Wilmington Elder John Miles, Canaan Elder Matthew Gardner, Ripley. Elder Jeremiah Fuston. West-liberty Elder David Hathaway, Decatur. Elder Enoch Harvey London. Maj George Adams, Greenville. Elder Barzillai H Mills Athens Davice Crane, Bethel. Elder Jehu Chamberlane, Nelsonville.

TENNESSEE.—Elder W. D. Jourdan, Sparta. John Coons, Sen'r Monroe: Amos Kirkpatrick, Meigsville: Doc. J. B. Sanders and Robt. Lochridge Columbia: Js. Shelton. Round-Lick: Elder James Y Green, Hurt's cross-roads: Elder And'w. Davis and John Davis, McMinville: Wm Hill, Readyville: Js Adams Stateville: Doc L. S. Davis, Syelbyville: Wm. Bell Gallatin: Griffith Cathey, Nixon's: Js. G Wilkinson, Bolivar: Col Robt Weakley. Nashville: Elder John M. Barnet, Waynesboro: Nicholas H Davis, Dandridge: Elder Jeriel Dodge, Jonesboro.

ALABAMA. Elders Js. E Matthews and Eph: D. Moore, Florence; Elder Wm I. Price, Doyal's mill; John Cawart, Bellefonte; Grant Taylor, Brownsboro; Maj Tho: Brandon, Huntsville; Joseph Griffin, Meredianville.

ILLINOIS—John R. Adams, Lawrenceville; Wm. Wilson, Palestine; P G. Kennett, Corrolton; Elder Austin Simms, Edwardsville; Nelson W. Nunnally, Paris.

VIRGINIA.—Parker Lucas, Giles' Court House; Samuel Bailey, and James Fittzpatrick, Abingdon; Elder Christy Sine, Back Creek Valley; Mich: Martz, Newmarket; Elder Robert M. Shankland, Estillville.

MARYLAND—John Miller, Western Port.

MISSOURI.—Philip Love, Fulton; Elder George Simms, Farmington; Elder Wm: McMurrey, Fredericktown; Js. J Tilton, Columbia; P G Rule, Union; Waddy T Curren, Fayette; Elder Joel H Haden, Franklin.

GEORGIA.—Elder John A. Hurst; Elder James Bays, Kellog's; Elder George L Smith, Social circle; Elder Jacob Callahan, Watkinsville; Elder Wm. McGauhy, Monroe.

SOUTH-CAROLINA.—Elder John L: Davis, Yorkville:
NORTH CAROLINA.—Hugh Parks, Charlotte:
PENNSYLVANIA.—Elder David Wallace, Waynesburg; Mark Stackhouse, Pittsburgh; Elder Peter T: Lashley, Springhall.

GENERAL AGENTS.

G. Vanouadal—Cincinnati.
Elder *Wm: D: Jourdon*—Monroe, West Tenn:
Wm Armstrong—Bloomington, Indiana.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
AT ONE DOLLAR (SPECIE,) PER ANNUM.
Postage paid by Subscribers.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,
AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."—PAUL.

VOL. II.] GEORGETOWN, KY. MARCH 1828. [No. 5.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONNECTICUT OBSERVER:—

SIR:—You must best know the object of the inquiry, "Has *Arminianism* changed its nature since the immortal EDWARDS thought it threatened unspeakable danger to the interests of piety?" But surely it would have been more consistent to have inquired, Has *Calvinism* changed its nature? I do not insinuate that it has, yet I know of nothing in the controversy on this subject, which gives the least countenance to such an inquiry, excepting it be the practice of Calvinists with regard to their doctrines.

It is well known that the time has been, when, if a preacher proclaimed the free agency of man, the universal atonement of Christ, and the general invitations of the gospel; if he urged sinners to pray, and exhorted them to a speedy return to the Lord, by repentance and faith, he was denounced as an *Arminian.* This "strain of preaching," as one of your own writers calls it, was rejected by Calvinists, who vehemently opposed to it the doctrines of decrees, foreordination, &c. In this opposition both ministers and people were active. And that they adhered closely to the Assembly's Catechism and the Saybrook Confession, is evident from the fact that their Scripture proofs were always those which are quoted in these works in support of those doctrines.

But is it so now? And, if not, in what does the difference consist?

The first thing that will strike the mind in this inquiry, is, that the "strain of preaching" which was once considered as *Arminian*, now "almost universally prevails." I have now before me an account of a very extensive revival of religion in the State of New-York, reported by an official committee, whose names give it the highest sanction. It is designed as a particular examination into the means of promoting a work of this kind, and the causes hastening its decline. And in

view of all circumstances, it must be admitted as an authorized example of a general course of proceeding among those who participated in it.

As causes of helping the work, during that revival, the reverend committee notice with interest that of "urging sinners to pray, and" they say, "sinners complied!" "Pressing the sinner's conscience, and encouraging him to a speedy return to Him from whom he had revolted;" and "avoiding all controversy, from a full conviction, that the first duties of a returning sinner were, repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." And among the causes hastening its decline, they mentioned that of "encouraging the sinner to linger, *by advising him to wait God's time.*" "This," they say, "takes for granted that the convicted sinner has done all his duty, has become reconciled, has submitted to God, and that God is now in fault for not having granted acceptance and relief. This is plainly laying all the blame on God, of the sinner's obstinacy."

This strain of sentiment would not, in former days, have passed without controversy. But it will be understood by most of your readers, that it is now common, especially in times of revival. About the difference, then, between the present and former times, we cannot be mistaken. It consists in having the peculiar points of the Calvinistic doctrine kept out of sight And it is only when these, particularly, are brought into view, that we hear complaints about "controversy," "disputations," &c.

The care that is taken to guard this point is evidence of the importance which is attached to it. In the narrative to which I have referred, and the address of the Presbytery who constituted the committee that reported it, we have a satisfactory exemplification of the nature of this policy. The language of the Presbytery is, "The time appears to have come when all intelligent Christians may see the impropriety of agitating minor points of sectarian difference, especially during seasons of religious revival. The spirit of revival is sure to fly before the spirit of controversy; and once secure that our ministers preach the essential truths of the gospel, we hesitate not to say, that the mere naming of minor differences at such seasons, any farther than strict necessity requires, is highly improper and criminal. We warn our members against it, by all the surpassing importance of saving a soul over that of gaining a proselyte." The same

kind of language is found in almost every page of the committee's report. Before the commencement of the revival in one place, they notice especially that the people "agreed to avoid all doctrinal disputation, and to attend to their own hearts;" but, in the sequel, "sectarian folly was evidently injurious to the awakening." Against such "folly," whatever it was, they utter, with great solemnity, the alarming denunciation, "We know that offences must come, but wo to every one by whom they come." In another place, "They had no doctrinal difficulties. They received the gospel of God without any doubtful disputations." And in another, the work "was not confined to any one denomination;" but, it is to be "remembered to the glory of God's grace, that a great *unity* of feeling and action pervaded the whole. There were scarcely any sectarian feelings or divided views manifested until the close of the whole work." And in a place where nearly one-fourth part of the population "were hopefully converted to God in four weeks," a little proselyting feeling killed the whole in a few days." On the whole, a principal cause of helping the work, was admitting "no perplexing inquiries, no doctrinal disputes;" "*avoiding all controversy—absolutely refusing to touch it.*" And its decline was hastened, especially by "doctrinal disputation, theoretical discussion, proselyting views of conversation," &c. Every possible effort, it appears from this narrative, was employed to inflame the minds of the people against any course of conduct to which they were instructed to apply these and similar expressions.

But it is worth while to know what that course of conduct was. As it was the same which now "almost universally prevails," I shall be understood when I say that any measures to bring into notice the peculiarities of Calvinism, and these only were denounced as "offensive attempts to draw the attention to doctrinal disputation." To have a correct view of it, let the reader form an idea of a neighbourhood under the influence of a religious excitement, where there are members of the different denominations, and the ministers of each are accustomed to labour. In the beginning he may perceive "great *unity* of feeling and action," "no *divided* views," "no doctrinal disputation," &c. But in this case he will perceive, too, that the distinctive features of Calvinism are not brought into view. The "strain of preaching," which occasions "no divided view," is of that kind which leaves these features out of sight.

So far all is peace. Next the people begin to think about joining a church. And, as a matter of course, those who feel the responsibility of so great an undertaking, will, if left to themselves, have some solicitude to know the doctrines of the donomination to which they think of attaching themselves. When once this question is agitated, if the articles of the Calvinistic creed are brought forward, the fire of contention commences. Every inflammable passion is roused into exercise. Teachers themselves evade direct inquiries respecting them, and often speak slightly of articles of faith altogether. The impression prevails, (not, however, without means,) such comparisons are made purely to injure the people who are reported as holding to these doctrines. And hence the merits of the subject are lost in the rage of passion before which the spirit of revival flies, for reasons which are obvious to every reflecting mind.

Such is exactly the case in question. Now if people would take into the account, that it is the rational duty of a minister to acquaint persons about to join a church, with the doctrinal differences of the several denominations, they would calmly attend to the subject, without any of these evil consequences. But this, it seems, will not do. For some cause or other, whatever else may be agitated with impunity, no one must call up the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism. If he does, like Elijah of old, he must be branded with troubling Israel. The people are gravely taught that the worst consequences result from "the *mere naming* of minor differences;" that it is, therefore, "highly improper and *criminal*." A venerable committee declares, with solemn solicitude, the pernicious results of "*turning the attention of awakened sinners to any thing besides the Bible.*" They "have known the reading of even Edwards on the Affections, though of unqualified excellence, totally discourage young Christians, and drive back again to the world some who were under convictions." With feelings alive to such events, and inflamed with such representations, the introduction of a book containing doctrines which, it appears, are not to be *named* at such times, may be easily made a matter of reproach. And in sober candor, I have never been able to see any other reason for all this systematic opposition against *books* and *doctrines* at such times, only to keep out of view the peculiarities of Calvinism. If the friends of this policy will only give a reason for it, and reconcile the denunciation of books of unqualified excellence,

and the introduction of doctrines which they affect to consider of vital importance, at the very time when people most need these aids, with the principles of propriety, it may be viewed in a most favourable light. But until this is done, the *haro* about "doctrinal disputation" and "proselyting conduct," can never be esteemed by deliberate observers in any other light than as a proselyting expedient itself.

But leaving this thought, it must be clear to every impartial observer, that the only appearance of a change in regard to this controversy, is to be found in the practice of Calvinists, as above described, of which the document to which I have alluded is but a single example.

PHILO-ADELPHOS.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE ARTICLE.

In the article above is a disclosure of facts, which we have long believed. Never, we think, did a revival of true religion, commence or progress under the preaching of Calvinism; but revivals have been checked and destroyed by introducing the peculiarities of that system. This we are glad to find, is the sentiment of a Presbytery of New-York; and is also, as we believe, the sentiment of those preachers in our country, under whose ministrations revivals are experienced. For the very doctrines and course, recommended by the committee of New-York, are mainly insisted on and pursued here. If those doctrines are considered dangerous and destructive to revivals, why should they ever be deemed necessary at any time? Why should they be at any time thought so important, as to be made terms of christiam fellowship? Why believe them and conceal them from public view, and preach what are deemed opposite doctrines?

The people in New-York are advised not to read books of controversy or of doctrine in times of a revival; the Bible is recommended as "the best and only book." Happy people! Should the revival continue, the Confession of Faith would be neglected, forgotten, and moth-eaten! Teachers in New-York, for the purpose of proselyting "often speak slightly of articles of faith altogether."—The same thing is acted here. We rejoice however that the gospel is preached, and its opposite, the Confession, is neglected. Amen.

EDITOR.

NEWS FROM IRELAND.

[CONTINUED.]

The remarks of the Rev. Mr. MONTGOMERY at the meeting of the Synod of Ulster, from which we gave copious extracts in our last paper, are continued in the present number. He proceeds to say:

"Were uniformity of faith, however *desirable*, (which to me seems exceedingly doubtful,) I am persuaded that creeds and confessions, and other "devices of men," are not the means adapted to produce it. The very churches which taunt us with our varieties or faith, and reproach us for permitting the disuse of our "ancient standards," have as great diversities of opinion in themselves as prevail amongst us. We might fairly turn upon them and say, "Physicians, heal yourselves!" It is as notorious as the sun at noon day, that the Established Church, at this very moment, is divided into two great parties of Arminians and Calvinists. I have seen a low Arian, if not Socinian work, written not many years ago, as I have been told and believe, by a dignitary of that church, turning the doctrine of the Trinity and Archbishop Magee's view of the atonement into contempt and ridicule in the most indecorous manner. And we all know, that from Tillotson down to the present age, many of the brightest ornaments of that church have wished that "she was well rid of the Athenasian creed." Do I mention these things from any invidious feeling towards the Established Church? By no means. I believe the clergy of that church to be a very respectable body of divines, many members of it are amongst my best friends, and some of the most pious Christians I ever knew were of its communion. But I consider the state of that church as a striking proof of my position, that uniformity of creed does not necessarily produce uniformity of faith. And when, on a previous day, I spoke of a few of the clergy as shewing themselves anxious about the dismissal of Mr. Porter from the clerkship, and interfering in the settlement of a Presbyterian congregation, I meant no reflection on the clergy of that church as a body. If some of them became "busybodies in other men's matters," I am convinced that ninety-nine out of one hundred of them would condemn such injudicious interference as much as I possibly could. But, whilst I thus express my respect towards the Established Church, I trust I shall be pardoned for not falling into that extreme courtesy (so common amongst us of late) which would exalt

her above the church to which I conscientiously belong. I should hold it disgraceful to continue a *Presbyterian*, if I preferred the doctrine, discipline, or worship, of *any* other church; and I freely confess, that I should place very little value upon a compliment from any man who told me that he considered *my* church superior to his *own*, whilst he remained in that which he disapproved.

"If we turn to the Church of Scotland it will not afford us much stronger proof of the efficacy of a uniform creed. There the Confession of Faith reigns in all its glory; yet, I have been told, (and I speak under the correction of Mr. Carlile,) that there is not on earth a body of men of more diversified religious sentiments than the ministers of the Church of Scotland. Nay, it has been more than hinted, that the very seats of learning are not free from heresy. Rumour tells a strange tale of a subscription scene in one of these venerable seminaries. When a professor was elected, who was pretty generally known not to be as orthodox as John Knox, the person who presented the Confession of Faith to him for signature, simply enough, asked him if he *believed it*? This, the learned gentleman very well knew, "was not in the bond." "You have nothing," said he, "to do with that: hand it here and I'll *sign it*." There may be persons who admire this mode of producing a uniform and orthodox faith; but to me it seems awful to think that a man would be excluded from the ministry, or any other office, for avowing the *truth*, who would be considered duly qualified for admission, by putting his solemn signature to a *lie!*

"I was wrong, however, in saying that there is no church in which uniformity is to be found. There is one, which, at least, boasts of being the same in every age, and clime, and country—the Catholic church. But are those who most strenuously press forward this Declaration, admirers of the beautiful uniformity of *that* church, and I suspect, that whilst some of them would not join me in my cordial wishes to see the benefits of the British Constitution extended to our Catholic countrymen, they will all unite with me in admitting, that the uniformity of the Catholic church powerfully tended to bring on "the gross darkness" of the middle ages, to retard the Reformation; to clog the wheels of science, and thereby to arrest the progress of civilization. The fact cannot be concealed; the uniformity of Catholicity has spread darknes over Spain and Italy; and the noxious weeds of Atheism and

Infidelity have sprung up under its shadow in the fair and fertile regions of France. This, however, in my mind, would have been the effect, though probably in a less degree, of any other system of faith which had attained equal power and extension; for it seems to be an ingredient in the nature of all churches to delight in the exercise of authority where they have power; and to follow, as a natural consequence of uniformity of faith, that inquiry should cease, and the independence of the mind be annihilated. The truth is, controversies and discussions, which can only arise from diversity of opinions, seem to be as necessary to preserve the knowledge and energy of religion, as the motion of the waves to purify the waters of the ocean; but the misfortune is, that in "the strife of words" the spirit of the Gospel is too frequently lost.

"I put it then to the Synod of Ulster, whether, in the pursuit of a shadow, a visionary uniformity, they will trample upon the right of private judgment, the very foundation of their church, and wilfully "lay a snare for the feet of weak brethren." A curse lies upon him "who causeth a brother to offend;" and I ask, is there a man in this house who does not believe, that if this Declaration be passed, some will assent to it with the lips, but not with the heart or with the mind? I beseech you to pause before you commit an act which must "cause some to fall." "Lay not the flattering unction to your souls," that the sin will lie solely at the door of him who shall make an insincere declaration. Every man who is concerned in passing it will be "a partaker in his sin." I can readily conceive what a struggle of nature there may be in many a heart, where the best feelings of humanity will be dragging the unhappy victim different ways. If he assent to a creed which he believes not, he is forever degraded in his own estimation; he shudders in the presence of his God. But he is a husband and a father, and if he resolve to put on the high, unbending port of a martyr, and to utter that which will make a bigoted multitude expel him from his congregation, what must be the conflict of his spirit! Unqualified for any other profession, perhaps in the wane of life, "to dig unable, and to beg ashamed," he sees, in prospect, his comfortable home made desolate, the partner of his bosom in tears, the children of his affection crying to him for that bread which he can no longer give! I ask any person, that has in his bosom "a heart of flesh," can he wonder if the

most powerful feelings of nature should overcome the stern commands of conscience? Can it create surprise if the unhappy man should say, "I will not leave HER desolate, whom, in the fond fidelity of my heart, I solemnly swore to protect; I will not leave the pledges of our love without the sustenance of nature, without the means of education. No: I will make this hateful Declaration; I will cast myself upon the mercy of Him who knows the pangs of my heart; I will wear my knees in secret prayer; I will wet my pillow with tears of penitence; and if all be too little to procure pardon for my offence, I may die without hope, but not without the consolation that I have sacrificed myself for objects dearer to me than life!" Oh! let us not call such a man a wretch, or a hypocrite; he is a husband and a father! Let us rather make the case our own, and not "cast a stumbling-block in his way." Let us not send him into that place from which nothing but the voice of sincerity and truth should ever be heard, with a heavy conscience and a falsehood upon his soul! If we do, his blood may be required of the authors of his crime.

"But it may be alleged that I underrate the firmness and virtue of our ministers. Possibly I may. And what is the reward proposed for those that will maintain their integrity? Why, you will kindly cast all the odium you can upon them in these fanatical times; you will distract their congregations, turn them adrift, if you can, and give them the charity of the world for their portion. But you will not have many thus to endow. Those may be courageous who are free from danger, and very upright, who have nothing to forfeit by their integrity. But I shall recall to your minds a passage in the history of a man with whom no individual here would dare to put himself in competition. I allude to the virtuous and illustrious Cranmer, the father of the Reformation in England. In the awful reign of Mary his love of life prevailed over his integrity, and he was induced to sign a paper condemning the Reformation. This sacrifice, however, did not save him; for, having degraded, they resolved to destroy him. Being led to the stake, and the devouring flames kindling around him, he stretched forth his right hand, and held it in the flames till it was consumed, repeatedly calling out in the midst of his sufferings, "O that unworthy hand!" Who then shall boast of the firmness of ordinary men, when he who was bold enough to rebuke the Eighth Henry, yielded for a season to his fears.

"There will, I admit, be a few honest men whom you may have the comfort and glory of exposing to inconvenience or injury. But your triumph will be very limited; for if you pass your test, I calculate that many will very soon perceive their errors. Amongst the first to rush forward to sign it, I suspect, will be a man who told me if worldly interest, and popular applause ran as high in favour of New-Light, as of Old-Light doctrines, he did not believe there would be above *half-a-dozen* Orthodox ministers in the Synod. This may be an erroneous estimate, but he is proud of being a particularly accurate man in his calculations. Next to him, in the race, will come, I should suppose, another eminent divine, who yesterday accused a better man than himself of blasphemy, but who has, nevertheless, a very comfortable idea of the compressible nature of a ministerial conscience, as I have heard him declare, "that he only required to know a minister's congregation, in order to tell his creed." Oh, what a pure body the Synod of Ulster will soon be, and how much of one mind, if you but give them a good confession!.

"But I have been told, that all this is proposed in pure kindness, in order to bring back the stray sheep into the true fold. This, I am bound to believe, is all true, as the principal promoters of the plan are, no doubt, superior to ordinary Christians. But whilst the *motive* may be approved, I must say the *means* seem but ill adapted to the end. There is a kind of resistance in human nature to the exercise of authority where no title to exercise it appears. There are some minds not very accessible to the logic of majorities, and which cannot comprehend the meaning of a threat from their equals. I tell you plainly and sincerely, if you think us in error, you must take other means to convert us. Uncharitable denunciations and unwarranted attempts to coerce our consciences, will rather wed us to our opinions. I shall venture to tell you a fable in proof of this position. In ancient times, as the *sun* and the *wind* were chattering together, they beheld a traveller passing over a plain with a cloak over his shoulders. Just for a frolic they laid a wager as to which of them could soonest deprive him of his cloak. The wind was to have the lead: and, mustering all his strength, he blew east and west, north and south, in the most violent and ingenious manner. But although the poor traveller was nearly blown down, he would not part with his cloak: the stronger the blast, he just wrapped it the more closely about him, and

held it with the more determined grasp. At length, the Wind exhausted himself with puffing, and gave up the task; when the Sun, who had retired behind a cloud, gently and gradually looked past the skirt of it upon the traveller, who held his cloak tightly for a while, remembering the rough usage he had experienced. But as the storm was past, and as the day became genial, he gradually relaxed his hold; the Sun put forth stronger beams; the cloak was thrown open; the traveller paused; the Sun poured forth the full tide of his splendor and his heat; the cloak gradually descended from the shoulders of the traveller, and he stood subdued and melted, in the glorious presence of the God of Day! The Wind is the fury of persecution: the Sun is the genial influence of Christian love. The cloak of error, if such there be, will only be held more tenaciously in the hurricane; but in the gentle calm of kindness, in the hour of friendly intercouse, it may be laid aside forever. There is a pride in the human heart which resists compulsion, though it will readily yield to love."

For the Christian Messenger.

Brother Stone,—Your answer to my inquiries, Vol. 1, No. 8, together with the address of Conference, to the Christian Churches in Kentucky, No. 6, were satisfactory; at least in a good degree. I confess I was not so well pleased with the reply of Bro: Philip, No. 12; but I thought it best not to answer him. In my opinion, his manner of writing is calculated to excite a spirit of controversy, which ought to be carefully avoided. While such a diversity of opinion exists, on the subjects treated in your work, if we are not well guarded, mischief will be done. As you are in a certain sense responsible, I hope you will be careful not to ingraft in your little books any root of bitterness, lest springing up it should trouble you. I had no intention of writing again, on the subject of my first communication, until I read the letter of Timothy, addressed to Prochorus, which seems to claim a deliberate examination. I shall not be particular, in considering the first proposition which Timothy states as my sentiment; viz: "That men are now specially called of God by the immediate suggestions of his Spirit to the gospel ministy;" because that sentiment is not expressed in my communication.

Bro: TIMOTHY reprobates the idea that men are now specially called of God to the gospel ministry, but concludes, "In a certain sense, it may be said, we are called of God to perform every religious duty, because our duty is pointed out to us in the gospel, which is the voice of God, or his Spirit." This is true, but the gospel teaches men to pray, and to believe that God will give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man, to profit withal." And I no more believe that it is the will of God, that his people should walk in darkness, or run uncertainly, or be destitute of his Spirit now, than it was in the Apostles' days. God does not designate individuals, or call men by name,—but if he has endued individuals with gifts and qualifications to preach, he requires of them the exercise of those gifts; and if they are faithful, they will earnestly pray to God, that they may know and be enabled to do his will; and he will hear and answer. And the call will be so far spiritual, that each one can say, "We is me if I preach not the gospel;" and it appears to me of small importance, whether he learns his Maker's will by immediate suggestion of the Spirit, or otherwise, provided he does it faithfully.

TIMOTHY inquires, "whether any were called to the gospel ministry who were not enabled by the Spirit to teach infallibly?" And whether they were not furnished with power to work miracles and to confirm their mission? The apostles and the seventy were thus furnished."

I answer: The seventy were not commissioned to preach the gospel in its full extent. The apostles were specially chosen to be Christ's witnesses; and although they taught agreeably to the scriptures then extant; yet as they were qualified and ordained for the special purpose of establishing the church of Christ and teaching the way and will of God more perfectly, and forming other scriptures for succeeding generations, it was indispensably necessary that they should be inspired to teach infallibly, and that God should confirm the word with signs following. Many others preached the gospel: no doubt they were called or sent of God; but I do not know that they were thus inspired, or that their doctrine was thus confirmed. Apollos was mighty in the scriptures; when Aquila and Priscilla heard him, no doubt, they discovered that he was a zealous good man, but in some points very deficient; they took pains to instruct him more perfectly. Paul instructed Timothy how and what to preach, and

to commit the things he had been taught to faithful men who should be able to teach others also; all of which would have been unnecessary, had they been inspired to teach infallibly. Jesus gave the words of his Father to his apostles. John XVII. 8. They have not only spoken but written; and what they have written is scripture. 2 Pet. III. 16. And the scripture cannot be broken. John x. 35. The word is the standard by which all doctrine must be proved. 1 Pet. IV. 11. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God. Isai VIII. 20. To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. So it is now, and so it has been always. Paul was forsaken of some who, I suppose, were once his faithful fellow laborers. Hymenius and Philetus erred from the truth. Men were fallible then as they are now. Yet we have the gospel treasure in earthern vessels; and it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. But the Bible is the standard, by which we may try them who say they are apostles.

The second proposition which TIMOTHY states as my sentiments, is correct; viz: That preachers now act under the commission given to the apostles. The substance of his objections, as contained in the first paragraph, appears to be—That if they act under the commission, Go ye into all the world, &c., they cannot with propriety be called bishops or overseers; that there were bishops ordained in every church; that their labors were chiefly confined to their respective churches; that the apostles had no particular charge, and went literally into all the world.

I answer: Preachers have their peculiar gifts. Some are evangelists and not bishops; they travel and preach extensively, but have not a talent for the exercise of discipline. Nor do I know that bishops or elders were ordained in every church. It is said of Paul & Barnabas, Acts XIV. 23. "When they had ordained them elders in every church," &c.; but from the context, "every church" there meant must be, those at Lystra, Antioch and Iconium. In Paul's epistles to the churches, he only speaks of bishops as belonging to one of them: viz: at Phillippi. He gives instructions to Timothy and Titus on the subject of ordaining elders; and particularly defines their qualifications: "If any be blameless," &c. Of course, if in any church men were not found possessing those qualifications, none were ordained. In some churches then,

as it is now, there might be a plurality: in others none; and the same person or persons might have the oversight of several churches. And with respect to the labors of bishops being chiefly confined to their respective churches, I believe every one ought to labor to the extent of his ability and opportunity. We see some bishops now, who have the pastoral care of some particular church or churches, preaching extensively and profitably; and generally when a preacher settles down and chiefly confines his labors to a particular church, he is of little use; death ensues both to himself and to the people. Again: that the apostles went literally into all the world and preached the gospel to every creature, I do not believe. Their sound went—their words unto the ends of the world. But they committed them to others, and those to others, and when these passed from the stage, others filled their place, and thus their sound is yet going and their words have reached us in these ends of the world; and all under the same commission, which is only limited by the extent of the world, and the end of it, or of time:—take notice, "I am with you always," &c. Preaching is the means of God's appointment for the salvation of men, [1 Cor. i. 21.] as well and as much in one age as another. One and but one commission is given: those to whom it does not extend have no authority from God, as I can see, but it embraces all gospel preachers in every age and every country; and every one is authorized to preach the gospel to every creature, to the extent of his apportunity. "No prophecy of the scriptures is of any private interpretation."

Was it not that it would swell this letter to an undue size I might shew that Christ and his apostles always made a general and unrestricted use and application of the scriptures. The contrary practice is fraught with evil. By limiting the commission to the apostles—the instructions to Timothy and Titus to them specially—the epistles to the churches to those to whom they are inscribed—the consequence is, that both preachers and people now are left without a lamp to their path or a ground of confidence.

Some discard the office of a gospel ministry, and deny the authority of the eldership or church to ordain preachers or judge of their qualifications, yet that any one who is capable has a right to teach and baptize. For my own part, I believe Jesus intended there should be a gospel ministry while sinners inhabited the earth; that they are called of God—

watchmen who shall never hold their peace day nor night; that their sufficiency is of God, "Who hath made us able ministers of the New Testament." 2 Cor. iii. 6. They go at his command; they rely on his promise, "Lo I am with you," &c. They pray for his Spirit that they may preach the word in demonstration of the Spirit and with power. They build on the foundation of the apostles and prophets; believing that they were inspired to teach infallibly they receive their word, not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God. I believe the instruction given to Timothy, Titus, &c., is scripture given by inspiration of God, profitable for doctrine, &c.; that it is the word of God which liveth and abideth forever, by which we are to be governed and learn our duty. The preacher is not to depend on miracles to prove his doctrine, but, "Holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine to exhort and convince the gainsayers." Tit. i. 9.

I shall notice more particularly the last inquiries of Bro. Timothy.

1. If preachers now act under the same commission, ought they not literally to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature as did the apostles? And expect the same divine aid and perform the same divine works?

Answer. They do go as literally; they are going in Europe, Asia, Africa and America. No one man or twelve men ever did go into half the world, or in their own persons preach to one tenth part of the creatures, but the world is their stage and many are running to and fro. They preach the word and like Appolles prove from the scriptures that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. They expect divine aid, and as to divine or miraculous works, The Lord do what seemeth him good.

2. The apostles were lawgivers. Have not ministers now the same right of lawmaking? Answer. The apostles taught God's commandments, and so ought preachers to do now—authoritatively too, as written in the Bible.

Lastly. If so—The Pope has assumed nothing? Answer. Whatever he inculcates more than God has taught, by his apostles and prophets, and Jesus Christ himself the chief corner stone, he has assumed. The word is the grand criterion.

I have written as briefly as I could. May God guide us into the truth. Let all our things be done with charity.

DAVID PURVIANCE.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM A FRIEND,

Dated February 1st, 1828.

DEAR SIR,—I take my pen in great haste to inform you that on yesterday I returned from Paris, where I preached on Wednesday evening. The good work is still going on, and the prospect, I think, a glorious one. Persecution rages higher against us there at this time, than I have ever known it in any part of Kentucky, yea *even* in Georgetown. As a specimen I send you a pamphlet of a most scurrilous and abusive character. It was published in Paris 1821, but recently brought to light, and now circulating in great numbers in town. They go so far as to send little negroes around to throw them into people's doors.

The pamphlet sent me by my friend was, AN ANSWER to the question "Why do you not go to the Unitarian Church?"

In reading the preface or Advertisement, we soon discovered that our friend had judged rightly in saying that the pamphlet was of a most scurrilous and abusive character. In reference to us the author says, "Entreaty, remonstrance, and refutation have been resorted to in vain, with western heresiarchs. Perseverance and hardihood are their prominent characteristics, blended with great profusions of charity, and of the humble christian spirit. It is time to lay aside all tampering, and to expose their hypocrisy, their errors and true character."—

We wish to make a few friendly remarks on those passages of the pamphlet, in which we are implicated. With regard to *Unitarians*, *Unitarian books*, and *Unitarian churches*, we have nothing more to do, than with other sectarian names, books, and churches. We have heard of but one Unitarian church in the West, and that is in Pittsburgh. There may be more unknown to us. They may defend themselves.

It is very common for our enemies to rank us among Socinians, Arians, and Unitarians of every grade, even with Mohomedans and Infidels, and to palm their notions, however extravagant and false, upon us. Why do they act thus? Because we deny the orthodox notions of a few doctrines which are thought by them essential and fundamental; or in other words, because we believe there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father. To crush us, and to exalt themselves, we doubt not, is their ultimate aim. It is a wonder to us that they do not yet see how vain and injurious are their attempts!

Were we to act towards Trinitarians as they do towards us, what a horrid picture we could draw of Trinitarianism—We could introduce the jargon of the Athanasian creed—the absurdities of Ambrose—the notions of Baxter—the contradictions of modern as well as ancient teachers—We could introduce the writings and opinions of some Trinitarians, virtually to prove the existence of three equal independent Gods—of others who virtually deny the existence of any God by representing the Father, Son and Spirit as mere modes or attributes; or as three *distinctions*, without attaching any idea to the term; indeed professing not to understand it.—Would the author of this pamphlet like to be ranked among such a group of Trinitarians? We think it would be ungenerous in us to do it, unless he avowed their notions.

The author of the pamphlet, for reasons unknown to us, has concealed his real name; yet we claim the right of a Yankee to *guess*. We shall for brevity's sake call him Mr. M.

Mr. M. p. 7, represents us as setting aside the articles of others as found in their creeds with respect to the Son of God, and giving our own Creed in our whole book, entitled Address 2nd Edition. This is acknowledged. But have we given this as authoritative and binding on any one? Have we bound ourselves by it? Whatever an honest man writes or speaks as his own, is his creed; that is, he believes what he writes or speaks to be true. This vastly differs from Mr. M. and his creed—he is bound to believe it, or be excluded from his church as a heretic. We have heard from respectable authority that since this publication, his own mind is vacillating on the subject of Creeds. This may not be correct information, yet we should not wonder were it true; for we have long thought that those *infallible substitutes* for an *infallible Pope*, must fly as dark clouds before the increasing light of gospel truth.

In p. 8, Mr. M. represents us as wolves in sheep's clothing, making fair professsions of charity, and yet excluding poor Calvinists from our charity, and consigning them to perdition. He then introduces as a specimen a passage from our Address 2nd Edition, pa. 8 & 18. "*Mytery* is one of the names of the whore of Babylon, written in large letters on her forehead. Her daughters have the same mark. Rev. 17.

Charity would hold my pen from writing this, yet truth convinces her it is expedient." In the language of Pilate we reply, "What I have written I have written," nor can we with a good conscience retract from the sentiment. We have long been convinced that many, very many of God's dear people of every name are and long have been in *Mystery Babylon;* and this conviction we have received from the word of God, who says "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev. xviii. 4. If they were not in Babylon, why call upon them to come out of her? Of this subject we have already written in some of our latter numbers, to which we refer those who wish information. Can it be a breach of charity to shew them their real standing, and warn them of the danger to which they are exposed? Or is it charity to see my friend on the verge of ruin and be silent, not warning him of his danger, lest I rouse his angry passions against me? Do not all acknowledge the the Church of Rome to be the mother of harlots? Can they deny that the reformed churches so called are her daughters? Did not the churches of the reformation receive the mysteries of trinity &c. from the old mother, when they dissented and broke from her? And are not those mysteries handed down to the present generation as the sacred truths of heaven?—If the various sects be not the daughters of the old mother, we would wish to know who are the daughters? In less than fifty years we presume there will be no difficulty in answering the question.

Mr. M. notices us again, p. 10. "Unitarians are in the habit of misrepresenting the views of Trinitarians and charging upon them sentiments which they disavow; for instance that they mingle in their devotions *a God the Father, a God the Son, and a God the Holy Ghost*," &c., and that they worship more Gods than one; and hold that God suffered," &c. Among other authorities to prove these assertions he refers to Stone's Address, p. 16. But on this page there is nothing said of worshipping more Gods than one—yet we did assert and plainly prove from the Creeds of Presbyterians and Methodists that they hold that God did suffer. We quoted these creeds verbatim, one which is in these words, "The Son of God who is the word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and the manhood were joined together in one person never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, *who truly suffered*, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us." Meth. Dis. Art. 2, Conf. Fth. chap. 8, sec. 2. See also Lar. Cat. Q. 36 and 37, Shor. Cat. Q. 27. Should any wish farther information on this point, we refer them to our Address pa. 13–17, and to our Letters to Doc. Blythe pa. 68–70. Can we misrepresent their doctrine *that God suffered*, when we hear them singing so frequently such songs as these?—

When God, the mighty maker died
For man, the creature's sin.

O the sweet wonders of the cross
Where God, the Savior loved and died.

The eternal God comes down and bleeds
To nourish dying worms, &c.

If they are ashamed of the doctrines, that God was born of a woman, suffered and died on the cross, why not expunge them from their Creeds, and books of devotion? This would certainly better comport with the Christian character, than to accuse honest men of the crime of misrepresentation, when they present the doctrine in the very words of their Creeds.

Mr. M. proceeds p. 10,—"At the Unitarian church I have no rational and safe way of approaching unto a righteous and holy God, and no assurance that he will accept my worship. There is no surety, or Mediator there held forth, that I can trust myself with—no blood or sacrifice to give peace to my conscience, which tells me in God's name I must meet with him in wrath, unless I find an almighty surety to bear off that wrath from me. This also the scriptures teach me,—"without shedding of blood there is no remission." of sins. Heb. xi. 22. "Cursed is every one which continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." Gall. iii. 10.

To whom Mr. M. may particularly refer we cannot say, being conscious that his remarks do not all apply to us. We always hold up Christ as the way to the Father,—and the faithful promises of God as the best assurance of our acceptance. Has he a better way? Has he better assurance? We hold forth Jesus as the surety of the better testament, and the Mediator between God and man. It is true that we attach different ideas to the suretyship of Christ than Mr. M.

does, or his Confession. Their ideas are that the sinner is indebted to law perfect obedience to all its precepts, and the suffering of death as the penalty for the breach of it—that the law demands the payment—which the sinner is unable to pay—that Jesus steps in as surety, and engages to pay the debt for him—Christ as surety in the room and stead of the sinner fulfilled the precepts of the law, which they call his active obedience, and suffered the penalty of the law, which they call his passive obedience. This active and passive obedience they call the righteousness of Christ, which they teach is imputed or reckoned to the sinner for justification and acceptance. This we know is considered by Calvinists the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, and they who deny it are denounced as damnable heretics. We have read the scriptures. We have read them untramelled by human creeds, and unawed by the fear of man. We fearlessly say that this doctrine, however important in the view of orthodoxy, is not contained in the word of God. No where in that book is Christ called the surety of man, whether elect or non-elect—No where in the Bible do we read of the imputed righteousness of Christ—No where in the Bible do we read of Christ paying our debt of obedience to law, or of our debt of suffering to justice. These are the doctrines of men, and not of God. If we err, we hope the pen of charity and wisdom will correct the error.

The term surety is applied to Christ but once in the Bible. Heb. VII. 22. "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better Testament." This vastly differs from the *orthodox* idea of his being the surety of man. God gave the testament or covenant to man, and Jesus became the surety of it to man. A gives to B a promissory note of $1000 payable at a specified time—to confirm B's mind that the money shall be sure at the time, C becomes A's surety,—So Christ is God's surety that his promises are certain. Hence it is said "he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week."—This he did by all the wonders of his life death and resurrection, and thus, was he the surety or confirmer of the covenant.

As to the sacrifice and blood of Christ, we attribute to them all the virtue and power attributed to them in the Bible; but we dare not go farther, as Mr. M. and the orthodox have done, in declaring that they satisfied the justice of God, and purchased his grace for lost sinners. These things we shall

believe when scripture proof is given, but till then we cannot.

Mr. M. says pa. 13, "Satisfaction for sin by a vicarious atonement is denied alike by Infidels and Unitarians—They not only agree in rejecting this scriptural and Calvinistic ground of pardon and peace with God, but they also agree in making *repaentance* and the mercy of God the ground." He them makes a lengthy extract from our Address p. 64, to which we invite the serious attention of every reader, and then will ask him, can he deny one doctrine there advanced? We boldly say, he cannot on Bible principles.

Mr. M. informs us that "satisfaction for sin by a vicarious atonement is the scriptural and Calvinistic ground of pardon and peace with God." The expression to us appears awkward—"satisfaction for sin by a vicarious *atonement*," or satisfaction, for so Calvinists define the word *atonement*.—This we acknowledge to be the ground of Calvinistic pardon, but we deny it to be the scriptural ground; and again call for proof. It is easier to affirm than prove; and with the populars one bold assertion, oiled with a few awful anathemas, will make void scores of scriptural arguments, with the credulous part of mankind. Will men never think that calvinistic satisfaction excludes the very idea of pardon? We read of a king who would take an account of his servants—one owes him 10,000 talents, and is unable to pay it. The king demands payment—law and justice demand it, for the debt is lawful and just.—He is perfectly insolvent. The king commands him to be sold, with his wife and children—poor wretch! what shall be done?—Let the Calvinist speak. He says the debt must be paid, and thus the demands of law and justice be satisfied perfectly, completely and fully. This he asserts is the only ground of pardon. We suppose a rich man moved with pity for the poor distressed debtor, approaches the king, and pays him the full sum in the debtor's stead. Should the king then address the released debtor and say, Now, sir, I forgive you—Would he speak truth? Is there any forgiveness, when the debt is paid? Could the debtor thank him, or feel any obligation to him? But let the calvinest say, Is not the debtor, though free from obligations to the king, still in debt to his surety who paid the king for him? This cannot be denied. Law and justice demand the payment to the surety. They must be satisfied by the debtor or by another surety, seeing on this ground alone

pardon can be granted. On this principle, it is easy to see there can be no pardon forever.

Let us now see the method of pardon, as taught by the great Teacher that came down from heaven. Matt. xviii. 21——"Then came Peter to him and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, until seventy times seven. Therefore is the kingdom of heaven, likened unto a certain king, which would take an account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him 10,000 talents," &c. It is evident that the Savior introduced this parable to shew the proper ground and method of forgiving sins. Peter must forgive his brother seventy times seven—Upon what grounds? "If thy brother repent forgive him." Our Lord shews from the parable that this was God's plan of forgiveness in the kingdom of heaven or gospel dispensation. He is the king—the debtors are the world of sinners—the penitent are forgiven, frankly forgiven without the payment of the debt by himself or any surety. How different this from Mr. M's plan! We are taught to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us," &c.

Should we be asked, What produces that repentance with which pardon is always connected? We answer in the language of inspiration, "The goodness of God leadeth to repentance." If we are asked, "Where is the goodness of God seen? We answer; In Christ Jesus; for in the gift, the life, the death, the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, the goodness, grace and love of God to the world, are seen in the brightest colors.—"They shall look on him whom they have pierced and mourn."

Mr. M. introduces some Deists, who have opposed his Calvinistic ground of forgiveness, his distinguishing article of Christianity. What follows? They must be wrong, and all that oppose the same doctrines must be wrong. Does Mr. M. reject every doctrine uttered by a deist? If so; he must reject the being and perfections of God—and many moral virtues which they have published. We believe the true information given by them is derived from the Bible, and we dare not reject truth wherever found. It is not strange that deists should see the absurdity of Mr. M's ground of pardon, and declare against it.—We may hereafter notice a few more particulars of the pamphlet. EDITOR.

Harrodsburg, Jan. 20th, 1828.

Brother Stone,—As the "Christian Messenger" is a medium through which religious intelligence is communicated to the world; and supposing your patrons delighted to hear of the spread and success of the pure, simple truth of the gospel of Christ, uncontaminated by *human creeds* and *party-names*, I shall give a concise account of the spread of truth in this section of country.

In August last, I visited the brethren in this section, and found them destitute of a preacher, and consequently in a cold, lifeless situation. Many had become discouraged, and almost given over trying to live for God; some had become tired of the yoke and name of Christ, and had joined other churches; others were determined to live and die contending "for the faith once delivered to the saints," though they should be laughed at and persecuted by the high-toned partisans around. I preached among them about two weeks, in which time 23 souls were added to the church. In Sept: I removed to the neighborhood, and took the oversight of the church at Mud meeting house. Since my settling here, I have baptized about 40 persons. The good work is still going on. It is slow, but progressive. There is no particular excitement among the people, but I hope the work is permanent. They appear to count the cost, to dig deep, and build upon the sure foundation. The brethren are all in love and peace; and by their holy walk and pious conversation recommend the religion of love, peace and union to all, with whom they are conversant.

I have just returned from Hillborough, Washington county, where I preach once a month. The excitement among the people there is great. Our congregations are large and respectable. And there are many, very many earnestly inquiring "What shall we do to be saved?" I exhort them as Peter did the people on the day of Pentecost, "To reform and be immersed into the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins, and they shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

May the good cause of Jesus still advance, till every thing incompatible with the genius and design of the religion of love may be destroyed; when christians, unknown by party-names, and untrammeled by human creeds, shall all walk together in peace and union, bound for the same promised land of eternal rest. Amen. B. F. HALL.

The Tenth Annual Christian Conference, on the Wabash, met at Bethsaida, Oct. 16th, 1827.

Elder John M'Crary was chosen *Moderator*, and Joshua Lindsey, *Clerk*.

Elders present—John M'Crary, Henry D. Palmer, Joseph Wassan, James Pool, James Moutray, and David M'Gahey.

Unordained preacher present—Joseph Ballard.

Exhorters present—William Blanchard, John Boren, and Benjamin Wiers.

Letters of Correspondence from the following Churches were received and read:—*Union, Bussorun, Liberty, Grand-prairie, Bethsaida, Springhill, Philadelphia, Village-prairie, Barney's-prairie, Coffee, Allison-prairie.* (A few Churches within the bounds of this Conference were not represented.)

Conference proceeded to open a door for the reception of members.

Elder Joshua Lindsey was received by letter. Brother Moses P. Conduit was received, and a presbytery appointed to ordain him to the Eldership. Brother Samuel Abbott was received and licensed to exhort. Brethren James Y. Baird and William Blanchard were licensed to preach.

Unanimously agreed, That the preachers of this Conference *carefully* impress on our Churches, the necessity of *a strict adherence to Gospel Discipline*, and of *a punctual attendance at our Church-meetings*

Unanimously agreed, That this Conference still adhere to a former minute, relating to the propriety of there being "A General Christian Conference established at some convenient place in the Western States, in which all the Christian Conferences in those States should be represented."

Agreed, That our next Conference be holden at Springhill, (Lawrence county, Ill.) on Wednesday before the second Lord's day of Oct. 1828, beginning at 10 o'clock, A. M.

JOHN M'CRARY, *Moderator*.

John Lindsey, *Clerk*.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ELDER JOHN SECREST TO THE EDITOR.

"The work of the Lord is going on in this country (Belmont and the adjacent counties, Ohio.) hundreds of souls are inquiring for truth. Partyism and sectarianism are fast falling, and the gospel of the Son of God is gaining ground. We have immersed some hundreds this summer past. It is no uncommon thing for 30 or 40 to profess faith in the Son of God at one meeting, and numbers are baptized in a day. I baptized as many as 65 at one meeting.

Farewell, JOHN SECREST."

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." PAUL.

VOL. II.] GEORGETOWN, KY. APRIL 1828. [No. 6.

NEWS FROM IRELAND

The following extract is the conclusion of Mr. Montgomery's Speech before the Synod of Ulster.

"I see, on the other side of the house, a gentleman who has long been a leading member of this body, and who has lately distinguished himself both from the pulpit and the press. I refer to my friend Mr. Stewart, whose sermon in defence of Orthodoxy I hold in my hand. In the preface to this discourse he tells the world, what I knew long ago, that he was first a Calvinist in his boyhood, that he was afterwards very sceptical on the doctrine of the trinity, and that it was only in the year 1825 he turned his attention to the Bible to see if it contained what he *now* calls the fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, which, unless a man believe, he is on the very verge of Atheism. Now, had the proposed declaration been brought forward in 1824, Mr. Stewart, as an honest man, could not have signed it. He might then have been cut off as a "rotten branch," and that very act of severity would, in all likelihood, have confirmed him in error. But see the happy consequence of kindness and moderation! He who might have continued an Arian, a Heretic, a Semi-Atheist, peculiarly dangerous on account of his talents, is now the zealous champion of orthodoxy, and one of the powerful enemies of Catholic error! What *has* been, *may* be. In two years, if you do not "lop us off," Mr. Porter, or myself, may be edifying the world with dissertations against our present opinions!

"But consider further, if you pass this declaration, you must extend it to probationers as well as ministers. Now, you tell the people that they have a right to choose their own pastors: but if they should not like a Calvinist, where are they to procure a teacher? I presume they must either submit to your dictation, or remain without a minister, which