

we look for the experimental proof among the learned or the ignorant, it is found that the soul is materialized in its views of God. It can neither see nor feel, nor reason, but upon matter and motion, in their endless variety of beauty and deformity. With self-confidence, that they can do something in their natural condition to save their souls, sinners will allow God to work by miracle, or in any way he pleases to bestow upon them wealth, without labour on their part; but they will resist God's power to save their souls by the same means.

In their answer, their ideas are material: "He gave our fathers bread from heaven to eat." Under the drawing of the Father their minds begin to open; and Christ labours to enter into the opening: "My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven." This teaching is powerful. It is felt. It produces in them deep interest and excitement. It gives utterance to its deep desires: "Lord evermore give us this bread." God, the Father, and God, the Son, now presseth sinners to be saved: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst."

It is evident that self-confidence resists the drawing of the Father. Christ also is wilfully neglected. "I said unto you, that ye also have seen me, and believe not." The whole human family are now told that God who knoweth all things, past, present, and future, knoweth how they would act in receiving or rejecting eternal life.

Christ informs those whom he now addresses, that he is eternal life—that those who believe in him as God manifest in human nature, he will not cast from him—that it was for this purpose he came down from heaven. God having the most perfect knowledge of the human soul, in every emotion, while in this world, presses upon its secret and hidden springs of action, to yield itself into obedience, confess its complete and utter helplessness, either to perceive, or come to, Christ, in its own natural strength, or to believe on him as the bread of eternal life.

The result of this drawing love of God, and the inviting love of Christ is, that they murmured against the wisdom of God, and refused to believe the testimony of Christ; which was, that he and his Father were willing to receive every lost soul.

Divine love bringing forth another motive: "It is written in the prophets: and they shall be all taught of God." This teaching is effective, when sinners perceive and feel that they are justly condemned, faith in their powers and purposes is destroyed; then God acts by giving the gift of faith, which leadeth them to Christ. This doctrine is again rejected: "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" or, in other words, faith to receive and be-

lieve his doctrine. God, the Father, is willing to dispose every sinner willingly to be taught of him—to eat the doctrine and drink the spirit of Christ.

To this display of Divine mercy and love, this is the answer of the proud sinner:—"This is an hard saying; who can hear it?" Its effect upon those who heard it, was "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."

In the controversy and struggle between God the Father, and lost sinners, Christ says to the twelve, "Will ye also go away?" Peter speaks the sentiments and the language of all those who are drawn by the love of the Father; "To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

This is affirmative evidence, found in the nature of man, and confirmed by the testimony of God, that man cannot come to Christ, but under the influence of the Father's drawing; and that all who hear the gospel, have the promise of this influence, to make them willing in the day of God's power. Those who refuse this drawing, are told, "ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life." This doctrine teaches, that God supplies the highest, the strongest, and the purest motives, capable of moving the soul in its lost condition. To lose faith in its own ability, to save from destruction, and trust all to God, as he is revealed and the cross of Christ.

A BAPTIST MINISTER.

July 10, 1852.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

As we predicted, the discussion between the Rev. Mr. WALLER and Dr. NEWTON, has attracted to our city a large number of citizens from different portions of our State, and of the various denominations of Christians.

The Baptist Chapel has been crowded twice each day, and on some occasions large numbers have been unable to obtain seats. The disputants are limited, by agreement, to one hour's speech, upon each occasion. There has been much interest manifested by the audience in listening to these able polemics, which, so far as we can learn, continues unabated. How long the discussion may be protracted, we will not again undertake to say. It may terminate during the present week, and probably will. Knowing that many of our readers at a distance would be interested in this discussion, we used every effort to obtain a stenographer, and offered the most liberal compensation to gentlemen at Natchez, and New Orleans, whom we knew to be competent to report the debate, and regret that we have been disappointed in obtaining the service of any one.

In the absence of a stenographer, we have attended the discussion and made notes of the arguments upon both sides, from which we are enabled to present the substance of the remarks made, for the first three days, and will endeavor, in our next number, to furnish the continuation of the same. The following are the propositions under discussion:—

1st. A version of the English Scriptures, in which *baptizo* and its cognates shall be translated by immerse and its cognates, would, to that extent, be faithful to the original.

Rev. Mr. WALLER, Affirms.

Rev. Dr. NEWTON, Denies.

2nd. The new version movement of the American Bible Union is founded in the desire and determination to substitute immerse and its cognates for baptize and its cognates.

Rev. Dr. NEWTON, Affirms.

Rev. Mr. WALLER, Denies.

First Night's Discussion.

Rev. Mr. WALLER, in support of the affirmative of the first proposition, assumed and supported the following positions:—

First.—That many of the most celebrated versions of the Scriptures, ancient and modern, have rendered *baptizo* and its cognates by words signifying to immerse, and that no version has been made directly hostile to this rendering. He stated that his proposition was made, almost, in the language of the late Mr. Greenfield, a celebrated scholar of England. These versions were the Peshito Syriac, of the second century, and Philoxenian Syriac of the sixth century, translated immerse. The Arabic versions of the 7th, 17th, and 19th centuries, translated immerse. The Ethiopic of the 4th and the Amharic of the 19th century, both of the same dialect, translated immerse. The Coptic dialect of Egypt of the 3rd century, as well as the Sahadic of the 2nd, and Basmuric of the 3rd centuries, render it immerse. The Armenian version of the 5th century, renders it immerse. The Gothic version of the 4th century, renders it to dip. Luther's version of the 16th century, renders it to dip. The Danish, Swedish, Dutch, and other kindred versions, all render it to dip. He also stated that in the Persian version of the 8th version, it was translated to wash, and in the Icelandic version of the 16th century, it is translated to cleanse. In the Anglo Saxon version of the 8th century, it was translated to dip and cleanse.

Mr. Waller insisted and ably argued that these latter translations were not hostile to immersion, for a person immersed might appropriately be said to be washed or cleansed, but that could not be said of any other mode of baptism, and people using those versions had always practised immersion and nothing else.

In relation to the Latin versions, he said that the version of the early fathers of the