, to serve as points of union among Christians, and as defences against the encroachments of error. Fourthly, do the churches belong to the ministry, or the ministry to the churches? Ans., neither, but both, if faithful, to the Lord, who placed those called by his Spirit, to the ministry; "over us in the Lord." 1 Eph. 5:13. A government of this description is certainly in no wise anti-republican; nevertheless to that form in which these elements exist in the Baptist Church, there is wanting that beautiful connectionism, with its checks and balances, which makes Methodism so close an imitation of our civil republic. It is this want of government properly so called, which renders the Baptist Church so unlike our Federal Government, and which produced the terrible disorders in your Georgia and Alabama churches, referred to in my last communication. Your lame apology for those disorders; for the wretched anarchical legislation, lamented by your own historian; for the existence of that "infernal spirit" which gets into every Baptist community however small, if your last Convention is correct; and for the exceedingly powerful advice given in your Tuskegee legislation on taxation, which advice threatens exclusion against any of your members, who dare refuse such iniquitous tax. I shall not tear away that fig-leaf concealment of your nakedness.

I am happy to inform you further, more that I agree with the great Robt. Hall upon the question of close communion; I concur with him most heartily in both his premises and conclusion. Whenever I can accredit any man as a true minister of Christ, in the highest functions of the ministry, namely, preaching the gospel of Christ, I will freely invite him to partake of the Lord's Supper with me, even were he baptized by a Papist, or never baptized at all. I know of no Methodist minister who would be guilty of the absurd inconsistency of repelling, on the ground of baptism whether valid or not, from the Lord's table one whom he himself acknowledged as a minister of Jesus Christ.

You still cling fondly to the allegation, that in our free land where every one may worship God under his own vine and fig tree, "we impose articles of faith upon our people without their consent, if it is not so the converse can be proved," namely, "the people frame them." Is it true, that if the people do not frame articles of faith,

these articles are imposed on them without their consent, when they voluntarily subscribe to them?!! This is sheer nonsense. Did preachers manufacture them? By no means: for we acknowledge none but Christ as the legislator of the Christian church; and both preachers and people believe God himself revealed these doctrines in his word. This proving of the converse, is a style of logic peculiarly your own. Hodge, Blair, Whately, and other logicians had not discovered that if a particular proposition be not true, the converse must be true. It is unquestionably Hendersonian, and worthy of a copy-right. Look at its application to current topics. "It is a very hot day, sir." "No, sir, it is only moderately warm for the season." "Well, sir, if it is not a very hot day, the converse must be true—it is a very cold day." Most lucid logic! Our fathers taught that the Holy Scriptures contained all things necessary to salvation (Dis); when they preached the word, our people like the Bereans, searched the Scriptures to see whether these things were so; and the word of the Lord was glorified in the voluntary addition to our church of the multitudes who would enjoy this salvation; and both bishops and people have failed to discover during the existence of American Methodism, any necessity for mending our articles of faith.

It is true, the Methodist Church like the Presbyterian and other churches, has but a single grand platform of doctrines for our entire membership; one God, one faith, one baptism into Christ's death (not into his burial, for his burial was a mere circumstance in no wise essential to the atonement).—We do not therefore upon the organization of every church, or every conference, call upon our members to form a new set of articles of faith; if we did, the articles thus framed, might be 18 centuries too late; and then our 12000 Methodist Churches might have as many varying creeds, agreeing in some points, and differing in others, as there are churches. In that event, it would be as great a fallacy to style these thousands of our churches, with their varying creeds, the Methodist Church as it is, to give the appellation which denotes unity, namely, the Baptist Church, to the 10,000 churches, having frequently dissimilar creeds, which agree with you upon questions of baptism. Hence in strictness of speech, there can be no such thing as the Baptist Church; unless it be some particular society claiming that title; for common sense teaches, that when thousands of churches severally try their skill at creed making, and manufacturing so many distinct confessions of faith, they cannot be one church, unless difference and unity, mean the same thing. This is the rather true, when we consider that every one of these churches, claims independent jurisdiction in every respect, as the minutes of the last Hivassoe Baptist Association, N. C., in the following language testify: "We have no high sounding titles as Pope, Cardinals, ruling or presiding elders, synods, assemblies, or conferences, to hear and decide upon appeals, and to pass laws for the government of the church. We meet together for mutual comfort and edification, not to decide upon appeals, nor to make laws." (Carolina Baptist, June 6th.) Now I humbly submit it to your good judgment, whether the members of numerous churches thus governed, with their several distinctive peculiarities, and without any law-making department properly so called, for the aggregate churches, and hence of course, without any representatives at all, whether lay or clerical, invested with legislative power, can with any accuracy be styled the Baptist Church? I think not. I submit also, that where there is no legislature, and your own authorities tell us you have none, there can be no legislative representatives; so that after all your invectives against our representation, it turns out, that in your anomalous system, neither your ministry nor your people have any representation at all. Nevertheless I frankly admit the practice of your churches is better than your theory.—The common sense of your people ignores the theory of your government, and by extra legislative, and extra judicial acts, secures in ordinary cases the benefits of government. But in all unusual or difficult cases, your churches are utterly at fault; and the good and wise among you, like Father Mercer of Georgia, and the Baptist Historian, Holcombe of Alabama, bewail in hopeless bitterness, the sad dissensions, distractions, divisions, anarchy, and despot acts of legislation of your people. We have no desire to frame the Methodist Church government after the pattern of this system of anarchy and confusion, inaccurately styled Baptist Church government. It is by far too much unlike our Federal Government to suit the republican spirit of Methodism.

You have charged our bishops with duplicity in affirming that Mr. Wesley preferred the Episcopal mode of church government to any other. Your proof is, his letter to Mr. Asbury, objecting

(Concluded on fourth page.)

THE S. W. BAPTIST.

TUSKEGEE, ALA.
VOL. 7, NO. 15.
THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 1855.

We have lately received several communications saying our paper does not reach its place of destination. One brother writes he has not received it for three months.

We know the paper is regularly mailed every week, and we are utterly at a loss to determine why it is they do not reach their destination. We shall enquire into this matter, and certainly expose the delinquency which must exist somewhere, unless the matter is speedily stopped.

[Errata.]—Two weeks since, we wrote the following article, and not being present to read the proof, so many errors occurred in it that we cannot think of correcting them any other way than by republishing the article. In the first line of the second paragraph of our article last week, on the subject of "Testimony," an error occurred which the reader will please correct.—For "leaving" read "being."

"Bro. Henderson."—Please to inform an enquirer why it is that our preachers are called *Elders*, and that all ministers of the Gospel are to be so considered.

We suppose "Episcopos" had not read our article published a few weeks since on the subject of "A New Testament Bishop," when he wrote the foregoing query. It strikes us, that his query is answered substantially in that article—at least so far as we are capable of answering it. In that article we maintained that *bishop, presbyter and elder* were all used by the writers of the New Testament as interchangeable terms. *Presbyter* is but an Anglicized Greek word, the original of which is *presbyteros*. Wherever it is translated it is by the word *elder*. *Elder* and *presbyter*, then, being exact synonyms, the only remaining question is, as to whether *bishop* refers to the same office. On this part of the subject, we refer our friend to the article above alluded to. The only shade of difference between *bishop* and *elder*, appears to be that *bishop* is purely an official title, and that *elder*, while it refers to the same office, is applied to the more aged pastors. For this reason, *elder* is the more honorable title of the two. Peter and John both claim to be elders. In a word, according to the pure speech of the New Testament, every pastor is a *bishop*—and the more aged are entitled to wear the cognomen of *elder*. The only reason why Baptist ministers are generally called *elders*, is that *bishop* designates in our language an order of clergy which we do not recognize; and rather than apply a term to our pastors which is associated in the popular mind with the pomp and circumstance of an earthly dignity, we have fallen back upon the more modest and unassuming title of *elder*.

METHODIST CHURCH PROPERTY CASE.

THE "SUN" AND "MOON" OF "OUR EPISCOPACY" SLIGHTLY ECLIPSED.—AN INTERESTING ENGAGEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO WINGS OF THE "TERRIBLE ARMY WITH BANNERS"—ESTIMATED LOSS UPON EACH SIDE—MORE ABOUT THE "DEMOCRATIC ELEMENT"—REPLY TO BROTHER HAMILL'S FIFTH LETTER.

Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? Why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded? I Cor. 6:7.

"Money is a defence."—Solomon.

It is proper that we again state the precise question at issue in this discussion. It is important that the reader should have it always distinctly before his mind. The question is this: *Is the Methodist Episcopal Church, in its nature and tendencies, anti-democratic and anti-republican?* In taking the affirmative of this proposition, we have distinctly stated from the commencement, that we are not attacking the patriotism of any man or set of men. We have been discussing a principle in ecclesiastical polity, which has in all ages of the world tended to abuse and corruption. We have been attempting to show that there is nothing in the Methodist complexion of Episcopacy, which has inclined us to change our opinion of its nature and practical results. Its origin and history up to this time, so far as our means of information extend, point unmistakably to the same spiritual and temporal tyranny, which has marked its progress in every age of the world, since it first extinguished the rights of the churches in the third and fourth centuries. And in pursuing our object, we have found it necessary to bring to light some plain and startling facts—all of which have been done with no unkind feeling to a living soul. That there is a complexion of narrow minded religious prejudice, which cannot comprehend low plain truths, told in a plain way, in regard to an organic principle of governmental economy, can comport with personal good will and Christian charity, is by no means surprising. But then to yield to such an influence, would be to sacrifice principle to policy—the authority of God to the authority of man—and practically to declare that every reformation which has ever been attempted in religion, morals and civil government, has been a curse to the world. And this we are not prepared to admit, even out of complaisance of "the largest denomination of Christians" in this country. The more extensive and widespread the evil, the greater the cause for alarm.

We now propose to examine the "Methodist Episcopal Church Property Case," as argued and decided in the United States Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York, printed and circulated under the auspices of the M. E. Church, South. We shall try and be as brief as possible, so as to dispose of it in a single article, though we assure the reader that a volume could be profitably written upon this single case.

And let us premise here, that if the "democratic element" really exists in the system, it certainly could not have eluded the perception of the learned counsel and court who argued and adjudicated that case. If ever an occasion offered itself in which to elucidate the *arcanum* of "our episcopacy," surely this was the occasion. The whole history of its establishment and practical workings for nearly three quarters of a century was placed in evidence before the court, and expounded with distinguished ability by the most learned counsel on both sides. The powers of the clergy, the bishops and travelling preachers, was the point to be argued and decided before that august tribunal. We shall recognize the "Property Case," then, as involving an authentic, reliable exposition of Episcopal Methodism.

When the ministers of any denomination assume the management and control of its property, they not only adopt the very principle which all civil despots have done to enslave the people, but are guilty at the same time, of departing from the great work to which they profess to have been called by the Holy Ghost. The tribe of Levi, who were the spiritual teachers of religion, were not allowed to own one foot of land, or indeed any other kind of property. The Apostles themselves would not so much as consent to disburse the benefactions of the Church at Jerusalem among the poor; but asked the Church to elect seven deacons, a kind of board of managers, to attend to this business, so that they "could give themselves entirely to the word of God and prayer." Observe, they did not appoint these deacons themselves, but requested the Church to do it. We beg the reader to observe these principles, as we proceed to analyze this case.

In 1844, the General Conference assembled in the city of New York. A case was carried up to it from the State of Maryland to this effect: A Mr. Harding, a traveling preacher, had been deposed from the ministry by the Maryland Conference because he was a slave holder. Possessing the right of appeal, he applied to the General Conference for relief. That body, by a very large majority, confirmed the action of the Maryland Conference, in deposing Mr. Harding. Immediately the question recurred, if we deposed a common circuit rider for being a slave holder, what shall we do with a *bishop* who is guilty of the same crime? Bishop Andrew, of Georgia, (than whom a more amiable, meek, and pious man perhaps never endured the mitre) was known to be a slave holder. This was the great question of the occasion. It brought on the engagement between the two wings of the "terrible army with banners." And never, within the history of this Republic, has ecclesiastical domination made such arrogant assumptions to interfere with the civil, social and domestic institutions of the country. Here is an aspect of Episcopacy which may well alarm the fears of the Christian and the patriot. A General Conference of the M. E. Church of the United States arraigns one of its first officers, and holds over him the penalty of degradation, and for what? For the crime of being a slave holder! assuming to interfere with an institution in the States, which the most rabid abolitionist declares Congress cannot do!

Well—the measure was carried. Bishop Andrew was instructed to suspend the exercise of the functions of his bishopric until he manumitted his slaves. Whereupon the Southern members of the Conference, brought in a solemn protest against the measure as "extra-judicial." That protest was answered by a committee appointed on the part of the majority. Dr. Capers, (the late Bishop) introduced a series of resolutions contemplating a peaceful separation of the South from the North, and the organization of a Southern General Conference. These resolutions also ceded to the Southern members, provided they should form such an organization, "all the churches, schools, colleges, cemeteries," &c., lying within their specified territory, and authorized the managers of the "Book Concern" to negotiate an equitable division of its funds with such commissioners as might be appointed from the South. These resolutions were passed by a decided majority. And here let it be distinctly noted, that the Bishops and clergy at this Conference assumed an absolute proprietorship in "all the churches, schools, colleges, Book Concern," &c., belonging to the M. E. Church in the United States. Time and again the impression has been sought to be made during this discussion, that "with regard to the business in which the laity are equally interested with the ministry—such business as constitutes the sphere of operations" of Baptist Conventions, State and general, (the M. E. Church) "have already lay delegation, and lay management"—and that it is only "the privilege of scattering" the "ministers to the four winds," appointing them to their respective fields of labor, that the laity have no voice. See Bro. Hamill's third letter, fourth column. Are the laymen of that church "equally interested with the ministry," in the churches, schools, colleges, cemeteries, Book Concern? &c. Brother Hamill will not deny this. And yet, when the Bishops and clergy in General Conference assembled assert an absolute proprietorship in, and a right to dispose of, all this immense aggregation of church property in the United States, not a single layman's voice was ever heard in the council that argued, or the vote that decided, the fate of this measure! Nay, further—in the parties litigant in the famous lawsuit we propose reviewing, as appears upon the face of the "Bill," there is not the name of a single layman upon either side!

But to proceed: After the Conference adjourned, sundry scruples suggested themselves to the minds of the Northern managers of the "Book Concern," as to whether the seceding party, (the Southern division), could be legitimately recognized as a Methodist Episcopal Church—whether the admission of such a principle would not destroy the unity of the church—whether the church had the right to cut itself in twain, and thus commit a kind of moral suicide, &c., &c. They therefore refused to enter into the negotiation with the Southern commissioners, as directed by the General Conference. Under the leadership of Henry B. Bascomb, than whom they could not have chosen a more chivalrous generalissimo, the Southern wing of the "terrible army with banners" organized its forces, and immediately issued a summons to the Northern wing to the "terrible army with banners," to "meet them at Philippi" when and where, with "weapons of warfare" that were "carnal," they should decide who was to heir the "images and superscriptions of" Uncle Sam.

We wish that time and space would allow us to enter into the full merits of this case. We have only time to establish two points which directly bear upon the question we are discussing.

1st. That the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States in its governmental economy, is nothing more nor less than the Bishop and travelling clergy.

2dly. THAT THEY HAVE NO CONSTITUENTS. They are sovereign, and are accountable to no power on earth but their own consciences.

chosen to adopt the Presbyterian or Baptist forms, either of government or of doctrine, it was in its power to do it. There was no limit. They represented the Church; they were the Church. The Church dispersed its light from the preachers. The laity were not known in the governing body. Matters of doctrine, discipline and everything were in the governing body. If that was so up to 1803, what was that body after that period? It was the same general Conference. [Prop. Case, p. 163.]

The Hon. REVEREND JOHNSON, who also represented the Southern commissioners in that case, spoke thus: "This Church, be it remembered, even unto the present time, and I speak it in no offensive sense, as regards its government, has been absolutely, since the days of Wesley, an aristocracy. Laymen, have had, and now have no voice in it. If there is a layman within the sound of my voice, he knows he has no voice now. Heretofore they have been satisfied with the government. They have acted upon the saying of Pope,—

"For forms of government let fools contest, That which is best administered is best."

They perhaps will be found changing their opinion when they find it is not always best administered.

"Now I want to know, if the entire sovereign power of the Church was in the ministers, the preachers, what other body on the face of God's earth was there in 1808 upon which to divide the power of dividing the Church, which must have been in the ministers, than the Conference of 1808. The ministers made the Church. The ministers, in the governmental sense, are the Church. The sovereigns are the ministers, and if it be a part of the sovereign power, in a body of this description, to divide itself, then that power existed in the Conference of ministers of 1808, or it is gone. The admission is that it cannot be extinguished. It is absolute, inherent, and alienable, as my brother, Mr. Choate, admitted. A body unlimited in the authority to create, is equally unlimited in the authority to destroy, responsible only to their consciences for the manner in which either authority is exercised."—*Math. Ch. Property Case*, p. 331.

Again, on page 328, speaking of the action of the Conference of 1784, Mr. Johnson said—

"They admit no constitution. The time is perhaps coming when, in all probability, they will be obliged to admit one for the good of the Church. They resolve for themselves, and for themselves alone, as the possessors of ALL ECCLESIASTICAL POWER known to the Methodist Church, to carry out the particular organization organized by John Wesley, without any other authority than his, and their own conviction that the good of the Church demanded such a special and particular organization." And still further, on page 329, Mr. J. continues,—

"No medium of power was left elsewhere. The Church was not to look elsewhere for any portion of authority? We could quote much more to the same purpose, but this is sufficient.

Now, let us sum up this evidence. Here are two of the first lawyers in the Union, employed by the complainants, the commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to defend their right to an equitable division of "Church property" before the United States Circuit Court, relying wholly upon the evidence which they furnished to their hand declaring what? That the Conference of 1784, composed of sixty traveling preachers, with Messrs. Asbury and Coke at their head, in adopting the doctrines and discipline of that church, "admit no constitution"—that not one particle of power was left elsewhere—that laymen have had, and now have no voice in it—that the ministers *embrace the Church*—that in a governmental sense "THEY ARE THE CHURCH"—that it is *absolutely an ARISTOCRACY*—that it possesses unlimited power "to create," and "to destroy"—that "it could have become Socinian had it chosen to do so"—and that it is responsible to no tribunal on earth but the consciences of those who wield its authority! All this, and much more of like character, was solemnly pronounced, as already intimated by two of the ablest lawyers of the United States, before one of the highest judicial functionaries of the country, as an exposition of Methodist Episcopacy, and published to the world under the auspices of the M. E. Church, South! And yet for daring to question its republicanism, we are to be denounced by its patented journals as a *demagogue*, a *bigot*, an *ignoramus*, a *legitimate child of the father of lies*!

But we have higher evidence than all this to sustain our position. After the case was elaborately argued by such men as Johnson, Choate, Lord and Wood, Judge NELSON delivered the opinion of the Court, from which we make the following extract:

"2. As to the power of the General Conference to authorize a separation of the Church organization.

The Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States was established in its government, doctrine, and discipline, by a General Conference of the traveling preachers in this communion. In 1784. Down to that time the Methodist Societies in America had been governed by John Wesley, the founder of this denomination of Christians, through the agency of his assistants. During this year the entire government was taken into the hands of the traveling preachers with his approbation and assent. They organized it, established its doctrines and discipline, appointed the several authorities—superintendents or bishops, ministers and preachers—to administer its polity, and promulgate its doctrines and teaching throughout the land. From that time to this, the source and fountain of all its temporal power are the traveling preachers in this communion in General Conference assembled. The lay members of the Church have no part or connexion with its governmental organization, and never had. The traveling preacher comprise the embodiment of its power, ecclesiastical and temporal; and, when assembled in General Conference according to the usages and discipline of the Church, represent themselves, and have no constituents; and thus the organization continued until the year 1808, when a modification took place."—[Appendix Prop. Case, pp. 10, 11.]

The "modification" to which Judge Nelson alludes, relates to the organization of a General out of the Annual Conference, which occurred in 1808. The Judge then proceeds to show that that modification did not affect in the slightest degree the principle he had laid down, to wit: That the bishops and clergy in General Conference assembled embodied all the power, "ecclesiastical and temporal," known in their governmental economy.

The decision of the Court, then, sustains every position taken by the counsel. We will state these positions again in still fewer words, confirmed by the extract from the opinion of the Court: All the *derived* power which is in the Bishops and clergy of the M. E. Church ever

had came, not from the Churches, but from John Wesley—they established its doctrines and discipline—created its officers to administer its polity—they also are the source and fountain of all its power—laymen have no connection with its governmental organization and never had—and when assembled in General Conference according to the usage and discipline of the Church, represent themselves AND HAVE NO CONSTITUENTS! No bill of exceptions was filed to this decision. The Methodist Episcopal Church, North, yielded to, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, accepted, the award! Both divisions of the Church stand committed to this decision, as containing a true and faithful exposition of the governmental economy of that church. Why have we never heard these lawyers and Judges denounced as *demagogues* and *bigots*—and as ignorant of the subject they were adjudicating? They aver, that so far as government is concerned, (and that is the only subject we are discussing,) the Bishops and traveling clergy are, *de facto*, THE CHURCH—that in its legislative and administrative economy, its lay members are unknown—that it is an *aristocracy*—and has no constituents. Now, if all this were untrue, can any man suppose for one moment, that the North would have yielded its claim to four hundred thousand dollars, and that the South would have accepted it? Is the "democratic element" in the M. E. Church, South, if it ever existed, worth only four hundred thousand dollars? And yet, to secure that pitiful sum, the six hundred thousand private members in the Southern division of that church, and we may add a larger number in the Northern division, aggregating a million and a half, or nearly so, of American citizens, are recognized, by the public records of the country, in their ecclesiastical relations, as *below the rank of common citizens*—as *BEING NO CONSTITUENTS*!! We do not desire to introduce degrading comparisons; but we must be permitted to ask, what more humiliating language could be used in regard to the subjects of the most absolute despotisms on earth, than that they "are no constituents?" Methodists! local preachers and private members! lovers of God, of truth, of liberty, and of your country!

"If you have nature in you, hear it not!" "The traveling preachers comprise the embodiment of its power ECCLESIASTICAL and TEMPORAL; and when assembled in General Conference, according to the usage and discipline of the Church, represent themselves and HAVE NO CONSTITUENTS!" What more have we ever said? Why is it, we again ask, that Judges NELSON and BETTS, the Hon REVEREND JOHNSON and his colleagues, have never been held to account for uttering such language as this? Was it because four hundred thousand dollars depended upon the maintenance of these doctrines? Or rather was it not because THEY SPOKE THE TRUTH? Why is it that they have escaped the ecclesiastical lash of the guardians of Episcopacy, religious and political, while "an obscure local organ," to use the very delicate and respectful language of a Methodist contemporary, for alleging nothing more than this, is to be denounced as guilty of "the lowest piece of demagoguism, and narrow minded bigotry that has yet transpired?" The United States Court was certainly capable of inflicting a more serious injury upon "our episcopacy" than an "obscure local organ." And yet, when that decision was announced, the editors of all the Methodist journals South, congratulated themselves, and their church upon the successful termination of the suit, and accepted the award of the Court without so much as questioning a single principle upon which it was made. "Our Episcopacy" says "Our Episcopacy" at one of the highest judicial tribunals of the country. The parties litigant prove to the satisfaction of the counsel and judges, that the Bishops and traveling preachers "made the Church"—that the Bishops and traveling preachers "are, in the governmental sense, THE CHURCH"—that "this Church ever has been, and is now ABSOLUTELY AN ARISTOCRACY"—that "they admit no constituents"—and have no constituency." And the solemn claim is set up, by these champions, that Methodist Episcopacy, as a distinct form of government, not only harmonizes with, but wonderfully illustrates and strengthens those great, fundamental principles which constitute the substratum of our glorious Republic—That all men are created equal—That all power is inherent in the people—and, That the will of the people, constitutionally expressed, is the law of the land!! He that can believe it, let him!

All we have to say is, we envy not the huge dimensions of that credulity, which can swallow that camel.

Such, then, was the engagement between the two wings of this "Terrible army with banners." Let us now survey the field of battle, after this "terrible" conflict, and try to estimate the "loss and gain" upon each side of the combatants.—The Southern wing of the "terrible army" lost a circuit rider, Harding, and had a bishop (Andrew) put hors d' combat, among the regular officers of the line. The Northern wing lost about four hundred thousand dollars, which, of course was gained by the Southern wing, and which, to that extent compensated for the loss of their officers. But now as to the "rank and file" upon either side—the heart sickens at the scene of carnage.

"If you have tears, prepare to shed them now!"

Up to the time of the commencement of this engagement, it was understood by the official organs of the two wings, that the "constituents," the common soldiers of the "Terrible army" amounted in the aggregate to about one million two or three hundred thousand.—But alas! from the dispatches which have reached us from the scene of conflict, signed and sealed by the proper officers, not one common soldier survives, to commemorate in verse or history, the deeds of valor which were performed "at Philippi!" The dispatch reads—THEY HAVE NO CONSTITUENCY! They had claimed up to that date "a constituency" of between a million and a million and a half. At the close of the engagement, Judge NELSON declares there is none! no, not one! Marathon, Actium, and Waterloo—Saratoga, New Orleans, and Sebastopol—hide your diminished heads! Here is a "terrible army with banners," that on one fell swoop, annihilates a "constituency" of almost a million and a half!

But look at another aspect of this power claimed for the Bishops and travelling clergy in general conference assembled. Says Mr. Lord, one of the counsel for complainants, and of course good authority with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, "If that body (the General Conference) had chosen to become Socinian; if it had chosen to adopt the PRESBYTERIAN or BAPTIST forms, either of government or doctrine, it was in its power to do it." What! change the whole Methodist denomination in the United States into a Socinian body? Or into a Presbyterian or Baptist organization, both in discipline and doctrine? Yes, says Mr. Lord.—"There was no limit. They represented the church; THEY WERE THE CHURCH; they admit no constituency," responds Mr. Johnson; "they have no constituency," says the Court! Now so far as we know, none of the organs of the church have ever denied these positions of the counsel and court. Indeed up to their successful maintenance depended the issue of the pending suit. If the sovereign power did not belong to the Bishops and clergy of that Church, they had no right to divide its property. But if the sovereign power did reside there; if "no medium of power was left elsewhere"—then as a matter of course, that power could be exercised upon all questions of doctrine or discipline without being responsible to any authority for its exercise "but their own consciences." Next we ask, can the most stubborn incredulity itself deny, if this be a faithful exposition of Episcopal Methodism, THAT IT IS A SYSTEM OF CLERICAL ABSOLUTISM.

Now, reader, do you not agree with us, that it will take a microscope of a hundred fold more power than has yet revealed the wonders of a universe in a single drop of water, to discover the "democratic element" in a system which "admits no constituency"—which "has no constituency!"

We congratulate bro. Hamill upon his safe return to the people of his charges. With a right good will, we again bid him welcome to our columns, sincerely trusting that his respite will enable him to enlighten us more fully upon the Democracy of "our Episcopacy." Again, also, must we commend him for the very kind spirit which pervades his article. It is so very different from that which has been manifested toward us by sundry of his brethren in several of the "Advocates," that the task of responding to it is a real pleasure to us. We trust that this discussion will prove one thing to the sensitive and censorious; and that is That it is possible for Christian men to discuss their differences with the kindest feelings to each other, as well as in a Christian spirit.

We had hoped after the lapse of so many weeks, that our brother was preparing an article entirely upon the question at issue between us. When lo! the very first paragraph contains another allusion to the "mad men of Munster," as they are called. On reflection, however, we suppose that the Munster insurrection has about as much connection with Methodist Episcopacy, as Methodist Episcopacy has with American Democracy. We suppose we must inform our brother that that movement in Germany was not a religious, but a political one. Its promoters were what were subsequently known in England as "fifth monarchy men." Various sects were engaged in it. One of its leaders, on one occasion, sprinkled several hundred of his followers with a soap—somewhat after the manner Mr. Wesley supposed John sprinkled the crowds that came to his ministry on the banks of the Jordan. Now, it strikes us that this is not exactly Baptist. Back says: "It must be acknowledged that the true rise of the insurrection of this period ought not to be attributed to religious opinions." "A great part were anabaptists." * * * A great part also were Roman Catholics; and a still greater part had no religious principles at all.

Then follows a pretty long episode upon "close communion" and "Baptist anarchy." Indeed most of the article is taken up with the latter subject. Now, bro. H., if you could demonstrate, not only to the satisfaction of every Methodist, but of every thinking man on earth, that Baptist Churches in this country were literally descended from the Munster insurrectionists—may, further, that this Baptist Church was organized in the bottomless pit, and was one of the "unclean spirits" which John saw issuing from the mouth of "the beast,"—what would all that have to do with the plain practical question at issue between us—Is Methodist Episcopacy anti-republican? Ichthyologists inform us, that there belongs to the finny tribe a singular species which has the power, when pursued by an enemy, of throwing out a dark, muddy substance which has much the same effect upon the water that a cloud has upon the atmosphere. And having created this pavilion of darkness, it very dexterously eludes the pursuit of its foe. It is called the "Ink-fish." Verbum sat.

Seriously, bro. H., what would "Hedge" pronounce of your logic, if the foregoing were adjuce as specimens? You set out to show what? Why, "the striking analogy between the Methodist Church government and the government of the United States." This you do, first by appealing to the insurrection among the peasants of Germany in the sixteenth century. Secondly to "close communion," as you call it, as practised among Baptists—and thirdly, to Baptist anarchy! That is,—there was an insurrection in Germany in the sixteenth century—moreover, the Baptists practice "close communion"—and still further, (how astonishingly cumulative the argument!) Baptist churches sometimes get into confusion: Therefore, there is a "striking analogy between the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the government of the United States!" Shades of Locke, Reid and Hedge! what profound reasoning! But as already intimated, that penetration which can evolve the "democratic element" in "our episcopacy," can find no difficulty in demonstrating the logical connection between the premises and conclusion of the above argument.

The four points we suggested as organic elements in a New Testament Church, are "partly correct," but "may need some emendation." Well, what are these emendations? First, as to the constituency of a Gospel church, bro. H.'s answer varies from ours only so far as to include, we suppose, "seekers." But as we did not set out to ascertain the constituency of a Methodist, but an Apostolic church, there is no need of a serious reply. Our position remains impregnable, that in the Apostles' age, churches were composed of "saints—faithful brethren—sanctified—saved," &c. Secondly, to our question—are these saints and faithful ones competent to govern themselves, he answers "they are within certain limitations." These limitations are, that Christ has given the fundamental laws—that the Spirit calls men to the ministry—that the church may judge who are called to the

holy office—positions these, which Baptists have held from time immemorial—and finally "to bear some sort of rule in the church of God, as Paul saith, 'remember them who have the rule over you,' &c., and may also do whatever else is necessary for good government." Pretty large margin this, bro. Hamill. Who are to judge of what is necessary for "good government," the rulers or the governed? It reminds us of the last article in the rules of a well known academy in a neighboring State. That as no system of rules could meet every emergency, especially in the government of naughty boys, much would be left to the discretion of the teachers. Reader, is not our brother demonstrating the "democratic element" with a vengeance? Thirdly: Has the New Testament indicated any form of church government? This answer to this is somewhat like "our episcopacy," a little difficult to understand. If, however, we can comprehend his meaning, he answers it negatively. He thinks, from the "brevity of Scripture, the variety of mental character, the fallibility of even good men," &c., "that 'concessions of faith, or creeds,' may 'serve as points of union among Christians, and as defenses against the encroachments of error.'" Now, there is but one way to test the correctness of any principle; and that is, to observe its practical operation. A few plain questions and answers may suggest to the mind of the reader all that need be said upon this point.

What divides the various denominations of Christians from each other? Creeds. What keeps up this division, and makes it more marked every year? Creeds. What is the first thing that every new sect does that springs up in the country? It "draws up a symbol of faith, called a creed." Does this effect a "union" of this sect among Christians? It separates its members from all other Christians. What is the first step to effect a union among all Christians? The destruction of that which now separates them—their creeds. What is the next step? The adoption of the Bible, and the Bible only, as the entire rule of faith and practice. The truth is, human creeds may make pretty good servants, but most wretched masters. Our brother gives one very singular reason why this discretionary power should be left in the hands of men. It is the "fallibility of even good men." Human fallibility,—it seems to us, is a pretty good reason why "even good" but uninspired men, should not be trusted to draft a constitution for a *divine* government. As to "creeds" being barriers to "error," we think the reverse. We think that they foster error. A Presbyterian denounces Methodism as "Anti-Christ." A Methodist avers that the cherished dogma of Presbyterianism, "eternal, particular, and unconditional election," emanated from the bottomless pit, and that it will return thither. Are they both right? And how long will it take their "creeds" to effect a union among these "Christians"? But fourthly, to the question, Do the churches belong to the ministry, or the ministry to the churches, our brother responds, "neither, but both," &c., and to prove this, he refers to a passage, upon which all despotic hierarchies have always insisted, "expanding it with a richness and an unctious as if the very substance of God's message to man were there, in summarily comprehended," says Isaac Taylor. The passage is this—"obey them that have the rule over you in the Lord." But in what were they to obey them? Why clearly in their spiritual instructions and admonitions. Ministers are members of churches, and as such have all the rights of other members. The office to which they are called, is a spiritual, not a temporal office. The injunction is purely a spiritual one for the Apostle immediately adds, "they (the ministers) watch for souls." Does it need a serious argument to prove that churches have the right to control that which emanates from themselves—the property? Yet, Judge NELSON, as we have seen, declares that in the Methodist Episcopal Church, "the travelling preachers comprise the embodiment of its power, ecclesiastical and temporal." &c. So that Episcopal Methodism places in the hands of its bishops and travelling clergy all power spiritual and temporal, known in its organization. "Not a medium of it is left elsewhere." It is, therefore, in the true and proper sense of that term, a system of CLERICAL ABSOLUTISM. Our brother speaks of the "checks and balances" of the system. Where are these "checks and balances"? Bishop Hamill affirms that they recognize "no tribunal to cure errors or rectify wrongs." Mr. Johnson avers, "they are responsible to no authority but their own consciences" for the exercise of their power. Where, then, are the "checks and balances"? We claim, then, that all our positions remain impregnable.

But our apology for disorders among Baptist Churches, was quite lame. So doubtless, the friends of Monarchy think in regard to our "apologies," for occasional out-breaks in our popular form of government—such as a spiritual rife in the State of Massachusetts in regard to the fugitive slave law. They could, no doubt, read us many lectures upon monarchy as being a "system of surpassing energy." Now, the only reasons why we cannot accept the remedy which "our episcopacy" proposes for these evils, are, first, it is unscriptural, as we think—secondly, it is worse than the disease. The dead *pascu* would free us from all sensations of pain, heat, cold, wounds and strokes. It is a "system of surpassing energy." Indeed, it is a kind of universal panacea for all diseases. Once let it fasten upon the system, and we are molested no more with other "disorders." But— the reader can supply the commentary.

That "exceedingly powerful advice," given at the Tuskegee Ministers' and Deacons' meeting, still haunts our brother's imagination. It was an "inquisitorial tax." Now, reader, we attended that meeting, as we have already informed you, and participated in its proceedings in some humble degree; and the sum and substance of that "threatened exclusion" and "inquisitorial tax" was this: The members who composed that meeting, expressed their opinions in two resolutions, introduced by a private member—first: That covetousness was idolatry, and that no idolater ought to be retained in the church. This is the "threatened exclusion." Secondly: That in meeting the necessary expenses of our churches, we ought to obey the rule laid down by Paul, viz: That every man should contribute "according as God has prospered him." And this is the "inquisitorial taxation." The issue upon these points is not between us and bro. Hamill, but between him and God's word. The "fig-leaf" was placed there by the divine penmen. Let him "tear it away if he can."

If we do, we cling to the allegation, that the bishops and travelling clergy imposed upon the members without their consent. The Code "represented themselves and had no constituents," says Judge Nelson. "He who has no row," cannot prescribe or plead any length of original exercise of this power were *adversely*—then its exercise forsooth, never can make it any thing else. We have a practical question to ask, not bro. Hamill, but any bishop or clergyman of the church, had the "Church Property Case," we would call the church;—and it is this: If the adoption of your form of government, your episcopacy were now an original question, and your General Conference were to grant you the privilege, which the national convention formed our federal constitution, gave to the several States to receive or reject it, **MANY OF YOU WOULD VOTE FOR IT.** How many of you would adopt voluntarily your form of government, if your rulers would allow you the privilege, which would not recognize you as "constituents?"

But our logic upon this point is peculiar—"Herdersonian." Now, we do not agree in the distinction of founding a new school of logic. True, it does require a new system of logic to evolve the "democratic element" in a system of government which "has no constituents." But we must beg our brother to be as sincere when we say, we are too modest to aspire to that distinction. That a certain position should be either true or false, is a "non-sense," is it? Well, if our brother will enlighten us as to how much truth and falsity may dwell together in the same proposition, a fraternal sympathy, we think he will make an achievement in logic, which will bear its palm from us! "Did our preachers misleadure them?" (Faith and Discipline, we suppose he means) asks bro. H. "They originated," answers Judge NELSON; "established its doctrines and discipline, appointed the several authorities—superintendents, or bishops, ministers and preachers—to administer its polity, and promulgate its doctrines and teaching throughout the land." And yet for saying that the Bishops and clergy in "establishing its doctrine and discipline," imposed their will upon the churches without their consent, we utter "heresense!" "If that body (the General Conference) had chosen to become Socinian," says Mr. Lord, "if it had chosen to adopt the PRESBYTERIAN or BAPTIST forms, either of government or doctrine, it was in its power to do it." Why, because, says Mr. JOHNSON, it "admitted a constituency." How is the weather now, bro. H.? "Hot" or "cold?" Is our "logic laid enough?"

"Our fathers taught that the Holy Scriptures contained all things necessary to salvation. Very well; we only wish their children would believe them."

But "in strictness of speech there can be as such thing as the Baptist Church." True, bro. Hamill, and we thank God for it. Repine repudiate such vernacular as implies such a centralization of power as that, please do. We have Baptist Churches—but to apply the term, "THE BAPTIST CHURCH" to this country of churches, is a phrase not of our coining. In the New Testament when a single church is intended, it is so named—"the church at Jerusalem"—"the church at Corinth," &c. But in a district of country is allowed to us, there are several churches, the phraseology is changed, and we read of "the seven churches of Asia"—as in all the churches of the same. &c. Now, suppose, we apply to bro. Hamill "strictness of speech," as applicable to "an episcopacy," and see how it will work. It claimed that there are nearly a million plus half of members in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. (It is only, however, according to the latest statistics that we have seen about 1,300,000.) In the "Church Property Case" it was argued by the counsel that "the ministers were the Church," as decided by the Court that these ministers, the Bishops and travelling preachers, "when assembled in Conference, according to the rules and usages of the church, represented themselves and had no constituents." Therefore, "in strictness of speech," the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, instead of having nearly a million and a half, have only a membership of between six and seven thousand! O, what a fall was there, my countrymen! That "strictness of speech" bro. H., is no mean syllable cut out of so many heads at one stroke. Truly is "our episcopacy" "a terrible army with banners!"

"Where there is no legislature, and your authorities tell us you have none, there can be no legislative representatives." Most truly spoken, bro. Hamill, and we thank you for the compliment. And if you will not exercise a candor in us, we will undertake to enlighten you a little now, and more hereafter, when the discussion closes, upon Baptist sentiments as this Christ and his Apostles and evangelists did. We do most religiously believe that Jesus Christ and his Apostles and evangelists did all the legislation necessary for the churches in all ages. We believe that "creed" and "form of government" which they drafted, and which is known as the "New Testament," is the product of infinite wisdom, as Christ only can know what is pleasing to himself, we are afraid to "add to" or "take from" that document a single "dot or tithe." If it had been written by uninspired men, like "our book of discipline," it might have needed "mending." But as it emanated from Him who "saw the end from beginning," we feel competent to add anything to it, and apply its teachings to the objects intended, it is all that we aspire to. The lustre of the sun at midday would not likely be much increased by the addition of a few flickering tapers.

We confess, bro. Hamill is leading us into some light upon the sacramental communion question. He informs us that he would hesitate to administer the communion to persons baptized in any way, (and so say we, provided they have been baptized,) and that Roman Catholic baptism is just as current as any other; (a pretty long stride toward Rome, we

think) and still further, if they have not been baptized at all, and give evidence of a desire to be the wrath to come, &c., he is ready to communicate with them. We say, brother, H. is enlightening us: First, we begin now to understand the import of a phrase quite common among his brethren. It is very usual for them to characterize their denomination as "a branch of the Church." Methodism was established by a "branch" of the Church of England. The English Church was established by a Catholic King, Henry VIII. So that the English Episcopal Church becomes the connecting link between the "branch," and the original "stock." Our brother's Roman Catholic proclivities are quite significant. "Traces of the family likeness are preserved with singular faithfulness, and loyalty even to the third generation. But, secondly, it matters not whether the applicant for communion has ever been baptized in any way or by any body, our brother will not refuse the communion to him on that account! Well, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind," has almost induced writers on religious subjects to give one of two reasons at least, for every item of faith and practice which they may adopt. First, it is taught in the Scriptures; or, secondly, it is taught in the "Fathers." That is, it is either scriptural or traditional. True, there is a wide difference between the two; but as already intimated, it is common even among Catholics to allege one or the other of these. But our brother does neither. Now, we say if there is a single precept or example in all God's word to authorize the administration of the Lord's Supper to an unbaptized person, it was in his power to have produced it. But this he has not pretended to do. And as to the "Fathers," we will quote for our brother's special edification, the declaration of Dr. Wall: "No church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that were ever held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before they were baptized."—Hist. Inf. Bap., part 2, ch. 9. Were it necessary we could make similar quotations from Justin Martyr, Jerome, Austin, Bede, &c., among the ancient fathers; and from Drs. Maunton, Doddridge, Dwight, &c., among modern divines.

Will bro. Hamlin answer us the following plain questions, without any circumlocution?—1st. Does the Discipline authorize him to administer the communion to any person who is guilty of that for which he would be excluded from the Methodist Episcopal Church?—2nd. Would a man be excluded from that church for persistently inveighing against its doctrines and discipline?—3rd. If such offensive person should happen to be a Presbyterian or a Baptist, would the church be less on that account?—4th. If our bro. had lived contemporaneous with Paul, he might have saved that Apostle of doom of trouble. He might have said to him, "Why Paul, why don't you frame your ecclesiastical government after the model of 'our episcopacy'?" Why put yourself to the trouble of writing to the various churches, entreating them to arrest the tide of 'anarchy and confusion,' 'inane confusion' and 'disorders and strifes,' among the 'ten thousand' Baptist churches in the United States, who have already alleged, that these are to establish the general principle, that 'anarchy' is 'the rule of the whole denomination!' 'What lucid logic!' It is a work, too, 'not congenial with his spirit'! (2) Very well! When a man sets out to do one thing, and does another, it creates a suspicion that it is not very unbecoming. By the way, it is not a little amusing to hear our bro. talk about 'rulers among us' (the Baptists), after demonstrating to his own satisfaction the 'anarchy and confusion' of Baptist churches. We had supposed that 'anarchy and confusion' reigned where there were no 'rulers.' And does he really suppose that those who adopt the New Testament 'as their only rule of faith and practice,' really have 'no church government?' Baptists, like other 'even good but fallible men' may err, in the application of the principles of the inspired volume in certain cases, but to say that those who adopt it as the only standard of appeal in all cases both of doctrine and discipline, have no government, is just saying, that Christ and his inspired Apostles were either incompetent or indifferent to the task of furnishing rules to govern the very bodies which they themselves organized. Where are the 'symbols of faith, called creeds,' which were 'points of union among Christians' in the Apostolic age? Are they the New Testament? If so, had they no 'church government?' Or if not, how comes it that those who had the same constitution which they had, have 'what is inaccurately styled . . . Church Government?' To such absurdities are 'even good but fallible men' driven, who, forsaking the inspired rule, 'throw out themselves cisterns, broken cisterns that can hold no water.' However, for his decided proclivity to 'look upon the Christian enterprise, and sweet pity of many of our members,' we are greatly obliged to him. And we assure him that similar characteristics among our Methodist brethren ever have, and ever will we trust, awaken our kindest Christian regards, their episcopacy to the contrary notwithstanding.

We accept our brother's explanation of the charge of 'falsehood.' The point of our complaint was in reference to the facts we had stated, not the arguments we had used.

SPECIAL NOTICES.
To the Churches of the Tuskegee Association.
We specially request the Churches of the Tuskegee Association when making out their next Church-Scales for the Minutes, to make out a separate and distinct scale for the black members, as we think it important to ascertain their number. W. W. MASON, Mod. J. M. WALK, Clk.

Association Meetings.
We give below the time and place at which the associations named will hold their annual sessions this season. The list of all the associations in Alabama would be given if the minutes had been forwarded to us. Will not some of our brethren send us copies of those not named that they may be inserted in due time?

We have two requests to make, and we hope they will be granted:
1. That the Clerks of the Associations in Alabama compile a complete list of the ministers (ordained and licensed) connected with the churches composing those bodies; and publish them in the minutes, giving the post-office address of each minister.

2. That copies of the minutes be forwarded to this office immediately after they issue from the press.
It is designed to compile a complete list of all the ministers in the State, and publish it in the next minutes of the Convention, if the names can be obtained.

3d Sabbath in September.
AUTAUGA Association with the Kingston Church, Autauga county, Ala., commencing on Saturday.
CHEROKEE with the Mt. Harmony Church at Lebanon, De Kalb co., Ala., commencing on Friday.
TUSKEGEE with the Union Springs Church, Macon co., Ala., commencing on Friday.

4th Sabbath in September.
MULBERRY with the Mulberry Church, Bibb co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.
UNION with the Grant's Creek Church, Tuscaloosa co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

1st Sabbath in October.
BETHLE with the Union Church, near Coffeeville, Clark co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.
CENTRAL with the church at Rockford, Coosa co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.
CANAAN with the Rock Creek Church, Jefferson co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

2d Sabbath in October.
ALABAMA with the Carrollville Church, Dallas co., Ala., commencing on Friday.
EPAULIA with the church at Clayton, Barbour co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.
SHELBY with the Providence Church, Shelby co., Ala., about eight miles South of Montealeo, commencing on Saturday.

3d Sabbath in October.
CANAHA with the Hopewell Church, Perry co., Ala., commencing on Friday.
JENKINS with the Antioch Church, near Skipperville, Dale co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

4th Sabbath in October.
BIGBY with the Gaston Church, Sumter co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.
WEST FLORA Association, with the Orange Hill Church, Jackson co., Florida, commencing on Saturday.

EAST ALABAMA FEMALE COLLEGE.
Tuskegee, Macon Co., Ala.
OFFICERS.
LITERARY DEPARTMENT.
HENRY H. BACON, A. M., President.
MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE.
GEORGE W. THOMAS, A. M., Higher Mathematics and Ancient Languages.
MISS LINDA WILLIAMS, Logic, Rhetoric and History.
MISS FRENCH, PENMANSHIP AND ENGLISH BRANCHES.
MISS MARTHA E. WOMACK, Preparatory Department.
MUSICAL DEPARTMENT.
DR. S. M. BARTLETT, Principal.
MR. GUSTAVUS GIESLER, Assistant.
MRS. J. J. TAYLOR, Assistant.
MISS LYDIA A. ROOT, Assistant.

ORNAIMENTAL DEPARTMENT.
MISS L. H. REID, Principal.
MISS ———, Assistant.
BOARDING DEPARTMENT.
MISS L. H. REID, Governess.
MR. ———, Steward.
MRS. ———, Stewardess.

WHILE we believe that our numerous patrons repose confidence in our abilities and intention to provide, at all times, a good corps of teachers; it is with pleasure we introduce to them, briefly, those whose names are given for the first time as members of the faculty.
Prof. GEORGE W. THOMAS, late Professor in the 'Literary & Scientific Institute,' Tuskegee, is a gentleman of high standing in our community, both as regards his scholarship and piety. As a teacher and a disciplinarian he has shown himself eminently successful.
Miss L. H. REID has been for some time a teacher in the 'Judson.' Besides having proved her superior abilities in that institution, she has graduated with her the highest recommendations from the late President M. P. Jewett, M.D. While there, she acted a portion of her time in the capacity of Governess.

Miss LYDIA A. ROOT is a citizen of Tuskegee, and one of our own graduates. Having displayed excellent musical talents while a pupil and an aptness to teach while affording us assistance at various times since she graduated, we feel no hesitancy in adding her name to complete the list of the musical faculty.
At the opening of the next term, an arrangement with reference to the Boarding Department will be made, which, in the estimation of many friends, is regarded as a very decided improvement.

Instead of renting out the building as heretofore, the Boarding Department will be kept by the President. By this it is not meant that he will leave his more important engagements and 'serve tables,' but that at his expense, and entirely under his control the department will be conducted. He will live upon the adjoining lot where his oversight will be equally if not more complete than if he were living in the building. The boarders will be under the supervision of the Governess whose duty it will be to direct them in all matters pertaining to their habits of study and recreation, and to the cultivation of their manners. The wishes of parents and guardians will be strictly observed in regard to the expenditure of money. Purchases for the pupils will in all cases be made by the Governess.

No rules shall hereafter have reference to the day scholars, for that they relate to their attendance at school, church and Sabbath-school, and to their conduct during study hours, and while they are on the College grounds.
N. B. The Faculty also wish it to be distinctly understood, that they will hereafter be in no degree responsible for the conduct of any pupil not boarding in the College.
August 16, 1855.

HOUSE & LOT FOR SALE.
Tuskegee subscriber desiring of leaving town, offers his house and lot for sale in Tuskegee, situated in the upper part of town near the Baptist College. Persons wishing to move to Tuskegee would do well to call and examine the premises EARLY as I will sell a great bargain.
THOMAS MORTON.
August 14, 1855.—1 m.

Lamp Oil.—Just received, fresh supply of Lamp Oil and Lard Oil, and for sale at the Drug store of FOWLER & GARY.
July 9, 1855.

2. That copies of the minutes be forwarded to this office immediately after they issue from the press.

It is designed to compile a complete list of all the ministers in the State, and publish it in the next minutes of the Convention, if the names can be obtained.

3d Sabbath in September.
AUTAUGA Association with the Kingston Church, Autauga county, Ala., commencing on Saturday.

CHEROKEE with the Mt. Harmony Church at Lebanon, De Kalb co., Ala., commencing on Friday.

TUSKEGEE with the Union Springs Church, Macon co., Ala., commencing on Friday.

4th Sabbath in September.
MULBERRY with the Mulberry Church, Bibb co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

UNION with the Grant's Creek Church, Tuscaloosa co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

1st Sabbath in October.
BETHLE with the Union Church, near Coffeeville, Clark co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

CENTRAL with the church at Rockford, Coosa co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

CANAAN with the Rock Creek Church, Jefferson co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

2d Sabbath in October.
ALABAMA with the Carrollville Church, Dallas co., Ala., commencing on Friday.

EPAULIA with the church at Clayton, Barbour co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

SHELBY with the Providence Church, Shelby co., Ala., about eight miles South of Montealeo, commencing on Saturday.

3d Sabbath in October.
CANAHA with the Hopewell Church, Perry co., Ala., commencing on Friday.

JENKINS with the Antioch Church, near Skipperville, Dale co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

4th Sabbath in October.
BIGBY with the Gaston Church, Sumter co., Ala., commencing on Saturday.

WEST FLORA Association, with the Orange Hill Church, Jackson co., Florida, commencing on Saturday.

EAST ALABAMA FEMALE COLLEGE.
Tuskegee, Macon Co., Ala.
OFFICERS.
LITERARY DEPARTMENT.
HENRY H. BACON, A. M., President.
MENTAL AND MORAL SCIENCE.
GEORGE W. THOMAS, A. M., Higher Mathematics and Ancient Languages.
MISS LINDA WILLIAMS, Logic, Rhetoric and History.
MISS FRENCH, PENMANSHIP AND ENGLISH BRANCHES.
MISS MARTHA E. WOMACK, Preparatory Department.
MUSICAL DEPARTMENT.
DR. S. M. BARTLETT, Principal.
MR. GUSTAVUS GIESLER, Assistant.
MRS. J. J. TAYLOR, Assistant.
MISS LYDIA A. ROOT, Assistant.

ORNAIMENTAL DEPARTMENT.
MISS L. H. REID, Principal.
MISS ———, Assistant.
BOARDING DEPARTMENT.
MISS L. H. REID, Governess.
MR. ———, Steward.
MRS. ———, Stewardess.

WHILE we believe that our numerous patrons repose confidence in our abilities and intention to provide, at all times, a good corps of teachers; it is with pleasure we introduce to them, briefly, those whose names are given for the first time as members of the faculty.

Prof. GEORGE W. THOMAS, late Professor in the 'Literary & Scientific Institute,' Tuskegee, is a gentleman of high standing in our community, both as regards his scholarship and piety. As a teacher and a disciplinarian he has shown himself eminently successful.

Miss L. H. REID has been for some time a teacher in the 'Judson.' Besides having proved her superior abilities in that institution, she has graduated with her the highest recommendations from the late President M. P. Jewett, M.D. While there, she acted a portion of her time in the capacity of Governess.

Miss LYDIA A. ROOT is a citizen of Tuskegee, and one of our own graduates. Having displayed excellent musical talents while a pupil and an aptness to teach while affording us assistance at various times since she graduated, we feel no hesitancy in adding her name to complete the list of the musical faculty.

At the opening of the next term, an arrangement with reference to the Boarding Department will be made, which, in the estimation of many friends, is regarded as a very decided improvement.

Instead of renting out the building as heretofore, the Boarding Department will be kept by the President. By this it is not meant that he will leave his more important engagements and 'serve tables,' but that at his expense, and entirely under his control the department will be conducted. He will live upon the adjoining lot where his oversight will be equally if not more complete than if he were living in the building.

The boarders will be under the supervision of the Governess whose duty it will be to direct them in all matters pertaining to their habits of study and recreation, and to the cultivation of their manners. The wishes of parents and guardians will be strictly observed in regard to the expenditure of money. Purchases for the pupils will in all cases be made by the Governess.

No rules shall hereafter have reference to the day scholars, for that they relate to their attendance at school, church and Sabbath-school, and to their conduct during study hours, and while they are on the College grounds.

N. B. The Faculty also wish it to be distinctly understood, that they will hereafter be in no degree responsible for the conduct of any pupil not boarding in the College.

HOUSE & LOT FOR SALE.
Tuskegee subscriber desiring of leaving town, offers his house and lot for sale in Tuskegee, situated in the upper part of town near the Baptist College. Persons wishing to move to Tuskegee would do well to call and examine the premises EARLY as I will sell a great bargain.
THOMAS MORTON.
August 14, 1855.—1 m.

Lamp Oil.—Just received, fresh supply of Lamp Oil and Lard Oil, and for sale at the Drug store of FOWLER & GARY.
July 9, 1855.

Appointments for Elder F. Callaway.

Elder F. Callaway will preach by Divine permission, at Pine Level, Macon Co., on Monday next, 27th August.

At Nottulsa, Tuesday, 28th.
At Concord, Wednesday, 29th.
At Tuskegee, Thursday, 30th.

At the Hawthorne house, near Echols' and Dowdell's mills, Saturday and Sunday, 1st and 2nd Sept.; and I especially request that the friends would let all their black people come out on Saturday as well as Sunday and Monday at 11 o'clock.

At Torbet's and Tate's Plantations, Tuesday 4th.

At Good Hope, the same night, and if the Church desires it, and will bring out their families, white and black, I will remain with them until Thursday evening.

At Hurricane Church, Friday, 7th.
At the Old Liberty Church, near Owens' Plantation, Saturday and Sunday, 8th and 9th. For the colored people of Bro. Battle, and all others who can attend, and I hope that the white people will also come out, as we will hold conference meeting.

At Enon, Monday, 10th. Brother Seaborn Moore can make an appointment for me at night where he thinks best.

At Mt. Zion, Tuesday, 11th.
At Aberfeld, Wednesday, 12th.
At Sardis, Thursday, 13th.
At the Association, Friday, 14th.

I earnestly request the brethren to make these several appointments as public as possible, and all my ministering brethren that can, to meet me at these respective appointments.

Valuable Class Books for School.
SCHOOL Directors, Teachers, and Parents, are requested to examine the following works, compiled in the 'Normal Series,' published by SHELDON, LAMPORT & BLACKMAN, 115 Nassau-street, New-York.

STODDARD'S ARITHMETICAL SERIES.
By John F. Stoddard, A. M., of Pennsylvania.
JUVENILE MENTAL ARITHMETIC, for beginners, 13c.
AMERICAN INTELLECTUAL ARITHMETIC, 20c.
STODDARD'S PRACTICAL ARITHMETIC—A thorough Treatise on Sale and Blackboard exercises, 40c.

STODDARD'S PHILOSOPHICAL ARITHMETIC.—A higher work, designed for advanced classes in Academies, Union Schools, and Colleges, 60c.
The above are daily increasing in popularity with the Schools of New-York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, where they are extensively used.

WEBB'S SERIES OF NORMAL READERS.
NORMAL PRIMER, beautifully illustrated, 12mo, 24 pp., paper covers, 64 cents. Stiff covers, 8 cents.
PRIMARY LESSONS, a series of three large cards, printed on both sides comprising a course of six lessons, and numbered in consecutive order, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, as they are to be used in connection with the Primer and First Reader. Price \$1.00. On the lower part of the cards, under each lesson, will be found instructions and suggestions, as an aid to the teacher. These should be carefully read by the teacher; even though they may not, in all cases, be deemed practicable for adoption in full.

Normal Reader, No. 1, 12mo, 72 pp., 13 cents.
" " No. 2, 12mo, 168 pp., 25 " "
" " No. 3, 12mo, 216 pp., 35 " "
" " No. 4, 12mo, 312 pp., 55 " "
" " No. 5, 822 pp., 85 " "

These Readers are used in many of the principal cities and villages throughout the United States, and are rapidly coming into use in the smaller towns in the country. Their merits have been fairly tested, and they have universally been pronounced superior to any series of Readers extant; not only for the improvement in the system of teaching, which is the Word Method; but also in the high moral tone and inspiring character of the pieces selected. The author, Mr. Webb, was recently from the State Normal School at Albany.

The Cards, together with the First, Second, and Third Readers, constitute the introductory course. By the use of these children are enabled to read, spelling, and the alphabet, in regular order.

The great advantages which this series possesses over any other Readers, are 1st: That from every common-sense and intelligent scholar, though out of the introductory course, there is nothing introduced or taught, but what may be progressively comprehended by the little learners. 2nd: That throughout the First, Second, and Third Readers, the word method is continued. 3rd: Before new words are introduced in sentences or paragraphs, they are all first introduced as words, and their orthography taken up. This secures at once the threefold object of making good spellers, and of giving intelligent scholars. 4th: They are the best Practical Readers that have come under my notice; they are all and everything they should be.

From Hon. S. S. Randall, Superintendent of Public Schools, No. 1, 12mo, 72 pp., 13 cents.
SHELDON, LAMPORT & CO., Publishers, 115 Nassau-st., New-York.
Aug. 15, 1855. 1m

For Sale,
A PLANTATION in a good State of cultivation and well improved, lying six miles, South-east of Tuskegee, and consisting of 200 acres. For terms apply to Wm. C. Melver, Esq. of Tuskegee, or to myself at Montgomery. It will be shown to any person, wishing to examine it, by my overseer, Mr. A. I. Hagin.

July 19, 1855. N. W. COCKE, nlf

NOTICE.
A Southern Gentleman and Lady desire to procure a Situation as Teachers for the year 1856, in a good village or Country School, and are qualified to teach the English and Latin Languages, with the rudiments of Greek and French. Any person desiring such teachers will please inform J. J. DAVIS, Newnan Georgia, Aug. 8, 1855.

Plantation for Sale.
I OFFER for sale my plantation, lying in Macon county, Alabama, five miles north of Tuskegee, and near the Railroad. It contains 240 acres, mostly pine land, 120 acres of which is cleared and in a good state of cultivation, including some choice bottom land. It is well watered, healthy, and has upon it suitable log buildings. If the purchaser wishes it, he can also take the stock, corn, fodder, &c., upon the premises. Persons wishing to procure such a farm, will do well to call and see it before purchasing elsewhere, as it will be sold on reasonable terms, work and cash only.
J. F. MAY, June 28, 1855—ns-3m

HOUSE AND LOT FOR SALE.
Wm. M. REED, wishing to go to Florida, offers for sale his house and lot, situated near the public square, convenient to the three churches, midway between the Baptist and Methodist Colleges, and is near enough to the Male Institute. The lot is well improved by a good house, and a large and comfortable dwelling house—the lot is sufficiently large for two settlements. Persons wishing to locate in this place to educate their sons and daughters, would do well to call very soon and examine the premises.
July 5, 1855—2m

WANTED.
A Lady is desirous of resuming teaching either in a School or private family. She will instruct in the higher English branches, French, German, drawing, painting in water colors, wax-work and embroidery.
Address Dr. G. D. HALL, Gaston Ala., July 31, 1855 6t

Teachers Wanted.
A Music Teacher, graduate of some Female Institution, and a male Teacher of good acquirement, can find a permanent situation in an Institution located at Spring Grove, Pickens co., Ala. For particulars address the principal.
REV. S. S. CROSBY. JAS. A. BURGIN, Pres. B. of S.
Spring Grove Ala. July 21, 1855. 4t

BELLS! BELLS! BELLS!
THE SUBSCRIBERS, at their long established and enlarged Foundry, manufacturing and improving, and keep constantly on hand, a large assortment of their superior BELLS, of all descriptions, suitable for FIRE ALARMS, CHURCHES, ACADEMIES, FACTORIES, STEAMBOATS, PLANTATIONS, &c., mounted with their 'ROTARY' YOKES, and other improved Hangings, which ensure the safety of the Bell, with ease and efficiency in ringing. Warranted given of tone and durability. For full particulars as to CHIMES, KEYS, WIGGONS, &c., apply for Circulars.
A. MENNELLY'S SONS, West Troy, Albany co., N. Y. 13—ly.

Election Notices.

We are authorized to announce **SAMPSON LANIER** as a candidate for Probate Judge of Macon county, at the election in May 1856.

We are authorized to announce **SPENCE M. GRAYSON, Esq.** as a candidate for Probate Judge of Macon county, at the election in May, 1856.

Tuskegee Classical and Scientific Institute.
The eighth annual session of this institution will be commenced on the first Tuesday in September next. It will be divided into two terms of twenty weeks each. The Autumn Term, commencing at the opening of the session, will close on the 10th day of February. The Spring Term will commence on the 13th day of February, and close on the 27th day of June. There will be a vacation from the 15th of December to the 7th of January, inclusive.

Rates of Tuition Per Term.
For Spelling, Reading, Writing, Primary Arithmetic, Modern Geography, and The Natural History of Birds and Quadrupeds, \$15. The foregoing, with English Grammar, Civil History, and Practical Arithmetic, 20. The Latin and Greek Languages, with any of the English branches in the Preparatory, or in the ordinary College course, 25. Tuition fees, payable in advance. No deduction or refunding will be made for absence; nor in cases of expulsion, suspension, or dismissal.

Course of Study.
While this institution does not claim, or even aspire to the rank of a College, the course of study is extensive, adapted to the condition, and adequate to the wants of those young men, who desire to acquire a somewhat liberal education, but who do not contemplate taking the regular College course. It is, at the same time, designed to afford the highest advantages to those who are preparing to enter any of the College classes. It is progressive and systematic, but not stereotyped, to be passed over by every pupil in a fixed period at a given number of strides, irrespective of capacity, scholarship, and mental habits; but that prescribed for each individual, and adapted to his age, mental capabilities, and contemplated future course.

The mind is not treated as a mere receptacle; but as a thing of life, growth, and action: the prime object is to develop a vigorous intellect, and to train the student to expand his powers, to mould and guide, aright its various and complex emotions; to bring into active exercise all its faculties; and to present in full and just proportions an *edifying* practical man, and not a 'graduated idiot' or 'learned automaton.' The pupil is taught to think, to reason, to investigate. He not only learns to comprehend what is said, but to examine the substratum and understand the reason of the proposition.

In the study of the Latin and Greek languages, pupils are exercised in translating, both orally and in writing, from the foreign into their vernacular, and vice versa, until by repeated and frequent application, every principle becomes so familiar, that the student can, with facility, connect the Latin and Greek words with their English equivalents, and to translate with accuracy and ease.

From the great variety of text books with which this institution has been furnished, such have been selected as are conceived to be best adapted to a philosophical and judicious course of instruction. The recitations and exercises in every department are interspersed with such familiar lectures and illustrations as tend to awaken the student's interest, and to invest the subject with greater interest.

Though we cannot boast of a rich Mineral Cabinet, and an extensive Laboratory, yet the institution is supplied with sufficient apparatus for illustrating the principles of the sciences; and such additions will be made from time to time, as may be deemed useful and important.

Respecting our *classical* studies, rules of order and discipline, we deem it sufficient to say that every pupil will be required to do *right*, or suffer such penalty as the teachers may think expedient. The decided co-operation of parents and guardians will be expected; a want of it will be sufficient reason for dismissing a pupil at any time. Communications from parents or guardians respecting the duty or deportment of pupils, must be made in person or in writing.

Our *classical* A. B. of July, 1855, has been engaged as instructor in the Latin and Greek languages, in place of Mr. GEORGE W. THOMAS, who has accepted a Professorship in the East Alabama Female College.

THE BOARDING DEPARTMENT is under the control of Hon. LEWIS ALEXANDER and Lady, with whom boarding, including lodging, washing, and fuel may be obtained at \$12 per month. Students from abroad will be expected to board at the Institute, unless they have relatives or friends in the community, who will take their guardianship, and become responsible for their strict conformity to all the rules and regulations of the Institution. Those who board in the Institution may be assured, that they will have a pleasant home, and friends, who will be attentive to their interests and studious of their comfort.

It is hoped that those who enter the school will do so on the first day of the session. It is highly important to every pupil that he be present at the organization of the school, and punctual in his attendance afterwards. Absence from roll call, or recitation will be carefully noted, and the delinquent held to an account. It is expected that students from a distance will not view the friends during the term. But if parents think it expedient for them to do so, they will be expected to make known their wishes to the Principal.

For further particulars inquire of the subscriber.
WM. JONES, Principal and Proprietor.
Tuskegee, Ala., July, 1855.

FRESH DRUGS.
AT THE OLD DRUG STORE.
(ESTABLISHED IN 1846.)
Sign of the Mammoth Golden Mortar.

We have just received direct from New York, large additions to our former stock of PURE DRUGS, MEDICINES, CHEMICALS, WINES, BRANDIES, DYE-STUFFS, PAINTS, OILS, GLASS, PUTTY, VARNISHES, BRUSHES, &c., &c., to which we would invite the attention of Physicians, Planters, and the citizens generally of Macon and its adjoining counties. Our stock has been carefully selected, and every article sold by us is warranted to be of the best quality, and will be sold for CASH or approved CREDIT, on as reasonable terms as can be obtained in Montgomery. The addition of freight only being added on heavy goods.

We would respectfully solicit orders, feeling confident that we can give entire satisfaction both as regards price and quality of our goods. Particular attention is paid to packing, so as to carry with safety to any part of the State.

Physicians' Prescriptions and family recipes carefully put up at all hours of the day or night.
FOWLER & GARY, n-4f
Tuskegee, July 5, 1855.

Teachers Wanted.
A Music Teacher, graduate of some Female Institution, and a male Teacher of good acquirement, can find a permanent situation in an Institution located at Spring Grove, Pickens co., Ala. For particulars address the principal.
REV. S. S. CROSBY. JAS. A. BURGIN, Pres. B. of S.
Spring Grove Ala. July 21, 1855. 4t

BELLS! BELLS! BELLS!
THE SUBSCRIBERS, at their long established and enlarged Foundry, manufacturing and improving, and keep constantly on hand, a large assortment of their superior BELLS, of all descriptions, suitable for FIRE ALARMS, CHURCHES, ACADEMIES, FACTORIES, STEAMBOATS, PLANTATIONS, &c., mounted with their 'ROTARY' YOKES, and other improved Hangings, which ensure the safety of the Bell, with ease and efficiency in ringing. Warranted given of tone and durability. For full particulars as to CHIMES, KEYS, WIGGONS, &c., apply for Circulars.
A. MENNELLY'S SONS, West Troy, Albany co., N. Y. 13—ly.

HOUSE AND SIGN PAINTING.
GILDING, GLAZING AND PAPER-HANGING.
The undersigned having formed a connection in the above business, solicit a part of the public patronage. Having plenty of help, they can promptly execute all orders entrusted to their care, in the best style, and on the most reasonable terms. They especially solicit country orders, to which they will give the best attention.
GEORGE E. COLLINS, July 15—n4f
STATES LEWIS.

To Invalids.—We have in store a very superior quality of old Port Wine, from Oporto, suitable for invalids. Also, genuine Bermuda Arrow Root, Tapioca, Corn Starch and Irish Moss.
FOWLER & GARY, Sign of the Mammoth Golden Mortar.
July 5, 1855.

HOUSE AND SIGN PAINTING.
GILDING, GLAZING AND PAPER-HANGING.
The undersigned having formed a connection in the above business, solicit a part of the public patronage. Having plenty of help, they can promptly execute all orders entrusted to their care, in the best style, and on the most reasonable terms. They especially solicit country orders, to which they will give the best attention.
GEORGE E. COLLINS, July 15—n4f
STATES LEWIS.

To Invalids.—We have in store a very superior quality of old Port Wine, from Oporto, suitable for invalids. Also, genuine Bermuda Arrow Root, Tapioca, Corn Starch and Irish Moss.
FOWLER & GARY, Sign of the

(Concluded from first page.)

to the title of bishop. I showed you that even the Baptist Discipline recognizes the title of bishop, and that Mr. Wesley considered it a Scriptural synonym for Presbyter, though he preferred we should not use it, because it had been unrighteously appropriated by prelacy, from which our brethren reclaimed it and restored it to its original sense; an act commended in the life of Wesley by Moore, who first published the much misrepresented Asbury letter. Mr. Wesley did prefer the Episcopal mode of church government. The Minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, were published six months after their adoption, at Mr. Wesley's press, and under his eye; and Dr. Coke defended them in Mr. Wesley's presence, and without contradiction, on the ground that he had done nothing without the direction of Mr. Wesley; and for four years we were styled a Methodist Episcopal Church, before Mr. Wesley repented Asbury for allowing himself to be called bishop. (Stevens' Church History, p. 100). So much for garbling our Church documents.

I have informed you that every itinerant is constituted such by two distinct acts of the members, and that the suffrages of the laity are indispensable to every church act in every one of the thousands of our churches; and that no bishop, nor even preacher in charge, can so much as vote in the trial of a member. You tell us the Discipline says the reverse of this—that the preacher is received by the Annual Conference, &c. Very true, sir, the Annual Conference does receive preachers. It would be singular republicanism which could force them to appoint preachers to the pastorate whom they thought unworthy; but then if you were better acquainted with our Discipline, you would learn that it requires candidates for the itinerancy to be licensed first, by the people, and then recommended by the Quarterly Conference; without which license, and recommendation, the Conference can receive none into the itinerancy. How sadly you have mistaken the character of our entire system. Your reverse logic, is of a piece with your converse logic. Unique specimens of reasoning. Let your own Mercer instruct you into the propriety of our course. "The ministry is to ministers what the church is to common brethren, and a man might as soon be introduced into the fellowship of the church without being received by the members of the church, as any one can be brought into the fellowship of the ministry without being received by the ministry." Memoirs, p. 453. Again he fixes the minimum number who may constitute a church at seven; and then the ministerial office being elective, he says, "in that case, not seven, but four against three, and these three may be the strength of the church, appoint one of themselves to the office of gospel minister. Is it possible that such an appointment can give to any one an authoritative claim on all churches, and ministers, to their cordial acceptance and brotherly companionship? Besides the door it would throw open to vile speculation, and base electioneering. Once establish the rule, that the church has the only and sole authority to induct into the ministerial office, and that it is elective and you have opened the flood gates to error, and exposed the church to feuds and destruction." (p. 454).—Well spoken, Bro. Mercer, though you have come upon the platform of Methodism to utter it.

Our ministers do summon offenders to trial, still an interior view of our Discipline, would show you that we try them by members only. As for what you may or may not have heard of the concurrence of members asked on receiving members, I cannot answer; but I presume you will not think, I got up a case of the reception of 14 members into full communion, by vote of the church, for your special benefit, and in anticipation of your denial of that custom only a few days after. You will understand Methodism better before I have done with you.

Your refusal to meet my challenge for the publication of the deed of any Methodist Church in the land, I take, as a silent abandonment of your position on the property question; and I await patiently your denouement of the mystery of the Book Concern.

With regard to the power of our bishops to control the suffrages of our people in civil affairs, I think you are well enough acquainted with Methodists to be assured, that if our bishops could be found silly enough to attempt such control, they would not only meet with moral resistance, but in many instances would be forcibly convinced of their error by very striking arguments.

Our venerable bishops McKendree, and Bascom, who had spoken so freely upon questions of church government you insinuate, were bribed into silence by election to the Episcopal office.—The members of Conference who elected them must have been of a happy temperament indeed to have rewarded those who "mercilessly castigated" them with the highest honours in their gift. "Would your Convention do likewise? Seriously the insinuation is utterly unworthy of you. You cannot possibly credit it yourself. If you duly consider the Scripture, "with what measure you mete it shall be measured to you again. You will be more chary in future, of your flings at the memory of the holy dead."

Upon a careful consideration of the reasons you have offered to prove Methodism anti-republican, I find your proofs evince an entire misapprehension of Methodism. You have created

man of straw, and battled valiantly with your own misconceptions of our system. My principal business, therefore, in this discussion, has been to rectify your mistakes concerning us. I have already informed you that almost all the business of your irregularly constituted Conventions is transacted in our system, by side-societies; such as Education, Tract, Missionary Societies, and Boards of Finance; in all of which we have as much lay delegation, and lay management as you could ask for; and that in every thing in which the laity is equally concerned with the ministry, it is the genius of Methodism to delight in lay co-operation. But in the Annual and General Conferences, whose chief business is the examination and reception of ministers, and their distribution on the itinerant plan—a plan which you yourself have highly commended—and the framing of laws regulating that reception and distribution; we admit no lay delegation, save in the financial and other enterprises specified. Why should we have lay delegates to examine and receive ministers in Conference, when lay members have already acted on the very same cases in their respective church courts, and the only candidates who can apply for admission into the itinerancy, have come up upon the recommendation of the laity? And with reference to the appointment of these ministers to their several fields of labour, I have already shown you, that if you had a hundred Baptist itinerant ministers assembled in Convention, to be scattered to the four winds upon a self-sacrificing mission; you could neither think it just, nor expedient, nor republican, that a Baptist layman should arise upon the floor of the Convention and command every one of these hundred Baptist itinerants to strike their tents and go whithersoever he ordered them, while he himself submitted to no such sacrifices, and quietly returned to his secular pursuits at home. Such republicanism would be a bitter pill to these supposed Baptist itinerants; they would soon come to the conclusion, that they knew no such rights and comprehended no such privileges. You have been very careful not to notice this distinction, which I have drawn between the act of distributing ministers upon the itinerant plan; and the support of other grand church schemes; the first illustrated in the case of the supposed Baptist itinerants, and the second in Missionary, Financial, and other Boards, which attend to business like that of your Conventions, and in which there is as much lay management with us, if not more, than you can possibly boast of in your system. You have gone even farther than we have in calling ministers' meeting without any lay delegation whatever; for you have done this, without the reason which exists among us for doing it, namely, the appointment of ministers to their field of labour, in which none should have a voice but those who submit to like sacrifices. You have called ministers' meetings, as Father Mercer informs us, without any business of this sort to be brought before them, and only according to Mercer "to prevent distracting controversies and to keep the beauty of the church from being marred."

Your remark that this was only a wish of Father Mercer, shows that you are not well posted up in the history of Georgia Baptists. It was not merely a wish, on the contrary; such a ministers' meeting was actually organized in Eatonton in October, 1835, but it was found difficult to secure a general attendance, and in two or three years it languished into non-existence. Memoirs, page 265. Father Mercer lamented its discontinuance and affirmed it was because "they were turned every one to his own way, and that young ministers have had the rearing of themselves in the churches, and have been so long accustomed to direct their own course, that it will be hard to bring them to submit to the discipline of a ministerial union." I find also upon a careful reading of the History of the Alabama Baptist, page 124, that when you plan a system of itinerancy upon a small scale, your ministers associate themselves for the work, and make among themselves their own arrangements for the supply of the given field with itinerant labour. If there were a Conference of ministers transacting business in which none but themselves are equally interested, and that too, with a lay-board of finance added to it, be anti-republican, how much more anti-republican must a Conference of Baptist ministers be who are without lay delegation, and who have no itinerant business to justify their exclusiveness. "Take the beam out of thine own eye, &c."

You have rejoiced over your quotation from Bishop Hamline as one that findeth great spoil. What a pity to spoil your pretty piece of fun! Mr. Hamline said, "The Class Leader becomes unpopular, and the preacher removes him, the itinerant preacher is not useful in his charge, and the bishop or presiding elder deposes him from his charge or pastoral office, and makes him an assistant. The presiding elder impairs his usefulness on a district, not by gross malfeasance, but by a slight misfeasance, or offender still because he is not popular, and the bishop removes him to a circuit."

In all these instances, the removal is summary, without trial, it is for no crime, and generally for no misdemeanor, but for being unacceptable. These removals are by a sole agent whose will is omnipotent in the premises, &c. Do you think Bro. Henderson, that in these removals, "the very existence of the church is utterly ignored?"

Why, sir, Bishop Hamline tells us,

they are made because of eccentricity, unacceptability, or unpopularity, with the Church; and hence, in every instance specified by him, according to the wish of the Church, which is certainly sufficiently republican. But further, do you know the design of Mr. Hamline's speech? the grand object for which it was made? If not, I will tell you then, it was to prove that the General Conference could remove every one of our bishops from office if it saw proper without any crime, or misdemeanor whatever, and even without accusation or trial, and summarily—that the authority of the Conference over bishops, was omnipotent.

In the very next paragraph to that quoted by you, Mr. Hamline says, "I shall argue our authority to depose a bishop summarily for improprieties morally innocent, which embarrass the exercise of his functions. Debates, p. 129. The Conference acting on these principles, suspended Bishop Andrew. Is it possible that an Episcopacy which may be removed summarily, without trial or the slightest impeachment of moral character, can be anti-republican!!! You are particularly unfortunate in quoting Mr. Hamline's speech, in support of your groundless allegation. If the sentiments of that speech be true, we are excessively republican, and our bishops are more perfectly shorn of power than any other ministers in our body. Moreover, had you possessed a copy of that speech, and not gotten it at second hand you would have better understood the nature of the removals he speaks of—that they do not affect in the smallest degree the Christian or ministerial rights or functions of the party removed. He says, "my mind, sir, (if not my words) has all along distinguished between orders and office. The summary removals which I have noticed, are from office, not from the ministry. In regard to ordained preachers, these two rules will hold:—

First they cannot be expelled from the ministry summarily; but must have a trial in due form. Secondly, they cannot be expelled for improper conduct, but only for a crime forbidden in the word of God. These rules with few exceptions will apply to private members; they cannot usually be expelled from the church without trial or the offer of trial (I add too by a jury of their peers); nor for improper conduct. The mistaken view you have taken of Mr. Hamline's speech, and the blunder you committed in referring to it, will punish you justly for your readiness to take our church documents in a garbled form, from the hands of our enemies. The fact that the summary removals are not from the ministry, will extinguish your momentary joy, and leave only a mortifying consciousness of ignorance of our system. The removals then, which you imagined to be so utterly anti-republican, are exactly similar to the frequent removals made by the President of the United States, when he transfers summarily, and without trial, the Captain of one naval vessel to the command of another, or the general of one division of the army, to the command of another division.

Bishop Andrews might still have preached the gospel, administered the sacraments, or presided over a church or district, in perfect accordance with the wish of the Gen'l Conference which suspended him from the Episcopal office. His orders were not touched; it was only his permanent moderatorship over the Conferences which was affected by the suspension. The President of the United States does immensely more of this work of summarily removing from office; and his removals affect the parties removed, to a vastly greater extent, in both powers and emoluments. The executive officers of our government under the President, are not supposed to be divinely called to their office, and their removal utterly extinguishes their official powers—as in the removal of the Cabinet, and Custom house officers, Governors of territories; these removals do not however, impair their rights of citizenship. But in the church, the ministers thereof are called by the Spirit of God to their sacred work, hence nothing but crime can subject them to be divested by any church power whatever, of their ministerial prerogatives. Can you not favor us with a pretty burst of indignation at the utterly anti-republican right of summary removal without trial, accusation, or appeal, by the President of the United States. Do "look it sternly in the face," and try your chivalry under the boughs of the tree of liberty ha! ha! ha! Your companion in arms Mr. Ross, of Brownlow Review notoriety, seems to have fallen into the same ditch. I leave you to sympathize with him, and when he again pronounces Methodism Anti-Christ, I will tell him, Bro. Henderson says not so Sir, "Methodists love our common Lord and have exhibited a zeal in his cause (and of course not the cause of Anti-Christ) worthy of all praise. When your nerves recover from the shock they have received at the idea of summary removal from office, for unacceptability to the people, by an agent whose will is omnipotent in the premises, Albeit he himself is subject to alike removal if he use this power improperly, you will see in this feature of the government of Methodism a striking likeness to that feature in our civil government, which reposes similar power, but to a vastly greater extent, in the President of the United States.

I again repeat Sir, there are differences such as I have before shown, between Church government, and civil government, namely that in the church

Christ is the sole legislator; Christ calls the ministry to their sacred office; the church can inflict no civil pains and penalties whatever; and in the Methodist church at least, if not in the Baptist church, the members can withdraw at pleasure. Within these limitations, the government of the Methodist church is as perfect a model of our civil government; as any church on the American continent can possibly be, and far more perfectly like the government of the United States, than your church government. Look at the points of resemblance. Every where with us the right of trial by jury is acknowledged: In our Conferences the democratic principle is established, that none should make laws but those who are themselves subject to them; but that in all things, in which the laity are equally interested with the ministry, namely, in all our grand financial and other enterprises, they shall have equal suffrage, and management. The itinerancy is constituted by two distinct acts of the membership, who first pass upon the qualifications of the candidates for the itinerancy, before the Conference can receive them; and then the itinerancy, like our legislatures or Congress, which elect their speakers or President of Senates, elects its own officers. Our State legislature elects its Senators; so also does our Annual Conference its members of the Gen'l Conference. The Senate of the United States, confirms the nominations of the President to the Cabinet, to the Courts of Europe, and most important of all, the nominations to a lifetime office in the Supreme Courts of the land—the judiciary of the United States. And these officers in turn appoint their subalterns, until, often the chain of appointments is removed several links from the people. So also our Gen'l Conference appoints our bishops and editors, only that in the Methodist church government, our appointments are not carried by many links so far from our people as in the civil government. The analogy between the two governments, within the limitations specified, is the closest perhaps that ever existed in our free country. If you charge such a government with being anti-republican, consistency it seems to me would demand of you, that you should devote your talents to the destruction of our civil government, of which the government of Methodism is so perfect a model.

With reference to the disorders in the Methodist church, they are exceptions few and far between, but with the Baptist church they are of common occurrence. Of course you will not condemn the Southern Methodist church for instituting legal process for the recovery of rights, denied by an abolition sentiment. Moreover, the very suit in question, was conducted in so kind a spirit, as to elicit the admiration of the legal gentlemen connected with it. That your disorders are of common occurrence is not surprising to any one who considers the incongruous elements of your system of government, which cannot properly be called a government at all. They exist at all times. Hear the language of the Baptist papers your own recent exchanges.—"The Bible Union at its anniversary refused to disclaim fellowship with the sentiments of Alex. Campbell."

Again what a melancholy spectacle is now exhibited in the Baptist denomination in some sections of our country—brethren who ought to love each other, have been indulging in mutual criminations of character, so virulent as would inevitably have produced bloodshed, had the same epithets been employed in political controversy. (Bible Recorder N. C. June 7th.) "The object of the leaders of the Bible Union is—to rule or ruin the denomination. (Tennessee Baptist). From the preamble and resolutions of the Alum Creek Baptist Church, Ohio, we learn that Peter Fitzgerald had been excluded, and had manifested no repentance for the crimes for which he was excluded."

Two years after his exclusion, the Berlin Church in the same county, investigated the charges against Fitzgerald; and acquitted him. The Alum Creek Church thereupon, resolved "that we as a Church do solemnly protest against the conduct of said Berlin Church and council, in said premises—as immoral in its tendency, and as such, we disclaim fellowship with all such acts of Popery." J. Frey Moderator, (Journal & Messenger Cincinnati June 1st). So it seems you have some Popery in your Church, as your own poets say. Once more "in the mountains a custom long prevailed, that churches considered it a part of their republican privilege, to choose their pastoral supply from year to year;" accordingly, Thomas Stradley anticipating this result, resigned his pastoral charge, but the party opposed to him not being ready to carry out their point, deferred the election until the next meeting; at which twenty voted for him and fifteen for James Blythe. On Sunday when Stradley went to preach, "James Blythe and his party set up opposition preaching within 60 or 70 yards of the Church. This is stated in a letter from Thomas Stradley Jr. to the Carolina Intelligencer June 14th.) Such are a few of the specimens of all kinds of disorder, existing in the Baptist Church to this very day.

I will gladly relieve your mind upon the question of the falsity charged upon certain positions taken against Methodism. If you look over my letters again you will find I have not applied the term falsehood to anything connected with our discussion. I pronounced the author of the article from the Watchman, a slanderer. I affirmed that certain propositions extracted from it were false. I add now that they were grossly slanderous. You

know the distinction between the terms false, and falsehood—the former simply denies the truthfulness of the matter in question; the latter charges the author of it with lying. Saul of Tarsus when he deemed Christ an impostor, no doubt uttered what was untrue, yet he was not a liar; but when Peter denied his Master, he uttered a falsehood, or in plainer speech, he lied.—Under the influence of prejudice, and in almost total ignorance of our system, you have sadly misrepresented Methodism, in sincerity no doubt, or you would not have opened your columns for this discussion. Nevertheless, the positions which were false in the Watchman are no less false, in your endorsement of them. And no less untrue are your own glaring errors, which I have so often been called to correct; such for instance, as that great mistake affecting vitally the rights of membership in our churches—that a bishop can reinstate an expelled member, and "the word of a bishop is the end of all strife." And now brother, I wot that through ignorance you did it as do also other rulers among you. Your fault lies not in being unacquainted with Methodism; but in attacking us without provocation, when you knew not what you did. It is not congenial with my spirit to point out the defective workings of your disjointed government, I would rather look upon the Christian enterprise, and sweet piety, of many of your members.

Nor do I look upon your government as anti-republican. I cannot use the word in so loose a sense. For nothing can be anti-republican, but that which would overthrow a republic; and I have no fears that you will attempt that. Albeit your system be never so unlike our civil government; to which Methodism bears so striking a resemblance. And withal the good sense and piety of your members, will make you prosperous in spite of the defects of your Ecclesiastical Economy.

With assurances of Christian regard I subscribe myself,

Yours in Christ,

E. J. HAMILL.

BUSINESS CARDS.

FOWLER & GARY,

DEALERS IN

Drugs, Medicines, Chemicals, Paints,

Oils, Glass, Brushes, Perfumery, Fancy

Articles, &c., &c.

TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA.

July 5, 1855.

BEELSER & MAYS.

Attorneys at Law and Solicitors in

Chancery.

TUSKEGEE, ALA.

Will practice in the various Courts of Macon County.

Office over the Jewelry Shop.

JAMES E. BEELSER, ROBT. L. MAYS,

Montgomery, Ala. Tuskegee, Ala.

ROBT. L. MAYS being general Administrator for the County of Macon, will attend to the settling up of Estates.

March 1, 1855. n41-ly

JOEL ELAM, P. A. STAMPS, & W. F. ROBERTS.

ELAM, STAMPS & ROBERTS.

TALLADEGA HOTEL.

JOEL ELAM PROPRIETOR.

Brick Fire-proof Livery Stables,

HORSES, BUGGIES, CARRIAGES AND HACKS,

At the Shortest Notice,

In connection with the Talladeega Hotel,

P. A. STAMPS & CO.

Wm. F. Roberts, one mile East from the Court House, is prepared with lots for drovers of every description. Corn, Fodder, Oats and Hay always on hand. He has also engaged at the Livery Stables of P. A. Stamps & Co., a lot for sampling and exhibition free of charge.

Feb. 1, 1855. n38tf

MORGAN, MARTIN & CHILTON,

ATTORNEYS AT LAW AND SOLICITORS IN CHANCERY.

SELMA, ALABAMA.

JOHN T. MORGAN, JAMES V. MARTIN,

THOMAS G. CHILTON, Talladeega, Ala.

March 1, 1855.

THOMAS S. HOWARD,

Attorney at Law and Solicitor in Chancery;

TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA.

Will give prompt attention to business committed to his care.

Office next door to Drs. HODNET & NECKOLLS.

GEORGE MARQUIS, CULLEN A. BATTLE.

MARQUIS & BATTLE,

ATTORNEYS AT LAW,

Will practice in the various Courts of Macon, Montgomery, Pike, Barbour, Russell, and Tallapoosa counties, in the Supreme Court of Alabama, and the United States District Court at Montgomery.

Office in the brick building, over Morton and Stevens' Store.

TUSKEGEE, Ala., August 17, 1854.—ly.

GEORGE W. GUNN,

ATTORNEY AT LAW,

and Solicitor in Equity.

Will practice in the Courts of Macon, Chautauque, Russell, Tallapoosa, and in the Supreme Court of the State, and the United States District Court at Montgomery. Particular attention will be given to securing and doubtful demands.

Office over Adams & Gunn's Shoe Store.

Tuskegee, Ala., Nov. 20, 1854.

W. F. HODNET, M. D., R. N. NECKOLLS, M. D.

Drs. HODNET & NECKOLLS.

HAVING associated themselves in the practice of Medicine and its collateral branches, would respectfully offer their services to the citizens of Tuskegee and vicinity. Pledging the most prompt and faithful attendance upon all cases submitted to their care, they solicit a share of the public patronage.

Office in the building on the corner of Main street opposite to Brewer's Hotel.

Tuskegee, March 29, 1855. —n45-ly.

J. J. STEWART, CYRUS PHILLIPS, W. B. FARIS.

STEWART, PHILLIPS & CO.,

WHOLESALE & RETAIL

GROCERS,

Montgomery, Ala.

October 5, 1854.—ly.

W. C. PURYEAR. [C. L. SIMMONS]

DRS. PURYEAR & SIMMONS,

Surgeon Dentists:

Office above stairs over the Post-office.

HAVE associated themselves together in the practice of Dental Surgery, and from their long experience in the profession, they can execute work with dispatch and in a neat and durable manner. They are prepared to mount teeth on plate from a single one to a full set, and feel no doubt of giving entire satisfaction. Work warranted to stand. Give us a trial.

Tuskegee, Ala., July 26, 1854.

W. L. LAPLASS,

TAILOR.

TENDERS his services to the citizens of Tuskegee and vicinity for all kinds of work usually done in the Tailoring line. He is prepared to execute his work in the very best manner and according to the latest and most approved styles.

Ladies' circle cloaks, talmas and riding habits, cut, or cut and made to order.

His shop is opposite Mr. J. D. Porter's Store, a few doors above the Allen House, and in the house formerly occupied by Drs. Johnson.

Tuskegee, Dec. 4, 1854. tf.

PORTER, ISBELL & CO.

RESPECTFULLY invite attention to their stock of

SPRING & SUMMER GOODS.

which in ALL RESPECTS AFFECTING THE INTERESTS OF purchasers, will be found decidedly more than ordinarily attractive.

April 12.—tf.

NOTICE.

A assignment of all their effects, debts, dues and claims, and demands having been made to me by Messrs. John Stratford and Richard Stratford for certain purposes therein specified; all these indebted to the late firm of J. & R. Stratford are requested to call at my office and settle as early as possible.

THOS. S. HOWARD, Assignee.

Tuskegee, Ala., June 7th, 1855. n5tf

HENDERSON & MCGEE.

HAVING this day associated themselves in the practice of the Law, will attend to all business intrusted to their care, in the counties composing the 9th Judicial Circuit; also, in St. Clair, Shelby and Coosa. They will also practice in the Supreme Court at Montgomery. Office in Talladeega Hotel.

January 25, 1855.

Auburn Water Cure.

THE Establishment, located in the pleasant and healthy town of Auburn, Macon county being on the Montgomery and West Point Railroad, is convenient of access from both East and West.

To invalids, all the facilities of thorough treatment, together with the personal attention of the physicians, are offered. Our treatment is purely hydropathic. The Water Cure, with its pure and salutary diet, air, exercise, cleanliness, and genial associates, has cured diseases that have seemed past all hope. All diseases are treated by us and where a radical cure cannot be performed great alleviation may be given. In female diseases, Water Cure has proved successful, where all other means have failed.

For particulars address

Dr. WM. G. REED,

Auburn, Macon Co., Ala.

August 10, 1854.—ly.

SAWYER, ANDERSON & ROBERTS.

DENTISTS.

And Manufacturers of Inexpensive

TEETH.

TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA.

WOULD respectfully announce to the citizens of Macon and adjoining counties that they have opened an office in Tuskegee, Ala., where they are fully prepared to execute all work pertaining to Mechanical Dentistry.

Having been engaged for a number of years in an extensive practice and being thoroughly acquainted with all the latest and most scientific improvements in the Manufacture and construction of full and partial sets of teeth, we can with confidence say that work in need of Dental substitutes, that will be executed in any desired style in the neatest and most durable manner, and at the shortest notice, and in adaptation, beauty and finish we guarantee as ample satisfaction as can be obtained of any Dentist north or south.

WILSON SAWYER,

TUSKEGEE, ALA.

ANDERSON & ROBERTS,

TALBOTTON, GA.

(11-12-13)

February 8, 1855.

I take this occasion to return thanks for the very liberal patronage bestowed during the past four years. And I will add in behalf of my present associates Drs. ANDERSON & ROBERTS, that an extensive practice for more than twelve years in every department of the business has won for them an enviable reputation as practical and skillful workmen, and can now guarantee with safety; that all operations performed by us in point of PAINLESS OPERATION and DURABILITY shall be inferior to none.

WILSON SAWYER.

LA FAYETTE FEMALE COLLEGE.

Located at La Fayette, Chambers Co., Ala., 1855.

THE first Session in the above institution for 1855, will commence on the 8th of January, and close on the last Thursday in June.

Faculty.

REV. H. WILLIAMS, A. M.

REV. J. F. BLEDSON.

MISS A. M. SHATTUCK.

MR. J. B. NORMAN, Prof. of Music.

Rates of Tuition per Annum.

Primary class, \$16 00

Preparatory, 25 00