

Ben C. L. Leate

THE BAPTIST.

R. B. C. HOWELL, D. D.
REV. J. R. GRAVES,
EDITORS.

"One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."

GRAVES & SHANKLAND.
W. F. BANG & CO.
Publishers & Printers.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM, INVARIABLY IN ADVANCE.

Vol. 3.

NASHVILLE, APRIL 17, 1947.

No. 34.

Minister's Department.

From the Religious Herald.
MINISTERIAL DIGNITY.
No. 3.

MR. EDITOR:

In my last article, I made some remarks on Ministerial Courage; in this, I propose to throw out a few hints on *Ministerial Dignity*. Perhaps no other ministerial qualification is as rare and difficult to be acquired as this. And yet it is indispensable. The want of it often renders other desirable excellencies ineffective. Its absence has neutralized and destroyed the effect of many a valuable sermon. What then is ministerial dignity or gravity? It is, perhaps, not so much a distinct trait as it is a suitable mixture and combination of other virtues. In general it stands opposed to a fantastic, light, and frothy behavior, to foolish jesting and buffoonery. In a minister of Christ, I would say, it is *manliness sanctified by grace*. Doubless, dignity in the herald of salvation differs from the dignity of the man of the world. Some ministers confound this difference; and in so doing, lower their sacred character. There are then two or three things in which ministerial dignity does not consist.

1. *The dignity that should characterize the ambassador of Christ does not consist in what the world holds to be gentlemanly behavior.*—We say, *what the world holds to be gentlemanly behavior!* In the proper sense of the term, the well qualified minister will certainly be a gentleman in his department. The world has never seen a more perfect model of a gentleman than the apostle Paul. The very genius of Christianity is opposed to coarseness and vulgarity. She bestows her high praise on whatsoever things are honest and of good report.—The world's notion of a gentleman, however, is artificial and arbitrary. Their standard is a false one. With them the most dignified are those who adhere the closest to the laws of fashion, honor and etiquette. Now, the minister of Christ who adopts this notion of dignity, and acts accordingly, is as much mistaken as he is contemptible.

2. *Nor does ministerial dignity consist in monkish gloom and repulsiveness.* It is difficult to say which is the more hurtful, moroseness or levity. Perhaps the latter. Ministe-

rial dignity lies between the two. Some few are found on the extreme of moroseness. They seem to think that ministerial gravity consists in "solemn silence," the pious look, the deep groan, and the heavy sigh. All this, however, may be merely the result of habit and affectation. But, we say again, this extreme is not only less frequent but much less hurtful to the interests of Zion than the other. A hundred ministers make a wreck of their usefulness against the Scylla of levity, to one that wrecks his usefulness against the Charydis of moroseness.

3. *Nor does ministerial dignity consist in clerical show.* The prelatial bishop with his gown and cope is, in the estimation of many, the greatest dignitary on earth. Many of the clergy in modern days magnify their office in a sense quite different from that in which Paul magnified his. But ministerial dignity consists in nothing outward. It is not the office that magnifies the preacher, the preacher magnifies the office. Gravity cannot be imparted to him by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery. Empowering him to preach and administer sacraments by no means clothes him with the virtue under consideration. Neither can learning nor talents invest him with it. It is personal. It is acquired by thought and prayer.

Having said this much in defining ministerial dignity, I will mention a few particulars in which some ministers show a want of it, and in so doing lower themselves, and render ineffective their efforts to do good:

1. *Some are greatly deficient in dignity in their manner and matter of preaching.* They abound in vulgar idioms and low wit. Others introduce jocose anecdotes to make the people laugh. Others degrade the pulpit by indulging in personalities—make it a fort from which they assail their enemies. Such preaching is in as bad taste as it is despicable.

2. *Others are dignified in the pulpit, but deficient in this virtue in the social circle.* They lay aside their solemnity when they leave the sacred desk, and seem never to resume it until they return to it. Faithfulness requires us to particularize. In the family and social circle, some ministers turn gentlemen, and assume as many airs and as much consequential dignity as ever characterized Chesterfield. Others become politicians, and spend whole evenings in furious debate on the great party Shibboleths

of the day. Others become *light-minded*—they put off the preacher—the man of God, and for the amusement of others, indulge in jesting, mirth and silly anecdotes. In this world of lamentations, sorrows and death, levity illy becomes any one, much less the minister of God. Others become the beau, the gallant, and sometimes carry on flirtations with the young ladies. Aye, it is in this particular that some of our ministry have not only lowered their dignity, but well nigh destroyed their influence. It is in the social circle, in these three respects especially, that the heralds of salvation, some times evince a want of gravity that is mortifying to the serious and prudent, degrading to themselves, injurious to the cause of Christ, and a source of triumph to the ungodly.

3. *Another particular in which ministers not infrequently lose their dignity is the loose and injudicious manner in which they manage their pecuniary affairs.* Such ministers contract debts which they are unable to pay, and consequently, make promises which they cannot fulfil. It is quite possible for a minister, as well as a private christian, to fail in business, become a bankrupt, and yet preserve not only his dignity, but his whole character, untarnished. But such is not always the case.

Let every legate of the skies then, for Christ's sake, both in public and in private, maintain a manly, serious deportment. Nor is such an attainment incompatible with cheerfulness. We have said the minister should not affect the gentleman, by which we do not mean that he should not cultivate gentility, urbanity, and politeness. These are essential elements of the dignity in question. On the one hand, let him cultivate sobriety without austerity; and on the other, let him be cheerful without lightness. This is ministerial dignity. It augments his influence, adds to his acquirements, ornaments, and ennobles his character, gives a lustre to his other excellencies and a charm to his piety.

"He that negotiates between God and man,
As God's ambassador, the grand concerns
Of judgment and of mercy, should beware
Of lightness in his speech. 'Tis pitiful
To court a grin, when you should woo a soul:
To break a jest, when pity would inspire
Pathetic exhortation: and t' address
The sleightish fancy with facetious tales,
When sent with God's commission to the heart."
TAU.

MARCH 12, 1847.

FALLING FROM GRACE.

Read before the Ministers' and Deacons' Meeting, by J. C. Foster.

"Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace."—Gal. 5: 4.

The apostle, in the first verse of this chapter, exhorts the Galatians to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free. As Christ had made them free from the law of sin and death, and had blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." (Col. 2: 14.)

thereby doing away the obligation we were under to keep the Covenant of circumcision, so we are freed from this ordinance. Now if we are not willing to trust in Christ for salvation, but think we must keep a part of the law, and think we cannot be fully initiated into the kingdom of Christ without being circumcised; we, by this act, bring ourselves under obligation to keep the whole law, and if we look for justification by the law, Christ is of no effect unto us. We are then to reject the covenant of circumcision given to Abraham and accept the new covenant spoken of by Jeremiah, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah;—this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people."—Jer. 31: 31--33. We must fly to Christ as the only refuge set forth in the gospel for guilty, lost sinners, or if we adopt the circumcision and depend upon the law for righteousness, Christ is to us of no avail, for unless we accept of him as our only, and entire righteousness he will reject us, having himself "become the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." No flesh can be justified by the deeds of the law. "Nur can the law give life; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law."—Gal. 3: 21. For if the law could have given life then Christ would not have suffered for our life, but "a man is not justified by the works of the law."—Gal. 2: 16. "For the law made nothing perfect."—Heb. 7: 19. If then any claim justification by the deeds of the law, they are none of Christ's, and have not come under the sweetly melting, gently constraining influence of Jesus' love. And being in this condition they are still in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity," seeing there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved except it is in and through the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Hence the apostle tells us, that all who put their trust in the law for justification, "are fallen from grace." By which we understand, they have rejected the grace of our Lord and Saviour, and have refused to yield submissively to his righteousness. They do not consider that salvation is all of grace, but partly of grace, and still more of works. They have been taught by the apostle that "By grace ye are saved, through faith, that not of yourselves it is the gift of God;" and now they are attempting to justify themselves by the works of the law, he tells them they "are fallen from grace," or departed from the doctrine of Christ, as he had taught it to them. He inquired to know "who had bewitched them," who had caused them to turn from the true path to follow after the tradition of men. But Christ is to the christian every thing. "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that according as it is written,

He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."—
1 Cor. 1: 30-31.

Original Articles.

For The Baptist.

REPLY TO REV. J. B. JETER, BY
REV. R. W. JANUARY, OF ENON,
TENN.

MESSRS. EDITORS:

I have read an article in your paper, transferred from the Religious Herald, from the pen of our brother J. B. Jeter, of Richmond Va. on the question whether abstinence from the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating drinks, should be made a test of fellowship in the Church. Bro. Jeter advocates the negative of this proposition. I am not satisfied with his reasons, and beg permission to be heard in a brief review of them.

He, as I learn from his letter, was an early advocate of the Temperance Reformation. He took this position, doubtless, that he might bring his influence more effectually to bear against the practice of dram drinking. That he has been instrumental in inducing many persons to take the temperance pledge, and for which they will be thankful to him forever, I cannot question. He was conscientious in what he did, and felt that God approved his course. Was what he did, right? Was it right for others to do the same thing? Would it be proper, when those who take the temperance pledge violate it, to turn them out of the Society? The Church is "the light of the world," and is it right for her members to do in a society, what it would be wrong for them to do in the Church? If Salem, or any other Church, thinks proper to adopt such a test of fellowship, is she not at liberty to do it?

But my appeal is to the word of God. He says—"I am opposed to making total abstinence a term of Church Fellowship, because

1. It is unscriptural. Christ and his Apostles have laid down many rules for the government of the Churches, and this is not among them.

It cannot legitimately be deduced from any principle revealed in the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. To the law and to the testimony we appeal. Let us have the chapter and the verse where this term of fellowship is revealed, or from which it may be logically inferred."

I propose to give the proof required. I think I can do it most readily. The terms of Church membership are the same as prescribed by John the Baptist, by Christ, and by his Apostles—repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and baptism. But the terms of *continuance in the Church*? The first Church "continued steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." What was the Apostles' doctrine? Did they not preach the Old Testament, as well as the New? Did they not teach that the disciples should abstain from any appearance of evil? 1 Thess. 5: 22, And

is there no appearance of evil in dram drinking, whiskey making, and whiskey selling? Where does drunkenness begin, if not with the first dram.

Does the Bible interdict to drunkards a place in the kingdom of heaven? Would it not be a very imperfect law that would send a soul to hell for drunkenness, and at the same time not condemn all that which leads to drunkenness? What, I ask, has been the cause of so many dying drunkards? Is it not because of the supposed innocency of this fashionable tipping. Will Bible readers, who live in the nineteenth century, believe that the Bible admits that which has been the starting point of the damnation of countless millions, and in which no good can possibly be made appear? Did you, or any other man, ever receive any real benefit from drinking spirits as a beverage, when in health. Is abstinence then unscriptural. What did the Angel say to Zacharias, the father of John the baptist, the forerunner of Jesus Christ. Luke 1: 15? "And he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall neither drink wine, nor strong drink, and shall be filled with the holy ghost, even from his mother's womb." John then was directed by an angel from heaven, to be kept from the use of wine and strong drink from a child, and the reason is given.—He is to be filled with the holy ghost. The first Baptist preacher should be taken as an example, for the present baptist family. I am aware that there are many baptist churches at the present day, not exactly of the same faith and order, as John the Baptist; and if John was to make his appearance among some churches with unchanged habits, he would be charged with bigotry, and would find hot times in these days of improvements. But were John called to the pastoral charge of some of our Virginia, as well as some of our Tennessee churches, he would make havoc with the fashionable rum sellers.

Our blessed Redeemer said something upon the subject of drink. Mat. 24: 48, 51. "But, and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, my Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken, the Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." What say you to Christ's own words. Is it right, according to the above quotation, for a church member to eat and drink with the drunken? If he does, he is interdicted to a place in the kingdom of heaven? Is not the keeping the commandments of God, a term of church membership.

Let us commence our investigations with the Old Testament scriptures, and see, whether or not we cannot find a law prohibiting God's people from the use of wine and strong drink. Lev. 10: 8, 9. Do not drink wine, nor strong drink, thou nor thy sons with thee; when ye enter into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die. It shall be a statute forever, throughout your generations. Why we would

enquire, were Aaron and his sons forbidden to drink wine, or strong drink? I answer first; because they were priests, set apart to the service of God, secondly, because the place, wherein they were to officiate, was also sanctified, set apart to the service of God. The Tabernacle of the congregation contained the ark of the covenant, wherein appeared the shechinah, or symbol of the divine presence; those who appeared there must be holy. It must have been viewed as sinful to drink wine or strong drink, or the prohibition would not have been given. If the priests indulged in drinking, they become defiled, and thereby defile God's house. The crime appears to have been so great, that death was the penalty of violating the law. But perhaps bro. Jeter may ask, did the priests not drink at other times, when they were not particularly engaged in their functions? Yes, I answer, they did, and the consequences are narrated. Isa. 28: 7, 8. "But they have erred through wine, and thro' strong drink, are out of the way; the priest, and the prophet, have erred through strong drink, they are swallowed up of wine, they are out of the way through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment. For all tables are full of vomit and filthiness, so that there is no place clean." As it was in olden times so it is now.

Another "thus saith the Lord."—

Numbers, 6 ch. 1, 2, 3, vs: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, when either man or woman shall separate themselves to vow the vow of a Nazarite, to separate themselves unto the Lord, he shall separate himself from wine and strong drink." The Nazarites were persons whose spirits God stired up to be, in their day, the ornaments of the church, the standard bearers of religion, and patterns of piety. It is spoken of as a great favor to their nation, that God raised up their young men, for Nazarites. Amos 2: 11, "And I raised up of you sons for prophets, and of your young men for Nazarites." The Nazarite must have nothing to do with the fruits of the vine.

But lest I should take up too much time on my brother's first objection, I will hand him out the text, and let him make his own comments. The reader will do well to examine carefully the 1st ch. of Daniel. He will discover that Daniel, as well as the three Hebrew children, refused to drink the king's wine, lest they should be defiled. Our dear brother will find himself sharply rebuked in the history referred to. The noble firmness of the prophet and his friends, should especially rebuke those who heretofore have signed their names to the Temperance Pledge, thereby making the most solemn vow that for the future they would abstain from drink, and afterwards, have failed to be impressed with all the importance of the transaction. I would also invite the attention of our esteemed brother to the history of the Rechabites, contained in the 35th ch. Jer.—also to Judges 13 ch. 4: 14. Now, therefore beware, I pray thee, and drink not wine, nor strong drink. The last text that I will give at

present, my good bro. will find Prov. 23: 31, 32. "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder."

My bro. says, that the lawfulness of making total abstinence a test of church membership cannot, in his opinion, be legitimately deduced from any principal revealed in the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. To the law and to the testimony he appeals. Let us have the chapter and the verse where this term of fellowship is revealed, or from which it may be logically inferred. I think that I have given the law, as well as the testimony, chapter and verse, and I am of opinion, that I have given him ground of logical inference. If I thought that our dear brother would not be satisfied with this, I have at hand a host of others, but perhaps we will have use for them when we come to try some of his other positions.

2. "It is not only unscriptural, but anti-scriptural. The scriptures not only do not reveal the term of membership under discussion, but are, in my judgment, directly at variance with it. Drunkenness prevailed, I know not to what extent, in the time of Christ." This remark is, I think a little strange, coming from the source it does.

I will offer a kind of apology for my brother, who is known to be learned, pious, and temperate. Perhaps it was a cloudy day, when he penned down his sentiments, or it might have been that there was a thick fog, that obscured the sun. I believe that Richmond is situated near a large stream and the vapor was unusually thick. If my good brother will have a little patience, I will try and let a little of the dark out by letting a little of the light in. Anti-scriptural, ch! The scriptures at variance with that which has led to so much woe, misery—that which has been the starting point, of blighting the bright prospects of so many families—that has parted so many husbands and wives—that has disgraced so many preachers, and so many private christians, that has caused so much bloodshed, that has destroyed so many lives every way, and sends so many precious souls to an eternal hell! "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Askalon!"

But this is not all. Hear bro. Jeter, again. He and his associates at all suitable times, censure the excesses, and warned men against strong drink, and interdicted to drunkards a place in the kingdom of heaven. Yet Christ, far from making abstinence from the use of wine a term of fellowship in his church, turned water into wine at a marriage festival in Cana! That this was intoxicating wine, he says, I have no question. It was the very kind of article concerning which Paul said, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess." If this hypothesis be correct; if our brother, can find one single text to prove that our blessed Saviour turned water into the same kind of wine, of which Paul speaks, and which mention is made so frequent in the Old Testament as well as the New. I am greatly mistaken. Bro. Jeter and myself are at the opposite poles from

each other. Where shall I go for my process? Right where I always go, to get testimony to prove every thing that pertains to any doctrine I attempt to promulgate.

In the Old Testament, are we not taught, that Jesus Christ is God? Do not Moses and the prophets all testify to the same thing? Did not the Saviour himself claim to be equal with the father; and that he and the father are one? Do not the apostles bear witness, to the Godhead—that in him (Christ) dwelt the fullness of the God-Head bodily? Now if Jesus Christ inspired the Old and New Testaments, he is the author of all that is said, all that is revealed. Holy men spake as they were moved by the holy spirit. Now, my dear brother, I would ask a few questions which I wish you to answer in the fear of God.

Who, I ask, spake to Aaron. Lev. 10: 8, 9. Who spake to Moses—Numbers 6: 1, 2, 3. Who delivered the message to Sampson's mother—Judges 13: 4 & 14; and by whose authority was the angel sent, who directed Isaiah, chapter 28: 7, 8; to denounce the priests and prophets, on account of their wickedness in drinking wine, and strong drink?

By whose direction did Solomon speak. Prov. 23: 31, 32. And again the wise man said, wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise. Who directed Isaiah to speak, and pronounce a woe, that should make drinkers and dealers tremble. Isaiah 5: 11, 14, 22, 23. Who was it that directed Habakkuk 2 ch. 15, 16, 17 vs., to pronounce the most awful woe that was ever pronounced against man since the world began, for furnishing to his neighbor a drink that would make him drunk? And in view of all this array of scriptural testimony, our dear brother says, that Christ turned pure water into accursed wine. This intoxicating wine! Yet we find in the Old Testament a law, forbidding the use of wine and strong drink. In the Old Testament Christ tells us that wine is a mocker; but in the New Testament, he goes to a marriage festival to mock his good friends that invited him to partake of their hospitalities. Solomon says, strong drink is raging and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise; but John in the New Testament, tells us that Christ at the wedding, turned water into wine; and bro. Jeter tells us, that Christ made poisonous wine. Solomon tells the Jews, not to look upon the wine. Isaiah tells us that there is a woe upon the man who is mighty to drink, and according to the exposition of some, John, 2d. chap. Christ made near 150 gallons wine, enough to immerse the whole company!

The Prophet Habakkuk, was directed by Jesus Christ, to pronounce an awful woe upon the man who gives his neighbor drink, and that maketh him drunken; and bro. Jeter tells us, that the wine Christ made was the same kind, of which Paul said he not drunken with wine, wherein is excess. Christ gave his neighbors drink! If his hypothesis is correct, what shall we say! He makes the Old Testament contradict the New! He makes our blessed Redeemer, a violater of his own law! But I

do not believe that Christ did turn water into intoxicating wine. I think it was pure wine that would not intoxicate, but that which would nourish, that which would not do any harm to those whom the Saviour would bless. I affirm, that there is no evidence to prove, that any part of the six water pots filled with water, were turned into wine, except what was drawn off, and taken to the governor of the feast. There is no evidence that the guests tasted one drop of the water that was made wine, as stated by bro. Jeter. The text says, when the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, &c. Bro. Jeter states, that abstinence from wine, and strong drink as a term of Church membership is anti-scriptural. I ask for the proof. I wish to see the chapter, and the verse; he has failed to give the scripture as yet—and I am of the opinion, that he will be driven to the 23d chapter in revelation to find his testimony, and while he is engaged in searching the very interesting chapter referred to, I will examine a few texts, contained in the old and New Testaments. The first I will notice, is 1 Tim. 5: 23. "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities."

This is a text that dram-drinkers claim as their own, and which is perhaps quoted a thousand times a day by the different tipplers as an apology for the indulgence. It will be recollected, that Paul said to Timothy, a bishop must not be given to wine.—1 Tim. 3d ch. 3d v. Certainly Paul would not at one time teach his son in the gospel to abstain from drink, and afterwards give him license to indulge! Why, was it necessary for Paul to tell Timothy to drink a little for his stomach sake? I answer, because Timothy viewed it unlawful to use intoxicating drinks, and would not indulge, even when sick, until he had apostolic sanction.—Were I to learn that my esteemed bro. Jeter was afflicted with a disordered stomach or otherwise, and some skillful physician was to tell me that a little wine, or brandy, or any other kind of drink would relieve my good brother, I should be certain to write him at Richmond and inform him of the remedy. This would be doing what Paul did in the case of Timothy. What deductions are we to draw from Paul's advice to Timothy? They are these: 1st. It is lawful to use wine when we are diseased, and wine is a proper remedy. 2d. We are to abstain when we enjoy good health; we should always give heed to what the Bible teaches. When the enemy would persuade us to drink from Paul's advice to Timothy, let us turn our eye to what the same writer said to Titus.—2-11. For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.

A text from the old Testament may not be amiss just here, that gives a seeming license to drink, but when properly understood there is no authority to use the article in health, but when sickness requires.—Prov. 31-4-7. It is not for kings, O Samuel! it is not for kings to

drink wine, nor for princes strong drink, lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted.

Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more. If a person is sick and ready to perish, give him strong drink, as other medicines in such cases are given. If a person is condemned to death, let him have wine to blunt his sensibilities. This was the custom in the early ages of the world, especially in the east. The prophet Amos refers to this custom, when he says, ch. 2:8:—"And they drank the wine of the condemned in the house of their God." I have noticed all the scriptures which are sometimes used as an apology for dram-drinking, and do we find any sanction for the practice of the present day, and for which our esteemed bro. contends as lawful, or from which it can be logically inferred?

There is a wine that will not intoxicate, but will nourish; this it is lawful to use; but there is a wine which we are forbidden to look upon.—Prov. 23-31-32. Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, &c. This is the wine forbidden. It is poisonous. The wine our Saviour made out of pure water in reference to its flavor, it was pronounced by the judges of the feast good wine; but from logical inference, it was as free from alcohol as the pure water from whence it came. Why any one should advocate the use of poisonous drugs now in vogue; in consequence of this miracle, we cannot easily conceive. It is not the use of that identical wine to which we object. If we can obtain the very wine which our Saviour formed from pure water, I say let us drink it. I have too much confidence in his wisdom and benevolence to believe that it would injure us. I should expect to find it a delightful beverage; but I should not anticipate any intoxicating effects. But so long as we cannot obtain that or any thing like it, (for the wine of the present day does not come from pure water, nor even from the juice of the grape,) why contend for the use not only of that which Solomon has described as "biting like a serpent and stinging like an adder," but also that which is composed of whisky, mingled with various poisonous drugs without one drop of the pure juice of the grape in it? It is an established fact, that, in New York, there is a manufactory where four barrels of wine are made from one barrel of whisky, by the addition of water, log wood, juniper berries, and various other substances. There are other similar manufactories in the United States from which our wine market is almost entirely supplied. And even that which is imported, in order to prevent it from the acetic fermentation while crossing the ocean, is mixed with one third of its quantity of brandy. Let not then bro. Jeter imagine that he has the Saviour's sanction for the doctrine he advocates.

Again he asks, is not Christ in all grape growing countries still turning water into wine by laws which his wisdom and beneficence or-

dained? Suppose I answer bro. Jeter by asking him if he supposes for a moment that our blessed Redeemer approbates the creation of the establishment in New York just mentioned, and has his wisdom and beneficence ordained the laws by which that filthy stuff called whisky should be turned into wine for the purpose of counterfeiting the pure juice of the grape, by which his precious blood shed on Calvary should be emblematically set forth in the eucharist?

Bro. Jeter states again—John the Baptist was an abstemious man—a teetotaler. He "came neither eating nor drinking." But the son of man was less austere in his habits. He "came eating and drinking." Now it is not affirmed that he drank wine, but plainly implied. His conduct is opposed to that of John, &c. According to my opinion of piety, bro. Jeter's language would seem to set forth John as a much better personage than our Saviour! He was not as temperate as John! Were He on earth he (according to the law which he ordained) would be found a transgressor, and his own disciples as well as John's would refuse to keep company with him. The wise man (says Prov. 23-20) be not among wine bibblers. A wine bibber means a tippler, a drinker, and according to the character which bro. Jeter gives the Saviour, were he on earth with unchanged habits, bro. J. himself would have to refuse his company. I cannot agree with my good brother. I have no idea that Christ was a tippler. It cannot be logically inferred from the facts before us, 1st. His own laws forbid dram-drinking. 2d. Christ was without sin; sin is the transgression of the law of God, and if Christ had been a drinker, he would of course have been a sinner.

3. I pass to the third argument in bro. Jeter's objection to entire abstinence as a test of christian fellowship in the church. Here I shall say but little. I concur with bro. Jeter in his exposition of church authority. He affirms that churches are merely exponents of the laws of Christ. When they (the churches) establish new terms of fellowship, they invade the authority of him to whom all power in heaven and on earth is given. So I say my voice shall always be raised against any new terms of fellowship; the Bible and the Bible alone is to be the rule of faith and practice.—But I see differently from the brother, and feel convinced from the reading of the scriptures it should make no difference what rule is passed in the church, no member should by any means drink as a beverage, or make, or vend ardent spirits. I do not feel any uneasiness about what rule is passed in the church, if it is according to the spirit of the gospel. I shall at all times feel myself bound to submit. But if it is contrary to the word of God I shall not willingly submit. In appearing before the public as bro. Jeter's opponent, it is not with the view of contending as to what the churches ought to do, or what they ought not to do. This matter I am willing to leave with each church, but would say with bro. Jeter, that the churches should stick close to the Bible, when they do

this they are safe, but when they leave the Bible they are like a ship at sea, liable to be driven upon the breakers at every blast.

4. Bro. Jeter states in his fourth objection that total abstinence as a test of church membership places those who adopt it in an attitude of glaring inconsistency. As respects the attitude in which a church is placed by passing an abstinence rule, I do not see the difficulty that has arisen before the eyes of our brother. I contend that every church is an independent government, and if any church is convinced from the word of God that a rule should be adopted that has not been previously in use, it is the privilege of that church to adopt the rule without infringing on the rights of a sister church. Be that as it may, I contend that every christian as well as any church should act with an eye single to the glory of God. I am not the least perplexed about what the churches will hereafter do. I believe in God; his word will stand firm, and what he hath proposed in reference to the church will be accomplished. I will state just here what I fully believe will take place. According to my understanding of prophecy, the time will come when there will not be a dram-drinker in the church of Jesus Christ, much less a rum maker, or a rum seller. I have no doubt but bro. Jeter would be as much pleased to see that day as I would. I believe this first from the signs of the times; secondly, from the word of God.

If my brethren will all examine closely the 62d ch. Isaiah, they will there see what the Lord says by his prophet in reference to the future glory of the church of God. The prophet when speaking on the subject of the cleansing of the sanctuary, says: The Lord hath sworn by his right hand, and by the arm of his strength, surely I will no more give thy corn to be meat for thine enemies, and the sons of strangers shall not drink thy wine, for that which thou hast labored. But they that have gathered it shall eat it, and praise the Lord, and they that have brought it together shall drink it in the courts of my holiness. It is definitely pointed out where the church of God is to drink their wine. Where, I ask, is the courts of God's holiness to be found? Settle that point and the promise is understood.— Shall we find the courts of God's holiness in still-houses? No. Shall we find them in doggeries? No. Shall we find them in these wholesale rum-selling stores? No. Shall we find them in these splendidly-furnished bar-rooms? No. Well, where shall we find them? I answer, in the church of God. Cast up, cast up the highway, gather out the stones, lift up a standard for the people! When the church of God shall have done this, the wine will be drunk in the courts of God's holiness. The night on which the Saviour instituted the supper, he said: Do this in remembrance of me. As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lord's death till I come. The emblem of the shed blood of Jesus is the juice of the grape. Whenever the church of God is brought up to receive bible doctrines, and discharge bible duties, this substitute for wine,

manufactured out of whisky, logwood, &c., will be laid aside and the pure juice of the grape will be sought after, whilst all sorts of counterfeits will be rejected. Should not christians one and all pray for the hastening of this day. This state of things God will bring about by instrumentality. Perhaps the time is not far distant when preachers will be more faithful, will preach more upon the subject of holiness; compromising teachers, and fashionable and worldly minded christians will rather hinder than advance the latter day glory. Thank God, there is a better day coming, and when it comes, there will be no heart-burnings in the church of God about test of fellowship, and christian liberty.

5. Bro. Jeter's fourth objection is, that an abstinence rule cannot efficiently be enforced. I presume I have the advantage of my brother on this subject. I expect he has never seen the rule tried. I have, and find it works delightfully. If he could just see the great improvement it makes in a church, he would change his opinions on this part of the subject.

6. Bro. Jeter under his sixth and last objection says such a test of church membership will, I fear, as human legislation in religion has often done, cause increased excess. If so, is he not acting very inconsistently in joining a Temperance Society? I believe these societies use human legislation to govern their doings; still I have been led to believe that they are accomplishing great good. They have reclaimed a great many inebriates. I hope they will not end in excesses. Now bro. J. says it is expedient for christians not to drink. If so, why may not the church say we will place all our members out of the way of temptation? In looking over this whole matter I have come to this conclusion: Let us preach the gospel; let us enforce the truth of God's word upon our churches; and if the brethren think proper to drive dram-drinking from their midst, let us say nothing that will cause men to think that we are on the side of the tempter

Yours, &c.,

R. W. JANUARY.

DREADFUL ACCIDENT.—On Saturday afternoon, a number of gentlemen undertook to fire a national salute, on the mound in the upper part of the city, in honor of the victories of Buena Vista and Vera Cruz. Two rounds had been fired, and while Mr. Baptiste Irwin was ramming the third charge home, with the coupling pole of a wagon, a premature discharge took place and mangled him in a shocking manner. Mr. Irwin's arm was broken in three places, the hand torn to pieces, the side much bruised, and the face badly burned. The heated air burned the air tubes so badly, that after suffering most agonizingly through Saturday night and yesterday, he was released from his sufferings, last evening, at 6 o'clock, by death.

He is the brother of Mr. John Irwin, who represented this city in the Legislature last winter, and we learn, was one of the most industrious, orderly, and well behaved young men in this community.

[Louisville Journal.]

The genius of Temperance dwells in the temple of Truth.

TENNESSEE BAPTIST.

NASHVILLE, APRIL 17, 1847.

A PROTEST.

Our sapient brethren in the east—the quarter from which wisdom emanates—have lately discovered a new and expeditious method of reforming the world. This invention is to act upon religious affairs in a manner not unlike that of Rail Roads, Telegraphs, and labor saving machines, upon the social and physical world. The Rev. Doctors Sharpe, Stow, and Choules, of the city of Boston, that great centre of religion and humanity, have actually drawn up a *protest*, in due form, against *slavery at the south*, and as soon as it receives a sufficient number of signatures of the Baptist citizens of that renowned city in particular, and of Massachusetts in general, it is positively to be *solemnly published to the whole world!* Now you slave-holders in the south, “you are done for;” this thunder will “knock you all into a cocked hat.”

As a sort of warning to us, a draft of the aforesaid protest has already found its way to the public press. We have blessed our eyes with a sight of it. We shall not publish it, since our readers will see it, doubtless, dashing down upon them like a burning comet, but too soon for their safety. Its substance however, is readily stated. These three Bostonians, two of whom, if we mistake not, are *Englishmen*, say they have told us of the south, again and again, to set our negroes free, and thus do our duty; but that, instead of doing as they bid us, we have paid no regard to them, and, so far as they see, are worse slave-holders than we ever were. They now apply the sovereign remedy, throw off “responsibility,” and *protest* against us. This will do the business; free our slaves; and blow us all into the middle of the next century!

These good brethren, having discovered the panacea for such moral evils, will not, we trust, stop here. They have demolished us—that’s certain. We propose that, in the next place, they *protest* against Popery in Mexico, and Central, and South America. We want to send missionaries there, and if we can get the power of the beast destroyed in those regions, it will be a glorious field. And this Mexican war, in which so many of our dear friends are falling by disease, and the sword;—if they will also put their *protest* upon that, they will stop it instantly, and thus do us a special favor.

Since they have “*smashed*” the whole “South,” by taking away our servants, we think, as it is so easy, it is as little as they can do for us to take away these plagues. One other little request of these potent Doctors—St. Patrick killed all the *snakes* and lizzards in Ireland; our miseries are the *musketoes*; O, brethren, do *protest* against the musketoes. We are tired of them, and abominate the bloodthirsty insect. Summer will soon be here, and they will be upon us in swarms; and all our servants gone! What shall we do? Brethren, *it is benevolent, and you are “responsible”* for all our evils. Do *protest*, and we shall never see another musketoe. When this is done, we will suggest some other evils to be removed by this new and easy, and *effectual* remedy.

H.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Missionary Union—the Foreign Mission organization of our Eastern and Northern brethren—will hold its next session in Cincinnati, commencing the 20th of May proximo; next month. We have a strong intimation to go up, and look upon the *servants* who will then and there be assembled. As we are a southerner, and therefore too great a sinner to mingle with “*pure christian freemen*,” we are not eligible to a seat in that body. But we wish to see their doings, and especially to hear their speeches, and observe their spirit. We must go, if possible, *Dro volente*, to “this Big Meeting.” Bro. Buck says that a respectable number of the Kentuckians will be there. We will take our position with *them*, especially if no Tennesseans venture their safety in the Buckeye city. If a few bombs are thrown into our ranks, they will not, we hope, do us much harm. *We must go, if possible.*

H.

OMISSION.

The printer did us honor, over much, by carelessly omitting the H. of our Senior in two instances. 1st. In the obituary notice of Bro. Maney. 2nd. In the leading article of last week.

To *Cæsar* be rendered the things that are *Cæsar’s*.

We will again remind our readers, and we wish them to distinctly remember, that we are not responsible for the opinions of our correspondents, unless we especially endorse them. We publish many communications with the sentiments of which we do not concur.

TO OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

"*Puseyism* is read with interest. We hope that Bro. S. will consent to become a constant contributor to our columns. We hope that Bro. J. will keep his promise to write frequently.

Thanks to Bro. Riply, for his promise to become a regular contributor to "The Baptist." To his proposition we say yes—cheerfully and may he accomplish more than even he expects. Lua's communications are ever thankfully received.

THE FOUNDATION.

The following from the *Christian Chronicle* shows either that the ordinary arguments urged in support of baby sprinkling, are not presented often enough, or that they do not carry conviction with them as heretofore:

NEGLECT OF INFANT BAPTISM.

"The Pastor of a Pædobaptist Church, in one of the large towns in Pennsylvania, recently stated, as a reason for preaching on Infant Baptism, that not one man connected with his church was favorable to the practice. They could not be persuaded to have the rite performed upon their children."

Some theologians contend that, those persons who neglect to sprinkle their babies ought to be made subjects of Church discipline for their neglect of a *divine* [?] ordinance. It is in proof that the Pædobaptists do not regard it as a divine institution, because they do not exclude those in their churches who refuse to sprinkle their children.

BRILLIANT WHITEWASHING.

The white coats of the gentlemen at the Masonic Hall a few evenings since, would easily have conveyed the idea of an assembly of Millers. Every coat that chanced to touch, never so slightly, the walls were instantly covered with a thick coat of lime. It is singular how white washing could have been *worse* made and put on. What a pity—what a shame to make a flour mill out of an assembly room. We remembered that we had in our possession a receipt for *lime painting* which might be of service to white-washers. Who has not heard of the brilliant stucco white-wash on the east end of the President's house at Washington? It can be easily, and cheaply made with the following ingredients, viz:

"Take half a bushel of nice, unslacked lime, slack it with boiling water, covering it during the process to keep in the steam. Strain the liquor thro' a fine sieve or strainer, and add to it a peck of clean salt, previously well dissolv-

ed in warm water; three pounds of ground rice, boiled to a thin paste and stirred and boiled hot; half a pound of powdered Spanish whiting, and a pound of clean glue, which has been previously dissolved by first soaking it well, and then hanging it over a slow fire, in a small kettle, within a large one filled with water. Add five gallons of hot water to the whole mixture; stir it well, and let it stand a few days covered from the dirt. It should be put on quite hot; for this purpose, it can be kept in a kettle on a portable furnace. It is said that about one pint of this mixture will cover a square yard upon the outside of a house, if properly applied. Brushes more or less small may be used, according to the neatness of the job required. It retains its brilliancy for many years. There is nothing of the kind that will compare with it, either for inside or outside walls. Coloring matter may be put in, and made of any shade you like, Spanish-brown stirred in will make a red or pink, more or less deep according to the quantity. A delicate tinge of this is very pretty for inside walls. Finely pulverize common clay, well mixed up with spanish brown, before it is stirred into the mixture, makes it a lilac color. Lampblack and spanish-brown mixed together produce a redish stone color. Lampblack in moderate quantities makes a slate color, very suitable for the out side of buildings. Yellow ocre stirred in makes a yellow wash, but chrome goes farther, and makes a color generally esteemed prettier. In all these cases, the darkness of the shade will of course be determined by the quantity of the coloring matter used. It is difficult to make a rule, because tastes are very different; it would be best to try experiments on a shingle and let it dry. I have been told that green must not be mixed with lime. The lime destroys the color & has an effect on the whitewash, which makes it crack and peel. When walls have been badly smoked and you wish to have them a clean white, it is well to squeeze indigo plentifully through a bag into the water you use before it is stirred into the whole mixture. If a larger quantity than five gallons is wanted, the same proportions should be observed.

For The Baptist.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

In the Baptist of March 20th, I notice an article taken from the *Christian Record*, a Presbyterian paper published in the city of Nashville, Tenn. The writer, Mr. L. makes the following quotation from an article recently published in the Baptist, under the head of Pædobaptist Campbellism. "Thus we have seen that the Methodists teach and believe that by water, the water of baptism individuals are regenerated or born again, and made fit subjects for heaven. The Presbyterians believe substantially the same doctrine in reference to baptism." Mr. L. speaking in reference to this statement says—"the charge against us is made without proof."

I am sure that if the writer had been as particular in the examination of the subject as

he was to make the above charge, which goes forth void of testimony, he would have seen proof of the statement under consideration. Let us examine and see if good and substantial evidences cannot be produced! I turn to the Old School Presbyterian Confession of Faith, "Ratified by the General Assembly at their session in May 1821, and amended in 1833." In this volume we are informed that there are two sacraments "ordained by Jesus Christ our Lord,"—baptism and the supper of the Lord.

On page 141, these words are "printed;" "Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him." What are we to understand by the term *confirm* in this passage? Does it not mean that baptism and the supper of the Lord, when received makes certain, and establishes our interest in Christ? By reference to another portion of this book, we have the necessary explanations. Page 334—"The sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not by any power in themselves, or any virtue derived from the piety or intention of him by whom they are administered; but only by the working of the Holy Ghost, and the blessings of Christ by whom they are instituted." Here it is written in plain terms that the sacraments, baptism and the supper of the Lord, not only become the means, but the *effectual means of salvation*. Remove these effectual means, and would there be any salvation? I presume not.—But furthermore,—for a clearer explanation see p. 392. "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption, are, his ordinances, especially the word *sacraments* and prayer; all which are made effectual to the elect for salvation."—This needs no comment. For further testimony turn to p. 147, under the head of Baptism.—Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized, are undoubtedly regenerated." In this passage the idea is clearly conveyed that some who are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.

When I assert that all the inhabitants of ancient Athens, in the time of the Apostle Paul, were not christians, would not the reader understand me to mean that some were christians? But more to the point:—p. 148—"The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the council of God's own will, in his appointed time." Here we have a witness bearing strong testimony in favor of baptismal regeneration. In the words of an eminent writer, commenting on the above passage, "The efficacy of baptism is such that *grace*, either at the time of the administration or afterwards, is really of-

ferred, exhibited, and conferred, in this ordinance, by the Holy Ghost; provided always, that the child so baptised is embraced in the councils of God's mercy—is one of the definite elect unto life—and therefore one of those "that grace belongeth unto." If he is one of the eternally chosen, the grace that is only exhibited and offered to others, is upon him actually conferred, and he is undoubtedly regenerated in baptism." But for fear I may be considered tedious, I will immediately examine another witness on this subject, one too, I presume that Mr. L. will not for a moment, hesitate to receive, and at the same time acknowledge that he perfectly understands the doctrines of the Presbyterians, as printed in their confession. Matthew Henry, the eminent commentator, in his treatise on baptism, makes the following statement, viz:—"The gospel contains not only a doctrine, but a covenant; and by baptism we are brought into that covenant. Baptism wrests the keys of the heart out of the hand of the strong man armed, that the possession may be surrendered to him—whose right it is. The water of baptism is designed for our cleansing from the spots and defilements of the flesh. In baptism our names are engraved upon the breast plate of the High Priest. This, then is the efficacy of baptism; it is putting the child's name in the gospel grant. We are baptized into Christ's death, that is, God doth, in that ordinance, seal, confirm, and make over to us all the benefits of the death of Christ." Here we have an explanation of the whole matter! Here baptismal regeneration is taught in as plain terms as language can make it. This is in perfect unison with the belief of the Methodists, for they teach that, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to justification of life;" the virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death are applied to us in baptism.

With the evidences which have been adduced, can any one who wishes to speak correctly, say that the Presbyterians and Methodists do not teach and believe substantially the same doctrine in reference to baptismal regeneration? Both teach it in their writings, and I presume believe the same.

The good sense of the Presbyterians and Methodists have taught them to preach that "the good old way of salvation" is the correct way—"By grace through faith." But here is a strange inconsistency to me.

In the pulpit they teach that persons are saved by grace without the deeds of the law, but when we turn to their confessions and standard writers we find baptismal regeneration taught in plain terms.—"The sacraments," says the Presbyterian, "become effectual means of salvation"—"The gospel contains not only a doctrine but a covenant; and by baptism we are brought into that covenant. In baptism our names are engraved on the breast plate of the High Priest. This, then, is the efficacy of baptism: it is putting the child's name in the gospel grant."

"Concerning baptism," says Mr. L. "we

hold that it is a sign and a seal of the righteousness of faith." Will he inform us where it is recorded in the scriptures of divine truth, that baptism is a sign and seal of the righteousness of faith? The scriptures inform us that we are sealed by the Spirit of God, and not by baptism. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Eph. 4: 30.

In conclusion, I beg leave to tender my gratitude to Mr. L. for his kindness in endeavoring to impress the minds of his readers with the idea that I am a thoughtless and ignorant scribbler, and assure him that the Baptists are so accustomed to receive such encomiums from the Pædobaptists, that it has but little, if any effect on their minds.

DIXON.

April 13, 1847.

For The Baptist.

ABSTINENCE A TERM OF CHURCH FELLOWSHIP.

JONESBORO', E. T. April 6, 1847.

Dear Editors—I find from your valuable paper, of the 27th March, that bro. J. B. Jeter, Pastor of the 1st. Baptist Church, Richmond Va., has taken ground against making "Total Abstinence from the use of intoxicating drinks, as a beverage, a Term of Church Fellowship."

Now, I would not say a single word upon the subject without the kindest regard for the feelings of bro. Jeter, but to my mind, he has not sufficiently sustained himself in the premises. He starts out first upon a negative, and then gives a challenge for the chapter and verse where this term of fellowship is revealed, as from which it may be logically inferred.

As I may have use for this hereafter, I will pass on for the present to his second reason. Mark his position.

2. "It is not only unscriptural, but *anti-scriptural*." He then assumes as his only scriptural ground of argument, "that Christ turned water into wine at the marriage festival in Cana—that this was intoxicating wine; and that Jesus not only made but drank wine."

I shall briefly examine these scriptural cases of bro. J.

1. That the Saviour made and drank wine, none will pretend to controvert. Noah was the inventor of wine, and as he was a righteous man, and as wine had long been in use among the Jews, there was nothing incompatible with the Saviour in making known his divinity by turning the water into wine. But it does not follow as a necessary consequence, that the doors of the church shall be thrown open to the abuse, even, of a good thing. When the Saviour drank wine, he done it with thanksgiving, and when wine is used at the Lord's supper, it is received with thanksgiving, but when it is not received with thanksgiving and sanctified by the word of God and prayer, we have a right to refuse it.—1 Tim. 4, 5. And when wine is taken by way of indulgence to the appetite, it cannot strictly be

received with thanksgiving. Hence we refer to a settled principle in theology,—that a thing, however good in its nature, may be rejected when it becomes offensive. When the ox became offensive under the law of Moses, he was to be killed, and his flesh was not to be eaten. Exod. 21: 29. 'And if thy hand, or thy foot offend thee cut them off.' 'And if thine eye offend thee pluck it out.—Mark 9: 43-7. Here is 'chapter and verse.' And I now ask, is wine, which is an invention of man, better than the creation of God? Or is wine, as a beverage, more indispensable to the church, than the hand, the foot, or the eye, is of use to the body?

But if abstinence from the use of wine, as a beverage, *pure wine*, had been the term of church fellowship, it is hardly probable that this controversy would ever have been agitated. For since the fountains of the great deep have been broken up, by the art of distillation, and the ten thousand streams of liquid fire have been turning upon our land, we might nearly as soon expect a shower of pure wine from the clouds, as to look for it, outside of a wine making country. And the vast disproportion of evil between the use of pure wine, and distilled liquors, probably differ as much as the time and circumstances of the Saviour turning water into wine, and the introduction of ardent spirits into the world. The water was turned into wine about the year of our Lord 30. The object of this miracle was to attract attention towards the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world; but the art of turning the products of the earth into a fiery spirit was discovered by an Arab about eight or nine hundred years afterwards. The effects of this invention soon became alarming, and efforts were made by a heathen people to arrest the evil. The history of the Jews furnish various accounts of drunkenness from the use of wine; but the history of our country gives an account of thirty thousand lives being lost annually, from the use of ardent spirits. And now, while the evils arising from ardent spirits are multiplying upon us, have we no scripture from which we can logically infer that they should be discarded as a beverage? How are we to apply such passages as these. "I am set for the defence of the gospel." "Abstain from all appearance of evil." &c. And such passages as forbid us to keep company with the drunkard.

2. "That the water that was turned into wine at the marriage festival, was intoxicating wine, I have no question."

This is very doubtful bro. J. The products of the earth do not contain within themselves the properties of alcohol; but to the contrary their property must be decomposed by a chemical process before the alcoholic qualities can be obtained, and this cannot be done without sufficient time for fermentation to take place. But the wine used at the marriage festival was altogether new, and had not time according to the laws of nature to ferment; yet as this was a miracle the Saviour had power to give it all the flavor of "old mellowed wine."

Again, that the wine made and drank by the

Saviour, was intoxicating wine is irreconcilable with the following scripture.—“Look not thou upon the wine when it is red, when it giveth his color in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder.” Pro. 23: 31, 32. Now, who dare charge the Holy One of Israel with violating one precept of sacred writ.

3. The concluding part of bro. J's. article is too flexible. One might suppose him to be on almost every side of the question.

Yours, &c.

WILLIAM CATE.

Poetry.

From the Banner and Pioneer.

LAST WORDS OF THE DYING M'COY.

“Never let the Indian Mission decline.”

A sigh on the breeze and a wail on the air;
The bright form of Mercy is bending in prayer!
Her leader has fallen! the first in the van,
To bear to the heathen salvation for man!
O! hark—she is pleading with accents divine—
“*The Indian Mission must never decline!*”

Then, a tear for the dead, who has gone to his rest,
But a heart for the cause which he ever loved best!

His path you may trace thro' the wild wood and shade,
Where oft on the ground his cold pallet was made;

Thro' the deep drifted snows, which blow fierce on the gale;

Thro' thick tangled grass, in the far distant vale:—
In winter, in summer, o'er hill and thro' flood,
He ever like Christ *“went about doing good.”*

Then, a tear for the dead, who has gone to his rest,
But a heart for the cause which he ever loved best!

Go stand by the graves where his children are laid,
And mark the deep prints which in kneeling he made;
Or see that fair daughter by ruffians all torn,
And wonder if ever like sorrows were borne!

But these can ne'er daunt him, nor cause him to yield;

'Midst death and afflictions he still keeps the field!

Then, a tear for the dead, who has gone to his rest,
But a heart for the cause which he ever loved best!

Still onward he presses, the first in the fight—

The Lamb's sacred banner unfurling so bright!

When far in advance, he oft turns to the rear,

The halting to lead, and the fainting to cheer;

Now o'er the death struggle he peals forth the sublime—

“The Indian Mission must never decline.”

Then, a tear for the dead, who has gone to his rest,
But a heart for the cause which he ever loved best!

His toiling is over, he's now in his rest,

But leaving behind as his dying request:—

“My brethren, undaunted by doubts or by fears,
Well nurture the germ till the harvest appears:

O! hear my last wish as I sever from time—

THE INDIAN MISSION MUST NEVER DECLINE!”

Then, a tear for the dead, who has gone to his rest,

But a heart for the cause which he ever loved best!

HENDERSON, Ky.

S. D.

Army News.

From the N. O. Commercial Bulletin, April 5.

Fall of Vera Cruz,

AND THE CASTLE OF SAN JUAN DE ULLOA.

NEAR VERA CRUZ, 29th March, 1847.

I have just learned that the *Princeton* is about starting for Pensacola, and though you may receive the news sooner by some opportunity direct to your city, I drop a few lines in great haste, to say that the city and castle are ours, after a severe and constant bombardment, in which the city has suffered dreadfully, and I deeply regret to add, with great loss of life to the helpless inhabitants—as yet, I have ascertained nothing positive on this point, and I sincerely hope the rumors will prove to have been greatly exaggerated.

Gen. Scott's arrangements were made with great system and science—he opened on the town with his mortars on the afternoon of the 22d, having previously summoned the city to surrender by a flag, but the answer was in the usual Mexican bravado style, that they would bury themselves beneath the ruins and perish to a man—they subsequently, however, “took wit in their anger,” and concluded it was better to live *above* the ruins than to die *under* them.

Though Gen. Scott was disappointed and greatly annoyed at the non-arrival of a large portion of his mortars and battering train, yet still he managed to keep up a most incessant firing with what he had, and evidently with great effect, as was evidenced by the conflagrations within the city. One of the batteries, with Paixhan guns, was worked by officers and seamen from the navy, with great success.

The fleet of small vessels, principally gun boats, ran close on the first day, and kept up a most incessant fire upon the castle as well as the city, with their Paixhan guns, which must have done great damage—how they escaped total destruction from the fire of the castle is a matter of astonishment, but they maintained their position until nearly dark, when they withdrew, in pursuance to signal from the flag ship, and so far as I can learn, without damage or loss—a single Paixhan shot, well directed, would have been sufficient to have sunk any one of them—the next day this gallant little fleet again took another turn at the enemy, but the firing from the castle came rather too fast and hot for them, and they had to haul off—Captain Tatnall commanded them,

and directed their movements with great judgment—he was in one of the small steamers—I am afraid they must have suffered some loss, though so far as to outward appearance, nothing material was visible.

The bombardment was kept up during the 24th and 25th, with great vigor, and on the 26th a flag came from the enemy with proposals to treat—it appears that Morales, who commanded, had been deposed in consequence of his determination to defend the city to the last, and some other officer appointed to replace him—if this is so, it shows the great state of insubordination in which the garrison was—the negotiations were conducted by Gen. Worth and Col. Totten, and the terms were finally settled and acceded to by the Mexicans on the 27th—I have not ascertained what they are, except generally a surrender of the castle and city, and all the public stores, etc.—and suppose the usual stipulations in favor of private property—whether the garrisons are to remain as prisoners, or to be released on parole, I do not know, but presume Gen. Scott will not wish to be encumbered with them, and will prefer to let them take care of themselves—for even if they were to violate the terms of not serving again until exchanged (which of course would be stipulated for,) it would make but little difference, as it is not *men* that the Mexicans want, for they can get any number of them, but the means and supplies to support their armies and render them efficient.

The castle and city are to be evacuated to-day, and the American troops to take immediate possession.

The whole of these operations on our part have been carried on to complete success, and this strong fortress and city captured with a very trifling loss, not exceeding 20 killed—Capt. Vinton, a most excellent and promising officer, is among the number.

We had a norther on the 26th, which has driven ashore a whole fleet of small craft, and among them the fine little iron steamer *Hunter*, Capt. McLaughlin—the crew had to swim for their lives—she was a fine vessel and would have been very serviceable in future operations on this coast.

It is said Gen. Scott will at once move into the interior, and that his first object will be Jalapa, which he will take and hold, until arrangements are completed and further reinforcements received for the march on the capital—he is fully impressed with the necessity of getting his army clear from the *vomito*, which may now be expected in a very short time—at Jalapa he could obtain considerable supplies, and can besides readily keep open his communications with the sea coast. It is thought that a garrison kept in the castle, surrounded as it is with the ocean, would be free from the attacks of the *vomito*, and it would so completely command the town, as to render it unnecessary to maintain a force in the latter.

The following letter from Mr. Kendall, of the Picayune, gives the details of the closing arrangements with more minuteness than any other that we have seen.

CAMP BEFORE VERA CRUZ. }

March 22, 1847—9 o'clock, A. M. }

Not knowing what vessel is to sail first, I have written duplicates of this letter to send off by any and every conveyance. It contains a hurried statement of the events of the past three days.

On the 25th inst. a portion of Col. Harney's dragoons, with two pieces of artillery, under Lieut. Judd, and small detachments of the 1st and 2d Tennessee volunteers, under Cols. Campbell and Haskell, had a sharp engagement with a strong force of the enemy at a fortified bridge a short distance this side of Medelin. The barricade at the bridge was carried by assault, and the Mexicans were afterwards entirely cut to pieces and dispersed by the mounted dragoons. They lost 40 or 50 men in killed, besides many wounded: on our side the loss was 3 killed, and 6 or 8 wounded—among the latter Lieut. Neill of the dragoons, severely but not dangerously injured by a lance.

Yesterday morning, the 26th, before daylight, a severe norther sprung up. At sunrise, a white flag came in from the Mexicans, and under cover of a truce for the benefit of foreign families, were overtures for a surrender. The batteries of the enemy had been mostly silent the night previous. Gen. Scott appointed a commission, consisting of Gens. Worth and Pillow and Col. Totten, to confer with the officers selected by the Mexican Gen. Landero, it being stated that Gen. Morales was sick. The members of our commission, if I am rightly informed, were instructed to insist upon the unconditional surrender of Vera Cruz and the castle of San Juan de Ulua, Gen. Morales having designated himself as commander of both, with all the arms and ammunitions—the prisoners to be sent to the United States, if Gen. Scott deemed it expedient. Gen. Worth and the other commissioners went out in the afternoon, when the Mexican officers requested until 9 or 10 o'clock this morning to give their answer.

Yesterday afternoon a deputation of the citizens of Medelina came up and requested Gen. Scott to send down a regular armed force to occupy that town and protect their property.

Some twenty odd sail of vessels, mostly Schooners and hermaphrodite brigs, have been driven ashore by the violence of the norther, and several square-rigged vessels have been dismasted under Sacrificios. The gale has been one of uncommon fury. It has abated this morning, and I see several small boats filled with French and probably other families between the castle and Sacrificios. They have been stopped by Com. Perry, and not allowed to proceed towards the fleet. With the timely warning they all had, they should have left the city before they did. Gen. Scott told them plainly what he intended to do, and it is their own fault if they did not believe him.

March 27—10 o'clock A. M.—Gen. Worth and the other officers of the commission have just started for the lime-kiln, which is little over a quarter of a mile from Fort Santiago, to hold a last talk with the Mexicans. I have learned, since I commenced this letter,

that Gen. Scott will permit the Mexican soldiers, after laying down their arms, to go free to their homes on parole. An hour or two will probably tell the story, and I shall keep this letter open until the result is known. If the Mexicans do not come to terms, there will be a din of round shot and shell about their ears such as they have not as yet been accustomed to—our batteries are increased and in the best condition.

Half past 1 o'clock P. M.—The commission has not yet returned from the lime-kiln, so we are yet ignorant of the result of the deliberations. An hour or two since a messenger came down to Gen. Scott, from the lime-kiln, probably for fresh instructions on some debated point. The Mexicans will palaver until the vomito or millenium comes, if they are permitted, which I trust and feel assured will not be the case. Their commander at first asked for the same terms granted the Mexicans at Monterey—to march out with colors flying, drums beating, trumpets blowing, and their arms at their sides; but of course Gen. Scott will accede to no such terms. The two cases are by no means parallel. At Monterey Ampudia had two roads open by which to retreat—here the Mexicans are completely hemmed in on all sides, by land as well as water, and entirely without the chance of escape.

Quarter past 3 o'clock, P. M.—From a messenger who has just arrived from the lime-kiln, where the joint commission is sitting, it is understood that the Mexicans have accepted Gen. Scott's terms, and it is expected that the treaty of capitulation will be signed in the course of an hour or two by the commanders on either side. Rumor has it that two-thirds of Vera Cruz is in ruins—the effects of our Paixhan shot and shells. Never has so strong a place been taken with so little loss. I shall probably send this letter, or a duplicate, by the *Princeton*, as I am told that she is to touch at the Balize, at Mobile or Pensacola. To return to the present state of affairs: fearing that the Mexicans may not come to terms, Gen. Scott is sending up additional mortars to the batteries. If the capitulation is not signed, the destruction and carnage will be terrible.

7 o'clock, P. M.—The news now is, that all the articles of capitulation have been accepted by the Mexican officers, and that the papers have gone to the castle; as well as to the city, for the signatures of the respective commanders; after this, the documents will be signed by Gen. Scott, and then the stronghold of Mexico will be in the hands of the American troops. It is asserted that many of the Mexican officers will refuse to accept their paroles, in which case they will probably be sent to N. Orleans. In front of some of the batteries a number of volunteers have already approached to the city walls, and it is even asserted that the Mexicans have come out and sold them liquor. I am told that a guard has been sent out to bring in all stragglers.

11 o'clock, P. M.—The thing is all settled. The commission has returned, the capitulation has been signed by all parties, and day after to-morrow, at 10 o'clock, the Mexicans are to march out of their "heroic" city, which they were to defend until not a man was left, stack their arms in presence of our whole army, and then set out on their parole as the cheapest way of getting rid of them.

Thus has fallen Vera Cruz, and along with it the famous castle of San Juan de Ullua. If so much has been effected with the limited means in the hands of the engineers, what would have been done with the entire amount of ordnance called for, including Alger's big gun, which has arrived at last? Why, Vera Cruz would have been a heap of shapeless, sightless ruins in twenty-four hours after the bombardment commenced, while the morale upon the entire Mexican nation would have been immense. And then, again, it might have been an agreeable and a pleasant sight to the officers of the foreign vessels, lying under

Sacrificios and watching all of Gen. Scott's movements, to have seen fifty of our mortars at work instead of ten—to say nothing of the useful lesson they would have been taught. The actions of some of the foreigners, in not wishing to leave the city until their own dwellings were tumbling about their ears, would indicate a doubt in their minds of the ability of the Americans to capture the place. They have found themselves mistaken, many of them when it was too late for either their safety or comfort; and hereafter the opinion will probably obtain, that when an American army sets itself down before a Mexican city, it is going into it most distinctly.

I shall probably send this letter by the *Princeton*, and a duplicate by some other vessel. If possible I shall get the terms of capitulation to send on.

Yours, etc., etc.

G. W. K.

The correspondence of the *Picayune* further states, that *Morales* was not deposed from his command, but was sick, in consequence of which *Gen. Landero* acted in the negotiations.

The total loss of the American army, from the day of landing, (March 9), is 65 persons, killed and wounded.

Officers Killed.—Captain John R. Vinton, 2d Artillery; Captain Alburdis, 2d Infantry; Midshipman T. B. Shubrick, navy.

Officers Wounded.—Lieutenant-Colonel Dickenson, South Carolina Volunteers, severely; Lieutenant A. S. Baldwin, navy, slightly; Lieutenant Belozin Davidson, 2d Infantry, very slightly; Lieutenant Lewis Neill, 2d Dragoons, severely. All the wounded are doing well.

Of the Mexicans, the slaughter is said to have been immense. The commanding General was stationed in the city, while his second in command held the castle. Their regular force was about 3,000, and they had about the same number of irregulars.

From the Delta Extra of the 4th.

COL. HARNEY'S DRAGOON FIGHT.

Information was received in camp this morning that a body of Mexicans were hanging on our rear intending to force the lines if possible and make their way into the city with a number of cattle. Col. Harney, with one hundred and twenty dragoons was ordered out in search of them, and report his observations. He discovered them about two thousand in number entrenched at a bridge and supported by two pieces of artillery, three miles from Gen. Patterson's head-quarters. Col. Harney started on his return, intending to prepare properly and attack them the next morning. But the gallant old soldier knowing that delays are dangerous, could not bear the idea of leaving the enemy after having come in sight of them, without having a brush. Accordingly, he returned to the place, took a position where he could watch their movements, and keep his men secure from the enemy's fire.

The Mexicans commenced firing at him, and threw a perfect shower of balls all around him, but without injury. Col. Harney then despatched a messenger to camp for a small reinforcement, and some artillery to break the breastworks. He was reinforced from General Patterson's Division, by Lieut. Judd, with two pieces of artillery, about 60 Dragoons, dismounted, and six companies of the 1st and 2nd Tennessee Volunteers, under the command

of Col. Haskell, accompanied by Gen. Patterson in person, although he did not take the command from Col. Harney, but merely participated as any other individual who was engaged. Col. Harney then formed the Tennesseans on the right, his Dragoons on the left, and advanced slowly, to draw the fire of the Mexicans, until Lieut. Judd got his artillery in such position as he desired.

The movement succeeded admirably: Lieut. Judd got his ground within 150 yards of the Mexicans, and commenced firing—they attempted to return it, but as soon as a slight breach was made in the parapet, Col. Harney ordered a charge, which was answered by a yell from the Dragoons and Tennesseans. Col. Haskell, Capt. Cheatham and Capt. Foster were the first men to leap over the breastwork, and, as a naval officer remarked, who witnessed the whole affair, the balance went over so much like "a thousand of brick" that there was no telling who was first or last. As might have been expected, the Mexicans were unable to stand a charge from "the boys who stood the fire of the Black Fort at Monterey." A few of the incumbrances were soon thrown out of the way, and Col. Harney, with his Dragoons, leaped the breastwork and gave chase. He had not proceeded more than a mile before he found the enemy formed in line to receive him. He immediately deployed, and from the head of the line ordered a charge.

When he approached within about 20 yards of the enemy's line they gave him a fire from their side-arms, but overshot. Then came the test of strength and skill—the Dragoon, with sword in hand, met the confiding Lancer, with pointed lance, ready to receive him. The contest was but for a short time. In many instances lances were twisted from their clenched hold; the Mexicans were unsaddled and driven helter-skelter in every direction, and pursued by the Dragoons in detachments. Col. Harney and several of his officers met their men in single combat, but none of them received any injury except Lieut. Neill, Adjutant of the Regiment, who was wounded severely in two places from his magnanimity in attempting to capture a Mexican instead of killing him. In full run he overtook the retreating Mexican, and placing his sword in front of him commanded him to surrender, whereupon the Mexican drove his lance into his magnanimous adversary.

As the Lieutenant wheeled his horse to despatch him, another Mexican charged up and struck him with a lance. However, severely wounded as he was, in two places, he conquered one of his foes, and a Corporal came up in time to "settle accounts" with the other.

In this affair Col. Harney had 4 wounded and 1 killed. Lieut. Judd had one killed; and the Tennesseans had Messrs. Fox, Long, Woody, and one other of Capt. McCown's company, whose name I could not ascertain, wounded. Mr. Young a Texan Ranger, who was acting as guide, was also wounded slightly. Nineteen Mexicans were found dead at the bridge behind the breastwork. Col. Harney killed 50 and wounded about the same number. The Mexican force near 2000; Col. Harney's about 500.

Col. Haskell, Capts. Cheatham, Foster, Sneed, Lieut. Judd, and all the officers and men in the command, are spoken of in the very highest terms by Col. Harney for their gallant conduct throughout the whole affair.

The Naval Officers at Gen. Patterson's battery were relieved to-day by Capt. Breese, Lieuts. Knox, Wemford, Alder, Taylor, Purser Harris, Midshipmen Bonnett, Mayo, Morris, and some others whose names I could not learn, Drs. Baxter, Nunn and Hambleton.

To-day a white flag was sent in, asking, on behalf of the people, to allow them to leave the city, with

their families and persons who were making no resistance. I could not learn what was the precise nature of the reply, but they did not get what they desired—they had waited a little too long. Gen. Scott was not the person to be caught by a ruse of this kind.

FROM THE RIO GRANDE.

We have our letters from Brassos to 29th ult., they contain nothing of particular interest—we give the following short extract:

BRASSOS, 29th March, 1847.

We learn from above, that so soon as Gen. Taylor had put matters to right at his encampment, at Agua Nueva, he left with two companies of Bragg's Artillery and Col. May's squadron of dragoons, to look for Gen. Urrea and his forces.

Gen. Taylor met Col. Curtis on the morning of the 16th, near Marin. The latter had about 1200 infantry, composed of the Ohio and Virginia volunteers, one company of dragoons, and two pieces of artillery. Gen. Urrea left Marin the evening before; he was waiting to attack Curtis's train, but finding old Roach and Ready advancing in his rear, he ~~ramossed to~~ Caddo, about 20 miles distant from Marin. General Taylor followed in pursuit the next morning, taking with him all of Curtis's command, but one company, which accompanied the train to Monterey.

From a spy that was captured by one of the Texas Rangers, it was found that Urrea had about 5000 cavalry and Rancheros. They have captured about two hundred wagons, a large proportion of which they burnt, carrying off the iron work, and murdering the teamsters.

We have a rumor that Gen. Taylor has written a letter to Camargo, stating that he has got Urrea hemmed in, so as to make it impossible for the Mexican General to retreat without giving battle! If the utter should prove true, it requires but little foresight I predict the result.

I am happy to inform you that our wounded at Buena Vista are all doing well; but few wounded with artillery; they have generally fallen back into the ranks, and are ready to march upon San Luis.

Saltillo, where the Mexican wounded were carried is a perfect charnel house, as they were much cut up with our grape and canister.

THE BATTLE OF VERA CRUZ.—It would seem from the following, which we find in the New Orleans Tropic, that the slaughter in the city of Vera Cruz has been very much over-estimated by the letter-writers:

A bomb fell through the roof of the Governor's Palace, killing a lady and her two children, who were seated near one of the parlor doors. The door way and the furniture in the room were entirely destroyed.

The number of women and children and other non-combatants in the city has been greatly overrated by the press. The whole number in the city did not probably exceed 1,500, and the number killed did not probably exceed two hundred.

The killed and wounded among the combatants in the city was said to be fifty-eight.

There was but one gun fired at the castle, and no one was injured in it.

The city and castle were entirely without provisions, but there was a large quantity of ammunition, powder, balls, and shells, both in the castle and city.

There was said to be a force of about nine thousand troops, mostly cavalry, between Vera Cruz and Pont del Rey, at which place it was supposed there would be some resistance.

These items we have derived from an officer of the navy, who visited both the castle and city after the surrender.—*Lou. Jour.*

Commercial.

Nashville, April 16, 1847.

The river falls slowly; but there is water sufficient for Boats of any class. Should the rains that have fallen for a day or two past, and which have made the streets in the vicinity extremely unpleasant, have extended to the country above us, in all probability we shall have an additional rise in the river.

COTTON—Sales of small lots occasionally take place from 9 a 10c.

TOBACCO—The market still continues to be animated, and the superior classes of Tobacco command excellent prices. Sales take place daily at the ware houses, 16 hds. sold at Johnson & Smith's yesterday, 13 at A. Hamilton's, and 30 at Yeatman & Armistead, prevailing prices range from 1 20 to 5 25.

The best hds. that has reached this market this season, was sold at Johnson & Smith's yesterday for \$5 63c. It was raised by Willis Jones, of Williamson county.

RECEIPTS

OF THE BAPTIST UP TO THIS DATE.

Z. Sanders, S. Cook, J. R. Wood, B. B. Hunter, A. McMillan, Mrs. E. B. Hobbs, J. Field, Miss S. A. Jordan, D. Brooks, J. W. Fort, C. Johns, M. Morris, T. Dean, C. Smith, J. Webb, J. Chambers, Elder H. S. Pettus, H. Owen, Miss J. Roberts, W. R. Green, N. L. Ward, J. B. Grace, M. Moore, W. Hood, A. Alvis, T. Meador, J. Pike, C. Tooly, J. Wiseman, J. Booker, G. E. Cunningham, R. v. J. Fite, O. Clark Mrs. E. Sittie, Rev. J. Bond, T. W. Bond, Dr. G. W. C. Bond, W. Johnson, L. S. Reed, W. Williams, P. Henderson, J. Graves.

HILL & MCINTOSH,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DRUGGISTS,

BROADWAY, NASHVILLE, TENN.,

WOULD respectfully say to Merchants throughout this State, that they have recently opened a splendid assortment of DRUGS, MEDICINES and DYE STUFFS, which are warranted fresh and genuine, and will be sold at reduced prices. Persons who purchase articles in our line of business, would do well to call on us before purchasing, as we do not intend to be out-done. We will sell almost at your own prices. We have always on hand an assortment of MEDICINE CHESTS, neatly arranged—they should be kept in all families, as they are almost indispensable. Our present stock consists in part of the following articles:

Aqua Amo.	Burgandy Pitch,	Cream Tartar,
" Fortis,	Borax, refined,	Caster, Russia,
Sulph. Acid,	Buchu leaves,	Calomel, Eng.
Nitric "	Bichromate Potass,	" Am.
Muriatic Acid,	Blood Root,	Jalap, Pulv.
Ether Sulph.	Blk. drops,	Rhi, "
Arrow root,	Balsam Copaiba,	Aloes "
Asphaltum,	Bay Rum,	Veratrin, Eng.
Almonds, bitter,	Balsam fur.	Eluteream, Eng.
Bitter sweet,	Caustic Potass,	Sup. C. Soda,
" Root,	Carbo. Iron,	Tartaric Acid,
Bay Berry Bark,		&c. &c.
Citrate. Terri.	Logwood,	Red Lead,
Blue Mass,	Redwood,	White Lead,
Iodine,	Riewood,	Black "
Hyd. Potass,	Ext. Logwood,	Linseed Oil,
Morphene, sulph.	Ven. Red,	Turpentine,
" acetate,	Sp. Brown,	&c.

All orders will be thankfully received and promptly attended to.

HILL & MCINTOSH.

March 6, 1847.

NEW AND CHEAP BAPTIST BOOK STORE,

Arcade Building, near the Post Office,

UNION STREET, NASHVILLE,

Graves & Shankland,

HAVE the pleasure to announce to the Baptist community of Tennessee and States adjoining, that they have just opened, and are now offering for sale a large and splendid assortment of rare and standard works, comprising nearly the entire range of the Baptist Literature of England, Ireland, Scotland, and America. The prices fixed upon the books are so exceedingly low, that it is confidently believed almost every individual in the "great Baptist family" of Tennessee has it in his power to supply himself with rich and varied treasures of useful knowledge. Many of the books are perfect gems of themselves, such as after having once been read by the devoted Christian, no consideration could induce him to dispense with.

It is hoped that the brethren, in this State, will bear in mind, that this establishment is virtually theirs, having been brought into being under the auspices of their Publication Society. Long and anxious has the desire, of zealous and active brethren of our State, been, that an establishment of this kind might be located here, believing that immense good would result to the denomination.

Acting under the influence of the above consideration we have each of us forsaken our former pursuits and embarked in this undertaking; and we, therefore, hope our untiring exertions to meet the wants of our brethren in this department, will merit their cordial co-operation in sustaining us in our enterprise.

Clergymen from the country, laymen and all, when visiting our city, are affectionately invited to make our establishment their home, where they will find in the rear of the Book Store a large and commodious Reading Room, furnished with the latest Baptist and secular newspapers from nearly every State in the Union.

The complete works of Andrew Fuller, a most acute metaphysician and distinguished Baptist divine, to whom the great masters in theology, of the present day, have awarded the title of "the Jonathan Edwards" of modern times—3 vol.

Dick's complete works—8 vols.

Comprehensive Commentary: Bap. edition—6 vols.

Complete works of Jonathan Edwards—4 vols.

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge;

Dowling's History of Romanism;

Life of Roger Williams;

Malcom's Travels in S. E. Asia;

Life of Melancthon;

" " Jesse Mercer;

" " Mrs. Taylor;

" " Ann H. Judson;

Baxter's Call to the Unconverted;

" " Saint's Rest;

Bickersteth on Prayer;

Comfort in Affliction;

Carson on Baptism;

Jewett " do.

Pengilly " do.

Communicant's Companion;

Horne's Introduction;

Cruden's Concordance;

Baptist Library;

Hinton's History of Baptism;

Todd's Sabbath School Teacher;

Christian Experience;

Reformation in Europe;

Church Member's Guide;

Life of J. B. Taylor;

Scott's Notes to Pilgrims Progress.

For sale by

GRAVES & SHANKLAND.

March 13, 1847.