

Tennessean Baptist

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY GRAVES & SHANKLAND.—J. R. GRAVES, Editor.

VOL. X. NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, SATURDAY, SEPT. 17, 1853. NO. 2

HISTORICAL.

John Smyth, the "Se-Baptist."

Among the exiles who near 250 years ago, with Robinson Ainsworth, and others, sought refuge in Holland, was the Rev. John Smyth, a man of talents and learning, who had been a clergyman of the established Church of England. Adopting the Baptist views, he, with Thos. Helwisse and others of like sentiments, resolved on the establishment of a separate church, and the question rose how baptism should be originated among them. The common story, pertinaciously adhered to, is that Smyth baptized himself—administered the ordinance upon his own person, and that then he proceeded to baptize others. Whether the story is true or false, is a matter of no possible practicable importance, and yet from the contradictory views which have been taken of it, is one of curious historical interest. Crosby, Ivimey, Taylor, and others, accredited historians have denied it, most of all, because it was never alluded to, either for denial or defence, in Smyth's writings, nor in the writings of his associates, and was, indeed, of late origin. Mr. Taylor and others have conjectured an explanation, which Mr. Underhill regards as fully confirmed by his own late discoveries. What that explanation is, we shall presently see.

The doubts which have been raised from the late origin of the story, can hardly stand against the testimony of John Robinson. True, his language is not absolutely inconsistent with the solution and testimony adduced by Mr. Underhill, but, as the reader will see, the natural construction of Robinson's language sustains the story—and Robinson's work in which it is found, was printed in 1614. Until we met this passage, we had ourselves supposed that the story of John Smyth's se-baptism was a slander altogether invented after his death. The following is the testimony of Robinson:

"If the church be gathered by baptism, then will Mr. Helwisse's church appear to all men to be built upon the sand, considering the baptism had and hath: which was, as I have heard from themselves, on this manner: Mr. Smyth, Mr. Helwisse, and the rest, having utterly dissolved and disclaimed their former church state and ministry, came together to erect a new church by baptism; unto which they also ascribed so great virtue, as that they would not so much as pray together before they had it. And after some straining of courtesy who should begin, and that of John Baptist, Matt. 3: 14, mislaid, Mr. Smyth baptized first himself, and next Mr. Helwisse, and so the rest, making their particular confessions. Now to pass his not sanctifying a public action by public prayer, I Tim. 4: 4-5; his taking unto himself that honor which was not given him, either immediately from Christ or by the church, Heb. 5: 4; his baptizing himself, which was more than Christ did, Matt. 3: 14. I demand unto what church he entered by baptism? or entering by baptism into no church, how his baptism could be true by his own doctrine? Or, Mr. Smyth's baptism not being true, nor he, by it, entering into any church, how Mr. Helwisse's baptism could be true, or into what church he entered by it? These things thus being, all wise men will think that he had small cause either to be so much enamored, of his own baptism, or so highly to despise other men's for the unorderly or otherwise unlawful administration of it." Robinson's Works, Vol. 1, p. 168.

If it is borne in mind, that the point in controversy between Robinson and Smyth was whether any person who can preach, and whose labors God blesses, has a right to baptize—in other words, whether baptism, and so a church state, can originate from among unbaptized persons by their own baptisms, it will readily be seen that he might interpret their accounts of instituting baptisms among themselves as instituting somebody's self-baptism. He certainly does not describe any thing which he had witnessed, but receives summarily and controversially, accounts received from others. It would be no marvel if he fell into the very mistake supposed. Certainly there is nothing in this testimony which can stand against the absence of all allusion to John Smyth's se-baptism in the writings of himself and friends, and especially since the discovery of Mr. Underhill has furnished an authoritative explanation of what were really Smyth's views. Before admitting to Mr. Underhill's discovery, however, we will copy from Benedict's 1830's note in which is given a summary of the grounds on which Smyth's se-baptism has been hitherto denied.

by Crosby and Ivimey, and in the strongest terms by Mr. Taylor. The substance of his arguments on the subject may be reduced to the following heads:

"1. It is not easy to trace the story to an earlier date than the middle of the seventeenth century; that is, nearly half a century after he became a Baptist.

"2. Bishop Hall, who wrote at this time, and appears to have had an intimate acquaintance with the persons and circumstances, would have seized with avidity a fact like this; yet he never alludes to it; a strong presumption that no such report was then in circulation. The righteous soul of this good prelate seems to be sore vexed at the conduct of the whole company of the separatists in leaving the church; and in conformity to the spiritual times, he was assiduous to detect all their imperfections, and exceedingly severe in his castigations.

"3. F. Johnson, in his Christian Plea, and H. Ainsworth, in his reply to it, tho' they frequently mention Mr. Smyth and his sentiments, make no allusion to this circumstance. When we reflect that they were, at first, Mr. Smyth's associates, and afterwards, his avowed opponents, it is probable they either had never heard the report, or knew it to be false.

"4. This is rendered still more probable by consulting Mr. Smyth's Character of the Beast. There was the fairest occasion in that work, to mention such a circumstance; and yet it does not appear to be alluded to by either party. * * * This work was in the form of a dialogue, and all the objections of his opponents are put down before Mr. Smyth proceeds to answer them. And as to the fact of his se, or self-baptism, was an event of but yesterday, if it had really taken place, it is, indeed, singular that nothing was said about it in this severe scrutiny of errors and mistakes, from Mr. Clifton and others concerned in the discussion.

"From some expressions in the writings of this man, and from what appears in a book published by his followers in less than five years after his death, Mr. Taylor draws the conclusion that Smyth and one of his companions baptized each other, as was the case with Roger Williams and some others."

As we have already said, the first of these objections is certainly weakened by the testimony from Robinson. Robinson's testimony, however, seems utterly overborne by the remaining objections, and specially by that of Mr. Underhill, communicated in a letter to the Rev. Dr. Benedict, and published three or four years ago in the New York Recorder. We extract the following:

"In a visit I lately paid to Amsterdam, I found some more interesting manuscripts relative to the church of which John Smyth was pastor, with the original Confessions of Faith published by him and his company. I was also able to discover and elucidate the name of Se-baptist given to Smyth, and so often used as a name of reproach. As these documents are now being copied for me, I am not able to send you the particulars, but the general facts are as follows:

"On Smyth and his people becoming Baptists, the question arose how they were to commence the practice of the rite, and by whom it should be administered. The Dutch Baptists or Menonites held at that time the opinion that baptism should be administered only by a minister or elder in office. As Smyth did not agree in several matters with the Dutch, they were unwilling to resort to them for baptism, and became of opinion that it might be originated among themselves—they were, therefore called 'Se-baptists—persons baptizing themselves—not that each one dipped, or baptized himself, but among them they commenced the practice. After this Smyth and several more came to be of the same opinion on this and other points with the Dutch, and applied to be admitted to communion with them. The Dutch received them, but at the same time required a recantation of their error. A fac-simile of this document, I possess. The heading is in Latin, purporting that the persons whose names are subscribed, renounce the sentiments that they may 'se ipso baptizari'—baptize themselves—as contrary to the order of Christ. It thus appears that the equivocal phrase 'se ipso baptizari,' became the foundation of the charge that Smyth baptized himself. But from the controversy which arose, it is evident that the meaning of the words is as I have stated it. Among the names which follow is the autograph of John Smyth and his wife Mary. A few remained of the first opinion, among whom was, I believe, Mr. Underhill. I have seen a MS. letter of his, in which this subject is taken up and argued with

the two Dutch pastors, to whom this letter is addressed, and he also treats of the succession of the ministry in reference to the same subject in a printed work still extant. A copy of this letter I hope soon to possess. I may therefore confidently affirm, that the charge of baptizing himself is, with respect to Smyth, a calumny, but arose from the circumstances referred to. In no other way can we account for the silence with respect to it, observed by himself in his writings, and in those of his friends."

For the Tennessee Baptist. The Tract for the Times—No. 4.

Mr. Editor:

There is a great disposition among Presbyterians in these parts, of late, to introduce comparisons between themselves and other denominations; and in the contrast to place themselves above, and others below what they desire. On page 35 of the "Tract," it says, when speaking of the Baptists: "It is remarkable how little Christian experience, and reception of the truth as it is in Jesus, are necessary in these days to make one a fit subject for immersion." This comes with rather ill grace from those who teach that the first good desire is regeneration, and receive persons into their church, as genuinely converted, that simply say, that they have a wish to amend their ways.—Again, it is said, "The Baptists will sit down at the Lord's table with a man who denies the divinity of Christ, or the personality of the Holy Ghost, the necessity of a great spiritual change, or almost any other important doctrine of the Bible, if he has only been buried with him in baptism." If Presbyterians believe this, it is a wonder that they are so pressed in spirit to sit down at the Lord's table with us, it would make them as bad as ourselves—if they do not, they are worse; for they are the vilest hypocrites. However, these quotations are fine specimens of the kind of logic used by Pedobaptists against-Baptists since the introduction of free toleration to all sects.—Previous to that time, and even now in despotic countries, it is even stronger. It is the arm of civil power, wielded by the magistrates. It has been felt, in not a few instances, in person and property—in the dungeon and at the stake. All that they can do in our happy republic is to taunt and misrepresent us. But time will not permit us to notice further the odious epithets used against us, in the "Tract for the Times."

I leave those that feel at liberty to make or publish them, in the hands of the Judge of all the earth, who will do right; and pass on to notice some of the high-wrought eulogies of Presbyterianism contained in it. And I cannot read them without the language of the apostle intruding itself upon my mind—"Be not high minded, but fear; for blindness in part is happened unto Israel."

Our author in his boasting, speaks of their intelligence, the piety, and the patriotism, &c., &c., as if there was nothing worthy of notice only among the Presbyterians; but as I cannot notice all that is uttered, I will call attention mainly to what is said about their being all in all in securing our present social and religious privileges, and their high claims in the educational department of our country—and to commence with their own words, "Had there been no Calvin, it has been said, there probably would have been no United States." Now this may be, but it is more likely if it had not been for the precedent of Roger Williams, in establishing the colony of Rhode Island, and the influence of the Baptists, that the United States would have been a Scotland, or Geneva, and Presbyterianism established. A man's taking sides against Great Britain, in the Revolutionary War, was no conclusive proof that he was a friend to free toleration, or equal religious privileges. And as we hear some boasting by Presbyterians, we will introduce some circumstances, that do not speak very favorably for them, on this point.—And first, their not changing those articles in the "Confession of Faith," that were favorable to religious establishment, and the right of the civil magistrate to interfere with the affairs of the church till after the independence of the United States was established. Why was not this done before, if they were such great friends of religious liberty? To have done this, and left undone some things they did, would have said more for them, than all of Mr. S.'s boasting now.

Secondly, Dr. Witherspoon, as a member of the Convention to form our Constitution, taking the Confession of Faith, without its being changed, as his model, by which to form the Constitution, as boasted by Mr. S.—leaves grounds to suppose that he may have had some hope, that it might have been adopted as the established form of worship. And thirdly, the desire of Presbyterians

to have, and their disappointment because their religion was not established, in the time of Cromwell. This circumstance does not only speak unfavorably, but goes to strengthen what we have just said about Dr. Witherspoon, as we have no evidence that Presbyterianism had changed at the time of the establishment of our government. These circumstances with some acts of intolerance since our fathers landed on Plymouth Rock, ought to keep the Presbyterians from boasting of their being almost the only friends of religious liberty, and the great instruments of obtaining it in America.

I hope I will be excused for introducing these things, as I think that Mr. S. and his Editors are claiming honors mainly belonging to others, and I hope also that they will take this modest hint, and be more careful hereafter. Baptists have some knowledge how things stand, and forbearance is not always considered a virtue. But their educational exploits! They claim to have more literary institutions under their care than all other denominations in America. Now, what institutions are they? They are not denominational in their origin; they only compare favorably with others in getting up institutions of learning—but they are those of the people, gotten up and supported by public patronage, from money received for public lands and otherwise.—How did they get possession of them—was it not by obtruding themselves in as Trustees of Public Schools, and rejecting all others, as far as possible, except Presbyterians and Congregationalists? It most certainly is. I know some things on this point that would do to tell, if time would permit. The inquisitorial influence of Presbyterian Trustees has been often felt, by worthy men of other denominations, and by this means they have shared largely in funds that they are no more interested in, than those that they have turned away, and secured a great influence with the young who were seeking to secure an education; and if they had stooped, in trying to secure their favor without prejudicing them against others, it would not have been so much, but they have not. Baptists know what it is to send children to public schools conducted by Presbyterians. But what is most strange is, that they, after all this, would claim so much honor for serving themselves, for having been pampered, and placed in influential positions by public funds, making them at the same time subservient to denominational purposes. Public schools have been so long at their control that they have become arrogant, and think they have a right to manage them entirely. I think they ought to have what is due to them, which, perhaps, could be as properly awarded by bringing the election of Trustees of public schools before the people, and let them choose, and by this means their locks will be clipped, and they will become as weak as other people, and cut off all occasion of boasting. There is no reason why the educational interests should be controlled by any one denomination.

Again, he seems to imagine that while the dipping Presbyterian (Baptist) has been rapidly diverging from the truth, the sprinkling Presbyterian has been moving onward and upward, and in this, perhaps, lies the great danger; for if their increase be as rapid as Mr. S. supposes, if not prevented by the conservative influence of the Baptists, Presbyterianism will soon need a crown, as Pedobaptism, in all cases where permitted, has matured in despotism. I have no reference to persons, but to systems, in these remarks. I charge no one of being anti-republican, but only holding to, and advocating systems that tends to despotism.—Here I should have closed, had it not been for the absurdity that our author and his editors have involved themselves in by comparing several denominations among us with each other—open the *Universalist and Unitarian* not excepted. This comparison is an admission that each denomination introduced has some claims to correctness, notwithstanding their positions are contradictory. I allude to points of controversy, and not to those in which we agree, and this remark is to prevent any from evading the force of our argument, by generalizing.—The admission in the comparison nullifies the Bible, and reduces things to a human standard, and places every claimant to denounce every thing specific, and sanctions the idea that all the discordant views of church polity have equal claims to the attention of the public. And by this means the odium of selfishness and bigotry is heaped on those that maintain that the Bible is specific and clear with regard to subjects and ordinances of the Church of Christ, and is the supreme law by which all should be governed. If the comparison be admitted there is nothing wrong in all the de-

nominations of Christendom in the World from the Catholic down. And those who have diverged from the truth, and covered their broad system under the mantle of charity, equalizing human tradition or the opinions of men with the Bible, have placed themselves in the awkward position that they cannot contend for their own views without fighting against themselves, or contradicting what they admit to be true.

Alas can it be, that deception is the leading motive of a large portion of Christendom? Do they wish to impose their views on the public at all hazards? But the case is quite different with the Baptists. On the field of controversy they stand separate and alone, discarding alike the claims of the Church of Rome to a supremacy over the word of God, and the broad system of Protestantism, that equalizes every thing with the Bible, making every invention of man equal to what is taught in it. Baptists alone maintain and carry out in practice the sentiment that the Bible and the Bible alone is to give laws and regulate the order of the Church of Christ. They, and they only, maintain that it is clear and distinct, and can be understood by the unprejudiced, and would, if implicitly obeyed, harmonize the christian world.

They only can enter the field of controversy upon firm basis, and battle with error in all its forms, without coming in contact with themselves—without thrusting a dagger into the vitals of some admitted truth. The potsherd of the earth may strive with the potsherd of the earth, but not with their Maker; and so may the Protestant sects strive and compare themselves with themselves, but not with Baptists. They, like some adjectives in this case, admit of no comparison. As a straight line, they may be used to detect errors, in those that have departed from the truth, but cannot be compared with them. They, on the points in which they differ from others, are either right or wrong—there is no midway ground; no mixing of truth and error, and hence no comparison. I know our position is an unpopular one—I know that we will be called selfish and bigoted, but I much prefer this, to stooping to such sophistry as our opponents have to, for the sake of popularity and success, to assuming the position that every thing is right which nullifies the Bible. If persecution, suffering and death, in all their most cruel forms come, let Baptists bear it patiently, but never let them forsake their position by taking shelter under such a refuge of lies. Truth can never triumph till a single-handed battle is fought.

DEFENSIO.

"Have No Time to Pray."

Indeed, friend, "haven't time?" What is time? yours is it? Who made time? Is time yours, or God's?—which? Has God given you time to live in, breathe in, walk in, talk in, pray in? Why not pray in it, then?—mind what God says? God commands you to pray—pray always—with all prayer and supplications in the spirit.

"But I have so much business!"—"Business," indeed! What business?—yours, or God's? Have you any separate business from God's business? If so, you are a rebel—attempting to dethrone God, and set up a separate kingdom!

Does God tell you to do your business, first, or his?—which? Have you any business aside from God's? Have you?—we say again, a rebel, a false steward!—"He that is not for me is against me."

Your business should be God's business, and God's business yours—and your gift and great business to serve God with all the heart, soul, mind, strength—this through eternity. The more business you have, the more you need prayer, grace, wisdom, righteousness, salvation, sanctification.

Some farmers, and some mechanics, and some merchants, run off, clasp the "muck rake," neglect the closet, the family altar. Friends, will not God by-and-by take from you the stewardship and give it to others, more worthy, more faithful, more honorable?—"Will a man rob God?"

"In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths."—"So shall thy barns be filled with plenty and thy presses burst out with new wine."

MARGARET, the author of the "Household of Sir Thomas Moore," and the eldest daughter of the minister, in speaking of the death of Erasmus, says: "To me he gave a copy, now precious of his Testament. You are an elegant Latinist, Margaret," he was pleased to say, "but if you would drink freely of the well-springs of wisdom, apply to Greek. The Latin have only shallow rivulets; the Greek copious rivers, running over sands of gold. Read Plato; he wrote on marble with a diamond; but above all, read the New Testament.—'Tis the key to the kingdom of Heaven."

For the Tennessee Baptist.

Brotherly Epistle. The following was read by Rev. A. H. Booth before the Ministers' and Deacons' meeting, held at Farmington, Miss., in August, 1853, was requested and ordered for publication in the Tennessee Baptist.

T. P. BOONE, Clerk. COMMUNION.

Communion literally signifies fellowship or intercourse between two or more persons. In religion it means mutual intercourse in doctrine and discipline. With the above definition before me, I have concluded thus, to have religious intercourse in the Lord's Supper, when there is a vast difference in doctrine and discipline, is a mere name without the thing, and in our judgment is urged, by Pedobaptists, more for effect than any thing else. In treating upon this subject, we shall very briefly show that there is no agreement, in doctrine and discipline, existing between the Baptist Church and the several denominations of the present day. The Baptist Church is an assembly of baptized believers in Jesus Christ—and admits of no unregenerated person to its membership, either adult or infant. In this it disagrees with all Protestant denominations. It acknowledges no law but the New Testament—and its government, so far as it relates to a temporal head—but a spiritual one—to wit: Christ. A church of this character is found in the New Testament. Proof—Mat. 28: 19, 20. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."—Mark 16: 16. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Acts 2: 41. "Then they that gladly received his word (Peter's) were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Chap. 8: 12. "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Is it not obvious that Christ's Church is a congregation of baptized believers. Hence, "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism."

This voluntary baptized association is republican or democratic in its government. Proof—Mat. 23: 9, 10. "Call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called Masters: for one is your Master even Christ." The first church transaction is found in Acts 1: 21-26, which was purely democratic, and proves that the supreme power was lodged in the hands of the people collectively. The second action of this kind is recorded in Acts 6: 1-3. Instead of those financial officers (deacons) being appointed by the bishops, they were elected or chosen by the suffrages of all the members present. The above is all in point—and establishes beyond controversy the pure democracy of Christ's Church.—Paul says, "Though we or an angel from Heaven preach any other gospel than that which we have preached unto you; let him be accursed." It is not very difficult to determine who stands upon this Apostolic platform. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, certainly is the incessant cry, and universal practice of Christ's Church, and that the immersion of a believer in water is baptism, and nothing else. Now, if Protestant denominations conform to, and practice the above, we all can and ought to commune in the Lord's supper together, otherwise we ought not. The Presbyterian society was established about the year of our Lord 1545—some 308 years ago. History knows nothing of its like previous to that date, and is always searched in vain to find it. Aside from this there is no agreement in the government; discipline and doctrines of this society, with that of the first church as stated in the foregoing part of this article. The powers of this society are vested in a few rulers, called ruling elders, who with the ministers constitute the session. This session has entire jurisdiction over the church independent of the popular vote. Moreover, they will sprinkle and pour, and call it baptism. This rite is also performed upon the unconscious babe, thus tending to a clear subversion of the Apostolic platform—both with regard to mode and subjects.

Incorporating in the church unregenerate persons, the Baptist or Christ's Church, as we have seen, has no such jurisdiction or customs. Therefore, we cannot, without the sacrifice of honest principle, commune in the Lord's supper with Presbyterians. Although we regard them as good men, and love them for their piety, yet we

are honest in believing them in great error with respect to a visible organized church, and while this is the case we cannot commune with them, in one of the principal and most important laws of our visible constitution. As much, or even more, may be said of our Methodist brethren, as a society. We hold that the powers of their system of government are not lodged in the people collectively—but in the Bishops.—Therefore, in the main—or at least so far as the laity are concerned, anti-republican. We refer you to the Discipline, not only in support of this position—but as presenting an organization or creed—which is opposed to, and openly at war with the Apostolic platform. We would also refer the reader to the published journals of the immortal Wesley, vol. 7: p. 98. "As long as I live the people shall bear no share in choosing either stewards," (think of the election of deacons, Acts 6: 1-8), "or leaders, among Methodists. We are not republicans, and never intend to be. It would be better for those thus minded to go quietly away." Other quotations, equally strong, might be made from Mr. Wesley's journals, but this is sufficient for our present purpose. It shows the mind of the man who, during the last century, put in motion the Methodist system of church government. (There is no congeniality between the laws of this society and those of the Baptist church, and still less in practice.) Like Presbyterians, we see them sprinkle or pour, and upon infants at that, in the dread name of the Trinity, and call it baptism. Moreover, they have often invited, and even urged upon mourners, to partake of the sacrament; which practice is contrary to, and entirely subverts the original design, of this holy institution. We cannot conform to this system, nor sanction its practice. Hence the reason we are not found at their tables. They profess to love us, and seem to think because we do not invite them to our communion, we do not wish to be friendly as citizens and neighbors; if indeed they are sincere when they thus speak, they are mistaken. We love them as well as they do us—as evidence we refer to the epistles they have used with reference to us. I know that we desire to meet them, joyfully, in this social christian feast—and will do so, that very hour in which they obey the simple teachings of the New Testament.

In conclusion, I refer the reader to "Howell on Communion," and "Baptism and Communion," by R. Fuller—where this subject is discussed in a masterly manner. Reader, if you have not those books, let me ask you to send and get them immediately. We have not room to speak of any more sects, but close by praying that the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, may dwell with, and bless you, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

For the Tennessee Baptist. ORDINATION.

Bro. Franklin Finney, of the Richmond Baptist Church, Itawamba County, Miss., was ordained to the ministry on Monday, after the 5th Sabbath in July last. Sermon appropriate to the occasion, by Bro. Stovall.

Examination by Bro. Hood. Prayer by Bro. Moore.

Charge by Bro. Thomas. Benediction by Bro. Richards.

May our young brother "be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might;" and may his labors of love be blessed of the Lord.

A. L. STOVALL. August 25th, 1853.

Anecdote of Rev. John Leland. Our country abounds with traditions of the pious, useful, but eccentric John Leland. The following characteristic anecdote should not be lost. Mr. Leland was in the habit of preaching long sermons; and being in Boston on a certain occasion, his friend and fellow minister, Dr. Baldwin, invited him to preach to his people in the evening. But as a matter of caution, the Doctor suggested to him before service that they were not fond of long sermons. So, after Mr. Leland had preached about an hour, and the people were getting uneasy, he stopped short in his sermon, and said:

"I understand that you Boston folks are fond of short sermons; and as I am about half through, and this being a very cold evening to allow those of you who have holes in the heels of your stockings, to go home, I will wait a moment and proceed." This did the business; no one went out till the long sermon was finished, for fear of exposing his heels.

Tennessee Baptist

NASHVILLE, TENN. SATURDAY, SEPT. 17, 1853.

TERMS—\$1.00 per annum, in advance, including postage. No number of subscribers will be received unless accompanied by the money.

Advertisements will be taken to a limited extent that are not incongruous with a religious newspaper. Terms of advertising: First insertion 5 cents per line, and 2 1/2 cents per line for each subsequent insertion.

Advertisements for Schools are charged for like any other. Poetry, whether original or selected, appended to Marriage or Obituary notices, cannot be inserted.

Office of the Tennessee Baptist over the Baptist Book Store and Depository of the Southern Bible Board, on Union Street, two doors from the Bank of Tennessee. GRAVES & SHANKLAND.

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Translated from the German of Von Rhoden by Wm. C. Duncan.

We received a copy of this work some months since, and promised to notice it before we looked into it, or we might now excuse our conscience and let it pass. Baptists in the South-west have become too intelligent and grounded in Bible doctrine to be easily led astray by the dreamy speculations of German neologistic Theology.

We have neither space nor leisure now to review this work as it deserves; but we may ere long, and especially if our decision is called in question by the admirers of German Theology. We, in the mean time, ask all who have a copy in their possession, to read carefully Parts 3, 4 and 5, especially, and judge for themselves as to the correctness of our decision. It may be thought by some that we ought to produce some evidence of the unsoundness of this work. We would gladly produce every passage to which we object; but that would require the republication of the entire book, excepting a few pages.

Baptists believe the first verse of the first chapter of Mark, and therefore teach that the ministry of John the Baptist was "the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God," and consequently they regard John's baptism as belonging to the Christian dispensation, and, since the blessed Savior himself and his apostles received it, as eminently the Christian baptism, and therefore as a profession of repentance and faith in Christ, instead of a washing, in the operation of which, or as the ultimate result of which, the pardon of sins and the new birth are to be secured, as these German writers and other American copyists (Campbellites) teach. Baptists, therefore, hold and teach that John's baptism, as administered by him, was not repeated, but was equally valid with that administered by the Apostles, and that the baptism administered by the disciples of Christ and under his own eye was Christian. Now, this German, Von Rhoden, and Prof. Duncan, in this work oppose all these positions, and teach a wholly different and, to Baptists, most odious and offensive doctrine. We say Mr. Duncan does; for we cannot tell in the body of the work, except in a few instances, who is speaking, the author (Von Rhoden) or the translator (Mr. Duncan). But that we do Prof. Duncan no injustice will be seen from one quotation from page 220: "Our view [that of Mr. D.] of the connection of John's baptism with the Christian rite, it will be seen, does not differ essentially from that of Von Rhoden!" Indeed! His views upon all the doctrines embraced in this work do not differ from this German's, or else Mr. D., of course, would not have been so much expense in introducing it to the American public or industriously circulating it among the Baptists in the South-west. Would he translate a French infidel work for the purpose of making gains? But he admits he differs somewhat with his author touching the relation that the baptism of Christ's disciples bore to the church ordinance.

But a few of the multitude of objectionable passages must suffice for this article; and here we must confess ourselves at a loss to know where to begin. We have at first, amidst four pages of matter on John's birth, parenting and development, &c., for which we have no possible use. Any man or child who has read twenty verses in the Gospel, knows as much about John the Baptist as the author of this work.

Mr. Von Rhoden or any man living can know; for those verses contain all that is revealed. We do not need the befogged speculations of German scholars, conjured up amid the pipe smoke of their studios. God's word is all that will do us any good. He intimates that John selected his own mode of baptism. "It must have been something new and extraordinary to the people," &c. p. 120. With this our Baptists who believe that John was commissioned by Christ to do certain specific acts, and consequently had no option as to the doctrine he was to preach or the mode of the baptism he was to administer.

2. He, or rather they, (Messrs. Von Rhoden and Duncan,) teach in this book that John's baptism was not a Christian baptism; and consequently needed to be repeated. 3. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

4. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

5. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

6. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

7. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

8. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

9. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

Christ's death, and in which baptism a new spiritual element is introduced into man, making him a new creature, and thus all the speculations of German scholars, conjured up amid the pipe smoke of their studios. God's word is all that will do us any good. He intimates that John selected his own mode of baptism. "It must have been something new and extraordinary to the people," &c. p. 120. With this our Baptists who believe that John was commissioned by Christ to do certain specific acts, and consequently had no option as to the doctrine he was to preach or the mode of the baptism he was to administer.

2. He, or rather they, (Messrs. Von Rhoden and Duncan,) teach in this book that John's baptism was not a Christian baptism; and consequently needed to be repeated. 3. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

4. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

5. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

6. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

7. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

8. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

9. That the baptisms administered by the disciples of Christ, under the direction and of the blessed Savior, was not Christian, and needed to be repeated, while these disciples baptized those previously baptized by John!

10. That genuine Christian baptism is for the actual remission of sins, the actual impartation of salvation, and included within itself the baptism of the Holy Ghost! What a climax in a series of errors and absurdities to be perpetrated and advocated by professed teachers of Christianity!! In proof of the first, see the work from page 205-218. That the disciples of Jesus baptized the disciples of John, see page 206: "Those followers of John who had afterwards become the disciples of Jesus, and from their own contemplation and conviction had recognized the Savior of the world, must have regarded the baptism of John, which still referred only to him who was to come, as imperfect. It is evident that both such as had previously received the rite administered by John and such as now came for the first to baptism, could become the subjects of this rite of the disciples of Jesus."—Page 207. Here we have the disciples of Christ baptizing the disciples of John! But Prof. D. or his German friend does not tell us who rebaptized these disciples of Christ; for he says their baptism was an imperfect one! Here are two water baptisms, and neither of them Christian, according to these gentlemen! They tell us positively that Christ did not command his disciples to baptize previous to his resurrection; that they took up the practice of themselves, and Christ did not forbid them!—page 207; that they discontinued it when they saw, [just as though Jesus had nothing to do with teaching them or directing them what to do and teach!] that the miracles were more powerful to confirm the faith of his disciples than baptism.—Page 209. This is neologistic with a witness! It destroys the inspiration, and consequently the authority of the Gospels as our infallible guide in faith and practice. We have no language in which to express our abhorrence of sentiments of this character scattered throughout this book! Are they such as Baptists can endorse and circulate? But the discovery that Christ never commanded these disciples to teach and baptize before his resurrection! See page 209. "It was not until after the resurrection that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize; but this is quite a different ceremony, genuine Christian baptism, of which we shall further occasion to speak." We now, in all humility and deference to the transcendent learning of these distinguished authors, beg leave to ask from what source they learned that Jesus never before his resurrection commanded his disciples to teach and baptize, that they are enabled to assert it so dogmatically? Have they been favored with a special revelation? Or have they held communion with the "rappers"? This is too monstrous for comment! He deems that neither John's baptism nor that of these disciples was Christian, and consequently had to be repeated. Three water baptisms!! They say, "What relation now did these two baptismal rites sustain to the Christian baptism?" "That both of them were only preparatory, [two preparatory!] we have already seen, since they only pointed to the Messiah, [the one, as yet to come;] the other, as having made his appearance,] who should bring forgiveness of sins, [no forgiveness was granted, then until after the resurrection of Christ; this will suit modern reformers!] Christian baptism, on the other hand, WAS THE ACTUAL IMPARTATION OF ALL THAT SALVATION WHICH HAD BEEN OBTAINED FOR MEN BY THE LIFE AND DEATH OF CHRIST." Hear ye, Baptists of the South-west. Such are the sentiments you are called upon to indorse before the world, by circulating this German work. Read on, "it did not merely promise forgiveness of sins, but INCLUDED IT WITHIN ITSELF, AND WAS A BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." p. 210. "But Christian baptism on the contrary, INTRODUCED A NEW SPIRITUAL ELEMENT INTO MAN, AND MADE HIM THEREBY A NEW CREATURE." &c. p. 211. "We, [Prof. Duncan and his German author,] are impelled, therefore, to the conclusion, that THE IMPARTATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS ALWAYS THE CHIEF THING IN CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, and that immersion in water as being an outward symbol is not wholly essential." i. e., not essential to Christian baptism!!

LETTER No. 21.

Methodist Presiding Elders—Sub-Bishops—Their Irresponsible and Oppressive Power.

To J. SOULE, BISHOP OF THE METHODIST E. CHURCH, SOUTH, &c.

Having shown in my last year's daring assumption in presuming to exercise the powers and authority you do, as Bishop over your brethren—(assumptions so impious and daring that your own Wesleyan Magazine in denouncing the first Methodist Bishop, "How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called a Bishop? I should, I start, at the very thought!") I will now notice your Second or Aid—the officer next to you in authority, and the oppressive and tyrannical powers, you delegate to him.

THE PRESIDING ELDER is a servant of the Bishop—he peculiarly belongs to his Bishop as no other minister does. He is chosen solely by the Bishop—holds his office during the pleasure of his master—can be dismissed at his master's pleasure for no reason except the royal pleasure of his lordship, and his business is, not to preach—to serve God—by no means—that is reckoned among his duties, but to serve the Bishop in the character of a sub-overseer—as a spy and informant upon his brethren, and he is for his exalted service allowed to share in the authority of his master during the recess of Conference, and to be judge in the Quarterly Courts of Appeals. This officer, from the very nature of his office and work, is the most respected character, in our estimation, of any in the whole society. The Presiding Elder is, of course, selected as one of the most pious tools that can be found among all the ministers—one that has the least principle and the least sense of honor or shame, or he would scorn to become the sweep, the very serf of the Bishop, or of any man—scorn to become spy and informant upon his brethren in the ministry—scorn to exercise the mastery over them, so hostile to the express letter and the very spirit of the Gospel. He is accounted to rule over the Gentiles of his district, and like the under rulers to whom our Lord referred in the text, he exercises an insolent and oppressive lordship over the preachers under him, as every circuit rider can testify, if he happens not to be as pliant and cowering as his little lordship, the Elder, desires.

I am aware that it becomes me to prove this. I have said that the Presiding Elder is the sole creature and servant of man—the Bishop, depending upon him alone for his appointment and continuance in office, and is responsible to the Bishop alone for his official conduct. Proof.—It shall be the duty of the Bishop to choose the Presiding Elders, to fix their stations, and to change them when he judges it necessary.—Discipline, p. 38. No one is permitted to nominate the candidate—nor when elected can all the preachers in the Conference control his acts, or suspend him from the exercise of his office for any crime! To his own master, the Bishop, he standeth or falleth. He can be dismissed at the Bishop's pleasure, for no crime, for no fault, and that, without any reasons being given, nor has he the right to ask a reason. "Suspension, removal, or deposition from office in the M. E. Church is summary, [i. e. despotic!] without accusation, trial, or formal sentence." "It is for no crime, generally for no misdemeanor, or for being unacceptable." "Most of the removals are by a sole agent, namely, by a Bishop, a preacher whose will is omnipotent in the premises." "The removing officer is not legally obliged to assign any cause for deposition." "The deposed has no appeal, if indiscreetly or unnecessarily removed he must submit."—Bishop Hamlin's Speech in Confer. of 1844.

I am compelled to ask you here, sir, did Jesus Christ ever endow his ministers with such "summary" and tyrannical powers over their brethren? By what right have you, sir, to remove an Elder from an office to which the Lord Jesus has called him?—What is the question you ask him?—"Do you think in your heart that you are truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ to the order of elders?" He answers, "I think so." Your Presiding Elders, of course, feel that they have an equal calling—and if so, how dare you recall and depose from office one whom the Lord hath called—and depose from an office which the Lord hath imposed upon him? How, sir, but by assuming to exercise powers superior to the King of Zion? But I can see how you meet this. "The office of Presiding Elders is one of my own creation, and the Presiding Elder is a creature of my own will. Jesus Christ has nothing to do with him—he belongs to me—Christ nor the Holy Ghost has anything to do with calling him. I call him—the Bishops call their Presiding Elders, and can consequently recall them. They are self-denying servants. They freely deny themselves the honor of saying with Peter, "Peter, servant and apostle of Jesus Christ" called of God, and with Paul, "Paul an apostle, (not of men,) neither [called and sent] by a man, but by Jesus Christ," that they may say, "Thomas Gardner, servant and apostle of my Bishop, called and sent to be a Presiding Elder, not of God, neither by Jesus Christ, but the will of my Lord Bishop."

Do I say too much when I say that the Presiding Elder is not a preacher—is not sent to preach—and that the Bishop does not mention preaching in his commission as one of his duties? Here is his commission—here the lordly powers, and ruling privileges granted to him under the Bishop for the voluntary prostitution of himself, conscience and service, soul and body to man service. It makes it his business to rule, to be judge of all the "Quarterly Courts of

Appeals" in his district—and to be spy and informant upon the preachers of his district! What an honorable calling, truly! Read his commission. See Dis. page 39, sec. vi.

Of the Presiding Elders, and their Duty. Quest. 1. What are the duties of a presiding elder?—Discipline, p. 38. 1. To travel through his appointed district. 2. In the absence of the bishop, to take charge of all the elders and deacons, traveling and local preachers, and exhorters, in his district. 3. To change, receive, and suspend preachers in his district during the intervals of the conferences, and in the absence of the bishop, as the Discipline directs. 4. To be present, as far as practicable, at all the quarterly meetings, and call together the members of the quarterly conference, over which he shall also preside. 5. To oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the Church in his district, and to promote, by all proper means, the cause of missions and Sunday schools, of Bibles, tracts, and Sunday school books; and carefully to inquire, at each quarterly meeting conference, whether the rules respecting the instruction of children have been faithfully observed; and to report to the annual conference the names of all traveling preachers within his district who shall neglect to observe these rules. 6. To take care that every part of our Discipline be enforced in his district. And to decide all questions of law in a quarterly meeting conference, subject to an appeal to the president of the next annual conference; but in all cases the application of law shall be with the conference. 7. To attend the bishops when present in his district; and to give them when absent, all necessary information, by letter, of the state of his district. 8. To direct the candidates for the ministry to those studies recommended for them by the bishops. 9. If any preacher absent himself from his circuit, the presiding elder shall, as far as possible, fill his place with another preacher. Quest. 2. Shall the presiding elder have power to employ a preacher who has been rejected at the previous annual conference?—Ans. He shall not, unless the conference should give him liberty under certain conditions. I have been careful to give the whole section, and not one word about preaching—that is a secondary matter. If you make it the duty of your Presiding Elders to preach in the Discipline, I have not been able to find it, and would be obliged to you for a reference to the page. He has but two classes of duties—obey his Bishop is the first, and to rule and watch his brethren—his equals and superiors, in true merit and self-denying labors, the second!

Some may think that I seek to turn the Quarterly Conferences into derision, by calling them "Quarterly Courts of Appeal," and the Presiding Elder "Judge of Appeals," for our brethren who are uninitiated are very exact to dismiss their religious meetings when these Methodist Courts hold their sessions in their neighborhood! I would not be so understood. I have called them by their true name, and in this I am not alone. Inskip says of the Presiding Elder, "He has charge of the administration of the discipline throughout the district. He is to take care that every part of our discipline be enforced. He is to preside at the trials of local preachers, and in the COURT OF APPEALS." P. 140. Again, "He comes as adviser, or JUDGE OF APPEALS." P. 142. If my language is irreverent, so is that of one of your own standard authors. I have said that he was not only a

unmistakably, that the pupils in their daily exercises were in the habit of being kept...

At a regular conference meeting of the Baptist Church of Christ at McMinnville, on Saturday, before the 4th Sabbath in August, 1883, the following preamble and resolutions were offered by Bro. N. Smith, and unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That Bro. John Powell, late pastor of the Baptist church at McMinnville, has resigned his pastoral charge of said church, with a view to a removal from McMinnville, we the members composing the church, desire to express our regret in receiving his resignation.

Resolved, That Bro. John Powell, for his pastoral care of our church, while acting in that high and responsible capacity—his humble, straight-forward and consistent course as a devoted Christian—his kind and affectionate bearing towards those under his pastoral charge, is justly entitled to, and has our warmest affections and kindest feelings.

Resolved, That we cordially recommend him to, and bespeak for him a kind and hearty reception of all Baptist brethren, wherever his lot may be cast.

Resolved, That with him will go our best wishes for his temporal welfare and success—and for his final triumph and acceptance in heaven, our united and unfeigned prayers shall be addressed to the throne of God.

Resolved, That this preamble and resolutions be entered upon the minutes of our Church, and a copy sent to the Tennessee Baptist for publication.

Signed by order of the Church. S. J. MITCHELL, CH. CLK.

one so much beloved, but a devoted wife's heart was so much wrung, and she was now mourning over the grave of her dear husband, and four lovely children...

Resolved, That we entertain a high regard for the piety, usefulness, and amiable worth of our dear brother, and will ever cherish for his memory the fondest recollections.

Resolved, That we offer to our dear brother sister and to the children of Bro. Green, our heartfelt sympathy and condolence, commending them to His who alone can give that higher consolation which can heal the wound from which they suffer.

Resolved, That these resolutions be signed by the Moderator and Clerk of this Church, and entered on our church book; and a copy be sent to the family of Bro. Green; also that brother Thos B. Barnett be requested to write an obituary notice, and forward the same with these resolutions to the Tennessee Baptist, with a request to publish them.

Done by order of the Church. ISAAC M. BASS, Modr. ELISHA LEMONS, Clerk pro tem.

Rev. Henry Hunt. Departed this life, at his residence in Franklin county, Tenn., Nov. 19th, 1852, Rev. HENRY HUNT, in the 73d year of his age.

Rebecca J. Shelburne. Departed this life, on the 15th of July, 1853, in Franklin county, Ala. RASACCA J. wife of Thos. R. Shelburne, and daughter of John and Henrietta Alexander.

PHILLIPS, SIMPSON & CO., BOSTON. HAVE in Press, and will publish about the first of September...

P. S. & Co. have Recently Published. THE LAST LEAF FROM SUNNY SIDE. By H. Trusta, author of Peep at No. 5, Sunny Side, &c.

Thomas K. Green. Died, at his residence in Madison county, Miss., on the 5th of August, 1853, Bro. THOMAS K. GREEN, in the 48th year of his age.

One Dollar Daguerrean Gallery, No. 31, College Street, Between Union Street and the Advocate Office.

RESPECTFULLY informs his friends and the public generally, that he has opened a DAGUERREAN GALLERY in Nashville, and is fully prepared to take likenesses true to nature in the best style of the art.

OL VITRIOL—25 carboys just received, and for sale by H. G. SOOVEL.

FISHING TACKLE—The attention of the extensive assortment of Poles, Hooks, Lines, Tubs, Soods, Trawls, &c., &c., &c. For sale by H. G. SOOVEL.

Nashville Female Institute. THE Trustees announce to the former patrons and the public that the next session of this Institution will commence August 29th...

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE ABRAHAMIC GOVERNMENT. NO. 100. FOUND FOR INFANT BAPTISM. BY REV. W. W. MILLMAN, PASTOR OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH IN NASHVILLE, TENN.

Being a Review of an Essay on Baptism by Wm. Knapp. Published by the Tennessee Baptist Publication Society, by GRAY & SHANKLAND.

REASONS FOR BECOMING A BAPTIST. By Rev. W. L. SLACK, formerly of an Old School Presbyterian—new Edition—paper covers.

UNIVERSITY OF NASHVILLE. MEDICAL DEPARTMENT. THE Third Annual Course of Lectures in this Department will commence on TUESDAY, the first of November next, and continue till the first of July following.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

NEW YORK BAPTIST BOOK STORE. 141 Nassau Street, New York. EDWARD W. FLETCHER, Proprietor.

HAVING recently established a Store for the sale of the above articles, will keep on hand a large assortment of Bibles, Testaments, and Holy Scriptures, of all descriptions, comprising every variety of Goods, which will be returned every day.

CLIFFORD & ABBOTT. Dealer in the Post Office, Nashville, Tenn. DEALERS IN GENTLEMEN'S APPAREL AND FURNISHING GOODS.

Liver Complaint, Dyspepsia, Jaundice, Chronic or Nervous Debility, Disease of the Kidneys, and all Diseases arising from a Disordered Liver.

DR. HOOFLAND'S CELEBRATED GERMAN BITTERS. PREPARED BY DR. C. M. JACKSON, No. 120 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.

THE next term will commence on Monday, September 11th, 1853, in the new building erected for the Institution.