

From the Christian Repository.
Marks, Re-Marks, and Land-Marks.

What sort of a book or tract is this, bearing on its title-page the singular name, "AN OLD LANDMARK RE-SET?" Is it a work on surveying? Its author is a member of a university—"Union University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee"; and he appears to have had readers, for it is imprinted, "Fifteenth thousand." Has the learned professor discovered that some landmark, originally set by the surveyors and old settlers of Tennessee, has been removed; and has he written this book to prove it, and to show where the original stake and stone ought to be set? What an amount of labor he must have undergone, rummaging old records, comparing surveys, deciphering field notes, and scratching through tangled cane-brakes, carrying his surveying compass, and dragging his Gunter's chain! Surely every reader ought to be prepossessed in advance, in favor of this very benevolent soul, and of what he may have to say. A book with such a title ought to be fraught with interest to all concerned in the lands whose metes and bounds are affected by the revelations of this "Old Landmark Re-set."

But, on turning over the title-page to look for the results of his siftings and collations of old surveys, and measurements, and range lines, what is the reader's surprise to find, over the top of the first page, in capital letters, this question, as the topic of his book:

"OUGHT BAPTISTS TO INVITE PEDOBAPTISTS TO PREACH IN THEIR PULPITS?"

What can this question have to do with the re-setting of "an old landmark"? Is the tract bound up in the wrong cover, and with the wrong title-page, by some book-binder's mistake? Or is it an allegory, and the writer another Bunyan, relating a dream? The book begins thus: "In the discussion of this question, opinions which have originated from our feelings and partialities, should, as far as possible, be discarded." Well, the first sentence does sound more like allegory than plain English. "Opinions originated from feelings!" Was the writer dreaming? He surely out-dreams Bunyan. But read on: "An honest and an earnest desire to know the truth, should gain ascendancy of the heart." He does not say that this "desire" should gain ascendancy in the heart, or of the other desires of the heart; but "of the heart." Now, as the heart is the seat of the desires, it is impossible for this desire to "gain ascendancy of the heart," unless it springs up inside of the heart. The rest of the first page is occupied with a series of truisms, to the effect that truth is better than error, especially revealed truth.

But, on turning over the leaf, another question is substituted for the one above quoted, thus:

"OUGHT BAPTISTS TO RECOGNIZE PEDOBAPTIST PREACHERS AS GOSPEL MINISTERS?"

No notice is given that a new question is introduced, no hint that the writer is aware of having substituted a new question for that with which he set out. Yet he is positive, to dogmatism, that this question "must receive either an affirmative or negative answer." "It does not admit," he says, "of an ambiguous response."

This is a pretty tall assertion for a writer to begin with, who prefixes an allegorical or parabolic title to his book, commences by telling about "opinions which originated from feelings," places one question, as the theme of discussion, over the first page, and a different one over the next. In which of these questions is the "Old Landmark" contained? That in capitals over his first page, where every reader would expect to find the topic of the book, or that on the top of the next page? If the writer is not allegorizing, or dreaming, he must be doing.

Turning over to page thirteen, however, it appeared that the writer took for granted that these two questions have the same meaning; for he says, "they (Pedobaptist preachers) are so recognized, (as ministers of Christ) whenever Baptist ministers invite them to preach, or exchange pulpits with them." This is mere assertion, where-as it is the thing which should have been first proved. But no proof is attempted, nor did the writer seem to be aware of the consequent fallacy of his entire argument, until an amended edition was to be issued, when, in an appendix, he has a few words on that point. But, instead of attempting to prove the point, he says, "really the matter is to my mind so very plain,

that I scarcely know how it can be made plainer." (p. 50.). The simple fact, he thinks, that a Baptist minister invites a Pedobaptist preacher to preach, instead of asking some one else, is a recognition of him as a gospel minister.

It appears, therefore, that the writer saw no difference in the meaning of these two questions, until his attention was called to it, and even then he does not attempt to prove that the one involves the other; nor does he perceive the awkwardness and ambiguity of putting one question at the head of his book, and then addressing his arguments to another, which, in terms, is so different, and which most readers would regard as quite different in meaning. What would be thought of a surveyor employed to re-set a lost landmark, which, according to the record, is north by three degrees east, twenty-five chains and five links from a given point; who should run his line north, by three degrees west, forty chains and five links, and there set up his landmark? If he did not perceive any special difference between the two surveys, it is quite likely that others would. Or, suppose a surveyor was employed to run two parallel lines by the compass, fifty rods apart, and it should be found, by measurement, that in running five hundred rods, his lines were sixty rods apart, would it not give rise to a suspicion that some disturbing element, perhaps a mine near by, had swerved his compass from the pole?

There is great reason to fear that our theological Surveyor and Landmarker is quite out of his bearings. What does he propose to do? He puts this question at the head of his book:—"OUGHT BAPTISTS TO INVITE PEDOBAPTISTS TO PREACH IN THEIR PULPITS?" Does any body pretend that they ought to do it? Have not Baptists the common right of all people, to do what they will with their own? "Ought to invite?" "Under obligation to invite?" Who ever heard of such an obligation? If it is the duty of Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, then Pedobaptists have some right to preach in Baptist pulpits. Does any one pretend that they have any such right? If Baptists ought to do a thing which they don't do, they neglect their duty. But as no one pretends that they neglect a duty in not inviting Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, no one can say that they ought to do it. Therefore, the affirmative of the first question of our ecclesiastical Landmarker is one which no sane man would undertake to maintain.

Now let us see what its negative is, if it has any; for the writer says, (p. 45), that in writing the "Landmark," he has "attempted the proof of a negative." Well, now, what is his "negative"? The short word "No," is the purest sort of a negative. Suppose, then, that our Landmarker's question is answered "No"; is his point gained?—Not at all. That answer merely denies the affirmative, which is, that Baptists ought to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits. The question whether they ought not, that is, whether it would be wrong to invite them, is still unanswered. To illustrate: "Ought Kentuckians to invite Tennesseans to their dinner-tables?" As no one would affirm this, the answer must be in the negative. But what is the negative? Is it that Kentuckians ought not to invite Tennesseans to dinner? Not at all. It amounts to just this: that, although all Kentuckians, as well as other people, especially bishops, should be "given to hospitality"; yet, it is not true that Kentuckians ought to invite Tennesseans to dinner. No Kentuckian will admit that he is under any such obligation.—Just so with our Landmarker; if he has "proved a negative" of the question, "Ought Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits?" he has only proved that it is not the duty of Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits, which is nothing to his purpose.

The real proposition which he seems to suppose that he is proving, as the negative of his first question, appears to be this: It is wrong for Baptists to invite Pedobaptists to preach in their pulpits. Why did he not so state it? Why put it in the form of a question which has no proper affirmative, and whose negative, if proved, leaves his "Landmark" as far from being established as ever?

But this is only the beginning of confusion. The writer does not stick to this question, but substitutes another, thus: "The question, Ought Baptists to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers? must receive either an affirmative or negative answer. It does not admit an ambiguous response. The truth is in the affirmative or nega-

tion. And the writer will aim to show that truth requires the question to be answered negatively."

Does any fair question "admit of an ambiguous response"? that is, a response of "doubtful meaning"? But an ambiguous question does not only admit of, but requires "an ambiguous response." And this is such a question. For it does not admit of an affirmative or negative answer. The affirmative is, that Baptists ought to recognize, as gospel ministers, all that class of men who are called, "Pedobaptist preachers." The man who would attempt to maintain a proposition so absurd, would be a curiosity, indeed. As none can answer "Yes," the question, according to the Landmarker, must receive the answer "No." Well, what does that mean?—Why the mere denial of the affirmative. Thus: "Baptists are not under obligation to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers." But the question whether it would be wrong for Baptists to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers is still untouched.

The logic may be illustrated thus: "Ought tall men to marry short women?" No one can say that they ought. The answer, then, must be, "No." But does the negative mean that it is wrong for tall men to marry short women? Not at all. It only means that it is not the duty of tall men to marry short women. The question whether it is right or wrong for tall men to marry short women is left where it was before. So, if our Landmarker had shown that his question "must be answered negatively," the negative would amount to just this and no more: That it is not obligatory on Baptists to recognize Pedobaptist preachers as gospel ministers.

What, then, does his dogmatism amount to, that this question "must receive either an affirmative or negative answer," since it makes no difference to his "Landmark" which answer it receives? Was ever a more awkward device to evade a definite proposition, than this method of throwing it into the form of a question to be answered negatively, by advancing backwards to the proof of one thing, under the pretence of proving another, entirely different? Did the writer choose this method in order to enlist the sectarian pride of his readers, so as to conceal the fallacy of his imaginary dilemma? Or was he blind himself to the fact, that when his negative is proved, his "Landmark" is as far from being set, or re-set, as when he began?

Such are the ambiguities, non sequiturs, and absurdities which are involved in the argument of this "Old Landmark." Yet the writer is peculiarly dogmatic; he enters on his task with the bearing of a martyr; he has undertaken the solemn work of restoring a lost landmark in the kingdom of God; he expects severe judgment from men, but appeals from it to the judgment of the Lord! He is very severe on the "unscriptural charity" of those who differ from him—"hearty ashamed of such Baptists"—protests that "if he should be stigmatized as a bigot," he "is willing to wear the stigma till death efface it," &c. All these anticipations of the pains of martyrdom can readily be spared, when he comes to know, that the logic of his book is the only martyr likely to suffer. The starting point from which he runs his line to his imaginary landmark, is as great a curiosity as his logic. Instead of going to the New Testament for his stake and stones, or "premises," as he calls them, (p. 53,) he takes them from a "Pedobaptist preacher!" And he does it, he says, in order "to present the subject as impressively as possible!" A preacher whom it would be wrong to invite to his pulpit, furnishes the "premises" of the "Landmark" which is to exclude him! This "Pedobaptist preacher" is no "gospel minister," according to this "Landmark." Yet, he provides the foundation of all the gospel contained in the "Landmark!" Another "Pedobaptist preacher," Dr. Nathan L. Rice, quotes from the "Landmark," and endorses it as "the legitimate carrying out of Baptist principles!" How comes it, that men who he insists "do not belong to the Church of Christ," and who write to bring Baptist principles into reproach, are the best exponents of those principles?

"If Pedobaptist societies are not churches of Christ, whence do their ministers derive their authority to preach?" inquires our Landmarker. Most pious logician! If a Baptist church invites a man to preach a discourse, does he not derive his "authority" to preach that discourse from the church that invites him to do it? "Is there any scriptural authority to preach, which does not come through a Church of Christ?" he continues. Well, if a church can give a man "authority" to preach once? He proceeds:—"The writer does not say there are not pious, devoted men in the Pedobaptist ministry, but he denies that they have any scriptural authority to preach." Just so; then, according to his own argument, they have that "scriptural authority" whenever they preach by invitation of a Baptist church. Again, he says, "Pedobaptists have as much right to commune unbaptized as they have to preach unbaptized." A strange confusion of ideas. No person, Baptist or Pedobaptist, has a right to commune at the Lord's Table, in any church, except that of which he is a member. So the "right" of every Baptist minister, to preach in any Baptist church, is limited to the invitation of that church; and the invitation of the church, according to the "Landmark," gives the "scriptural authority." Again, he says, "Pedobaptist ministers are not in the visible kingdom of Christ." Truly! And what is "the visible kingdom of Christ?" Baptists sometimes talk about "visible churches," by which they mean churches, in the true acceptance of the word; but who ever before heard a Baptist speak of "the visible kingdom of Christ?" This is the language of Oxford and of Rome. And this is not the only instance. "The official acts of Pedobaptist preachers," he says, "have no validity in them. Immersions administered by them ought to be repudiated by Baptists." So, then, the "validity" of baptism depends upon the "official" status of the administrator! Rome never went so far as that. It is the Puseyite doctrine, in which the daughter exceeds the mother. Is the baptism of a believer sanctified by his own faith, or by the "official" standing of the poor mortal who performs the physical act of putting his body into the water, and pronounces the baptismal formula? No well informed Baptist needs to be told that Baptists have always rejected the doctrine which makes the validity of baptism, or any other act of obedience to Christ, to depend on the "official" standing of the minister. What! Baptists put a priesthood between the believer and his Savior? A "Landmark," truly!

But enough of this "Old Landmark Re-set." It sets out with one question—shuffles it off for another—both of which are purposely or ignorantly so framed as to admit of no proper argument. The writer promises to prove a negative, which he does not prove, and which, if proved, makes nothing to his purpose; he mixes up false doctrine, false logic, and bad English; yet seems to suppose that he has been doing God service, and exposing himself to the dangers of a social martyrdom! It is humiliating to think that such a book could have found fifteen thousand readers, and become the watch-word of a party! Its author may be as conscientious and self-sacrificing as he thinks himself to be, but he has made a sorry exhibition of himself in this performance.

As to the sentiments or doctrine which it appears to have been the object of the writer of this "Landmark" to establish, it will be soon enough to affirm or deny, when the author or some one who is capable of doing it, shall have put them in the form of unambiguous propositions, with, at least, an attempt to reason from premises to logical conclusions. Till then, the proper treatment of Pedobaptist preachers may be safely left where it always has been, with the churches, under the guidance of the word and Spirit of God. They may err on the side of a mistaken charity, they may fall into bigotry; but a praying heart is a safer guide than an illogical, dogmatic head. The writer of the "Old Landmark" has, according to Dr. Rice, veered around, within a few years, from the extreme of being "the most liberal of the Baptist preachers," to his present, opposed extreme.

If this be so, his example is as vacillating as his logic is disjointed and inconclusive. Both unite to show that he is a very unsafe guide. The study of the living Word, with earnest prayer, in the spirit of peace, humility, and love, is a far safer guide than such a "Landmark."

Believer, every morning your prayer should be, "Hold up my going in by paths, that my footsteps slip not." Whatever you feel working in your nature, opposite to Jesus, Christ, take it to him, to crucify and subdue it.

Another reason why you ought to pursue the course marked out by the blessed Savior is, that you will thereby promote his honor and glory. Any enterprise whatever, that is designed for the promotion of the good of our race, which in theory, commends itself to the reflecting and discriminating mind, and in practice exemplifies the correctness of its theory, cannot fail to honor him whose mind conceived it." Let us apply the above principle to the point under consideration, and note the result.

The infinite mind of Jehovah conceived the plan of human redemption, and "in the fulness of the time, sent forth His Son," who, by his life, death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession consummated that plan; and in order to make it known to man, instituted the Gospel, and in order to overcome the enmity of the sinner's heart, sent the Holy Spirit, (to accompany the word) whose office is to enlighten the mind, regenerate the heart or soul, and make it a new creature in Christ Jesus; and so transform, the mind as to bring it into entire submission to the will of God. It is evident, therefore, that if that love and forbearance, together with conformity to the Word of God, are exemplified in the life and character of professed Christians, which will testify to the world that they have indeed been changed by divine power, they will thus honor God, who is the author of the great scheme of human and spiritual amelioration, set forth in the Gospel of Christ, whose theory precisely adapts itself to the wants of our race and in the practice of which, the oil of joy and the balm of consolation is poured into desponding and troubled souls.

Be faithful, therefore, in every part of Christian labor, and discord and confusion, will be driven from the house of God, his name will be glorified, and that Christian union will be secured, which is the strength of the church, and the happiness of its members.

The application of this law is simple and easily understood. If you have been wronged by a brother, or even think yourself wronged, the Bible forbids your communicating the matter to your best friend; not even the wife or husband should be informed of the of-

For the South Western Baptist.
Church Discipline.
NUMBER 2.

Matthew, 18th chap. 15th, 16th, and 17th verses: "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone; if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the Church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a Publican. Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

By the above scriptures, we learn that, notwithstanding the prior obligation to seek a reconciliation, rests upon the offender; Yet, should he utterly fail to do so, that failure in no wise exonerates the offended party from obeying the Savior's command to him. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone." You are to go to the offending brother, (not wait for him to come to you,) and expostulate with him in the kindness of your Christian affections, and if possible, settle your difficulty.

And you ought to do this, first, because the good of the offender requires it. The great Apostle to the Gentiles said: "Do good unto all men, especially to the household of faith;" he also said, "Love as brethren, be pitious, be courteous," &c. Now, if you really love your Father's children with fervency of spirit, you desire their good. And you can not promote their good in any other manner as effectually as by faithfully and affectionately pointing out to them their improprieties of word or action, with a view to their reformation. You ought, therefore, to be faithful in your friendly and brotherly admonitions on the first beginnings of disaffection towards your brother, and he will not only rectify his wrong, but also be saved from a repetition of the same or similar offense.

"The words of the wise are as goads and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd." Eccles. 12: 11. "A word fitly spoken, is like apples of gold in pictures of silver. As an ear-ring of gold, and an ornament of fine gold, so is a wise reproof upon an obedient ear." Prov. 25: 11, 12.

Another reason why you ought to pursue the course marked out by the blessed Savior is, that you will thereby promote his honor and glory. Any enterprise whatever, that is designed for the promotion of the good of our race, which in theory, commends itself to the reflecting and discriminating mind, and in practice exemplifies the correctness of its theory, cannot fail to honor him whose mind conceived it." Let us apply the above principle to the point under consideration, and note the result.

The infinite mind of Jehovah conceived the plan of human redemption, and "in the fulness of the time, sent forth His Son," who, by his life, death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession consummated that plan; and in order to make it known to man, instituted the Gospel, and in order to overcome the enmity of the sinner's heart, sent the Holy Spirit, (to accompany the word) whose office is to enlighten the mind, regenerate the heart or soul, and make it a new creature in Christ Jesus; and so transform, the mind as to bring it into entire submission to the will of God. It is evident, therefore, that if that love and forbearance, together with conformity to the Word of God, are exemplified in the life and character of professed Christians, which will testify to the world that they have indeed been changed by divine power, they will thus honor God, who is the author of the great scheme of human and spiritual amelioration, set forth in the Gospel of Christ, whose theory precisely adapts itself to the wants of our race and in the practice of which, the oil of joy and the balm of consolation is poured into desponding and troubled souls.

Be faithful, therefore, in every part of Christian labor, and discord and confusion, will be driven from the house of God, his name will be glorified, and that Christian union will be secured, which is the strength of the church, and the happiness of its members.

The application of this law is simple and easily understood. If you have been wronged by a brother, or even think yourself wronged, the Bible forbids your communicating the matter to your best friend; not even the wife or husband should be informed of the of-

fense. If, however, on reflection, you are willing it should pass unnoticed, without any abatement of Christian love, you would not violate the letter of the law, by burying the matter in your own bosom. Yet, such a course would not fully carry out its spirit and design, which are two-fold. First: the maintenance of Christian union. And, secondly: the restoration of the offender; the former and proposed, may, in a good degree, and for a time, be secured by simply forgiving wrong, and making a charitable allowance for its commission; but in that case, the offender would be very liable to commit another offense against you; and the repetition would not only weaken your confidence in him, but also have a hardening influence upon his mind; and in this way he would be deprived of that power of resistance to evil, which promptness and faithfulness on your part, would have imparted to him.

If, then, a Christian feels himself aggrieved, it is his duty to go at once, and alone, to the offending party, and earnestly and affectionately strive for that perfect union, which is the bond of strength among the children of God.—For, "If any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." James 5: 19, 20.

The honor of God and the promotion of the kingdom of Christ, require all the heirs of salvation to obey every injunction of the Savior in order to the maintenance of that perfect union, without which the church exerts no savory influence upon the world. And if you thus labor with a brother, and he hear thee, "thou hast gained thy brother."—And by your faithfulness won him back to his duty, as a Christian, secured an increase of his love; and his promptness in retracting his wrong has also enlarged your affection for him, and thus by obedience to the commands of the blessed Savior, what at first appeared to be a difficulty, is overruled, so as to promote and increase the mutual love and Christian growth of the parties at variance; the world remains in ignorance of the whole matter, and the church strengthened, and invigorated by the faithfulness of its members, moves forward harmoniously in the promotion of peace on earth, and good will to man.

If, however, the offending brother should seek reconciliation with the offending party, and fail in his efforts, he is required to "take with him one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established. The brethren chosen, being fellow heirs with the parties at variance, to the heavenly inheritance, are required to use all proper means to reconcile the parties, hence they ought plainly and unreservedly, but affectionately, to point out what they think wrong in either party, and suggest what they think to be equitable adjustment of the matter, but should the arbiters fail in their labor of love, the whole case must then be submitted to the church: and if either party refuse to comply with the awards of the church, the party so refusing will become the offender, and must be cut off from the church, lest the gangrene of a single member be communicated to the body, (the church) and ultimately the candle-stick be removed, and the faithful be gathered in to other flocks; "and whatsoever is bound on earth (by this rule), is bound in heaven." By which we learn that everything pertaining to the churches of Christ, must be done by the rule given, or else it is nugatory and displeasing to God.

Let us, then, as the children of God, bow submissively to His will, acknowledge Him in all our ways, obey all His commands, and by our example show sinners that the Holy Spirit has power to change the vile affection of the human heart, and bring all the powers of the soul into sweet subjection to, and heavenly union with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honor and glory, and might, and dominion, forever and ever.

For the South Western Baptist.
"Cast thy bread upon the waters for thou shalt find it after many days."

The weaver was hastening on with muffled music to lay its wealth of water in the lap of the ocean. The ancient city upon its banks was hushed in silence for the voice of God had commanded rest, it was the holy Sabbath. The chime of its many bells as they called the worshippers forth, had died upon the air. Along a shaded street whose aged trees almost formed a living wall, lived the

blue eyed Kate Van Dora. The trembling leaves on the locked branches above, formed a dark and ever changing net work beneath her feet, and the cherished flowers in front of the dwellings bent low as they poured their incense on the altar of the air.—But sweeter far than the blown blossom, of vine or shrub, was that human bud. Before her rose the dark brick wall of the Protestant church, with its low cupola of four fingers pointing upward, reminding one of an inverted table. In the low vestry of that simple church she received each Sabbath morning her Bible instructions from her blue-eyed teacher. In its broad and airy room, above ten years before, the cooing infant's downy head had been dampened by the consecrating drop from the hand of the minister.—Since that happy hour of dedication, the tender lamb of the fold of Christ had been guarded with the greatest care by her Christian parents. Her infant feet were early taught the way to the Sabbath school. Her bell, as she termed it, was the sweetest music to her childish ear; the sound of it would close her lips upon the half spoken word, and stay her busy feet as if spell bound until it died away, when she would bound away with the graceful glee of innocence to give her teacher the first kiss and to catch the first words that fell from her loved lips. Words of love, for the love of God was her favorite theme.—

She with her glowing imagination would picture so vividly the New Jerusalem, with its golden streets and pearly gates; with its tree of life, beneath whose evergreen branches flowed the river of life, and with its angel inhabitants with their robes of white and crowns of glory and ceaseless songs of praise, that the sweet child would sit motionless, while the tears of joy would steal beneath her drooping lids, and sparkle on her delicate hands fit gems for heavenly lachrymatory. But when she touched upon the mightiest proof of God's love, the gift of his only begotten Son, and showed her the picture of the cross, and told her how the outstretched hands of the meek and lowly Jesus were nailed to it, and his feet nailed through, and his side pierced by the spear of wicked men until the blood flowed down.—She listened perfectly absorbed, and on raising her eyes, she exclaimed, "Oh! Jesus! I and fell fainting in her teacher's arms. She saw the whole scene enacted on the wall before her.

A few more leaves were added to the volume of the past. And the lovely Kate stood beside the vestry door, fair and fragile as the water lily, beside the mountain stream. The bud of beauty had expanded with surpassing loveliness. The fair hair that waved upon her childish brow, fell in heavy ringlets draping her thin shoulders, and the blue eye was veiled in thoughtful languor by the long lashes which rested upon her fair cheek. Thoughtfulness well became her, for that tall and manly youth that left her side with proud step and happy smile, carried with him the maiden's vow. It was Conrad Cotta, a professed Romanist. Which had barred against him the father's door for he feared the safety of his loving, trusting daughter. Sabbath after Sabbath they had parted there. Words of love had been spoken, which won her heart, and she was aware of it, and that morning she had given her hand, wondering why her parents so strenuously objected, simply on account of his religion; for if he was a Catholic, she was not obliged to be one. As she entered he passed to his mother church, and bowed before the priest. Was it to commission him with a few more prayers to the throne of God? or was it to acknowledge the sin of stealing a young heart from its parental care? It was to ask him to perform the marriage rite between him and sweet Kate.

A sea of heads waved beneath the lofty arches of the catholic cathedral.—The robed priest stood beside the altar. The prophets were unrolled beside him, and the Madona with her infant son, and angels grouped around her. The thunder peals of the organ were echoed, and re-echoed from wall to wall. As they grew fainter and fainter, there stood before the priest a virgin rivaling that of the artist. A bridal wreath was upon her ivory brow, and its silvery veil shaded her pale face and faultless form. But she heard not the words that were spoken. The loudest notes of the organ, as she passed down the broad aisle, impressed not her tympanum. All her senses were wrapt in the home scene. Her sorrowing father and weeping mother were before her. She felt that she had wronged her dear

ing parents. And nothing save their pardon could ease her burning heart. What will not woman when she loves? Soon a deeper grief crushed her parents' heart. The cross upon her neck, and the beads in her fingers spoke too plainly to be denied. She too was a Romanist. She could no longer kneel around the family altar, nor at the communion table. The low vestry saw her no more, for the priest's will was thenceforth to be hers. It was in his confessional she knelt, instead of in the Sabbath school, and at his feet, instead of at the feet of Jesus, and the holy virgin was her intercessor. It was more than a father's love could brook. She was denied his presence. The last link was then broken that bound her to her loved home. And her husband was enabled, without a word of reproach, to release his cherished dream, -- a home in Eden America.

REULURA
(Continued in the next)

The S. B. Baptist.

TUSKEGEE, ALA.:
THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1888.

Apologetic. Our readers may suppose that we have devoted too much space this week to "re-examination." We can only say, we regret its necessity as profoundly as any of them can. What is done, however, in these respects, must be done quickly. When certain brethren cease to magnify themselves and their private interests above all Southern Baptist enterprises, then we will cease magnifying these enterprises above them. We do think that denominational interests are more important than private interests. The work, however, will soon be dispatched. Be patient. Weigh, consider, and decide wisely.

TENNESSEE BAPTIST AND S. B. P. SOCIETY, CHARLESTON, S. C. -- Next week we shall try and ascertain the extent of the friendship of the editor of the Tennessee Baptist for the Southern Baptist Publication Society. We have not space to devote to it this week. Meanwhile, we ask the reader to prepare himself for a new and original chapter in the science of friendship. It is decidedly rich and eminently worthy of its origin.

Though nothing that can emanate from that source can surprise us now, yet we must say that this is the cleverest piece of *legerdemain* we have yet seen.

Read Dr. J. R. HAND'S advertisement. Any person wishing to reside in the beautiful and thriving town of Tuskegee, would do well to call and see, forthwith. The residence is beautiful, retired and healthy. A good small farm can be made upon the premises. It is also convenient to the Male and Female Schools. It is so located that a family can enjoy all the advantages of country life, and yet be convenient enough for all school and town advantages.

K. HAWTHORN, pastor of the African Baptist Church, Mobile, still continues, as may be seen from his advertisement, to keep on hand a large assortment of Books. Brother Hawthorn is every way worthy of public confidence, and should be liberally patronized in his business. Persons visiting Mobile should lay in a supply of his valuable books.

Read brother HILLMAN WILLIAMS' advertisement. He is known to many of our friends in East Alabama. Of course they will patronize him, if they have any business in his line.

Grace of God Magnified.

The following notice of the Second Edition of this work is from the *Southern Baptist*. We keep on hand a supply of them for sale:
THE GRACE OF GOD MAGNIFIED, by Rev. H. E. TALLER, Junior Editor of the *Southern Baptist*, Tuskegee, Ala. With an Introductory Essay, by Rev. B. Manly, D.D. Second Edition. Charleston: Southern Baptist Publication Society. The former large edition of this book was soon exhausted, proving that the work is most timely and important. It is now re-issued, on firm and beautiful paper, and the price is materially reduced. The small bound form is 25 cents, at retail, and the thick paper covered form is 20 cents per copy. The book should be sent broadcast over the land, as it tends to deepen the work of grace in Christians, and especially in ministers. Nothing that we have read of this kind, tends more to humble man and to glorify God.

"A Request of all Baptist Churches in the South."

Such is the imposing caption to the two concluding paragraphs of an article on the "Southern (?) Baptist S. S. Union," published in the last two issues of the Tennessee Baptist, in which "the pastor, or clerk, or one of the deacons of each Baptist Church in the South," are urged to "read bro. Pendleton's letter," and the editor's "defense of the plan and aims of the Union," at "its next monthly meeting!" And then after reading these eight or nine columns of closely printed matter, which cannot take up less than two hours, to be read to an audience, the vote is to be taken on the question, "Is the plan of the Union approved?" Now, whatever opinion we may have entertained as to the *modesty* of our cotemporary, we really supposed that he had more common sense than to have made that draft upon the patience of his brethren. In the event that this request is complied with, let us see how much time will be consumed in the process! There are about six thousand churches in the South. Two hours in each church devoted to elders Graves, Pendleton and Dayton's "Un-

will amount to twelve thousand hours! Twelve thousand hours make five hundred days! Five hundred days make one year, four months and two weeks! Now, is not this a very modest request to make of Southern Churches in regard to a matter that not a single Baptist paper in the South has dared to advocate except the paper that started the enterprise? But as "Tantery Bogus" has taken up the cudgels for his master, we "knock under," and call attention to his rousing advertisement in another column. We must say, however, that we cannot give it but one insertion. And this we do as much, or even more, out of complaisance to the "Adjutant" than to his chief.

The Tennessee Baptist and Polygamy.

Our readers will remember that we called attention last week to some articles that recently appeared in the *Tennessee Baptist* on the subject of "Polygamy," over the signature of "An Old Fashioned Baptist," which the editor of that paper pulled into importance by calling attention to them, and saying that they were from the pen of "one of our ablest writers." It will be seen that those articles are awakening attention from some other quarters. The following communication, we extract from the "Montgomery Mail" of the 27th ult. Does not the offence against Public morality deserve just such a rebuke as is here administered? We now turn over this whole matter to the political press:

Eds. Mail: A few days since, I noticed, with astonishment, two articles published in the Tennessee Baptist, of the 30th January and 6th February, 1888, on the subject of "Polygamy." These articles are written by some person who signs himself, "Old Fashioned Baptist," and are published in a newspaper edited by a man of some notoriety, called J. R. Graves. The editor calls special attention to these articles; and it is to be inferred from this, and from the fact that the sentiments are not condemned, that the editor approves them.

These articles announce the monstrous proposition, that polygamy, independent of municipal law, is not inconsistent with the Christian religion! If such sentiments are the sentiments entertained by the Baptists of Tennessee, I, as an Alabama Baptist, desire to declare, in the most emphatic terms, that Alabama Baptists utterly repudiate the statements of our sister State entertain any such *Mormon* doctrines; and that they are but prurient excesses of "old Fashioned Baptist" and the editor of the Tennessee Baptist. All who entertain such "notions" should emigrate to the latitude of Salt Lake, where, undisturbed by the municipal law of any civilized State, they may luxuriate in the licentious retinue of Brigham Young.

Will you not, Messrs. Editors, call public attention to these monstrous heresies? and oblige your readers generally, as well as

AN ALABAMA BAPTIST.

On the Road to Bethany.

Landmarkism in the hands of judicious brethren may do but little harm; but when believed in and wielded by men of strong prejudices, ultra minds, and but little logic, it is dangerous to the cause of truth. In a late number of the *Mississippi Baptist* two ultra Landmarkers have taken positions, legitimately carried out, will land in Campbellism. Here followeth what one of them says:

"1. Can there be any Christian religion without legal baptism or immersion?"
"2. Or has any person a right to be called a Christian until he has submitted to the ordinance of baptism by immersion?"

"3. If so, where is the distinguishing difference between the Church of Christ (commonly called the Baptist Church) and the Pseudo-baptist societies, or Churches as they call themselves, not the New Testament."

"4. They are believers in Christ, but does this legally entitle them to the name of Christians?"

"5. Will brother D. A. H. explain and show where in the New Testament, after the ascension of the Savior, an unbaptized person was called a Christian?"

Wm. Halbert.
The good editor of the Baptist, a Landmarker by the way, justly calls these "startling positions." He says, further, "Who can read them without shuddering at the amazing amount of sectarian blindness in this enlightened age and Christian country, where Baptists have boasted about all others of their independence of thought and freedom of sectarian bias."
But, after all, has not "Wm. Halbert" drawn his positions legitimately from the new Pendleton Landmark? He may be running a little ahead of the music, but the rest of the musicians will come up unless they change the tune. When such players upon Landmark instruments as "Wm. Halbert," and there will be many, we fear, go to Bethany, A. Campbell and his musical will respond in the same strain, it will excel a "Harp of a thousand strings."
To keep up our figure, here is a piece of music, in the same key, from another musician, "M. L.," song in the same paper, more expressive, if possible, than that of "Wm. Halbert":
"Ninth. What authority have you for calling a man a Christian, who has not put on Christ by immersion?"
Our good brother of the *Miss. Baptist* declares this to be a discord, also. He is right. But is not legitimate music from Bowling Green, Pendleton Landmarkism? It surely is. Alas! for men when they leave the true Baptist Bible Landmark. Such men as the above will plunge into Campbellism; and such writers as "Old Fashioned Baptist" on Polygamy, in the Tennessee Baptist, will plunge into Salt Lake.

Brother ROBERT BLANK, we presume, had not seen the paper in which his query was substantially answered.

Reflections of the Late Question Southern (?) Baptist S. S. Union.

BY THE NASHVILLE TRIUMVIRATE.

This is the fruit of craft:
"Like him that shoots up high looks for the shaft,
And finds it in his forehead."

It little boots the reader where our text is found. Suffice it that we "did not write it," as our anti-mission brethren are accustomed to say. Nor are we exactly responsible for the use the reader may make of it, or even for placing it at the head of this article, unless it can be shown that man is accountable for that law in the mental economy called "association of ideas." And if we were even to go on and quote still further from our nameless author, thus:

"That sows in craft, does reap in jealousy."

we could scarcely be blamed by those thoroughly acquainted with the laws of mind. Nay, if we were impelled to say from the same authority that,

"craft once known,
Does teach drillers wit," &c.

we might still claim the benefit of that law which guarantees to every man freedom of thought. But a truce to pleasanties.

On opening the Tennessee Baptist, of the 13th February, as stated last week, we found about fourteen columns devoted to what we have chosen to call "Reflections of the Late Question (?) Baptist S. S. Union," -- to Dr. Howell, pastor of the 1st Baptist Church in Nashville, Elder Matt. Hillman, editor of the Baptist Watchman, and pastor of the Baptist Church in Knoxville, Tenn., the editors of this paper, &c.

And the first of all, the entertainment is opened by a letter from Secretary Dayton to "My dear brother Pendleton." Brother Pendleton addresses "dear bro. Dayton" a letter occupying something over five columns of the Tennessee Baptist. Immediately following this, is a communication of over three columns from one who signs himself "A Member of the Convention," and whom we immediately recognized as "dear brother Dayton," who we suppose, chose this new dress in order to give some variety to the farce. [Query: Did bro. Dayton ever read the Fable of the Ass and the Lion skin? We mean no offence, positively.] Think of brother Dayton in *ag. speaking* of brother Dayton in *propria persona*, thus: "I have been a careful reader of bro. Dayton's writings, [don't doubt it!] yet I do not now remember ever to have seen a single sentence from which I could determine whether he is in favor of *pulpit communion* or *against it*." We need not ask the reader to join us in a hearty laugh over this unsuccessful effort of bro. Dayton as "a member of the Convention," to find out what bro. Dayton as a writer, believes concerning "pulpit communion." Well, we hope when the discovery is made, due notice will be given to the public. We vow that we hope he will "determine" "the question of the age" properly. These compose the first "broad side."

The second "broad-side," (we mean a "broad-side" of the Tennessee Baptist, of course!) is opened by an "Ominous" communication, first published in the Christian Index, by one who signs himself "Baldwin," followed by still more "Ominous" "Remarks" by the editor himself, in which among other kind admonitions, he says, "Let Southern Baptists now be true to those who have been true to them!" An expression, by the way, which our readers will please remember, as we may have occasion to refer to it hereafter. Then follows over three columns under the caption, "Editorial Remarks on the Origin, Design and History of the Southern Baptist S. S. Union." On the third page, brother Dayton throws aside the mask and appears in person to discuss what he very justly styles "The Great Iniquity," (attempts at irony will occasionally let out the truth,) and the scene is concluded with sundry "remarks" from the chief of the "triumvirate."

Now, we beg to say that we have no more idea of reviewing all this array of matter, as to what these brethren thought, did and said at their meeting, which may, or may not be true, for ought we know or care, than we have of taking a drag net and fishing for the lost treasures of "Captain Kid." We may observe, that a brother who was all the time in the Convention, and who took down at the time all its proceedings, is more apt to be right, than those who give simply their recollections of its proceedings several months after the meeting. Trust us! *brothers Hillman and Howell's accounts of that occasion will be believed.*

We propose, however, calling the attention of our readers to some considerations suggested by the present development of the authors and finishers of this Sunday School Union. And,

First: The *aim* of these articles is worthy of consideration. The exaltation with which everything is remembered which effects either one of the party by the other two -- as if at

"If bro. Dayton will say that he neither detected nor wrote the communication above referred to, we will ask him right. But no other person can deny it for him."

the time the events were transpiring, they each had a certain precedence that they would be called on to testify for each other, and therefore, particularly committed them to the safe keeping of a memory which could not prove treacherous -- the readiness with which they testify for each other -- brother Dayton endorsing for brother Pendleton, and brother Pendleton in turn, endorsing for brother Dayton, and, as a matter of course, each of them endorsing for bro. Graves -- all this, and many other things, it is now useless to mention, gives a unity to the whole affair, as if one mind dwelt in three heads. Whether Southern Baptists will discount the paper, remains to be seen.

Again: Every intelligent and pious Christian, who is at all free from any improper bias, (for the best of Christians may be thus affected at times,) on reading this *expose* by these three men, will want no other reason for thanking most heartily those brethren, Hillman, Howell, Bayless, Pindexter, Toon, Williams, &c., who plucked themselves in the breach, and prevented the consummation of that movement. We wish we had the time and the space to quote some of their expressions; but have not. Suffice it, that it is not the spirit in which Sunday School books ought to be written.

Secondly: Elders Dayton and Graves were the originators of the Convention that formed the "Union," [better have called it *dis-union*,] and Dr. Howell, as he himself acknowledges, was unwittingly the "passive instrument" in their hands, (doubtless, to give it currency with the denomination.) Remember this fact -- that elders D. and G. originated the movement -- and then consider the two following:

1st. That brother Dayton virtually asked to draft the constitution by moving a committee on that subject, of which, of course, he was made chairman. We suppose the constitution had been drafted some time before the meeting. Whereupon, after its adoption,

2ndly. Brother Graves virtually asks the privilege of locating the Board, and nominating its members and officers, by moving the appointment of a committee on that subject. Nay, as the President of the Convention, Dr. Howell was likely to leave out the mover of the resolution, in appointing said committee, brother Dayton "suggested that it would be parliamentary to make the mover [bro. Graves] of the appointment of the committee, chairman." These brethren, then, Dayton and Graves, are the alpha and the omega, the originators and the finishers of the concern -- and we are perfectly willing that they shall have all the honor and the profits which are to accrue from it. What we have been insisting on all along is, that the Baptists of the South have some right to say whether they recognize the right of that body that met in Nashville at the call of these two brethren to legislate for them. They are, of all people, the most jealous of their own rights. The great body of Southern Baptists had no more to do with that meeting in Nashville, than the Czar of Russia. We do maintain, that Southern Baptists have the right not to be distracted with the private business of that Nashville concern. Let them print and publish as many books as they please. Even if they desire to issue a Mormon Bible, with "notes and illustrations" by "one of their 'ablest writers'" whose lucubrations have recently enriched (?) the columns of the Tennessee Baptist, maintaining that *Polygamy* "was not, according to the Scriptures, or *per se*, a sin," -- why, in the name of our common depravity, let them do it. No body ever thought of proscribing them. But when it comes to throwing fire-brands into our churches -- when it comes to demanding the endorsement of its wares by the entire denomination South -- when it seeks to fight "all the world and the balance of mankind," under a denominational organization -- we have the right to protest against such unblushing effrontery, and expose it to the scorn of every lover of the peace of Zion. This we shall do, "at all hazards, and to the last extremity." The issue is now fairly made up between this "Nashville dynasty" and Southern Baptists. And we have sadly mistaken their character if those who attempt to sow the seeds of discord among them and brow-beat them into measures, do not meet with a rebuke commensurate with their offence.

Thirdly. Brother Graves is a wonderfully persecuted man -- and is so ready to forgive! Hear him. "We can forgive all that has been said to injure us with our brethren. If not Time, our final Judge will determine whether we are as charged, a mere selfish, mercenary partizan," &c. Now, what shall we, what can we say to these saintly declarations? They sound very sweetly, and we do aver that we should like to give the deponent credit for all they are worth. But it was our misfortune, years ago, to read a little volume written by Dean Swift, called "A Tale of a Tub." In this little book, there is a passage in the life of one of the Dean's characters -- Jack -- which pops into

our mind with such force just now, that we really must be excused for referring to it: Well, the Dean affirms that when Jack had any trick to play, he would down on his knees, up with his eyes, and fall to praying -- then it was that those who understood his pranks, would be sure to get out of his way. He would stand in the turning of the street, continue the Dean, and calling to those who passed by, would say to one, "worthy sir, do me the honor of a good slap," to another, "honest friend, pray favor me with a handsome kick," and again, "madam, shall I entreat a small box on the ear from your ladyship's fair hand?" "Noble captain, lend a reasonable thrack, for the love of God, with that cane of yours, over these poor shoulders," &c. And when he had, by such earnest solicitations, made a shift to procure a basting sufficient to swell up his fancy and his sides, he would return home extremely comforted and full of terrible accounts of what he had undergone for the public good. Thus much, then, for the Dean. Naughty people will apply the anecdote, without a word from us. As to his appeal to the "final Judge," we are opposed to such long credits. We had rather settle our accounts as we go. We are inclined to fear that our brother has too many such cases docketed for that occasion for his own good.

Again: The South Western Baptist, (naughty paper!) has 'applied epithets' which it had not *or't* have done! It saw proper to use the epithets "Nashville clique," "Nashville dynasty," "Nashville hierarchy" and sundry other "in-sinuations." We only regret a typographical error that occurred in one of the sentences he quotes, which we would have corrected the week after it appeared in our paper, had we supposed it was destined to figure so conspicuously in this discussion. Instead of saying, "Why did ye *haste* the enterprise," &c., we intended to say, "Why did ye *barb* the enterprise so that it stuck in the throat of a private concern, the 'South Western Publishing House,' before it could be swallowed." If this slight correction will relieve our cotemporary any, well and good -- if not, we shall just have to leave the whole concern sticking in his throat, half swallowed. But then, as to these epithets, "clique, dynasty, hierarchy," what of them? Why, just this: "clique," means "a narrow circle of persons; a party." So says Webster. "Dynasty," means, according to the same authority, "government, sovereignty." And we simply meant by them, that a very "narrow circle of persons" were seeking to legislate for the whole Baptist denomination South -- nay, that one of this little "party" in his place in the Convention, declared in behalf of himself and his co-laborers, that "they had come there to have an organization, and intended to have it!!" This is the language of "sovereignty," and as it was used on that occasion, we supposed that "sovereignty" was there, and we called it the "Nashville dynasty." They called the Convention -- they drafted the constitution of the thing then and there formed -- located the seat of its operations -- appointed its Board, officers, &c. These, we repeat, are the prerogatives of sovereignty, in the matter concerned. "Hierarchy" means, "dominion or authority in sacred things." The providing of Sunday School books for Southern and South Western churches without their consent, implied or expressed, we supposed was a stretch of authority in "sacred things," so utterly unknown to Baptists, that we chose to call it a "hierarchy." We cannot, therefore, modify these epithets, until these brethren cease to arrogate their several prerogatives. And this we shall most gladly do, just so soon as a *modicum* of "that virtue that highly adorns a woman," and a man too, is manifested by them.

But we shall make this article too long. And moreover, we expect to recur to the subject just as often as circumstances may seem to demand. "Hereafter" belongs as much to us as it does to the Nashville "Triumvirate." [By the way, as our brother may call us to account for the use of this word, we will anticipate him by saying; that "triumvirate" means, "a coalition of three men; a government by three men in coalition." We hope this will prove satisfactory.] We must, therefore close with one other remark. There is a studied effort in each of the articles under consideration, to thrust "landmarkism" before the denomination and to make it the great question of discussion at American next April. Is it their wish to bring on a general disruption of the denomination at that time? It is said, that an effort is being made to proscribe "landmark" men, by those who refuse to endorse this "Union." If this is meant to refer to anything we have written, we can soon settle that account. In an editorial article written in answer to brother Dayton's third communication for our paper, in reference to this Sunday School Union movement, we devoted perhaps, as much as a column to "landmarkism." It was stated by Dr. Howell, and not

contradicted by brother Graves, though the Doctor *seems* to be *corrected*, if he was wrong, that a quorum of the Board nominated, were known to entertain "peculiar views," &c. Bro. Graves permitted that impression to be made upon the Convention; and thereby endorsed it. Well, with this state of facts before us, and the additional one, that almost every book issued from the "S. W. Publishing House," was stuffed with "landmarkism" either in prefaces, foot-notes, or appendices, we felt that we were not willing to trust our Sunday School literature in such hands. We also stated most specifically in another article, that "we had reasons enough to sustain our position without ever referring to 'landmarkism'." Nay, further, that "we had much stronger reasons than that for our course." We ask, is it unlawful for us to discuss "Landmarkism?" The very moment we have the presumption to allude to it, "proscription" is the hue and cry raised against us. Now, our cotemporary may save his breath; for we have heard that kind of thunder too often to care one straw for it. Why, the editor has the assurance to ask pastors and clerks of all our Southern churches to read these articles at their next Conference, and then vote upon the question, "Is the plan of the Union approved?" Now, it is time for us to deal plainly with this faction. No man can be blind to its objects. These are, either to revolutionize all our churches to their sentiments, or strike for a split in the denomination. The first is simply impossible. Taking the whole Baptist denomination in the South, there is not one in ten in our candid judgment, who has any affinity whatever, for this new movement. What means that systematized effort on the part of these three men to crush Dr. Howell in the city of Nashville! a man, by the way, who has done more for the cause of Christ, not only in Nashville, but throughout the whole country, than the whole of these men combined, ever have or ever will? What means that note of preparation to all our churches, so authoritatively sounded in the present issue of the Tennessee Baptist? What means that system of *espionage* introduced among the peaceful and quiet pastors and churches in the South, by the editor of that paper so utterly revolting to every honorable minded gentleman, to say nothing of Christian? Who is safe amongst us, when an "informant" may be at his side to report his most confidential conversations to the Nashville "star chamber?" A universal spirit of distrust must be the inevitable consequence! The nearest of kin and the best of friends are alienated! And all this is done (we blush to write it!) in the name of the religion of that blessed One who said, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another!" The bare supposition is shocking to one's sensibilities! As if Christ and the great Adversary had changed names and natures, and now the command was "bite and devour one another!" and the churches of his saints were made the scenes for the display of the vilest passions of the human soul! Dear brethren! this is the work of strangers! "An enemy hath done this!" New and vexed questions are thrust upon us! There was a time when our Southern Zion was peaceful, happy and prosperous. But now, alas! she is bleeding at every pore! Whose hands have inflicted these wounds? Ponder this question well. Its proper solution will open many eyes.

We beg the reader in conclusion, to look at a single aspect of this whole question. The matter of permanent organization was deferred to a future day, it was said, to give the denomination in the South an opportunity of discussing the subject, and deciding whether they would accept the "Union" formed in Nashville or not. Every Baptist paper in the South, that has alluded to the question at all, (and they have nearly all discussed it,) except the one under whose auspices that Convention was called, the Tennessee Baptist, has declared it in the form in which it is offered to them, as unnecessary or unworthy of confidence. And yet in the face of all this -- in the face of an overwhelming negation to the whole question which is without a parallel, -- these three brethren come forward to dragoon the denomination into its measures! They asked the Baptists in the South for their opinion -- they have recorded their opinion through their several organs with a promptitude and unanimity which we have never seen surpassed -- and yet this trio steps "forward" to the support of the Union and its friends in this day of reproach! This is the language of the editor himself. It is plain, therefore, that the only right they recognize Southern Baptists as competent to exercise in the matter, is, simply to *end, r. e. their measures!* Indeed, this is expressly involved in the form they have given the question, which they have dictated shall be discussed before Southern Churches and at America! to wit: "Is the Union approved?" *Brothers! will you submit?*

Innocent Amusements.

BRETHREN EDITORS: Not long since a country pastor delivered a discourse upon the above topic, which raised quite a hubbub in the town. The elite and fashionable members of his church were surprised that their minister should entertain such contracted views. Some went so far as to unite with the popular outcry against his strict, puritanical notions, and declared in their indignation that they would not hear such a man preach. In short, such a storm was gotten up, both in and out of the church, that, for a time, it was considered doubtful whether he would not be driven from his pastorate. But I find that this spirit of opposition to plain practical preaching -- this enmity to the plain declaration of God's Word -- is not confined to this part of the world. The man of God, who dares to raise his voice against the polished vices and fashionable sins of the world -- to confront the seductive allurements to crime, and expose in their naked deformity the amusements falsely called innocent, -- such a minister may expect the ridicule and the opposition of "lovers of pleasure," wherever his lot may be cast. In looking over a late London paper, I find the following with regard to Rev. C. B. Spurgeon:

"HARROW-SQUARE ROOMS. -- Mr. Douglas Thompson delivered here on Wednesday evening, a lecture with the strange, and not very attractive title, of 'A Lay Sermon on Self-Worship.' . . . The most amusing part of the lecture, was that in which Mr. Thompson entered into ruthless strictures, unmercifully prolonged, upon Mr. Spurgeon, though it must be confessed that the Baptist preacher brought them on himself by his arraigned and arraigned in the pulpit at different times on such innocent and unwholesome recreations as the drama, dancing, and novel-reading. Here Mr. Thompson showed off to much effect his great powers of mimicry, by imitating, amid the laughter of his audience, the manner, voice and style of Mr. Spurgeon, whom he denominated the 'Sermonizer of the Sunday School,' and whose discourses, he said, were stuffed with coarse jests."

Montgomery Baptist Book Emporium.

During our recent visit to Montgomery, we called in at this establishment under the management of our brother B. B. Davis. It is doing a much larger business than was expected by its warmest friends. The sales of the first month were over two thousand dollars. Our brethren who visit the city, of course will not fail to call at the "Emporium." All kinds of books -- School -- Law -- Medical -- Theological -- Miscellaneous, or what not, that ought to be found in a first class book store, together with stationery of every description -- are kept constantly on hand. When we went in to visit bro. Davis, we did not think of making any purchases, on account of "hard times," but positively, we brought away about as many books as we could carry. We commend the establishment to the confidence and patronage of the public generally.

"Marks, Re-Marks, and Landmarks."

Every "Landmarker" who is willing to hear that subject discussed by one who differs from him, will be interested in the article on the outside of this issue, under the above caption. It is says the editor of the Christian Repository, bro. Foss, from the pen of one of the ablest men of the denomination. We fully endorse the entire article except a single paragraph, in which the writer, as we think, lays too little stress upon the "administration" of the ordinance of baptism. If he means that the work of a minister in this respect, ought not to be repeated, even if that minister turns out to be unworthy, we fully agree with him. But if he means that a Pedobaptist minister, who neither believes nor practices Christian baptism as we understand it, except in special cases, and even then yields to the necessity with reluctance, why we do not agree with him. Taken as a whole, however, it is the most thorough refutation of the whole theory of "Landmarkism" we have yet seen, unless it be the article of the Rev. DAVID LEE, of this State, and which we recently published. We need not bespeak for the article a general reading.

Notice.

The Board of the East Alabama Convention will meet at Oxford on Wednesday, the 17th of March, at 11 o'clock, to appoint Home Missionaries. The members of the Board are requested to attend promptly. Brethren Jeter of Coosa, and Waldrop, of Jefferson, and Garrett, of Cherokee, we hope will attend. The other members are notified.

The object of the Convention is to place a copy of the Bible in every household; to engage all the available force in supplying the destitution in our territory.

Communications from Ministers who are willing to ride, or from those who wish ministers appointed, will inform us what they want done, and by whom they wish it done. The Board wish to carry out the desire of their brethren in this work.

Brethren Saml K. Borders and S. G. Jenkins are requested to attend, to supply the places of J. L. M. Curry and the undersigned.

Address the undersigned at Oxford, Beaufort county, Alabama.

JESSE A. COLLINS, First Secy.
Board East Ala. Con.

HERZOG'S ENCYCLOPEDIA. -- The 6th number of this work has been published. It is a condensed translation of the German work. The original is recommended by all acquainted with it, as able and thorough, and at the same time truly evangelical and Protestant. The translation is done by competent hands. It is published by Lindsay & Blackiston, Philadelphia. Price 50 cents each number.

For the South Western Baptist.

Innocent Amusements.

BRETHREN EDITORS: Not long since a country pastor delivered a discourse upon the above topic, which raised quite a hubbub in the town. The elite and fashionable members of his church were surprised that their minister should entertain such contracted views. Some went so far as to unite with the popular outcry against his strict, puritanical notions, and declared in their indignation that they would not hear such a man preach. In short, such a storm was gotten up, both in and out of the church, that, for a time, it was considered doubtful whether he would not be driven from his pastorate. But I find that this spirit of opposition to plain practical preaching -- this enmity to the plain declaration of God's Word -- is not confined to this part of the world. The man of God, who dares to raise his voice against the polished vices and fashionable sins of the world -- to confront the seductive allurements to crime, and expose in their naked deformity the amusements falsely called innocent, -- such a minister may expect the ridicule and the opposition of "lovers of pleasure," wherever his lot may be cast. In looking over a late London paper, I find the following with regard to Rev. C. B. Spurgeon:

"HARROW-SQUARE ROOMS. -- Mr. Douglas Thompson delivered here on Wednesday evening, a lecture with the strange, and not very attractive title, of 'A Lay Sermon on Self-Worship.' . . . The most amusing part of the lecture, was that in which Mr. Thompson entered into ruthless strictures, unmercifully prolonged, upon Mr. Spurgeon, though it must be confessed that the Baptist preacher brought them on himself by his arraigned and arraigned in the pulpit at different times on such innocent and unwholesome recreations as the drama, dancing, and novel-reading. Here Mr. Thompson showed off to much effect his great powers of mimicry, by imitating, amid the laughter of his audience, the manner, voice and style of Mr. Spurgeon, whom he denominated the 'Sermonizer of the Sunday School,' and whose discourses, he said, were stuffed with coarse jests."

ty.

the es-
sacient
184 Kno-

ayyine-
dies in
at. pres-
the road
ould no-
ertain

ulate

ty.

erator de
proposed,
and said
declared:
1858, he
is same;
and con-

R.
rotate

unity.

ry, 1868.

of the
account
I exists :
to the ad
ratio be
surge-live

DER.
robust.

Q. I asked
number, by
in evidence
is there
months, or
Adm'r.

P.
of Wm. J.
d. having
October,
ce of Pres-
to and
payment;
are re-
by law,
Adm'r.

P.
he second
his Probate
of the
owed. All
not given
any will be
aid and
Adm'r.

Q. William
sented to me
a son and
aid estate,
Adm'r.

INSON.
discreet

Q. I will ask
to William

all the
of the
not Father,
Phanition.
of Jan-
soncy.
Administrator.

erence of the
Probate for
the late prob-
ary, deceased,
at twelve
belonging
deceased, to
east corner
of said
county, probate,
to the
said land will
by the inde-
no sufficient

Administrator:

— 1864,
Administrator, by
the estate of
— who was ar-
rested at the
at the time
was about
from being
remanded in the
nal was proce-
ed to about the
the process
on to her ar-
and said estate;
being engaged
as inter-
their claim to
see, that the
the State of
GEASLEY,
Administrator.

SCIENCE.

PHYSIC,

M. WILLIAMS,

by to Anshurst
 \$1 50.
 surviving to this
 were adopted as
 day, Anshurst
 ley, Mass.
 work in man-
 nures of inter-
 est, and are in-
 tunately at-
 tention
 of Georgetown
 on taint on the
 motive, and in
 law, as a re-
 course as a
 case of *Worcester*
 on this subject
 I am acquaint-
 ed, but don't
 fully admit it
 unpopularity in
 the last, parti-
 cular views on
 that it will be
 worth a visit
 Boston, 1857.
 supporting in
 the law he ord-
 ined not unques-
 tionably explana-
 tion, and the
 into the science;
 and he had in
 consider to par-
 aded, a
 it is plain well

have been adopted
 At the same
 time the elements of
 a magnificent
 fascination with
 full style of the
 etc. like the
 woman, a * *
 intends to see the
 is which charac-

4. Boston. 27
 MAY. 28
 Town of Toisgrange,
 now the improved
 country, and will
 be the
 ED WILLIAMS

