



TENNESSEE BAPTIST.

Nashville, March 30, 1845.

Dr. Howell's articles are marked H, for such only is responsible.

Our article on our first page headed "Reading Sermons," should be credited to the Editors' Recorder. Our outside was printed before the omission was discovered.

SOMETHING WRONG IN THE P. O. We learn that not a solitary number of this paper was obtained by our large list of subscribers in Lebanon! Every thing was right at the office here. We hope so as the office there. We defer any judgement for the present in this matter. We have our fears. Will any one inform us whether the Banner reached Lebanon last week.

THE THREE QUESTIONS AGAIN!

Some one of late has very judiciously said, "Expose what is wrong fearlessly, but avoid bandying epithets with an opponent. If you thrust a chimney sweep out of the way of a fair lady, all will applaud you; but if you condescend to grapple with him breast to breast, you will gain nothing for your pains, even if victorious, but some soot." That this sentiment is true, every editor in the South, or West, who ever had the slightest controversy with the "Advocate" will bear the most abundant testimony. Its editors can only be compared to men standing knee deep in a puddle of dirty water, and defying any one to come near on pain of being bespattered. An encounter is by no means dangerous, but extremely offensive and unpleasant. One is compelled to put on some old cast-off suit previous to an engagement, or lose the future wear of a good one.

Our readers are aware that the editors of the Advocate stand forth the gratuitous vindicators of Rev. John Wesley, from all charges of holding improper doctrines or sentiments. They are particularly concerned that Mr. Wesley's fair fame be not in the least sullied. They are his special friends; but who would not pray to be saved from such friends. After spattering us through nearly one whole column, it makes the following faint and vague admissions:

"1. That Mr. Wesley when he ordained Dr. Coke and sent him over to organize the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, claimed his authority from the fact that he was a Presbyter of the Church of England; true, that every Methodist in the United States, that has read Mr. Wesley's life and the history of his own church, has always known this fact."

Certainly, but a presbyter of the Church of England has no right or power according to his own principles to ordain. "I suppose, if any presbyter had assumed the Episcopal character and authority without such choice and public ordination to his office he would have been communicated by the other churches. Mr. Wesley was never publicly elected by any presbytery and people to the office of a bishop, nor ever consecrated to it, which made his brother Charles say,

"So easily are Bishops made, By man's or woman's whim, Wesley his name on Coke hath laid, But who laid hands on him?"

The answer is nobody. His Episcopal authority was a mere gratuitous assumption of power to himself, contrary to the usage of every church ancient or modern.

"There is no precedent either in the New Testament or in church history, that can justify his proceedings in this affair. And as Mr. Wesley had received no right to exercise Episcopal authority either from any Bishops, presbyters, or people, he certainly could not convey any right to others; his own notions therefore, are spurious, and of no validity."

"Dr. Whitehead's Life of J. Wesley. Mr. Wesley was in his dotage when he laid his hands on Coke. His brother Charles being witness, 'It was age not he, 'twas his brother's excess.' Therefore, according to the doctrine of ordination as held by the Methodist church, there is not a legally ordained Bishop in the whole body! But this in passing.

The Editor continues— "But then another historical fact. Mr. Graves says, that Mr. Wesley 'was never a member of the Methodist Church.' How this despatch by lightning shocks our nerves, and how it will grieve the Methodist church to atoms and throw the fragments into the water, the drift will be seen floating in all the streams of the country."

Now what does Mr. G. mean? We should like for him to explain. And if he can satisfactorily, we will be among the first to sign a petition and send to the department at Washington, praying that he may have a patent for the discovery."

We mean just what we say, and say what we mean. We will gratify the Advocate upon this point. In Feb. 1822, a person not known proposed to Mr. Wesley a few questions, among which was the following: "If it your wish that the people called Methodist should be or become a body entirely separate from the church [of England, &c.], answer by Wesley, No! Dr. Whitehead's life of Wesley, page 245.

"Next after the primitive church, I esteem our own, the church of England as the most scriptural church in the world. Wesley's last Journal, 1840: 'Dr. W's Life of J. W.' page 308."

The above will discover in what light Mr. W. regarded the Methodists as a sect. Again he said—

"When the people joined together simply to help each other to heaven, increased by hundreds and thousands still they had no more thought of leaving the church than of leaving the kingdom. Nay I continually and earnestly cautioned them against it, reminding them that we were a part of the Church of England, whom God had raised up, not only to save our own souls, but to enlighten our neighbors, those of the church in particular. And at the first meeting of all our preachers in conference, in June 1744, I exhorted them to keep to the church, charging that this was our peculiar glory, not to form any new sect, but abiding in

our own church." Extracts from his last Journal. Again, "I never had any design or pretence to separate from the Church [of England] I have no such design now." I do not believe the Methodists in general design it, when I am no more seen. I do and will do all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless in spite of all I can do, many of them will separate from it. These will be so bold and injudicious as to form a separate party, which consequently will divide away into a dry-dull separate party. In flat opposition to these, I declare one once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England! and that none who regard my judgement or advice will ever separate from it.—John Wesley. Extracts from his last Journal, Vide Life of J. W. by Dr. Whitehead, page 309, 310.

This is what we meant Mr. Advocate. We wish no patent for this information. We are willing you should copy it into the Advocate for the unfed benefit of your numerous readers, whom you have kept in the dark upon this subject—either by being ignorant of the facts yourself, or knowingly and wilfully misrepresenting them, for which they, not the "BAPTISTS" will ere long, bring you to an account. As a specimen either of his ignorance or wilful misrepresentation, read the following piece of bad English:

"To the serious and well informed reader it is not necessary to say, that there is a distinction so far as organization is concerned, between the Wesleyan Societies in Great Britain and the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. In Great Britain Mr. Wesley formed societies who [which] were expected to remain in connection with the Church of England."

"Is there so difference Mr. Advocate, between the Methodist church, and the Episcopal church, save in 'organization?' You well know that you differ as widely from the church of England or the Episcopal church, in doctrine, as you do from the Presbyterian church. You also know, that the Wesleyan Methodists differ as widely from you, and dislike you fully as much as the Baptists differ from, and dislike the Campbellites. And with these facts known, you would fain have your readers understand that there is only a slight difference in 'organization.' Oh! shame! After Mr. Wesley had organized his societies in England, as late as the year 1741, several queries were sent him from Holland or Germany, two of which, and Mr. W's answers we give below.

"5. Whether they [the Methodists] are all of one mind, and whether they have the same principles? Especially.

"4. Whether those Methodists that are still at Oxford, approve of the sentiments and actions of Mr. Whitefield and Messrs. Wesley? Answer—They are all of the same principles with the Church of England, as laid down in her Articles and Homilies, and 4. Do accordingly approve of the sentiments of Mr. Whitefield and Mr. Wesley, and of their publishing them elsewhere, since they have been shut out of the Churches."—Dr. Whitehead's Life of J. Wesley.

But the Advocate in closing his article admits that Mr. W. was a presbyter of the Established Church. He does it reluctantly and blindly so as to keep his readers still in the dark.

Mr. Wesley, though a Presbyter of the Church of England, never, after he commenced the Reformation, exercised his office as a pastor in any Parish of the established church, but exercised his ministerial functions in connection with his societies alone, and on his dying bed made arrangements for the perpetuity of his societies, which since his death have enlarged the prerogatives as a branch of the church of Christ.

The idea is carried above that Mr. Wesley in a manner withdrew from the church of England, and was unwilling to exercise his functions as a pastor in any of the churches. This is the coloring the Advocate gives it. The fact is, he never received an invitation to settle with any church, save that of his fathers at Epworth, so far as his history informs us, [and was moreover shut out of all the established churches, owing to his unpopularity!

"I went to America strongly attached to the Bible and the Church of England, from which I would not vary one jot or tittle on any account whatever." In this spirit I returned as a regular clergyman as any in the three Kingdoms! till after not being permitted to preach in the churches. I was constrained to preach in the open air. Here was my first irregularity."—Dr. Whitehead's Life of J. Wesley.

But then he admits that Mr. W. never left the Church of England. Very well. Now, Mr. McFerrin, have you not by your manner of writing, the same as denied this fact? If Mr. Wesley was always a preacher of the Church of England, how did Mr. MEACHAM SLANDER HIM! Can you make it appear that's the point! You said, No. 9:

"John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, says, immersion was the custom of the first church, and I can prove it, if any one denies it."

What motive had Mr. "M." in writing the above paragraph? Why leave it in that young lady's Bible? Let the reader answer. In this paragraph we affirm that Mr. Meacham did slander "John Wesley, the founder of Methodism." Whether he did ignorantly or of design we of course are not prepared to judge. But Mr. M. proceeds to adduce his proof, and goes directly to the case of Mr. Parker's child, which he refused to sprinkle in Savannah.

Now Mr. Meacham ought to know, and perhaps does know, that all this occurred when Mr. Wesley was a minister of the Church of England, and missionary in Georgia, in 1736, before he was converted."

This occurred when Mr. W. was a minister of the Church of England. Does not this imply that he was not a minister of that church? It does. And that he entertained different views when a member of the Methodist Church? It does. And on this you make the slander to appear? Before he was converted? Does not this imply that he was not converted while a member of the Church of England? It does. Did you not convey the idea to your readers, that Mr. Wesley was once a minister of the Church of England, but subsequently founded the Methodist Church, and was a bishop or officer in that? And that Bro. Meacham's slander consisted in charging upon Mr. Wesley, a Methodist minister doc-

trines and sentiments which he only held when an Episcopal minister? These were the sentiments you taught, if language means anything. We charge you then, with being guilty, according to your admission above, of gross misrepresentation, whether wilful or not is your own affair. If you plead ignorance, your admission cuts you off at the knees. If you claim to know all these facts, then out of your own mouth in No. 9, of the Advocate, you convict yourself of a dereliction which treads hard on the heel of falsehood. In this unenviable predicament we leave you before the public. Be assured, Sir, that all your low wit and disgusting nonsense, your sallies and lame jests, will prove unavailing in the eyes of all christian and candid men to relieve your position.

LETTER IV.

TO MESSRS. R. L. CARUTHERS, J. S. MCLEIN, W. L. MARTIN, D. C. HIBBITT, N. CARTMELL, AND ANDREW ALLISON.

GENTLEMEN: Your pastor commences his second chapter by affirming the following proposition:—

"The inspired writers often use the word baptism with reference to other objects aside from the christian ordinance, where they have no allusion to immersion."

Now, since we shall test the proof he brings forward to sustain this proposition, we wish it to be distinctly remembered. Keep all its terms strong in view. The word baptism is often used by the inspired writers, in cases in which they have no allusion to immersion—mark that; NO ALLUSION to immersion. His first proof is adduced from Mark 7: 4—"And when they [the Jews] come from the market, except they wash they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." The words here translated, in our version, to wash, your pastor correctly informs you, are in the original baptize. Well, and what of that? Why, it is concluded, that in these cases, baptism is used in a sense in which it has no allusion to immersion—certainly not—none whatever. When people wash cups for example, they never put them in the water! You, gentlemen, have doubtless seen your housekeepers wash your tea cups after supper, just as the Jews washed their cups. They have, you know, a vessel of water, and successively dip the cups into the water, and thus wash them. That is the way they do it. Is it not? But then, Mr. Lowry says, and you certify to the fact, that this dipping the cup, is not immersing the cup at all; indeed it has no allusion in the world to immersion! But the brazen vessels and tables—were they immersed? Why not? The brazen vessels were small, and as in the case of the cups, the easiest and most convenient method of washing, was to immerse them. As to the tables, Mr. Lowry had his mind, doubtless, and so had you, upon the great clumsy tables used by us, to suit our fashion of eating. Is not this a fact, gentlemen? You were not obliged to know any better; but really I think your pastor ought to have known better. Now what sort of tables do you think the Jews commonly used in those days? Would you be surprised to find that the table was only a piece of leather, which they spread down and upon which they had a little stool. Preposterous, you exclaim! Very well. Don't you believe it? To the authorities then. Please take up Jah's Biblical Archeology, and turn to section 146, and you will read thus: "The table in the east is a piece of round leather, spread upon the floor, upon which is placed a sort of stool, called Shulshan." How would your house-keepers wash a piece of leather, and a little stool? They would "soak" them both into a vessel of water, and thus make short work. Luke says they were dipped; to dip them for the purposes proposed would have been the most easy, convenient and natural way; but this, Mr. Lowry says, has no allusion, not the remotest, to immersion.

But we have not, gentlemen, attended to the former part of this text—"The Jews, when they came from market, except they wash [baptize their person or hands] eat not." Now your pastor thinks it monstrous that so many washings should (although in a tropical climate) be immersions! We will look a little into the authorities upon this point also. Home, (an Episcopalian) in his "Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures," vol 3, p. 326, says: "The Jews had two sorts of washing; one, of the whole body, by immersion, which was used by the priests at their consecration, and by the proselytes at their initiation; the other of the hands or feet, called dipping or pouring of water, and which was of daily use, not only for the hands and feet, but also for the cups and other vessels used at their meals."

We have already referred to Jah's (a Lutheran.) Look again into his Biblical Archeology, section 320, and you will find that he speaks thus:

"They [the Pharisees] taught that, if a person had not departed from the house, the hands, without the fingers being distended, should be wet with water poured over them; and then elevated, so that the water might flow down to the elbow, &c. On the contrary, those who had departed from the house, washed in a basin, or at least immersed their hands in water with the fingers distended. The ceremony in this case, (Mark 7: 4), is denominated *lavare manus*, and by the Rabbins, *lavab*."

No allusion in this to immersion; gentlemen? Mr. Lowry says there is none whatever; and you say there is none whatever! But let us see if Mr. Lowry does not contradict himself, and thus overthrow entirely, his own argument. We read on. Down near the close of the first column he introduces Scaliger as saying—"that dipping before meals only prevailed among the more superstitious of the Jews." Ah! Then some of the Jews, only, the more superstitious however, understood the word baptism to mean immersion, and dipped accordingly! But his proposition is that the word baptism sometimes has no allusion to immersion, and this instance which he brings up in proof, he admits does have allusion to immersion? But we read on. In the second column, near the top, Mr. Lowry says—"The cups, pots, and brazen vessels, may or may not have been dipped; but it is not at all probable that the tables, and couches, as the original has it, were." The word baptism in this case, your pastor as you will remember, maintains, has no allusion to immersion! Yet he, in the most unsuspecting manner possible, confesses that it has! He admits that some of the Jews dipped themselves in obedience to this tradition; and that the cups, pots and brazen vessels, may have been dipped! So, he acknowledges, the original has it. But in all this dipping there is no allusion to immersion!—not the least! Of one thing he is entirely certain. To have dipped the tables—ah, those tables; they might have been couches—would have been very inconvenient. Therefore, although the original says they were dipped, they were not dipped! Here, gentlemen, we have Lowry against Lowry! Yet you are greatly edified, and certify the truth of his arguments both ways. You are equally pleased when he proves the truth of a proposition by one argument, and when he proves the falseness of the same proposition by another argument. Nor do I mean by this to impugn either your intelligence or sincerity. You loved your pastor; he immersed his arguments in a vast amount of smoke and dust; you simply heard them stated, and had no means to examine their soundness; he wished you to certify them, and you did so as a matter of gratification to him, not having observed their absurdities, and want of conclusiveness.

Mr. Lowry introduces another passage in proof of his proposition—Heb. 9: 10—similar in substance with that of which I have disposed; but is equally unsuccessful in its management. He asserts that the divers baptisms, that is, the many or frequent dippings, of which he had himself just been treating and of which this last passage more particularly speaks—were not what he had said they were, frequent or many baptisms, but baptisms in various ways. In this you must see that if he was right before, he is wrong now; and if he is right now, he was wrong before. You may gentlemen, select that horn of this dilemma which pleases you best on which to hang impaled. I will only add that the emblematic purifications of persons under the law, of which Mr. Lowry speaks in this connection, and takes occasion from them to make a fling at Dr. Howell had nothing to do with baptism. This is very certain. He ought, if not you, to have known this fact. The arguments now noticed, your pastor intermingles with dissertations on bathing, which he tells you can be done without immersion, since there are such things as shower baths; and upon washing the hands, which may be done by pouring water upon them; and he thinks that this pouring method must have been the way in which the Jews ordinarily washed their hands! Now all these conjectures, suppositions, and guesses, which are aside from the subject, and demonstrate Mr. Lowry's failure to prove his proposition, may be very sage. They are, I confess, conspicuous, with a witress. And they are "conclusive" too, of the fact, that he has missed the mark altogether.

I have not yet, gentlemen, noticed the demolition by your pastor, of Dr. Carson, Dr. Howell, Mr. Hinton, and others of our Baptist ministers, but shall see about that in due time.

Mr. Lowry next proposes to sustain his position, that baptism is administered without immersion, by analogy from the baptism of the spirit. He here brings himself, and you, to this conclusion: "Pouring is the form—the only form—spoken of in the Bible." Mark this proposition, gentlemen. Be particular. Pouring is the only form of spiritual baptism. "It is certainly pouring." Very well. Since the mode of spiritual baptism fixes, in his opinion, the mode of water baptism, and this is undoubtedly pouring and nothing else, Mr. Lowry will adhere to pouring. We read on; and before we have advanced half a column, we find the following:—"With us [Presbyterians] sprinkling a little 'clean water' (Ezek. 36, 25), answers all the purposes of a symbolic washing." Again, "If water touch the body by sprinkling, or pouring, must not that be baptism?" How is this? Your pastor repudiates immersion. That's not the thing at all. Well, what is it? Why pouring, certainly. But he repudiates pouring also, and now tells you that sprinkling is the exact thing! Only "if a drop of water touch the body" that must be baptism! Here again, we have Lowry against Lowry; and you see, gentlemen, that he refutes himself with much greater ease than he does Drs. Carson and Howell. His argument amounts to this: In spiritual baptism God pours out his spirit upon the person baptized; of spiritual baptism

water baptism is a figure, and is to be administered in the same form; therefore water baptism is to be administered by sprinkling. Glorious logic! Let Hodge, and Whately, and all such dabblers in syllogisms, "hide their diminished heads." Mr. Lowry is the man. True, his premises and conclusions have no relation to each other. But what of that? It is good logic; since you, gentlemen, know, and you have certified that it is "conspicuous and conclusive!"

I appeal to your candour, gentlemen. Dou you really think that the spirit was literally poured upon the bodies of the disciples on the day of pentecost? Was the baptism in question a literal or external operation; or had it to do with the soul only? Did not Joel, when he described it by an allusion to floods of water poured forth mean to express simply the great measure of divine influence they should receive? This Peter calls a baptism. Is it not true that the language is metaphorical, expressing not a literal pouring, or a literal immersion, but the placing of the disciples under the influence of the spirit? You must, it seems to me, answer these questions in the affirmative. But to this your pastor violently objects, calls upon Dr. Howell, by name, in the second person, and then says: "No action of the spirit, according to his views, has anything to do with spiritual baptism." He continues: "Here I might demand the agent that puts men under the influence of the spirit, &c." Why, gentlemen, I very respectfully ask, what action of the spirit there is when he is poured upon men, or when he is sprinkled upon men, any more than when men are put under his influence? And I too make a demand—I demand that agent that pours the spirit, or sprinkles the spirit upon men. So you see very plainly that you have no advantage over us here. Gentlemen, the Holy Spirit is a person, is he not? Now I cannot readily understand how one person can be literally poured upon another person; nor can I conceive how literally one person can be sprinkled upon another person! But I know well enough how one person can be put under the influence of another person. If the baptism of the Spirit is, as your pastor contends, the literal pouring upon a man, or the sprinkling upon a man, of the third person in the Holy Trinity, then I know nothing of the matter, nor, I suspect, do you either. It is a mystery too profound for any human thought to penetrate. Indeed it is not presumption to pronounce it a glaring absurdity. It looks to me as verily like a contradiction as the popish dogma of transubstantiation, which pronounces a piece of bread, flesh and blood, at the same moment that all my senses convince me it is certainly and only a piece of bread.

The Baptist doctrine that defines the baptism of the Spirit to be the putting men under the influence of the Spirit, is simple and obvious. The scriptures abound in figures, which swell with oriental exuberance. Keep this in memory; and recollect also, that the Spirit as God, is omnipresent. He, on the day of pentecost, made his presence to be felt spiritually by the disciples, sensibly, overwhelmingly, as they would have felt, physically floods rushing upon them. What did the spirit do to the disciples? According to the narrative, "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost." That is in plain language, the Holy Ghost took possession of all the powers of their soul and mind. God the Father, for the sake of the righteousness and merits of God the Son, their Redeemer, put them all under the influence and direction of the Comforter, the Teacher, the Sanctifier—God the Spirit. Do you not gentlemen, believe in your heart that this was the true state of the case? Yes, these are the plain, the delightful, the glorious facts. In the baptism of the Spirit men are put under his influence; and in the baptism of water, men are put under the water. Talk about pouring and sprinkling, to represent this glorious work of the Spirit! Such "babbling" belittles the whole subject! No, gentlemen, if the baptism of the Spirit is represented at all by water baptism, its mode, as you now see, must be immersion.

Thus far all your pastor's arguments for pouring and sprinkling, and against immersion, have gone to the winds. But just here he is particularly amusing. He has discovered that, after all, Baptists do not always immerse the whole body in baptism, and particularly that they do not wet the candidate all over! How profoundly astonished will be all our Baptist fellow-citizens, when this surprising intelligence shall reach them! This reminds me of an old lady of a Pedobaptist Church who, a few weeks since, encountered one of our ministers, and in arguing before a large company, with him, against immersion in baptism, asserted and incontinently maintained—it is a positive fact and occurred not a hundred miles from Lebanon; that the Baptists where she came from, uniformly have their children sprinkled! She had seen it with her own eyes. Our brother told her she was mistaken. But no such thing. She knew it to be true! And why not believe the old lady? The story is fully as credible as Mr. Lowry's. But does Mr. L. actually penetrate such a "fish story" as that? Well, hear him—"Then, Doctor [Howell] to the question, &c. 'Admit with you that water baptism involves the action of the element upon the subject. Indeed I attach more importance to that than you do, for I apply it to the surface, to the face, that part of the body through which the soul looks; but you

Dr. Howell by use of the baptismal gown, &c. exclude the water from the body; and persons have been baptized when the head did not go under the water at all. Why then this endless controversy about the quantity of water used in baptism, when the most of it touches the clothes, and not the subject in immersion?"

Gentlemen, did you really hear Mr. Lowry tell that in his sermon? Did you believe it? "Persons have been baptized when the head did not go under the water at all." Eh? What, by Baptist ministers, and such persons considered by us as baptized? Is this one of the statements the truth of which you endorse? Better, gentlemen, instead of subscribing it, have advised Mr. Lowry to "tell that to the marines," whose credulity is particularly easy! We don't like to dispute your word; but until we can have some competent proof in the premises, you will excuse us, if you please. But this is not all. Those "baptismal gowns" that the Baptists wear when they are baptized—they are horrible things! Why, they "exclude the water from the body!" Alas! Those abominable gowns keep away the water! The water is kept away from the body by the gowns, and the head does not go under at all. Such is the fate of these hated immersionists! Into such a pickle, according to Mr. Lowry, people get themselves who are so simple as to be baptized by Baptist preachers. Your pastor does the thing elegantly! He applies the water to the soul illuminated face! Well, gentlemen, your pastor's arguments, and his stories, are very much alike. As the old woman said: "They are much of a muckness." It is very possible he may, one of these days, have his eyes opened, and ascertain that it is his duty to be baptized. Stranger things than that have happened. If so he will wear a "baptismal gown," and will then know whether in despite of such gown, the water comes to every part of his body. And if Dr. Howell, or any other Baptist minister, baptizes him, I will stand security that his whole body, head, face, and all, goes completely under the water.

One other passage is introduced in the chapter under review to prove that cases of baptism are narrated by the inspired writers, in which no allusion is made to immersion. Mr. Lowry says:

"In 1 Cor. 10: 2, we have an account of water baptism where immersion was out of the question. The Israelites were baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea. For a fuller account of this baptism, see Ex. 14: 22. Observe, they were baptized unto Moses by which they professed obedience to him as their leader, and faith in his doctrine. But neither Moses or Paul tells us how this baptism was administered, except by implication. David, however, furnishes what they omitted. Ps. 77: 17, 'The clouds poured out water! Here, is the water, and form of its administration. Every one can see that it DOES NOT MEAN IMMERSION. Now look at this: Here are two walls of water, how far a part we are not told; the distance is sufficient to admit of at least two millions of persons passing in a solid body—while a cloud, perhaps at the ordinary height, was suspended above. Where is there any thing like immersion here? Nothing of the kind. Suppose you walk between two streams of water a mile apart, and a cloud the fourth of a mile above you, would that constitute a figure as much like immersion as it well could be? But it is unnecessary to remark further on the Apostle's language. He speaks without a figure—speaks of water baptism, which according to the 77th Psalm, was administered by pouring."

There; the matter is now fixed up handsomely. To those who do not think, and whose prejudices against immersion in baptism are strong, it may pass unquestioned. But that you, gentlemen, and particularly those of you who are lawyers, did not see its contradictions and absurdities, is accounted for only upon the supposition that you did not exercise your usual sagacity. Paul does not tell us how the Israelites were baptized; Moses does not; but David does tell us, the clouds poured out water upon them, and that was the baptism! The carelessness of Mr. Lowry's observation will be seen by some little mistakes here, to which I call your attention. They are important. David is not the author of the 77th Psalm at all; therefore, David says nothing about the matter. Look at your Bible and see if I am right. Again, Asaph wrote the Psalm in question, in which he speaks of the clouds in the plural, that poured out water; Moses and Paul speak of the clouds. Now either Mr. Lowry is wrong about the clouds that did the business of baptizing the Israelites, or there is no conference between the singular and the plural number; or else the inspired writers disagree among themselves. Which of these alternatives will you choose. According to Moses and Paul there was but one cloud; Asaph says clouds, more than one; your pastor insists that the clouds must have been the clouds. You, gentlemen, are aware; Mr. Lowry is one; are you Mr. L. any? Surely not. No more were these clouds of Asaph that cloud of Paul. Otherwise, as we have said, the inspired writers disagree, and I do not see why the truth of scripture should be rendered questionable, just for the purpose of getting pouring recognized as a mode of baptism! Your pastor, gentlemen, is certainly wrong. Besides, Mr. Lowry makes the clouds, or the clouds (which?) the administrator of the baptism! By what rule is this argument

rational? A cloud, the administrator of a real baptism—for you renege your pastor will; not admit that baptism was figurative! Here have truly a cloudy business! Moses and Paul, and Asaph, perpetrate such nonsense. Let us look again at the passage: "All our fathers were der the cloud, and all passed th der the sea; and were all baptised Moses in the cloud, and is the Your pastor insists that Paul do tell us, nor does Moses, whether baptism was by sprinkling, pouring immersion. True he says distinctly the fathers were baptised in the cloud and in the sea, which looks to us ly, not like sprinkling, nor like pouring but like an immersion; but he not see, nor can you see any such He then goes to work, gets the spoken of in the Psalm, makes into a cloud, and puts this cloud a ter of a mile high! He will not ai to come any nearer to the people also puts the waters of the sea i distance off. And now he sets th to baptising by pouring water on the ple! Bravo! He illustrates—You between two rivers a mile ap cloud is suspended "a fourth of above" you; that would be no im sion. No more than that were t raelites immersed when they we tied unto Moses!

This representation, gentlemen, endorsed by you, contains, pardon some capital defects, the principal is that it contradicts Paul makes his narrative false. Mr. ry says that, since the waters o sea stood a mile apart, the Isra were not baptised by these at Paul says, they were all baptise the sea." Mr. Lowry tells you th cloud was "the fourth of a mile hove the people, therefore, that th ple did not get near it, and of c could not be baptised in it. Paul they were all baptised in the cloud. Lowry says, the cloud baptise people by pouring out water upon from its height a quarter of a m above them. Paul says they we the cloud! Mr. Lowry and Pa against each other; they totally di. Now which shall we believe, Mr. ry, or Paul? You gentlemen, an others who choose, may still h Mr. Lowry, if you please; but B will certainly believe Paul. W foolish enough to think he knew about this matter than your p does. We subscribe, and ex Paul, who says the "fathers wer rised [dipped] in the cloud and sea," and we shall still think th baptism in the cloud and in the sea an IMMERSION.

I am, gentlemen, respectfully, obedient humble servant, SAGRITARI

FRANKLIN, Md. FROM AND FLOOD IN WILLIAMSON, Md. Heavy rain on Monday night and Tuesday night on Big Harpers river to a height unprecedented forty years past. On Tuesday afternoon the river was running across the Franklin and Nashville pike, about a foot above the usual stage, and by some of our citizens, very many others—carriages, &c.—either turned back, or camped night at some convenient place in the vicinity willing to stem the running current. As the water continued to rise, the elevated road, a was up to the hills, and overflowed the field opposite side of the river for some distance damage done is immense. From all parts country—as far as we have heard—rising water, in some places, has devastated very many injured, rails and saw logs in immense numbers were swept away, fencing destroyed, and valuable bodies of land just ploughed and planted, till will be the best and some of the new corn, &c. that was sown, was so injured, that it will be necessary to re-sow it. There was but little business done in court day, and many of the defendants were detained by the danger or impossibility of the various streams. It will take weeks to put up the fences of even where the soil is not injured, and the loss and damage must greatly retard all farming.—Review.

JUSTICE TO BOYS.—We have often heard had it on the point of our pen to say, that it was an unfair time of it in this world. They get sick of the turkey, at dinner, and have if the best cakes at breakfast till every body is plied; they are satisfied when they are in bed just to make such a racket they are a bed just in the sweet edge of the evening, who are contented to sit and tell stories in a ways they are put upon and robbed of the rights as independent voters and citizens. Justice, therefore, to see that for once, and in they have a fair trial, taken into consid the new laws that are to be put in New Bed what is done there for the boys—

"We are having a great excitement here coasting line, the only fashionable one in the city, and had eight or ten days since made fine sleigh the boys soon converted School street into slide upon. Whereupon the Mayor and C dered all homes and carriages to be kept of street corners, they might enjoy the fun. In they filed their order, the members of the Council Mayor joined in the sport. This was enou very popular and in a few evenings a fashionable people, ladies as well as gentl be done down. One street was not enough, so the eng brought out, and several other streets w into they were converted into ice hills. A fashionable place in Walnut street, w estimated that there are from five to seven people at Walnut street every night until 1 and some three or four hundred at Maxw Many others are as numerous visited. The value of the ice is estimated at over one per very large amount of coffee and confection Common sleds let at fifty cents per hour. If that Mayor is not perpetual Mayor of ford as long as he lives we shall say that Bedford boys have no influence with their mothers none with their husbands.—N. Ad.

SAD ACCIDENT.—The New Orleans M the 18th, says: "Major Willard and B. G. Lines were in the lake on Thursday under the following circumstances. They were engaged in examining the line, and about to cross the lake in the Fort Poll, when Mr. L. rose for the [changing] position, but upon the boat's tempt. Thomas Downing, who rowed states that they all struggled for a long time and got on board; but though he twice in bringing them to the boat, they were not on, it being turned bottom upwards, and them perished without the power to save it great exertions he succeeded in pushing th to a shoal, where he righted it and baild with his hat. He was shortly after rescued from his perilous position in an ext

ell by use of the baptismal... exclude the water from... and persons have been bap... the head did not go under... at all. Why then this end... every about the quantity of... in baptism, when the most... the clothes, and not the... immersion."

rational? A cloud? The administrator... of a baptism? Do you remember... your pastor will not admit that... baptism was figurative? Here we... have truly a cloudy business! Moses... and Paul, and Asaph, perpetrate no... such nonsense. Let us look again at... the passage: "All our fathers were un... der the cloud, and all passed through... the sea; and were all baptized unto... Moses in the cloud, and in the sea." Your pastor insists that Paul does not... tell us, nor does Moses, whether this... baptism was by sprinkling, pouring, or... immersion. True, he says distinctly, that... the fathers were baptized in the cloud... and in the sea, which looks to us verily... not like sprinkling nor like pouring... but like an immersion; but he cannot... see, nor can you see any such thing... He then goes to work, gets the clouds... spoken of in the Psalm, makes them... into a cloud, and puts this cloud a quar... ter of a mile high! He will not allow it... to come any nearer to the people. He... also puts the waters of the sea a long... distance off. And now he sets the cloud... to baptizing by pouring water on the peo... ple! Bravo! He illustrates—You walk... between two rivers a mile apart; a... cloud is suspended "a fourth of a mile... above" you; that would be no immersion... No more than that were the Israe... lites immersed when they were bap... tized unto Moses!

From the N. York Journal of Commerce, 18th inst.  
**Arrival of the Cambria.**  
**FIFTEEN DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.**  
**REVOLUTION IN FRANCE!**  
**Abdication of Louis Philippe—A Republic Proclaimed—Dreadful Loss of Life.**  
The French mail steamer Cambria reached her dock at a few minutes past 7 o'clock, Saturday morning. She left Liverpool Feb. 27th, at 3 P. M., having been detained one day in consequence of the arrival of the morning of the day fixed for her departure, of the Cambria, which left Boston Feb. 12th. The Cambria was retained by a succession of violent gales from the N. W. and bad weather, which prevailed during the whole passage.

The Commercial Bank at Havre has failed. Our intelligence is of the financial measures of the French government, in reference to popular demonstrations in favor of electoral reform, were met with armed opposition on the part of the people, and as in the revolution of 1830, but with less hesitancy at the present crisis, the troops declared in favor of the people, and the King was compelled to abdicate his throne, and with his family to retire from the capital. Louis Philippe declared his abdication to be in favor of his son, the Count of Paris, son of the late Duke of Orleans, and heir-apparent to the throne. But the people seem to have had enough of monarchy, and to manifest a disposition to try republican institutions. As the first outbreak, before the troops refused to act on the part of the government, and the number of killed is said to be upwards of 200, principally in the neighborhood of the Palais Royal, and between that and the Tuilleries.

At the last accounts the people were in full possession of the government, and the streets, the railway stations and arrival of troops from the country. The prospect was, however, that no further opposition would be offered to the establishment of popular institutions. The details, which we give in full as far as received, will be found of thrilling interest.

We noticed in our last the feverish state in which political affairs stood in Paris on the night of Thursday last, and in regret to announce that each day has added to that excitement, and that on the 22d, the day on which it had been fixed to hold the great reform banquet, that the entire city was in open insurrection. The conversation which took place in the Chamber of Deputies, on Monday evening, between Barrot and Duchesne, prepared the people for the formal prohibition of the reform banquet which was to take place on the following day. Proclamations by the prefect of police, and the day by the commandant of the National Guards, were published, forbidding the banquet, all assemblies of people, and prohibiting the appearance of National Guards in uniform, unless ordered by their chief. In consequence of these acts of Government, the Chamber of Deputies met, and the banquet did not take place, that a motion for the impeachment of ministers be made in the Chamber of Deputies. It was further resolved, that should this motion be negatived, they would resign their functions as deputies.

The army collected within Paris and the surrounding villages and forts considerably exceeds one hundred thousand men. This force, unless the soldiers are well paid, will crush the French republicans, while the King and M. Guizot might indulge their animosity to public meetings with perfect safety. Orders were given to take military occupation of the points of the capital on the assembly of the Chamber of Deputies, and to attempt to disperse the assemblies in the streets gradually, until dense crowds filled the principal thoroughfares leading to the legislative chambers, and large numbers of police and military were called out to preserve order. They assembled in great numbers around the Chamber of Deputies, and forced their way over the walls. They were attacked by the troops and dispersed; but re-assembled in various quarters. The day after the Chamber of Deputies was demolished, and the King and M. Guizot fled to the Hotel de Ville, and were again repulsed by the troops. All the military in Paris, and all the National Guards, were summoned to arms, and every preparation made on the part of the government to put down the people. The latter raised barricades in various places, and unprepared the streets, overtook omnibuses, and made preparations for a vigorous assault, or a terrific resistance.

All the accounts from Paris represent the city in a state of excitement and dismay the whole of that day. All the streets leading to the chamber of Deputies were, like the bridge, occupied by strong detachments of troops, and no one was allowed to cross. The day after the Chamber of Deputies was demolished, and the King and M. Guizot fled to the Hotel de Ville, and were again repulsed by the troops. All the military in Paris, and all the National Guards, were summoned to arms, and every preparation made on the part of the government to put down the people. The latter raised barricades in various places, and unprepared the streets, overtook omnibuses, and made preparations for a vigorous assault, or a terrific resistance.

TERMS OF THE Tennessee Baptist... The Tennessee Baptist is published every week...

THE TENNESSEE PULPIT

NO. IV. A PRACTICAL SERMON

Written for the Pulpit by Rev. J. B. GRAVES, Pastor of the 2d B. Church, Nashville.

That God had a design in our nation, is evident from the fact that never acts without one.

God is glorified by us in proportion as we cultivate, improve and use those intellectual faculties...

By making ourselves more into it is the duty of every christian, however humble his...

as well as those books that unorganized and laws of the which he lives.



Nervous Complaints.

READ the following facts, and then doubt if you can that GALVANISM, as applied by DR. CHRISTIE'S GALVANIC AND MAGNETIC FLUID...

RHEUMATISM, AN EXTRAORDINARY CASE.

To satisfy the public of the authenticity of the following statement, it has been attested before the Mayor of New York.

DR. CHRISTIE'S GALVANIC AND MAGNETIC FLUID. A REVIEWER has said that the Introduction by Dr. Williams...

Debility of the Nervous System.

The following is from the Hon. W. A. THOMPSON, late member of Congress from the State of New York...

Special Caution.

Unprincipled persons have attempted to imitate these articles, and thus deceive the public.

Rheumatic Gout.

To DR. CHRISTIE: After a fair trial of almost everything which you had offered...

CAUTION TO THE PUBLIC.

We feel a duty to caution the public against purchasing any of the imitations of Dr. Christie's Galvanic and Magnetic Fluid...

For the Sick. CALL and get a very superior article of TAPICA...

PEARL SAGO, another nutritious article of fine quality...

MEBEN FUN.—The celebrated Chinese Skin Powder, can be found at SOEVEL'S.

Lamps, Lamps. JUST received at the CITY FURNITURE...

Carpeting. A good stock of Imperial 3 ply, Ingrains, Venetians...

Floor Oil Cloths. FROM 3 to 18 feet wide, and 80 feet long...

Church Member's Manual. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

NOTICES OF THE PRESS. "We think the plan of the book is excellent, and worthy of imitation even by Unitarians..."

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S GUIDE. By Rev. J. A. JAMES. Edited by J. O. CHOULES, D. D.

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

For the Sick. CALL and get a very superior article of TAPICA...

PEARL SAGO, another nutritious article of fine quality...

MEBEN FUN.—The celebrated Chinese Skin Powder, can be found at SOEVEL'S.

Lamps, Lamps. JUST received at the CITY FURNITURE...

Carpeting. A good stock of Imperial 3 ply, Ingrains, Venetians...

Floor Oil Cloths. FROM 3 to 18 feet wide, and 80 feet long...

Church Member's Manual. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

NOTICES OF THE PRESS. "We think the plan of the book is excellent, and worthy of imitation even by Unitarians..."

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S GUIDE. By Rev. J. A. JAMES. Edited by J. O. CHOULES, D. D.

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

THE CHURCH-MEMBER'S MANUAL. OF Ecclesiastical Principles, Doctrines, and Discipline...

of children, and their good Physician was all their delight...

And you, dear children, who have been healed, who have been made to rejoice in the Saviour...

RUTH. PROFANITY.

Profane swearing is a great sin; God abhors it and often punishes it in this life.

It is a vulgar sin. He who swears an oath, at once loses the respect of the good, and above all loses a respect for himself.

PUZZLE. Oh my Love by hearts those United, and mingled into Fondly so vows those keep still one...

The Tennessee conference of the M. E. church, South, closed its session on Tuesday week.

"I CAN'T AFFORD IT."

So said a christian when invited to take a religious paper. He was smoking when he said this.

Wonder if he is pinched in his politics; as he is in his religion. Here is a partisan paper.

BEGINNING TO FLOW BACK.

The Christian Intelligencer says: "We have learned with surprise and delight, that a Foreign Missionary Society...

store them to health and strength again, but it was now too late; they had eaten so much dirt...

The poor children cried still more bitterly, and said, then we must all die. Foolish children! foolish children we have been to throw away the rich blessings of God...

"LIGHT, MORE LIGHT!"

Such were the last words of Goethe. The God eman'd the dower At early dawn looks up...

Then twilight steals away, The wood-bird singing, grieves, And calls the evening back To tint the leaves.

Then comes the life's broad noon, With sun and sunny gleam; And soft the soul doth err, In act and dream.

More light! more light! to see What mystic path I tread, What dangers hover o'er My heart and head!

Youth's Department.

For the Tennessee Baptist. THE DIRT EATERS.

An Allegory. Our young friends know, that there are some children that are very fond of eating dirt...

Some of the children would not believe this lie, but some of them, though they did not scarcely believe him, concluded to taste it...

Some men are like cats. You may stroke the fur the right way for years—talk and write to please them, and hear nothing but purring...

PAALPY For the Tennessee Baptist. BY J. V. R. C. Love not this world of sorrow and care...

They vanished, they fled like the shadows of night. They told me life's ocean no ruffle should bear I've marked its rough surface and mountains are there.

"LIGHT, MORE LIGHT!"

Such were the last words of Goethe. The God eman'd the dower At early dawn looks up...

Then twilight steals away, The wood-bird singing, grieves, And calls the evening back To tint the leaves.

Then comes the life's broad noon, With sun and sunny gleam; And soft the soul doth err, In act and dream.

More light! more light! to see What mystic path I tread, What dangers hover o'er My heart and head!

Youth's Department.

For the Tennessee Baptist. THE DIRT EATERS.

An Allegory. Our young friends know, that there are some children that are very fond of eating dirt...

Some of the children would not believe this lie, but some of them, though they did not scarcely believe him, concluded to taste it...

Some men are like cats. You may stroke the fur the right way for years—talk and write to please them, and hear nothing but purring...