ten. He took up our cause while it lay shivering on the ground, and to use the words of Gray,

"Ope'd its young eye to bear the blaze of greatness."

In fact, religious liberty was his favorite theme; and when he dwelt upon it, his periods rolled with more than his ordinary magnificence. How greatly did the nephew yesterday bring the uncle before all of us who remembered him! I have great pleasure to say, that when the Catholic Relief Bill was pending in 1791, Mr Pitt exerted all his powers in our cause. You know what favorites we were with Mr. Burke: how Mr. Wyndham spoke of us· that a wish for our emancipation was breathed in the last word uttered by Mr. Grattan. What men were these! How great is their authority!

I am sure, that yesterday, whenever the Duke of Wellington's great and glorious victory at Waterloo, and our hopes of him, were mentioned, it brought to your mind the oration for Marcellus, in which Cicero shows so admirably how greatly a general shares his triumphs with his officers and his soldiers, but that a deed of clemency is all his own. Should not his Grace—should not his Grace's friends—sometimes think of this?

I had the pleasure to sit next to our common friend, Dr. Thomas Rees. May God bless you both! Though we now pray in different churches, may we—may all that joined us yesterday—meet in the tabernacles of heaven, and sing the praises of the Almighty, and bless his holy name through all eternity!

Excuse my taking this liberty, and believe me, with the most heartfelt thanks to you and your friends, for your celestial deeds of yesterday, your and their most obliged and most obedient Servant, CHARLES BUTLER.

Lincoln's Inn, June 19.

Elder Js. McVey writes to the Editor that the religious prospects are good in Baltimore, and especially in Brookville, 30 miles from the city. In this place he has baptized a goodly number.

Elder Christy Sine, of Va. also writes, that there is a considerable revival in his bounds—that since July he has baptized 46, who professed to be born again, and that other Elders, in those parts, had baptized about as many more.

We promised, in our last, to give a particular account of the secession of Methodists in England. We have not room.

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: 3.] GEO: TOWN, K. FEB. 1829. [No. 4

From the Christian Register.

REV. MR. MONTGOMERY'S SPEECH.

We continue our extracts from Mr. Montgomery's speech before the Synod of Ulster.

One argument (continues Mr. Montgomery,) much relied upon by our opponents is, that every society has a right to make laws for the government of its own members, and for the admission of others to its privileges. There is some plausibility, but no solidity in this. No society has any right to make a subsequent law in violation of a previous compact. Now, the projected overture would be a direct infringement of those liberal regulations under which we entered the Synod of Ulster; and if you take from us any power or privilege which we then enjoyed, you are guilty of a gross breach of faith. So much for your power of making laws affecting those already in your body: and now a few words respecting those who claim admission. On this point I assert that you have no power to make any laws, but such as are in accordance with the clear and express word of God. The Lord Jesus Christ is the King of his Church, the Bible is its constitution, and we are subjects bound to obey the laws of his kingdom. Our sole business, therefore, is, to regulate our conduct by the laws contained in the Statute-book; for it is evident that we have no right to alter any law, either to benefit ourselves or to injure others. Upon this principle I shall amply prove, that you have no right to refuse admission to any individual of sufficient attainments, and irreproachable life, who holds such religious opinions as I entertain. "To the law and to the testimony," I bring the matter for trial; and I refer you to the Acts of the Apostles, viii. chapter and 37th verse. You will there find the terms on which the Ethiopian was admitted to baptism by the Apos-

tle Philip. "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized: and he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God:* and Philip baptized him." Now, does not every Arian believe this with all his heart, and will you dare to refuse admission into the Synod of Ulster to men who would have been admitted to the holy ordinance of baptism by an inspired follower of the Lord? I refer you farther to the 1st Epistle of John, iv. chapter, where you will find explained the manner in which we are to *try* the spirits of men. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come into the world." But where is the Arian who does not most joyfully and most gratefully confess that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh! Yet, in direct opposition to God's word, and to their own knowledge, some of our brethren have had the hardihood to brand us in a public journal with the appellation of "Antichrists, and Men of Sin." I now call upon those ministers, and that journal to retract the groundless calumny which they have circulated against men, to say the least, as respectable and as Christian as themselves! I shall only refer to one passage more, (though I might easily multiply quotations,) to prove that, according to Scripture, we are entitled to the same privileges as any other member of this church. The passage is 1 John iv. 15: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." Could language be stronger than this? And yet, although holding my opinions, solemnly *confessing that Jesus is the Son of God*, the Spirit of God may dwell in me to enlighten my understanding and sanctify my heart. Mr. Elder and Mr. Dill have the modesty and good feelings to allege, that I am not holy enough to associate with *them!* I put it to you, "fathers and brethren," is it honest, is it seemly, is it Christian in you, to prescribe stricter terms of communion than those appointed by the Spirit of God, or to put men to inconvenience for maintaining opinions which would have ganied them free admission into the churches of the apostles?

But it has been asked by Mr. Morell, "Where shall we

stop? Shall we admit all professing Christians, Socinians, Catholics, &c.?" I answer: We should just stop with our guide,—with the Holy Scriptures. If we go one step farther, we shall be involved in the mazes of conjecture; and, endeavoring "to become wise above what is written," we shall be lost in endless perplexity and doubt. Upon this ground I would refuse to hold communion with those churches that have "decreed rites and ceremonies" not prescribed in the word of God; because these are "the inventions of men," and I know that woe is denounced upon those who add to the Scriptures or detract from them.

* * * * * * * * *

Mr. Barnett has inquired in the language of Scripture, "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" I would just ask him, "Agreed in what?" Is it in faith, in all the shades of doctrinal opinions, and in all their views of church government? If this be his interpretation of the text, I would advise him instantly to leave that orthodox seat in which he is now sitting; for there is not in it a single man who, in all points, agrees with him; nor probably any two that agree with each other. Surely, then, the agreement required cannot be Mr. Barnett's visionary one, but a real, practicable unity; a unity of kind affections and forbearance; a unity of design to promote the glory of God and the salvation of sinners. I admit, however, that there is a very powerful bond of union amongst our opponents, in one sense. They have agreed to lay aside all their own points of disputation for a season, and to concentrate their forces for a joint effort against the unfortunate Arians. Dr. Wright, although he says, "it cuts him to the heart to think that there is an Arminian in this Synod," nevertheless joins "hand in hand" with Mr. Johnson and other known Arminians, to make war upon the common enemy. This shews great prudence. The Goths and Vandals of old united in over-running Italy, and when they had accomplished their primary design, they fought with each other for the spoil. So will it be with you; when you have suddued us, you can turn your arms against one another to prevent them from rusting through inaction; and in the end we may have many divisions.

There is one consideration which I would most earnestly and solemnly press upon you, my brethren, on the opposite side; and I think I shall not press it in vain. You all admit that you are fallible and sinful as individuals; and you ad-

mit, that no possible combination of fallibles could make an infallible: for although, in chemistry, amalgamation frequently changes the nature of substances, yet in church courts, I believe it will be found that the mass will partake of the same properties as the different ingredients which compose it. Is it not then possible, with all your confidence in the soundness of your own conclusions, that you *may be wrong*; that you may, at this moment, be giving all the weight of your influence to perpetuate *error;* and that "haply you may be fighting against God," at whose tribunal you will one day be answerable for the measures which you are now taking to arrest the progress of the truth! If this be *possible*, if, from the nature of man, it be exceedingly *probable*, I do beseech you for your own sakes, and ours, to follow the advice of Gamaliel: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this work and this counsel be of men, it will come to nought; but if be of God, you cannot prevail against it." It sounds very well to talk of "supporting the cause of God and truth;" but you should remember, that this is taking for granted the very subject of dispute, viz. whether truth really *be* on your side. If it be, God will sustain his own cause, without such violent efforts on your parts. The mole that raised a hillock to support a fortress was less presumptuous than men, when they speak familiarly of protecting the cause of Heaven. I entreat you rather to attend to the great Christian principle "of doing unto others as you would they should do unto you." Now, suppose that at this moment the majority of this Synod were Arians, and that the tide of popular feeling was flowing as strongly in their favor as it is now doing in yours; I ask, would these circumstances convince you that you were in error? No such thing: you would be then as satisfied of the truth of your opinions as you are at this moment. How then would you feel were we to take such steps as you are now pursuing, to eradicate your opinions, to fill your pulpits with Arian ministers, to expose conscientious Calvinists to inconvenience, and to prevent any orthodox young man from receiving licence to preach? Would not the whole kingdom resound with the voice of your just complaint and indignation? All we ask, then, is even handed justice: let our opinions have fair play; let young men be licensed with their true characters, and let the people choose or reject them as they think it right.

There is nothing more remarkable than the direct opposition which often exists between the words and the actions of men. This contrast is peculiarly manifested in religion. The right of private judgment is a pleasing and fertile theme at controversial meetings, and at Bible Societies, where all sects meet together, as they ought to do. But let the declaimers come into another situation, and the very right which they so strenuously pressed upon Catholics, they will deny to Protestants; and the Bible which they put into men's hands, without note or comment, they will declare to be inadequate to lead them to salvation, unless they adopt their views of its doctrines. In the same manner they speak most humbly of themselves, declaim about the weakness and fallibility of man, and then act in a way which nothing but immediate inspiration could justify. I have been led to these observations by a statement of Mr. Barnett, who said that he would admit no man to the Lord's table that did not think as *he* did on doctrinal subjects. I never heard any sentiment with more pain. If Mr. Barnett be, as he will freely admit that he is, a fallible and sinful man, I would sincerely ask him, how he dares to stand between any man and his Redeemer, and to render his opinions the standard by which to measure all who desire to become "soldiers of the cross"? It may be, in this uncertain world, that an individual rejected for no moral offence, but simply for supposed error of opinion, should never have another opportunity of testifying his faith and his love by a devout communion; and I do appeal to Mr. B. whether he can altogether enjoy the approbation of his own mind in reflecting, that he has prevented an individual so circumstanced, from strengthening his hope, confirming his repentance, and perhaps, closing his eyes in peace!

Mr. Cook says, "we should all wear the same livery."—Now, I hate livery, because it is a badge of subjection to man. The livery of sects creates as much disturbance as the livery of parties. And, after all, outward conformity by no means implies internal resemblance. Even externally, however, Mr. Cooke's friends will wear but a motley aspect: the collar, and perhaps the sleeves of their liverymay be the same; but the body and the skirts will be as patched and diversified as the pantaloons of harlequin. Stern Calvanism, moderate Calvanism, Arianism, and many fainter shades of difference, never can present a uniform appearance. Variety, indeed, is the immutable law of nature. If we cast our eyes

over this fair earth which we inhabit, how beautifully is it diversified with hill and dale, with lakes and plains, with oceans and continents, with woods and rivers, with the wilderness of nature and the richness of cultivation! In all the extended surface presented to the eye, we cannot find two trees, two animals, nor even two blades of grass, exactly alike.—And if we turn to the beautiful conopy of Heaven, we perceive that "one star differeth from another star in glory."—When I look aronnd upon this assembly, and contemplate the "human face divine," I see the same principle amply recognized in the infinite diversity of features, expression, and intelligence, presented to my view. And, could I penetrate the hearts, and enter the secret recesses of the minds by which I am surrounded, what an endless variety of emotions, and passions, and opinions, should I behold! To attempt, therefore, by human legislation, to produce an absolute agreement in religious sentiments, would be to rise in rebellion against nature, and consequently, against "Nature's God." Wherever such attempts have been made, and just in proportion as they have succeeded, the beauty and the power of religion have declined. In turning the eye back upon the course of time, what a deep and melancholy gloom broods over those ages in which the power of man imposed creeds and confessions, and daringly interfered with the prerogatives of Heaven! The state of our church, before our late contentions, has been compared to the Dead Sea. The comparison will not stand examination. There was no deadness or stagnation among us: there was diversity of mind, but unity of heart: there was an honorable maintenance of our own opinions, and an equally creditable forbearance with regard to the conscientious convictions of others; we met and parted like men and Christians! But, if the proposed measures could succeed, then there would, indeed, be a dead sea of Presbyterianism: inquiry would cease; the salutary agitation of conflicting opinions would be done away; and one unnatural and unwholesome calm would reign over the whole extent of your church. But I rejoice in the certainty that this cannot be: there are conflicting elements amongst yourselves; and the various sects with which you are intermingled, will not permit you to stagnate in heartless inactivity.

The wise man gains more enemies by his virtues, than the vicious man does by his vices.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

Extract from the Minutes of the Boon Creek Association of Baptists in Kentucky, for the present year.

"On motion, The following remarks and resolutions were adopted, in answer to a request from several churches composing this Association, for an amendment of her Constitution, so as to make it more Scriptural, or compatible with the word of God, to-wit: This Association having taken into consideration the request of some of the Churches for an amendment of her Constitution, after mature deliberation, she is decidedly of opinion that the word of God does not authorize or prescribe any form of Constitution for an Association in our present organized state. (Our Constitution we have caused to be printed in those Minutes, for the inspection of the Churches in making up their opinion to the next Association;) but we do believe that the word of God authorizes the assembling of saints together for his worship; we therefore recommend to the Churches an abolition of the present Constitution, and in lieu thereof, an adoption of this resolution:

RESOLVED, That we, the Churches of Jesus Christ, believing the Scriptures of the Old and Nestaments to be the word of God, and the only rule of faith and obedience given by the Great Head of the Church for its government, do agree to meet annually on every 3rd Saturday, Lord's Day, and Monday in September, of each year, for the worship of God; and on such occasions, voluntarily communicate the state of religion amongst us by Letter and Messengers."

This is a most excellent substitute for the annual advisory councils and legislative deliberations of a church representative of churches. Any number of Christians who please to meet at any time or any place for such purposes as the Boon Creek Association contemplates, has all the authority which reason and Revelation make necessary to acceptable service. Instead of a judicial court of inquiry, and of resolves, we have a meeting of fellow Christians for prayer and praise and thanksgiving, for mutual exhortation and edification. It would be a happy era in the history of Christianity if all ecclesiastical courts, whether papistical, episcopalian, presbyterian, independent, or any thing else would regenerate themselves into worshipping assemblies.

In our 2nd No. we noticed the separation which had taken place between the Presbyterian Church at Nicholasville and their Pastor—and that a large majority of the Church had rejected his Calvanistic doctrines and confession; and that they were about to build a splendid house for divine worship. This information we received from what we deemed unquestionable authority. The separation is acknowledged by certain gentlemen; but they deny that the church has rejected the Calvanistic doctrines, and the Confession of Faith; but "we believe," say they, "the doctrines which it contains, are the doctrines of the Bible." We have no doubt of these gentlemen's sincerity in what they state as being their convictions; yet we think that the majority of every Presbyterian Church in the West, do not believe all the doctrines contained in that book, the Church at Nicholasville not excepted. These gentlemen may think we designed to derogate from the dignity of their church at Nicholasville by stating what we did. We assure them, the entire reverse is true. In this we are not alone; and we are persuaded posterity will highly approve such a course. Many Presbyterian preachers evidently prefer preaching the doctrine of the Bible to those contained in their Confession, if we can judge from their late public exhibitions. This observation is common, not only in the West, but in the East. To make this evident I subjoin a piece from the Christian Advocate, printed at New-York, Nov. 7, 1828. EDITOR.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal and Zion's Herald.

"A PROP OF IMPENITENCE REMOVED," OR A NARROW ESCAPE.

In a late number of the Connecticut Observer, there is an article "furnished by a pastor," entitled "A prop of impenitence removed." It relates a conversation between a minister who believes in "the doctrines of grace," as he is pleased to call them; that is, the doctrines of Calvinism; and a certain young lady with whom he happened to fall in company. The minister inquired of her why she should not also share in the revival, which it seems had lately commenced in the place where she lived. The young lady replied, that she had often wished that she *might*, and hoped the time would come when she should be a partaker of this blessing. The minister then inquired whether she was satisfied to let the matter rest here. She answered, "what can

do? My salvation is the work of God—I do not suppose that I shall, of myself, do any thing towards effecting it." He then told her, that it seemed to him she was, to say the least, *practically* wrong on this important subject. He then proceeds to tell her, that she cannot expect pardon, or a divine influence to save her, except she ask for them. He inquires of her whether God has any where undertaken to repent for sinners, or to believe for them. To these inquiries the young lady answers, "He has not, to be sure." "Then," says he, "is there not something for you to do, if you would be saved, notwithstanding the sovereign grace and power of God in the matter?" She replies, "I suppose there may be." This he says was the point to which he wished to direct her thoughts. In concluding the account, he says she promised, with the help of God, to give the subject an immediate attention; and that a few days after this, he was told that Miss S—— was the most anxious among those who inquired after salvation, and soon after she was hopefully numbered with the penitent.

The pastor remarks upon this circumstance, that "it disclosed in a striking manner one resting place of impenitent sinners, who have been educated in the doctrines of grace." He farther says, "I am led to believe scarcely any mistake is more common, or more fatal, than that which converts the agency, the purposes, or the grace of God, into an occasion of doing nothing for our salvation." "Orthodoxy abused to such indifference, will prove as destructive to the soul as the rankest infidelity."

I consider the above scrap of private history as very interesting. It shows how near destruction this young lady came, in consequence of entertaining wrong views of the way of salvation. It exhibits the natural tendency of the peculiarities of Calvinism, which are here denominated "doctrines of grace;" and it shows its *incompetency*. Its ministers, when they would arouse sinners, are obliged to call in foreign aid. He very justly calls it "one resting place of impenitent sinners." I believe Calvinism does furnish a resting place, where many millions have rested to their eternal destruction. The view which Calvinism gives of the purposes, agency, and grace of God, is calculated to make men think they have nothing to do in order to secure their salvation.

Respecting God's *purposes*, Calvinism teaches that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of

his own will, freely and *unchangeably* ordain *whatsoever* comes to pass." According to this view of the Divine purposes, all events that come to pass, however wicked they may be, are precisely according to God's purposes. We may well say, this view of Divine purposes furnishes a "resting place to impenitent sinners," for it teaches them that all their actions, however wicked they may be, are according to the Divine will, unless his will is contrary to his purposes. How can an impenitent sinner alter God's *unchangeable* decree?

As it respects the "*grace*" of God, Calvinism teaches, that for the manifestation of God's glory, some men were eternally predestinated to everlasting life, and others are foreordained to everlasting death. The number thus predestinated and foreordained is so certain and definite, that it cannot be increased nor diminished; neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only. This is the extent of the *grace* of God. According to Calvinism it extends to a certain part of mankind, a definite number, which cannot be increased; it extends to "the *elect* only." The rest of mankink God was pleased to pass by, and ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sins, although their sins are exactly according to his eternal purposes. This is the soverign grace which Calvinism teacheth! According to this, the young lady here mentioned might very well conclude that she could do nothing towards effecting her salvation: for if she were not one of the definite number which could not be increased what *could* she do? And if she were of that number, which could not be diminished, what need she do to effect her salvation—was it not already effected?

And with regard to the *agency* of God, Calvinism teaches, that all those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased in his *appointed* and *accepted* time *effectually* to call by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation; renewing their wills, and, by his *almighty power*, determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ, and they are *altogether passive therein*, until being quickened and *renewed* by the Holy Spirit. Here is divine agency irresistibly working on the elect who are included in an eternal covenant of grace; and they are "altogether passive" in this business, *until* renewed by the Holy Spirit. This is the divine agency taught by Calvinism;

and if it be a correct view of it, the young lady might with great propriety say she need do nothing towards effecting her salvation: divine *agency* would effect it if God had so decreed.

The above peculiarities of Calvinism are called by the imposing title of "Doctrines of grace," and "Orthodoxy;" but I think they are doctrines of "wrath" rather than of "grace," for they represent by far the largest part of the human race as vessls of wrath, and as being made such by the dercee of Godfrom all eternity? There is no occasion of *abusing* this orthodoxy in order to produce indifference in sinners. Only let the doctrinces have their natural tendency, and I will venture to say "they will prove as destructive to the soul as the rankest infidelity."

But it is really curious to observe how this minister, who firmly believes in these "doctrines of grace," removed this "prop of impenitence." How did he do it? Did he quote a part of his own creed? Did he say "God would in his *appointed* and *accepted* time *effectually* call her, and that she would be altogether *passive* therein *nntil* renewed by the Holy Spirit? No—to be sure he did not; but he told her she was *practically* wrong, and that she must do something she must "repent," "ask," and "believe," in order to obtain salvation. But in giving her these directions he certainly departed from his "orthodoxy;" he removed her prop of impentitence with a hammer not his own.

Quere.—Would it not be best to renounce doctrines which naturally furnish such fatal props to impenitence?

New-Haven. T. S.

NO. II.

STRCTURES ON MR. N. H. HALL'S SERMON,

[CONTINUED.]

He says "The eternal existence of the logos, or second person in the divine Trinity is clearly proven by the following declarations in God's word. Prov. VIII. 23–30—I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was. Then I was by him, as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. Mr. Hall adds, "He was brought up with, or in company with the Father from everlasting, consequently he was eternal."

This is one of Mr. Hall's clear proofs, that a second person, of a supposed Trinity, existed as God from all eternity:

whereas, neither Son, second person in God nor Trinity is mentioned in the Chapter to which he refers.

Suppose I admit the Son of God was intended in the passage quoted, what is then proven? Surely the very reverse of that for which Mr. H. produced it. For were I to undertake to prove, (as he has done) that one person is as old as another, and in doing that, were to say. that the one, set up the other, or that the one was brought up by the other, every one who could understand the meaning of my words, would believe that I had proved the reverse of what I had proposed. Because the one that set up the other, must have existed before he performed the act of setting up, and if the one brought up the other, he must have existed before the one whom he brought up. Acts always imply time, therefore instead of the passage proving the Son to be eternal, it proves that he was not.

Mr. H. still injures his cause, by his comment; because to say, a person or being was brought up, or in company with another, implies a plurality of beings; for whoever thought of a persons being brought up with, or in company with himself. Mr. H. asserts, that because the Son was brought up in company with the Father from everlasting, he was consequently eternal, whereas the word everlasting is explained, not to mean eternal, in the 23 verse, this I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." So that this word everlasting means, according to Solomon, from the beginnings, or ever the earth was. If Mr. H. had noticed the 24 verse, he would have seen that his comment was erroneous! because in this, we have these words "when there were no depths, I was brought forth. Who brought forth the eternal God? Such an idea would degrade the self-existent God. *Being brought forth*, denotes posterior, and not eternal existence. Indeed it is impossible for an eternal person to be either set up, or brought forth.

I wish the public distinctly to recollect, that unless Mr. H. produces proof, for an eternal second person in God, he fails altogether. Such, we believe is the effect of the sermon under consideration.

Says Mr. H. The same doctrine is taught in Micah v. 2. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judea, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." There, *from of*

old, and *from everlasting* mean the same thing. If Mr. H. had thought of this it would have saved him the trouble of adducing this passage, to prove an eternal Son. But he concludes, that if the goings forth of the Son, have been from everlasting, he must have existed from eternity, whereas, I conclude, his *goings forth*, mean his acts in the creation: for we are assured, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. III. 9. Also, Heb. I. 2. "By whom also he (God) made the world." If *the goings forth* of the Son, means his acts in the creation, it follows, that as these acts determine the time from which Mr. H. concludes him to be eternal, that, instead of their proving this, these acts, or goings forth, prove him not eternal; because an eternal act is no act.

In the 4th verse of this chap. we have additional proof that the being to whom Micah referred, was not the eternal God; for it is declared, "He shall stand and *feed* in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God." Could words express dependence more strongly? Did the eternal God ever feed in the strength of any being? or in the majesty of the name of any being? Surely not. Besides, it is acknowleged here that the Son has a God, all which prove, at least, that Mr. H. ought to look over his clear proofs again.

The next passage, produced, as clear proof of Christ's being eternal, is from John VIII. 58. "Before Abraham was *I am*." Mr. H. adds, "*I am* is expressive of a proper eternity." How Mr. H. came to know this, he has not informed us. He might have proved, with as much ease, that the blind man, whom Christ cured was eternal; for he said, *I am*, &c. John XIV. 9. the word *he* is a supplement. We have before proved, that Christ existed before Abraham, as an agent in the creation, which is a full answer to this argument.

I am inclined to believe, that any man, who holds that Jesus Christ is the self-existent God, must be hard pressed for proof when he, as Mr. Hall, produced the following passage in support of it. "John XVII. 5. And now O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Mr. H. adds, "The glory which the Son had with the Father before the world was, is learned from Phil. II. 6–12. 'who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took on him the form of a servant, and was made in the likenes of men.'"

I shall not object to the connection of the two last quoted passages; but will fearlessly assert that both prove the contrary of what Mr. H. intended.

The reader should recollect that Mr. H. was attempting to prove that the Son is eternal, and that he is a divine person in the Godhead, or as he is pleased to call it; in the divine trinity. If this be true, the Son must have been the same being to whom he prayed, at the very time he prayed, which was impossible. If Mr. H. should say, it was the human nature, which prayed to the divine nature, then I would ask him, if the human nature had a glory with the Father before the world was? for it was the same person denoted by the pronoun *I*, that had had the glory, and that prayed for it.

God is said to be unchangeable; yet the argument of Mr H. certainly makes him changeable, because it is necessarily implied, that at the time the Son prayed, he did not possess the glory he once had; therefore, one of Mr. H's. persons, constituting his trinity, must have changed; and if one changed, all his trinity must have changed; for the persons are inseparably connected according to Mr. H's. Creedbook. A bad cause defeats itself.

Mr. H. is equally unfortunate in his last passage; because he assumes the very thing to be proved, and which, I aver, never can be proved, viz: that there is a second person in God. He says, "when was the second person or *logos* in the form of God? &c." Thus taking for granted, that which he has not produced a particle of evidence to prove. This often happens, when a man is determined to support a cause or party. The form of God, may mean the glory, which the Son had with the Father before the world was; but common sense says, that the form cannot be that being whose form it is; nor does the word robbery or equality convey any intelligible meaning, when confined to a single being. The Son exercised no authority upon the ground of robbery; for the Father authorized him to officiate in the great work of saving man; and, in this respect, he was equal to God, not by robbery, but by legal gift. Equality always implies plurality, so that the passage proves the existence of two beings instead of one. Wherever a comparison can be made, identity of being is necessarily destroyed. Of course, unless Mr. H. intended to prove the existence of two supreme Gods, he ought not to have introduced this passage

In the perusal of Mr. H's. sermon, we are required next to see Col. i. 14–20. The evidence in some of these verses, in favor of an opposite doctrine to that of Mr. H's. is so clear, that it would seem prejudice itself would surely give way before such shining light. It is asserted in the 15th verse, that "Jesus Christ is the image of the invisible God, that he is the first born of every creature." Now, I aver, that no being can be the image of himself, consequently this proves clearly that the invisible God and Christ are not one and the same. Again, Christ is declared to be the first born of every creature. Mr. H. may believe as he pleases, but I fearlessly affirm, that the one Supreme God never was born; then it follows, the Son was not the Supreme, seeing he was born. Again, verse 19, we have these words, "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." This shews that the fullness in the Son, depended on another being, even on the pleasure of the Father, as the passage asserts. Mr. H. must have forgotten the object of his discourse, when he introduced these verses to prove an eternal Son.

Says Mr. H. "The proper eternity of Jesus Christ is emphatically stated by the Apostle Paul, Heb. i. 12. and xiii. 8 In these passages it is not intimated that Jesus Christ was eternal. In the first we have these words, "and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." The first and third verbs are in the first future tense, of course expressive of future time; the second in the present tense, which means present time, from which it appears that there is not a word that gives the least intimation of Mr. H's. second person from eternity. This is the point in hand. That the Son *shall exist* eternally, as will all his saints, is clear. Heb. xiii. 8. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." This passage from the context, evidently relates not to the person, but to the doctrines of Christ. Verse 7 reads thus, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." Again, verse 9. "Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines." The true meaning is, that the Apostles invariably preached the same doctrine; and that Christians ought to adhere to it, and not suffer themselves to be seduced from it by the arts of false teachers. Applied to the person of Christ, it

can never be affirmed, in truth, that he was the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, because Christ, as a person, underwent various changes. Is he the same now that he was when born? when he was hungry and weary and faint? when he exclaimed my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? enough for the wise.

Mr. H. has drawn the conclusion from the next quotations that Jesus Christ is the Almighty. If he understands logic, he knows that a conclusion is false if the premises be false. I shall endeavor to shew that his premises, in this case, are false, consequently his conclusion must be so too.

In the beginning of the Rev. we are told that God gave this revelation to Jesus Christ: This is saying in plain language that Jesus Christ is not the Supreme or Almighty God; because it is not possible for a revelation to be made to the Almighty or eternal God. The text which Mr. H. adduces, to prove that Christ is the Almighty, is Rev. i. 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. That this passage refers to the Father, and not to Jesus Christ, the reader only need examine the following texts, Rev. i. 4, 5. "grace be unto you, and peace, from him *which is, and which was, and which is to come*, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ." The 8th verse refers to the 4th and ascertains it by the definite article *the*. It is the same Lord called the Almighty in the 8th verse, to whom Jesus Christ is added as an additional being. To establish this explanation more fully, if possible, we have the same or similar evidence in Rev. iv. 8, "Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." In chap. v. 7. it is said, Christ took a book out of the right hand of this being. Could he take it out of the right hand of himself? In addition to which read Rev. xxi. 22. "The Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, &c." Because Jesus Christ is called the *first* and the *last*, Mr. H. seems to rely on it as conclusive evidence in favor of the eternal existence of the Son. This passage is capable of several explanations, which will involve no contradiction, but if Mr. H's. explanation be true, the most gloomy idea is presented, of which we can possibly conceive. If this passage means the being called Jesus Christ, that as to his existence he was first, it would make him before the Father, whom trinitarians say begat him. If under the same view, he will be last; then all other beings, Mr. H. among them, must come to an end, or be brought into nonentity, in order to make him last. This doctrine may comfort the damned in hell, believing their pains will cease, but it annihilates all the glorious prospects of the righteous. So far we find no evidence in favor of Mr. H's. eternal Logos or second person.

[To be continued.]

We learn from the Baptist Recorder of Jan. 10, "that the Regular Baptist Church at Oxford, Ohio, has seceded from the White-water Association, of which it was a member, because that Association has countenanced the errors of a certain *Wilson Thompson*, a Baptist preacher at Lebanon, O."

The Church at Oxford has not informed us what those errors are, which were published by Mr. Thompson, and received so generally by the Association; nor have we made ourselves sufficiently acquainted with them to give our readers correct information. Elder S. Clack has promised an expose of them in the subsequent numbers of the Baptist Recorder. Then, it is hoped, we shall be correctly informed. The errors must be of a very serious and destructive nature, we presume, or this church could not be justified in seceding from the union.

The tenure, which has long held the Baptist Church together, is broken; and they appear to be crumbling to dissolution. Some prefer the ancient order of things as contained in the New Testament, and reject every thing as authoritative besides—others prefer the modern order as contained in the Philadelphia Confession—some rigidly adhere to the doctrines of Calvin; while others as rigidly oppose them —some reject the very name Baptist, and take the name Christian only. Some are even joining the Presbyterian church as stated by the Reformer for January, 1829. "A Baptist church in N. York lately under the pastoral care of "Rev." Isaac Chase, has become a Presbyterian church, "by the advice and consent of a council of Presbyterian ministers."

The same appearances of division also exist among the Methodists. In England not long since, we stated that 30,000 Methodists had seceded from that church, after having protested against what they deemed its errors. Having promised a more particular account, we will now redeem the pledge. The first account we saw of this division must have

H—n

been written by an enemy of the secession. The true state of the case appears from their own protest, as given by the British Traveller of Sept. 6, and copied by the Christian Register, as follows:

"Their protest among other matters, declaims against the effects of that unchristian and irresponsible authority exercised by the preachers, and confirmed by Conference, in making, altering, suspending, or abrogating laws binding upon the whole Methodist body, without consulting the societies, or any persons appointed on their behalf—a power assumed by no other Protestant authorities in the world, civil or ecclesiastical. They also protest against the Conference securing to themselves the property of the connection in the chapels, schools, &c. built by the people, and for the debts upon which the trustees alone are responsible. They protest against alterations which they say have destroyed the primitive simplicity of Methodism, and defaced its orginal character, and against forms of government, terms of authority, and titles of distinctions, assumed by the preachers, not only without the sanction of the Rev. John Wesley, but in contradiction and contempt of his recorded judgment and writings, and even against the laws of the connection. They protest, finally, against submitting any longer to the unlimited authority of the preachers, as contrary to Christianity, the practice of the primitive church, and the privileges of English subjects."

We have also seen that the Presbyterians in Ireland are in a high degree of excitement. One party contending for the Bible alone, and liberty from the shackles of men—the other, for human tests of orthodoxy to bind the free mind. A great division among them has recently occurred. Even the Dutch Reformed Church has lately been aroused from their long slumbers by the following event, mentioned in the Christian Register:

A young man of their own seminary, a candidate for the ministry, named Leonard B. Van Dyck, was refused admission into the church of his fathers, in which he was brought up, and in which he intended to serve as a minister, because he entertained doubts concerning two points in theology:—*The eternal generation of the Son of God, and the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son.*—This has awakened inquiry, and a pamphlet is published in

the City of New-York, of deep interest to the religious community. The title and motto of the pamphlet are

"*Remarks on liberty of conscience, Human Creeds, and Theological School, suggested by the facts in a recent case—By a Layman of the Reformed Dutch Church.*"

"Who knows not that truth is strong, next to the Almighty? Give her but room and do not bind her: Let her and falsehood grapple: who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?"—*Milton.*

The Quakers too, are confused and divided into parties.

These accounts cause party spirits to weep, and howl for vexation; but to us they produce a contrary effect. We have long believed that God would *overturn, and overturn, and overturn*, till Messiah shall reign alone, and all submit to his government. This cannot be, while popular establishments of long duration stand in opposition to the government of the King of kings; in opposition to one another, and to religious liberty. These establishments must fall in order to prepare the way of the Lord. Never were greater exertions made in any age than in the present to support them. Money, learning, zeal, societies of every grade, and kind, are enlisted by the various parties to sustain their cause. All look for the millenium in their sect and on their plan. If we dare judge from the plans of some, the millenium will commence within 20 years, for within that time, by the American Sunday School Union, by the theological schools, and by the monopoly of printing establishments to issue books and tracts, the whole country will beoome orthodox—and then our President will be orthodox—congress orthodox—state Legislatures orthodox—civil magistrates orthodox—every state officer orthodox—then will orthodoxy be established by law, and heterodoxy be driven from the earth—then will church and state amalgamate—then will the orthodox or prevailing clergy reign and triump over the people. This appears to be the millenium expected by many, when Christ will reign in spirit on earth a thousand years. Should this be the millenium, alas! how disappointed are the expectations of the pious! This millenium was once enjoyed, till spoiled by the Reformers. Is it possible that Protestants will endeavor by the same means as were used at first to restore it? We are comforted in this, that the Lord reigneth, and will bring to nought the counsels of the ungodly. EDITOR.

SABELLIANISM IN THE WEST.

We have lately read the Circular Letter of the Mount Pleasant Baptist Association, published in the Baptist Recorder of January 10. By this letter our former convictions are confirmed, that Trinitarians are very restless, are veering to every point of speculation to evade pressing difficulties. This Association have fled to the refuge of Sabellius, and we think have advanced a few degrees beyond his doctrine.

"We maintain (say they) the unity of the divine essence, and that there is but one God.—Isaiah xiv. 5. Yet we assert from the scriptures that there are three in the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that these three are one. 1 John v, 7. The name of the Father may appear greater than that of the Son, or of the Spirit; but as these are names of office, and not of essence, they only describe the nature of the office assumed, which may be greater or less, but as to the essence there is no inequality."

On this extraordinary doctrine I beg leave to make a few remarks:—

1. They teach that God is one, one divine essence. This one God or divine essence is not named Father, Son, nor Holy Spirit; for these names are not the names of essence, but of offices. Therefore the Father is not God, nor is the Son God, neither is the Holy Spirit God. If this be true, the scriptures cannot be; for Paul says, "With us there is but one God, the Father."—now as God is one divine essence, and called the Father, then it follows that the name Father was the name of essence.

2. If the names Father, Son, and Spirit, are names of office, and not of essence; then are those names mere empty sounds, names of abstract nonentities, destitute of all intelligence, power and activity. Therefore, when the scriptures affirm that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world, they mean that one name of an office, or one unintelligent nonentity, sent another name of an office, or unintelligent nonentity to be a Saviour! When the Son says I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me—it must mean, that the Son a mere name of an office, or unintelligent nonentity came not to do his own will —(whoever before heard of a nonentity, or name of office having a will?)—but the will of him that sent me,"—the will of another unintelligent nonentity, a mere name of office; and yet this empty name was active in sending! This exposition would be awful, and doubtless rejected by these brethren; yet it is believed to be in perfect accordance with the doctrine they have taught.

3. If the Father and Son be the names of office only, and not of essence, will it not follow that neither the Father nor the Son is an intelligent person or Being? and is not this a plain denial of the Father and Son? John says, "He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son."

4. These brethren admit of an inequality of the names of office; but of no inequality of essence. They acknowledge that the Father, Son, and Spirit are equal, but not equal in name nor office, but of essence. This is a novelty in theology. The orthodox never talk of an equality of essence; but affirm that the essence or substance of the Trinity is the same, and indivisible, and so exclude the idea of equality of essence. Does this Association believe in three equal essences or substances, called Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? If so, they contradict themselves, for then these names would be the names of essence, and this essence is one. I would humbly ask these brethren, what do they mean by the equality of the trinity, if it consist not in name, nor office, nor essence?

Strange and inconsistent as it must appear, yet this Association in their Circular attempt to prove from scripture, "a plurality of persons in the Godhead." They say "the doctrine of Trinity is a scriptural doctrine, and we cannot reject it unless we renounce the Bible." Now what is their doctrine of Trinity? A plurality of names of office and not of essence. These names they say are Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and these they call persons. But they cannot without a contradiction admit these persons to be any thing more than unintelligent nonentities; or, according to professor Stuart and his followers, mere distinctions. This Association must surely be in great confusion. Yet it is essential—a *sine qua non* of religion to believe——they know not what,—a tissue of contradictions and absurdities. They are not alone; the like confusion appears in every system of this doctrine we have known. One salvo preserves it from ruin, which is, that it is a mystery. And thus they wrap it up. We design to notice their arguments on shis subject in subsequent numbers, unless more important matter prevent us.

EDITOR.

CINCINNATI, Jan. 5, 1829.

To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.

DEAR SIR—I am informed that it is stated in your periodical of late, that I have renounced the Baptist creed, and have withdrawn from the church, taking with me about 100 members, *this is not so!* I assisted in constituting a Church in this city a few weeks since, "on the foundation of the Apostles, and Prophets,—Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner Stone." She deemed it due to herself and others to give a declaration of some of her views of the doctrines and commandments of Christ, and is in fellowship with the Enon Baptist Church (which she obtained letters of dismission from) and all other orderly Baptist churches in the land.

As there is also a report in circulation that the church of which I am the pastor has embraced the Arian creed, with myself, in consequence I presume, of the notice given me in your "Messenger," *which is utterly without foundation.* You will do me the justice to insert this letter in one of your papers, as early as convenient.

I am respectfully yours,

JAMES CHALLEN.

Reply to Elder James Challen.

DEAR SIR—Hearing it rumored by some of my bigotted enemies, that the account published respecting you in the C. Messenger (No. 2. Vol. 3.) was not correct, I immediately addressed a note to Bro. J. G. Ellis near Cincinnati, (from whose letter to Bro. T. M. Allen, I had received the information,) requesting him to give the statement as correctly as he could. In a few days he addressed me the following note:

DRY CREEK, Campbell County, Dec. 29, 1828.

Bro. Stone:—Your letter under date of the 27th inst. came to hand this day, and as soon as I read it, I applied to Mr. *Hugh Terry*, a Baptist gentleman from Cincinnati, and made the enquiry you wished me to make. He produced an instrument containing ten articles, which he said was a confession of faith of what is called JAS. CHALLEN's Church.

On the first day of the Presidential Election at Newport, Ky. I fell in company with a Mr. *E. B. Reeder*, a member of Challen's Church (as he told me himself he was) and he gave me precisely the information in respect to Challen's Church that I communicated to Bro. *T. M. Allen*; and in Cincinnati he has since told me the same—that is, Challen's church was constituted on the Bible alone. You may rely on the above statement being correct.

I am your brother in love, J. G. ELLIS.

I remark to Mr. Challen my astonishment that he should deny that he had rejected the Baptist Creed or Confession of Faith. Have you not, Sir, often expressed your conviction that that Confession ought to be rejected, &c. One who heard you express this sentiment in company, and having heard of your denial, desired me to propose the question to you. Would you, Sir, constitute, or assist in constituting a Church on the Bible alone, as the foundation, if you were a believer in the Baptis Confession! Is not the regular Baptist Church constituted on this Creed as their foundation?—If a particular Church in this connexion withdraw from this foundation, does it not withdraw from that Church *ipso facto?* You will in all probability learn this from matters of fact, not long hence. Could I be heard by you, I would advise you to act indepently on your own convictions. You cannot serve two masters. The report of your having become an Arian, I had never heard till you named it. I am glad, Sir, you reject the Arian doctrines. I believe they are not true, yet I am far from denouncing and anathematizing them in Athanasian style. But you think the report rose from the circumstance of my publishing your defection from the Baptist Confession. This is novel. I never before knew that all the Baptists who seceded from that confession, were accounted Arians. If your language was designed as a squinting at us as a people, we inform you once more, that we are not Arians, but CHRISTIANS; a name given by divine authority, and derived from our Head, Lord, and Leader, CHRIST, the Son of the living God. EDITOR.

Extract of a Letter from Elder ISHMAEL DAVIS, *dated* MONTGOMERY C. H. Ala. Dec. 1828.

Brother Stone: There has been a considerable revival of religion in the region where I live, and it still continues in a tolerable degree; though we are afraid that Sectarianism and proselyting will impede its progress. About 18 have joined us since brother McGaughey wrote you. He is now in this country. The brethren appear to be steadfast in the doctrine of the gospel.

Extract of a Letter from Elder JAS. MCVEY, *to the Editor.*

BROOKVILLE, MONTGOMERY C'TY. Md. Dec. 1828.

I wish some of the Lord's servants of Kentucky could feel

it their duty to come and help us. The Lord is shaking Sectarianism, and many are falling out with their Creeds. And I can assure you that the Christian Messenger is read with great delight in this part of the world—I think it will excite many to the Bible, and that will prove destructive to priestcraft and creeds. Oh, may Jesus reign from sea to sea and from the rivers to the ends of the earth. This is the prayer of one that loves the name of Jesus. Farewell—The grace of God be with you. May he give you wisdom to indite for the Messenger, that it may still be edifying to the saints of God, that never have seen you in the flesh.

JAMES MCVEY.

From the Gospel Luminary.

It is about one year and a half since I first came into this county, and my time has been mostly occupied in preaching the gospel. While I reflect upon the goodness of God in convicting and converting sinners, my heart is filled with joy inexpressible. Three Christian churches since my arrival have been planted within the bounds of this county, by Elder Chase and myself. There have been, also, *ninety* members added to the church in Hector and Enfield, most of whom were young converts. E. MARVIN.

Enfield, Tompkins Co. N. Y. Dec. 20, 1828.

OBITUARY.

Died at his residence near Murfreesboro' Ten. the 7th of January, 1829, Elder JOHN BOWMAN. He died the third day of his illness, perfectly composed in mind, and resigned to the will of his God. Having exhorted all around him to the love and fear of the Lord, he fell asleep in the arms of Jesus. With him the Editor has enjoyed an acquaintance for 35 years. He was educated and ordained a Presbyterian preacher in North Carolina, a short time before my acquaintance with him. Some years after, he moved his family to Tennessee, and united himself with the Church of Christ, to which he was truly a father and guide. His piety and good sense were never disputed. His life was exemplary in holiness and meekness. His enemies, if he had any, were few; his friends were many. His family, his neighbors, and the Church lament and feel the loss of him. But it is hoped they willingly yield to heaven her gift.

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: 3.] GEO: TOWN, K. MAR. 1829. [No. 5.

From the Christian Register.

REV. MR. MONTGOMERY'S SPEECH.

We have given copious extracts from the documents relating to the Synod of Ulster, Ireland, and particularly from the speeches of Rev. Mr. Montgomery:

The proposed measures are eminently calculated to violate the rights of the people. You tell them that the privilege of choosing their own pastors is one of the greatest which men can enjoy; but should your overture pass into a law, this privilege will be only a name. Whatever may be their views of the gospel truth, you will permit them to elect no pastor but one that has been measured by the standard of faith, erected by your Committee. But they may obtain a minister, you say, from the Presbytery of Antrim, or from England. Very true: but will you ordain him? By no means. Then must they lose their bounty, to which, as contributors to the general revenue of the country, they are fairly entitled; and their ministers must be excluded from the important advantages of the Widow's Fund. Now, is it not a monstrous inconsistency to tell the people that they have a right to choose their teachers, and then to inflict upon them a pecuniary mulct for the conscientious exercise of their privileges? I appeal to the representatives of the laity, who have come hither to assist in the passing of laws for the curtailment of our liberties, whether they may not be forging heavy fetters for themselves and their children. That they have an unquestionable right to judge for themselves "in the things pertaining their own salvation," I most cheerfully admit; but I do put it to their modesty, their education, and their Christian feeling, whether, as unlettered men, (which they generally are,) and educated under the influence of strange prejudices, they should attempt to force