## HUMILITY.

Humility has been justly called the daughter of faith and the mother of contentment: it is a radical grace, out of which grows the sweet fruits of meekness, patience, love, charity, forbearance and contentment: it is the only favorable soil for the culture of every Christian grace. Humility empties a man of self conceit, and produces that charity which empties of self love: it is the veil with which the rich attire of a Christian ought to be covered. Humility enables a man to receive as truth all that is contained in the sacred volume: it promotes prayer and thankfulness, and enables all who are in affliction to say, "It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good." The benefits to be derived from this inestimable grace are numerous; it supports in affliction, it produces patience, it is well pleasing to God, who hates and resists its opponent, pride, against which sin all the perfections of God are in battle array. Humility preserves from the snares of Satan—keeps us low in our own estimation: it reminds us from whom we have received our every talent, and makes us anxious to devote ourselves to Him from whom cometh every good and perfect gift. The means to obtain this desirable grace, is to reflect on and endeavor to realize the majesty and purity of Jehovah, and contrast with it our own meanness and guilt, and also to compare ourselves with holy men of old, the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles; and surely we must then acknowledge ourselves to be but dwarfs in comparison of them, for they were as giants in every desirable grace and attainment. Think also often of your danger, from the strength of your various and powerful foes; and, above all, meditate on the method God has used for your salvation. "He so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, who, though rich, for our sakes became poor;" he humbled himself, that we might be exalted; he died, that we might live forever. Here learn humility.—*Selected.*

## EXTRAORDINARY MOVEMENTS.

The present day possesses some remarkable features and indications. The Jews are agitated. The spirit of inquiry and expectation pervades their nation to an unusual extent. They begin to explore causes, to examine testimonies, and to feel the galling yoke of moral bondage. The tide of the great eastern defection is beginning to be rolled back, and its refluent wave is tinged with blood.—*Selected.*

## ADVERTISEMENT.

THE CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK will very shortly be finished. It will be printed in Georgetown, Ky. This book is carefully selected by Barton W. Stone and Thomas Adams, by appointment of Miami Christian Conference. It will be printed on superior paper, and well bound.

April 1, 1829.

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: III.] Georgetown, Ky. May, 1829. [No. 7.

## NO. III.

## STRICTURES ON MR. N. H. HALL'S SERMON,

CONCLUDED.

Mr. Hall says, "The divinity of Christ is clearly proven by the following considerations, viz: the scriptures speak of him as the Mighty God and Father of eternity. Isa. ix. 6. "For unto us, a child is born; unto us, a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."" Mr. H. adds, "This child born, this Son given, is Counsellor in the eternal counsel of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. He is the Mighty God; he is the everlasting Father, or Father of eternity."

By Mr. H's. comment on this passage, he has certainly destroyed its sense; for whoever thought of any one being the Father of eternity? If Christ was, he must have existed before eternity, which was impossible. To be Father of any thing, necessarily implies prior existence to that thing. Thus Mr. H. not only makes Christ to have existed from eternity, but before it; for he says, "he was the Father of eternity."

Mr. H. asserts, that this child born, is Counsellor in the eternal counsel of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The difference between the Prophet and Mr. H. is this: the Prophet speaks of future time, by saying, his name *shall be called* Wonderful Counsellor; whereas, Mr. H. looks back to eternity to find his Counsellor, for he says, "the child was in the eternal counsel, &c." So long as Mr. H. continues to look through spectacles, colored by the Westminster Confession of Faith, and his party, I shall not be surprised, that he should differ from the sacred writers. The eternal counsel, of which Mr. H. speaks, is not in the Bible.

We should bear in mind, that God is the author of the above passage, that the Son of God is the subject; and that the Prophet Isaiah is the describer of this child, or of this Son given; to which add the idea conveyed in verse 7, that the zeal of the Lord will perform this, and the whole subject is easily understood. Taken in its connection, the passage proves, that Jesus Christ is not the eternal, or Almighty God. The eternal God never was

born: this child was born—therefore, this child was not the eternal God. The self-existent God never was given by any being; the Son of God was given, as asserted in the passage—therefore, the Son of God is not the self-existent God. Further—the appellations in the passage, were given to the child born, to this Son given, by the eternal God, whose zeal was to perform every thing promised in the passage—consequently, nothing in the text was ever intended to exhibit the Son either as a second person in God, or as the self-existent God. The only titles, on which any rely, as proof, in this passage, that Christ is the Almighty, or eternal God, are, his being called the Mighty God, and everlasting Father. Now, if we believe as the scriptures declare, those beings, to whom the word of God came, were called Gods, we have conclusive evidence that the title God is not exclusively applied to the one Supreme God. To establish this fact, we have no less than the authority of Jesus Christ himself, John x. 35. If this testimony requires any additional evidence, we have it in various places. See Exo. VII. 1. "See I have made thee a God to Pharaoh. Also, XV. 11. "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the *Gods!*" Deut. x. 17.

It is, therefore clear, that the name *God* may be given, according to the practice of sacred writers, to all persons, to whom the word of God comes, or, who are authorized, or inspired, to declare the will of God to mankind. Seeing the Son was only to be called the *Mighty God*, as the passage asserts, and this being only the positive degree of comparison, as every grammarian knows, it follows, that it affords no proof, whatever, of Christs being the Supreme God.

The word *God* does not signify a *trinity*, but dominion, power, or authority. The children of Israel had been governed by men, as judges, prophets, and rulers, who were called Gods, because the word of God came to them, but the Prophet would foretell that this child and Son, should have the dominion over the people of God, as displayed under the gospel, by having the government placed upon his shoulder; and therefore, he alone should be exalted in the gospel day; and that the old system should be changed. All power in heaven and earth was given to the Son—he had the spirit given to him without measure—he was placed at the head of the Christian Church, as the leader and commander of his people. Surely no being, his Father excepted, was ever so much entitled to the name *God*, as Jesus Christ.

Everlasting Father. To apply this appellation to the Son, as expressive of Supreme Deity, as Mr. H. has done, destroys the order of the trinity, as maintained by all the orthodox; because the term Father, has been made to denote the first person in the trinity, and the Son the second, &c. Thus Mr. H. has confused his readers and injured his cause. Dr. Gill declares, if the term Father, in this passage, is made to denote the deity of Jesus Christ, the order of the trinity will be destroyed. The Dr. I believe, gives the true meaning of this term, as used in the passage; which is, that the Son of God should be the Father of the gospel age. Christ will have many children, for he will say, "behold I, and the children which God hath given me." From what we have said, it is evident, that this whole passage is a description of what should take place under the gospel; therefore, gives not the least intimation, either of Mr. H's. second person in God, or eternal Logos.



Mr. H's. next clear proof, he finds Isa. VIII. 13–14. compared with 1 Peter II. 7–8. Mr. H. adds, "The stone of stumbling, and rock of defence, as Isaiah declares, is the Lord of Hosts himself—but this stone of stumbling and rock of offence, as is affirmed by Peter, is no other than the blessed Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ—therefore, the Lord Jesus Christ, the blessed Savior, is the Lord of Hosts."

Because the God of Israel is called a rock of offence, and a stone of stumbling; and by Peter the same language is applied to Christ, therefore Mr. H. concludes, or takes for granted, that Isaiah and Peter intended the same being: Whereas, the language applied to both is metaphorical; not intended, by either, to express being, or the attributes of being, but the manner in which both the Father and Son would appear to the people. If sameness of language, applied to two beings, will prove both to be the same being, then Peter may be taken for Christ, and men for Supreme Gods; for in John I. 42. Peter is made to signify *a stone;* and God gave Saviours (meaning men) to ancient Israel. Bad premises will make a false conclusion. Christ applied the same language to his Apostles that he did to himself and his Father. See Luke x. 16. "He that despiseth *you*, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."

One rule of exegesis is this, and will be allowed by all good critics, that no inference should be taken against positive proof; and surely this is a safe rule in theology. We before proved, in plain language, that the one God is the Father—therefore, unless Mr. H. proves, with equal clearness, that the Son is the one God, his inferences ought never to be received. Having, as I conceive, the advantage of Mr. H. according to the rule just laid down, I shall not trouble the public with all his inferences, as I believe, (if possible,) the rest are more inconclusive than those to which we have attended.

Taking for granted, what remains to be proved, Mr. H. has come to the conclusion, that Jesus Christ is really the being he set out to prove; and has introduced a text (which really proves the contrary,) that he should be worshipped as Supreme God. It is John v. 23. "That all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." To quote no more of the connection than this, the sense of the passage never can be obtained; for the preceding verse gives the reason why we should honor the Son. The connection is this: "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men

should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him." Surely nothing can be more clearly stated, than that we are required to honor the Son, because the Father hath committed all judgment unto him. Under this view, we should honor him as we would the Father, because he acts under the authority and appointment of his Father; therefore, any dishonor done to the Son, is, in the sense of the passage, done to the Father. I would ask, could the power of judging have been committed, by any being, to the one God, the Father? If not, the passage proves that the Son is not the Supreme God, and that he was dependent on his Father and God, for the authority by which he acted, as the passage asserts. If Mr. H. had produced a text, declaring the Son to be self-existent and independent, then, indeed, supreme worship would be due to the Son. But to produce a passage asserting the contrary, ought to convince every one, that proof, on that side, does not exist.

Mr. H. says: "The same doctrine, with some of its reasons, is forcibly presented in Paul's Epistle to the Heb. i. 3. "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, (that is, the person of the Father,) and upholding all things by the word of his power; when he had, by himself, purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high." If there be but one God, and Jesus Christ is that one God, then when Christ sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, he must have sat down on the right hand of himself, or on the right hand of his own Majesty, which was impossible. Again, if the Son be the eternal God, he was the image of himself, and the brightness of his own glory. Indeed, no chapter in the bible, more clearly shows that the Father and Son are not the same being. We are told in the beginning of this chapter, that it was the same God, who spake to the Fathers by the Prothets, who hath, in these last days, spoken unto us by his Son. The idea forcibly conveyed is, that the Son is as distinct from the one God, as the Prophets were.

Mr. H. adds: "Again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, He (God the Father) saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." The meaning would have been very different if the Father had said, let all the angels worship me or myself; but he speaks of his Son, as a third person, distinct from himself. This worship was, therefore, authorised by the Father, consequently, it can be no idolatry to worship the Son. The Son is above angels as well as men; of course it is right to worship him; for in doing this, we worship the Father.

A mistake has prevailed, (and Mr. H. seems not to be clear of it,) about the term *worship*. Some have supposed that whenever it is applied, in the scriptures, it necessarily implies supreme worship; whereas, it simply means reverence, or respect, from an inferior to a superior; and the degree is in proportion to the obligation the inferior is under to the superior. According to this sense, "All the congregation bowed down their heads and worshiped the Lord and the King." 1 Chron. xxix. 20. Again, Christ informs us, that a man, when invited to a feast, if he would take a low seat, might be invited to take a higher one, and then he should have *worship* of all present. According to this view, it is easy to see our obligation to worship the Son, without his being the Supreme God. In honoring, or worshiping the Son, we do the same to his Father; because he acts under the authority of his Father. Indeed, we are informed that every knee is to bow at the name of Jesus, and every tongue is to confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Phil. ii. 9, 10.



In Mr. H's. next quotation, the Father and Son are made so distinct that the one is represented as addressing the other. Mr. H. thus states it: "But unto the Son, he saith, (that is the Father) Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." Mr. H. adds, "here the Father calls the Son God." "The Father continues to address the Son:" "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath annointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Mr. H. wishes his readers to understand the Son here, addressed by the Father, to be the Supreme God; and for this purpose, he introduced the passage. Let us try his sense of it; according to which, it will read thus: But unto the Supreme God, (the Son,) the Supreme God, (the Father,) saith, thy throne, O Supreme God, (the Son,) is forever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of the Supreme God's kingdom. The Supreme God has loved righteousness, and the Supreme God has hated wickedness; therefore, the Supreme God, even the Supreme God of the Supreme God, (the Son,) has anointed the Supreme God with the oil of gladness above the Supreme God's fellows. Such is the absurdity of the construction given by Mr. H. to this passage. I know that a fair construction, as I have given, will be unpleasant; but why should a man object to his own meaning? If he should, he ought to reject his opinion. To understand the term *God*, as applied to the Son, as before explained, involves no absurdity whatever; but upon the Trinitarian hypothesis, no one can give an intelligible meaning.

The next argument, urged by Mr. H. is directed against infidels; for, says Mr. H. "Infidelity, sometimes with an air of triumph, asks the question, Can a man have a son as old as himself! intending to apply this doctrine to the Father, God, and Son." Mr. H's. answer is this: "Did you ever know any man to be a Father by nature, in the same sense that he breathes, and his blood circulates in his veins by nature." To this he answers, that men become fathers by circumstances; not so with God the Father, he is Father by nature, in the same sense that he is God by nature, and he has a son by nature, for he could not be a Father without a son; therefore, he is God and

Father from eternity by nature. I am truly sorry for the cause of religion; that Mr. H. has made so poor an argument against Infidelity. Men finding that they must reject analogy, and the use of reason, to receive what Christians call the doctrines of christianity, have been induced to reject the Bible as an imposition upon their credulity: Whereas, if professors of religion would shew, (as is really the fact) that the Bible contains no absurdities; nothing contrary to enlightened reason; and that the whole system is an appeal to man as a rational being, the number of infidels would be greatly diminished. Mr. H. in his argument against infidels, take a position that is wholly false, viz: that God is an eternal Father, and, by consequence, there is an eternal Son. In answer to this, I boldly affirm, that neither the phrase, *eternal Father* nor *eternal Son*, can be found in the Bible; consequently, the co-relation, of which Mr. H. speaks, is founded neither in reason nor the scriptures. I can as easily conceive that God could exist without being a Father, as I can that Mr. H. ever did, before he was a Father. No being ever was a father until he had a child. I can as easily prove, that angels and men are eternal, by Mr. H's. argument, as he, by it, can prove that the Son of God is eternal; because men and angels are the Sons of God, and may, therefore, claim God as their Father. Surely God existed without being Father to angels and men, until he produced them; when this took place, then he was their Father. I shall now draw to a close. Surely every one who is, any way, impartial, must believe that Mr. H. has failed altogether, to prove the existence of an eternal Son in God. The texts brought, have generally proved the contrary; therefore, I do hope, that an enlightened public will see that the doctrine of the Trinity is neither found in reason nor the Bible.

The doctrine of the Trinity, perhaps, is as incomprehensible as any thing; and yet, I do not disbelieve it because I cannot comprehend it. I disbelieve it, first, because I find no authority for it in scriptures; secondly, because it is contradictory in itself; thirdly, because it is inconsistent with the moral attributes of God; and fourthly, because it violates all the rules of right reasoning, by which, in other cases, I am enabled to come at a knowledge of truth. THOMAS SMITH.

## THE GOSPEL PLAN OF SAVING SINNERS.

*NO. II.*

In my last number, I gave the reader reason to expect additional evidence in favor of the *gospel plan*. His attention is, therefore, in the first place, invited to the conversion of the Jailor and his household. Acts XVI. 29–34. "Then he (the Jailor,) called for a light, and sprang in, and came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." The Jailor was, in all probability, equally opposed to the Apostles, and their doctrine, with those who had them arrested; for he "put them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks." That he was a wicked man, is evident from the circumstance of his being about to kill himself: yet *in one hour*, this wicked man, and his family, were rejoicing in God. Many good people, in the present day, would be completely astounded to see a notorious sinner changed to a christian *in one hour*. They could hardly believe their own senses, and would be ready to declare that his religion would be of short continuance. They would say the man is a fanatic—he has not had time to experience true repentance—religion that has been obtained so easily, will not be duly appreciated; therefore, it cannot last long. But it would be well for such persons to recollect, that such conversions were uniform in the apostolic age; and the world has never produced more holy, self-denying christians than they were. I will further remark, that we have no account of the Jailor and his household's rejoicing until after they were baptized; but when he had brought them into his house, *then* "he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." Of course, I think it fair to conclude, that they did not receive the remission of their sins before they were baptized.

We will now attend to the baptism of the disciples at Ephesus. Acts XIX. 1–6. "And it came to pass, that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." It is probable that these disciples had been baptized by Apollos, on his way from Alexandria to Corinth, for he knew *only* the baptism of John. They had not received the Holy Ghost when Paul found them, for *they had not heard of any Holy Ghost*. But after they were baptized, Paul laid his hands on them, and *then* the Holy Ghost came upon them This evidence is deemed decisive; but we will attend to the import of a few more passages of scripture.

1 Pet. III. 21. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but

the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here Peter expressly says, that "baptism saves us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" that is, it is the means appointed by heaven, through which we are saved. As Christ, by his resurrection rose above the power of sin, (by which he died,) so in baptism, we consider ourselves risen with him—saved by baptism, and that our life shall now be an emblem of the life of Christ, who is at the right hand of God. If baptism saves us, or rather, if we are saved in baptism, it is evident that we are not saved before. The words included in a parenthesis, in this text, seem designed by the apostle to guard the minds of his Jewish brethren, (to whom he wrote,) from identifying baptism with the purifications under the law. They knew that the "divers washings" under the law, were designed to purify the flesh; and as the subjects of baptism were washed, or immersed in water, Peter knew, from the predilections of the Jews for externals in religion, that they might suppose that baptism was designed to purify the flesh. But he lets them know that this is not the design of the ordinance—that it is designed to affect the heart, or give us the answer of a good conscience towards God.

I now proceed to answer objections, against what I have termed the *gospel plan*. An objector asks, if your plan be correct, why were the house of Cornelius not baptized before they received the Holy Ghost? I answer, that I have not said but that God may save us out of his *ordinary* plan; and as respects the house of Cornelius, he had an important reason for so acting. Peter's preaching to Cornelius and his household, was one of the most important eras in the annals of the Gentile world. It was the opening of the door of faith to the great mass of the human family; so that, in reference to this event, we may emphatically say, "They that sat in darkness, saw great light, and t them that dwelt in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up." We know that the Jews possessed an inveterate antipathy against the Gentiles; and although their prophets had told them that Christ "should be for salvation to the ends of the earth"—that "he should be a light to the Gentiles," &c., it appears that the idea that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs with them, of the same inheritance, had not once entered their minds. Peter, himself, appears to have been destitute of the enlarged views of a "common salvation;" and therefore, it was necessary that some *unusual* circumstance should transpire to convince him, and the church generally, that the blessings of the gospel were to be extended to the Gentiles. Thus God begins with Peter, while he was on the house top at prayer, by causing him to fall into a trance, and presenting to his view an extraordinary vision. Acts x. He saw "heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet, knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth, wherein were all manner of four footed beasts of the earth, and creeping things, and



fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter, kill and eat. But Peter said, not so Lord, for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the voice spoke unto him again, the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common or unclean." By their law, the Jews were not allowed to eat any beast that was common or unclean—of course, this vision was calculated to convince Peter that he was not to live any longer under its restrictions. The vision, in its application, was designed to affect the relation, which Peter conceived he sustained to the Gentiles. In the mean time, an angel had appeared to Cornelius, and instructed him to send for Peter, who would tell him what to do. Accordingly, he immediately sent three messengers to Joppa after Peter. The Holy Ghost knowing the timidity which Peter must necessarily feel of going to the Gentiles, upon his coming down from the house, and meeting with the messengers, told him to "go doubting nothing." When he met with Cornelius, he offered an apology for his coming to one of another nation, on the ground of God's having shown him that he should not call any man common or unclean. When Cornelius had informed him of the visit of the angel, and that he had instructed him to send for him, (Peter) &c., Peter exclaimed, "of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." Although Peter appeared to have been convinced, himself; yet it was necessary that something more should take place to convince those of the circumcision, who had come with him, as well as those at Jerusalem; for, when Peter began to preach, and the "Holy Ghost fell on all of them that heard the word," "they of the circumcision, which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because, that on the Gentiles, also, was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now if these had been convinced *before* the Holy Ghost was poured out on Cornelius and his household, they certainly would not have been *astonished* at that event—of course, this circumstance was designed to remove every doubt in their minds. The gift of the Holy Ghost, was, by them, used as an invincible argument in favor of the truth of christianity, on the day of pentecost; and they would, indeed, have been extremely sceptical, not to believe that the gospel extended to the Gentiles, when they had the same evidence before them. Peter considered it such an irrefragable evidence, that he exclaimed, "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we. And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

As might have been expected, when Peter came up to Jerusalem, those of the circumcision contended with him: But when he rehearsed the whole affair, he concludes by telling them that as he began to speak, "the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning;" and he adds, "What was I, that I could withstand

God." This was enough—their prejudices were destroyed—"And they glorified God, saying, then hath God also, to the Gentiles, granted repentance unto life." Who does not see the design of God, in thus acting out of his ordinary plan!

JAMES E. MATTHEWS.

---

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

No doubt it behooves the disciples of Jesus "earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints." Volumes have been written, and thousands of sermons preached, for the purpose of getting the people to believe correctly. Councils, synods and associations have exerted all their skill, and racked their inventions, in forming systems of divinity to bring the people to the unity of the faith. All earnestly contend for their own faith; but too frequently in a manner repugnant to the spirit of the gospel. To establish and propagate the faith, which they have adopted, recourse has been had to the sword, fire and faggot; and even in our own enlightened day, and free country, unchristian and uncharitable measures are often used. A correct theory, or true faith, is important, and desirable; and I verily believe that truth is rising, and will triumph over error. But a christian spirit and correct practice are more important. And to be successful in promoting, and earnestly contending for the faith, we must be zealous of good works—our "light must so shine before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our father which is in heaven." A reformation in doctrine is of little worth, unless it produces reformation in practice. We ought earnestly to teach the people "pure and undefiled religion," which does not consist in faith alone, but in "visiting the widows and fatherless in their afflictions, and keeping themselves unspotted from the world." Were that golden lesson, taught by our Savior, Matt. VII. 12. "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them" attended to by his professed disciples, their influence would be great, and the cause of God would *gloriously* advance. Let the spirit of this short lesson prevail, and great would be the reformation in our world—jars and discord would be swallowed up by pure charity—paper-calumny, pulpit-invective, and private slander would be heard no more—dictating to others in matters of faith, and persecuting them, because they cannot receive our dogmas, would not be heard of—unfair dealings, one with another, would be at an end—a prompt fulfilment of contracts and promises, would deliver us from those fears and disappointments under which we now labor—and, above all, we should be delivered from that distressing evil which caused the God of Israel to meet Moses at the burning bush of Horeb, viz: *oppression*—never more would the husband and wife be separated by unfeeling men, for the sake of gold; nor the child sold, because it is unfortunately black, nor be dragged from the embraces of an affectionate mother, to spend a miserable life under the whip of a relentless master.



It will be acknowledged that a strict adherence to our Savior's command, would accomplish all this, and a great deal more. In order to complete this important work, let us "bind the law of God to our hearts," and pray for the real spirit of it in our souls, and teach it to our children, and to all to whom we can have access, both by precept and example.

L. P.

---

Extracts from a sermon preached by Mr. DUDLEY PHELPS, at Haverhill, Nov. 9. 1828. The sentiments are so good we cannot refrain from transferring them into our columns. Coming, as it is believed, from the pen of an *orthodox* teacher, their value is enhanced in our esteem:

"I know these terms, faith and works, have been sometimes falsely applied to things, which God never required of his creatures. Hence, because some men love perplexity more than simple truth,—because they had rather be in the confusion, which confused minds have raised, than in the clear light of the gospel, they have considered the connexion between faith and works as very mysterious. Some, while in this needless perplexity, I had almost said, wilful blindness, have thought, that, as faith is so much insisted on, and held out to be so essential, therefore works, or obedience to the commands of the gospel, which is the very same thing, are entirely set aside—as if it were no matter what a man does, if he only believes—no matter what his outward conduct may be—no matter about his doing justly, and loving mercy, and walking humbly—about his loving his neighbor as himself, and doing good to all as he has an opportunity—if he only has faith. As though a man could believe the gospel, without regarding its precepts—could have a living faith in his holy Creator, who cannot look upon sin but with abhorrence, and yet continue careless, in his course of transgression. As though he could put his supreme trust in his holy Redeemer, and be reconciled to him in a new and everlasting covenant, and yet be disobedient to his commands—and could importunately supplicate the Holy Spirit to sanctify his own heart, and free him from the dominion of sin, and yet not be careful to conform his conduct to the rules of action which this heavenly teacher has revealed."

"How foolish, yea, how ridiculous does it seem, aside from the consequences of such insensibility, for an assemblage of men to enter on a discussion of their various systems of religious belief, while they are alike destitute of the faith, which purifies the soul, and lifts it above the world! Some contend strenuously for these points as true, and essential to salvation; others as strenuously for those; while not one of the doctrines proposed, has a perceptible influence on their characters. Could I overlook the perversion of feeling, which such conduct indicates, and which is totally the reverse of that disposition, required by the gospel, as the only evidence of a preparation for heaven—I should say, these men would not exhibit greater folly, by assembling at frequent intervals, to hold grave and serious intercourse about their

separate imaginary possessions in one of the recently discovered stars;—to measure the quantity and compare the value of what each might call his own in that immensely distant region. All their interest on this subject would of course consist in mere words, and so it is with regard to their eternal things.

"Believing in the only sense which God approves, and in the only sense, which every preacher of the gospel, who knows the gospel, enforces, is equivalent to obeying—to performing acceptable works. True, the apostle says, *a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.* But does he mean by this, that a man is justified by believing merely, without doing works corresponding to his belief? *God forbid!* says the same apostle, that any such meaning should be understood. So far from making void the claims to obedience—to the performance of acceptable works by this faith, we establish,—we confirm these claims.—To be justified by faith without the deeds of the law, is to take Christ for our Redeemer, and through him to be freed from the penalties of the law, and not to venture before our holy Judge on the ground of our own merit, without a Saviour,—without an advocate. This, and no more, is meant, by being *justified by faith.* And the faith which thus justifies, implies, or rather, is of itself, a spirit of obedience, of love, of gratitude, of hope; a spirit which can no more be inoperative in him who has it, than can the living soul be in the body, and yet the body be only a lifeless corpse.

"It is strange, very strange, that faith and works should ever be separated, even in imagination. To suppose their separation is absurd. Genuine faith is to believe the truths of the gospel, and to act in accordance with them. This is all the mystery which there is in faith Acceptable works is to act in accordance with a full belief of the truths of the gospel. This is all the mystery which there is in works. Now conceive, if you can, of their being separated. It is impossible.

"Show me a man, who is most carefully doing all the duties which the Bible requires of him, and with the spirit it requires, and I wish not to inquire what he believes. I want no other evidence of his genuine faith, than his benevolent and devoted heart; his consistent and active life. For only genuine faith could thus purify his affections, and enable him to overcome the world—and exercise so transforming an influence upon his whole character. On the other hand, shew me a man, who lives for the world supremely; who regards the things which are his own, exclusively; who is selfish and worldly in all his coversation and deportment, manifesting no concern for his own immortal interests, nor for those of his fellow men, and I have evidence enough of his unbelief,—of his entire destitution of that faith, which is essential to salvation. Whatever he professes to believe,—whatever creeds he may bring forward and advocate as his own, and as what he views as indispensable to his eternal well-being; his conduct is a demonstration that he is an unbeliever. He has no



faith, because there is nothing within him that works by love, and purifies the heart, and overcomes the world."

Upon this sermon, a writer in the Christian Register, makes the following remarks:

"What a rare and anomalous publication for these times!—But rare and anomalous as it is,—that similar publications may be multiplied, and that a similar style of preaching may revive and prevail, till all, who claim to be ranked with the ministers of Christ, are more anxious to disseminate the practical influence and spirit of Christianity, than to "compass sea and land," in quest of proselytes to the metaphysical dogmas of human creeds, is "a consummation most devoutly to be wished."

In that event the different speculations, and clashing tenets of the clergy, would produce no injurious effects upon the people at large. Accustomed to hear instruction from every pulpit, adapted to encourage and assist them "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God," they would seldom enquire, or care to know, who was orthodox, or who was heretical, in the modern acceptation of the words. These invidious distinctions would soon fall into disuse and oblivion; "the churches would have rest, and be edified."

---

*From the Christian Register.*

1 John v. 7,

This famous text has been pronounced spurious by the soundest critics, both Trinitarian and Unitarian. It is however quoted by those who are willing to employ an argument without understanding its validity, and sometimes even by them, in whom we know not whether ignorance or unfairness be more inexcusable. Two or three sturdy combatants however have endeavored to support its genuineness. One of these champions of a desperate cause is an English prelate, *the Right Reverend* Bishop Burgess. His repeated attempts within the last seven years to substantiate the claim of the text of the three heavenly witnesses to a place in the Christian scriptures, have at last it seems drawn forth a writer, to speak in sober criticism. A recent number of the British Critic contains a review of this controversy. The British Critic is the high church periodical. Its title (Quarterly Theological Review and Theological Record) in some measure indicates its character. It sustains to the Church the same relation which "the Quarterly" bears to the State. We may be sure therefore that it will evince no partiality to Unitarianism; and its judgment against the genuineness of a verse which if authentic, might not improperly be called, "the chief bulwark of the orthodox faith," is entitled to peculiar attention. The testimony of the Eclectic Review on this matter has often been quoted; we would place by its side that of the British Critic. In speaking of Bishop Burgess's labors, the reviewer says "the causes of this bad success are not to be looked for in the want of zeal or talents in the advocate—but in the utter hopeless

ness of the cause which he has attempted to maintain." After examination of the various positions assumed by the Bishop of Salisbury, the Critic concludes in the following language:

"Believing that the verse is unquestionably spurious, and consequently that *its authenticity cannot be maintained, except by the admission of principles which would tend inevitably to destroy our confidence in the authenticity of every other passage in the New Testament*, we have witnessed with uneasiness the attempt of the learned prelate to establish its claim to an inspired origin, and have wondered at the arguments by which he thinks its claim is proved."

An error committed by Horne the author of the Introduction to the Study of Scripture, which has found a ready sale in this country, is likewise exposed by the reviewer. Horne was inclined to retain the verse, and was disingenuous enough to assert, that though "it is not to be found in a single Greek MS. written before the 16th century," yet this fact should be qualified by a regard to the number of unexamined MSS. "In the library at Florence, alone," says he, "there are at least a thousand Greek MSS. of the New Testament, and of these only twenty-four have been collated." On which the Critic remarks. "*A thousand MSS. of the Greek Testament*—from the first chapter of Matthew to the last of the Apocalypse of course—in the single library at Florence! Mr. Horne should *know* there is not a twentieth part of *such* MSS. in all the libraries in Europe." In a subsequent number of the British Critic is this note. "We have seen the new edition of Mr. Horne's Introduction, and on referring to his observations on the disputed text of 1 John v. 7, 8, we perceive he has given it up as spurious." We hope never again to see it adduced in proof of the Trinity. A late number of the Glasgow Pioneer contains a summary of the evidence against the genuineness of this text, which, as it is brief and conclusive, we copy rather to refresh than to instruct the memory of our readers.

1 John v. 7, 8, "For there are three which bear record *in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness on earth*: the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." This text, at least so much of it as is printed in Italics, is I think, decidedly spurious. It is so considered by Bishop Lowth, who denies the use of understanding to the man who defends it; by Dr. Middleton, by the late Bishop of Lincoln, by Bishop Marsh, and by Archbishop Newcome, editor of a new version of the New Testament; by Erasmus, and Zuinglius, and Luther, whose dying request it was, that his translation should not be altered; by Michaelis, and Simon, and Wetstein. It is omitted in the editions of Aldus, of Strasburg, and Colinæas, and in those of Harwood and Matthæi; and is marked as doubtful in those of Bullinger, and of Boyer, and Knapp. It is rejected by Griesbach, the most eminent biblical critic of modern times; by Porson, the unrivalled Greek scholar; by Charles Butler, the Roman Catholic, and Adam Clarke, the Methodist, author of a most powerful and critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures; by the Quarterly Reviewers, the champions of the English Church; and by the Eclectic Reviewers, the organs of Trinitarian Dissenters: and if to these we add the names of Newton and Locke, Lardner and Milton, of Priestly and Lindsay, Belsham, Carpenter, and Wardlaw, we shall find the most eminent critics of all parties in the Christian world, united in their opinion against this text, and in the expulsion of it from those Scriptures in which they all alike believe and trust.



The reasons for which these excellent and learned men have rejected this text, are briefly these. It is found in no Greek manuscript older than the fifteenth century, and in no Latin one older than the ninth. It is not found in any of the ancient versions; it is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical Fathers, some of whom (particularly Athanasius) have ransacked the whole New Testament for proofs of a Trinity; and have actually quoted the words before and after it. It is not quoted by any of the Latin Fathers, even where it would have been most pertinent, and where the subject seemed to require it. The sense is much more complete without it, as any one may see by reading over the passage, leaving out the words in question, thus: "For there are three that bear record," "the Spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." It would thus form, I think, a natural and proper conclusion to the sixth verse, for "the blood" and "the Spirit" are all mentioned there, but not a word is said about the "Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost." But this text, even if it were genuine, would no more prove that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Gost, are "three persons and one God," than it would prove that the Spirit, the water, and the blood are. *Calvin* says on this text,—"Three are one, does *not* denote the essence but the consent."

---

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

*Brother Stone:* By reading the Christian Messenger, I find it is your practice to give your opinions on any difficult point when requested; I therefore beg leave to state my views on a certain point—not with any design of entering into a controversy with you; but, from a real desire to get your opinion on the subject.

There has been much said about *foreordination*, *predestination*, &c. After much attention to both sides of the question, and searching the scripture for myself, I have settled on the following belief:

That God did (under the Mosiac dispensation, and till the resurrection) govern the passions of many by an irresistible power, for the glory of his name and the salvation of sinners. I will now give my scriptures. Exodus VII, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 IX, 12, 16. X. 1, 20, 27. XI. 9, 10. XIV. 4, 9, 13, 17 The nations of the earth did not acknowledge the God of Israel to be any more in power and glory, than the images they worshipped; neither did the

Egytians themselves; although they had it recorded (no doubt) what God had done for them by Joseph. To convince, not only the Egyptians, but all the world of his power and glory, God performed those wonders before Pharaoh and all Egypt—to convince the whole world that He is God, superior to all gods, whom the nations of the earth worship. I think Pharaoh was entirely willing, many times to let them go. There are other passages through the Old Testament which have a bearing that way, such as 1st Kings xxii. 20, 21, 22, 23, and others which might be named. Let this suffice for the Old Testament. We will now come down to the 11th chapter of Romans. When I read this chapter, and join with it Peter's expression, Acts iii. 17, 18, I must believe, that the rulers of the Jews did not, and could not believe, that Jesus was the Christ. Had they believed that Jesus was the promised Savior, they would not have delivered him to be crucified. If Christ had not been crusified, there would have been no atonement.

From this chapter before us, I do think, that blindness happened to the Jews, that they should not know the Savior, that they might kill him, that salvation might be possible to all the world.—"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men, every where, to repent."—Acts xvii. 30.

I believe the Gospel free to all; that all are invited; that Christ tasted death for every man.

I cannot express my thoughts as plainly as I wish, but I hope you can make out my meaning.

If you think this subject worthy your attention, give me your reply as soon as convenient, and as plain as possible, and not too short; and in doing this, you will much oblige one, who wishes to know and do the Truth.

I also believe, that the Jews continue in this irresistable blindness, to this day; and that, if there be any thing like predestination, or reprobation, since the crucifiction; it is on them, and not on us Gentiles.

Dear Brother,—sometimes when I meditates on the strange changes that have, and are taking place in religious points, I am astonished above measure; and think,—where will it end! I am afraid, many times, the zeal of some of our preachers, will run them out of the scriptures. May the great Shepherd lead his flock in the right way! I am afraid, that the convincing of some of their errors, will cause others to be exalted above measure, and put too much confidence in the flesh. O! that humility and meekness, may possess each heart, where christianity is professed! Let all take this resolution:—Render not evil for evil, nor railing for railing;—when we suffer, commit our souls to him, who is able to save, to the uttermost, all who put their trust in him. May God enlighten all who are searching after truth, and establish them in the same, is the sincere desire of W. N.

Callaway county, Mo. 23th March, 1829.



REPLY.

Dear Brother,—With the christian spirit of your letter, I am highly pleased. Were all possessed of this spirit, contention would die, and diversity of opinion would produce no injury to society. You state your settled belief, that "God did (under the Mosaic dispensation, and till the resurrection) govern the passions of many by an irresistable power, for the glory of his name, and the salvation of sinners." On four particular cases you ground your faith; as

1. God hardening Pharaoh's heart; 2. Of his hardening the Egyptians to pursue the Israelites into the Red Sea; 3. Of his putting a lying spirit into the mouth of Ahab's prophets; and 4: Of the Jews killing the Savior. These have long been considered difficult cases to solve, so as not to destroy the free agency of man, and not to make God the author and perpetrator of sin. Yet we believe they can be solved in perfect accordance with the whole tenor of revelation. Let us in the spirit of humble inquirers fearlessly advance to the solution.

1. It is admitted by all, that hardness of heart, and that killing the prince of life, are sins of a crimson dye.

2. If God by his power *irresistably* governed, moved upon, and disposed the passions of Pharaoh to oppose the will of God; and the passions of the Jews to crucify the Son of God—then were Pharaoh and the Jews passive instruments in the hand of God to effect these evils. As well might Alexander blame his sword with the crime of killing his faithful and long-tried general Clitus. For how could the sword resist his power. If Alexander was guilty, and not the sword; then how can, my brother, condemn Pharoah, the Egyptians and the Jews and justify God!

3. If their passions were *irresistably governed*, then they were not free, but necessary agents—If such, they were not accountable for their conduct—they could not commit moral evil.

4. If hardness of heart and murder are sins, and contrary to the will of God, then he must have acted contrary to his own will in irresistably influencing and governing the passions of Pharaoh and the Jews to commit those horrid deeds recorded of them.

5. It will not do to sanctify the means by saying the end was good. You say the end God had in view was his own glory and the salvation of sinners; but will he do evil that good may come? God forbid!

It is commonly said that God judicially hardened Pharaoh's heart, and judicially blinded the Jews that they should crucify the Savior. This is a salvo to hide the horrors of the doctrine. But can my friend for a moment think that God would influence his creatures to commit sin in order to punish their former sin? You cannot. The salve is more horrid than the doctrine of absolute predestination, if possible.

It is frequently stated in the Bible that Pharaoh himself hardened his own heart. Exo'd. viii. 15, xxxii. 34, 35. The Philistines were once addressed in these words: "Wherefore then

do ye harden your hearts, as the Egyptians and Pharaoh hardened their hearts?"—1. Sam: VI. 6. If God by irresitable power hardened Pharaoh's heart, then Pharaoh could not have done it himself; nor have any part in the work, unless you view him as a co-worker with God in the sin.

God is said to have done many things in scripture, in which the whole connexion proves that he had no agency in effecting. Thus in Isai: LXIII. 17, he is said to have made Israel to *err* from his ways, and hardened their heart from his fear. Can you think that God actually did those things to Israel, and then blamed and condemned them to be punished for them? No: he had no other agency than suffering them to be done, or not interposing to prevent them. God is said to have moved David to number Israel and Judah, 2. Jam: XXIV. 1; And yet it is said, 1. Chro: VXI. 1, that satan provoked David to number Israel. Surely God was not the author of this great sin, in any other sense than suffering it to be done. God is said to have cut off Job's property and children; "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away;" yet the whole history shews that satan did it. God suffered it to be done, not interposing his preventing power to hinder it. God is said to have bruised his Son—to have smitten the Shepherd, and to have turned his hand upon the little ones, i. e. to persecute and kill the humble followers of Christ. For this is signified by the act of turning his hand *upon* the little ones. The whole transactions examined, it will appear irrefutable that the Jews and wicked Gentiles killed the Prince of peace, and persecuted to death millions of his saints. If God irresistably governed the passions of these people in committing such horrid deeds, might we not as well say that he is the author, and at the head of all the sin and mischief in the world?—O what a dark vail we draw over his lovely character! Who in this belief can see the glory, the justice, or the love of God? Are they not all lost behind this impervious vail of darkness?

Though God did not govern the passions of men to commit these evils; yet we are well assured that he so governs the evils, that they shall eventuate in good to his cause and people. For, "the wrath of man shall praise thee."—"All things work together for good to them that love God," &c.

The passage in 1. Kings XXII. 20, I consider nothing more than a parable, uttered by Micaiah, to convince Ahab of his certain ruin if he attended to his false prophets. Infinitely distant be it from my heart to think that God would influence any one to speak lies; or that he should make use of any other agent to influence any one to commit this evil! God did not prevent it, but governed the event to his glory. So he does not prevent any of the countless sins committed daily in the world. This would be to destroy the liberty of man, and consequently would marr the glorious work of God.

We grant that in one sense God may be said to harden the heart of sinners. His gospel is calculated to soften and draw the hearts of sinners to him. But this gospel rejected, it is well known, will harden the unbelieving rejector, and be to him a savor of death unto death. This is the sense in which the scriptures uniformly teach. Comp: Isai: VI. 9, Matt: XIII. 14, Joh: XII. 40, and Rom: XI. 8, with Acts XXVIII. 26, 27. In the former of these references God is said to have hardened the hearts, and blinded the eyes of the people; in the last reference, they are represented as having shut their own eyes and hardened their own hearts. The whole account plainly shews that the Lord by his prophet and servants preached the gospel to the people, but they wilfully disbelieved and rejected it, and were therefore hardened from the fear of God. With this sense, as being that of inspiration, we should be contented, and cease from speculations, which bewilder the mind, and dishonor the spotless character of God. How, can God, on your theory, judge the world in righteousness?

With the latter part of your letter, I am delighted, and with pleasure have given it a place in the Messenger. It has confirmed me in the opinion that piety and erroneous opinions can, and do exist in the same person. May the Lord bless you abundantly in time and eternity. EDITOR.



## AN ORATION,

*Delivered by* Doc: S. G. MITCHELL, *February* 22, 1829, *in Indianapolis, on the subject of colonizing the free people of color, in Africa.*

GENTLEMEN & LADIES,—Should it not be deemed an intrusion, I beg leave to suggest a few remarks on what I consider a very interesting subject. I do it in obedience to the request of my friends, whom our Legislature has appointed a committee to make arrangements for the celebration of this day, which gave birth to our illustrious Washington. The subject to which I allude is, the propriety of organizing a society at this place, as auxiliary to the mother society at Washington, for colonizing the free people of color in Africa, the land of their forefathers.

To carry into effect this benevolent object, a national society was formed at the Federal city, a few years ago, which yet exists, at the head of which stand the most distinguished men of our nation, among which worthies the name of Henry Clay stands pre-eminent. This heaven born enterprize was planned by the pious, learned and philanthropic Robert Finley of New-Jersey. To a general meeting in Washington the scheme was first promulged Dec. 28, 1815. Then a society was formed; and from that period has increased; and auxiliary societies have multiplied through the United States beyond the expectation of liberty's warmest friends. With the march of the American mind, in science and religion, we anticipate a still greater progress of this noble enterprize. We look forward to the day when the cloud of oppression shall become pacified, when slavery, the foulest blot on America's escutcheon, shall be wiped off, and liberty

reign without a blush over her willing and obedient children in America and Africa. What can excite human sensibility so much as the cries of distress—the groans of the unfortunate and wretched—the tears and sighs of the oppressed? But the dawn of that day appears—is it an illusion of fancy?—when neither our eyes, ears nor heart, shall be affected any more with these things. Are you not apprised that the voice of humanity and justice is now listened to with attention; and that the benevolent of every nation joyfully hail the doctrines of liberty, civil and religious liberty? It should not be thought strange that we in a free state, which has debarred slavery from our coasts by an impregnable wall, should support the colonization plan; and thus aid our sister states to free themselves from this growing evil.

The white men brought the children of Africa from their native land. England, our mother, first introduced them into our country. Yet we her children, are bound to remunerate for the injury she inflicted. By restoring them to their native land, we may avert that dark and lowring cloud, that hangs over our country, which, at no distant day, will pour forth a desolating flood. By constituting a colonization society in this place, subordinate to that at Washington, we should aid in sending to the benighted regions of Africa a population partially civilized, enlightened and christianized, which would diffuse these rich blessings among the millions of that land, to whom the white men could never have access, because of inveterate prejudices against them.—We should aid in removing a population, a real terror and injury to ourselves, to a land extremely fertile—to a climate more congenial to their constitution—to a society of free blacks already numerous and flourishing, who are stimulated to industry by the rich rewards it affords, and who enjoy the blessings of letters, religion and liberty. Shall we in the West hesitate what to do, when the blackmen in hundreds, through the liberality of the East, are sailing over the ocean to revisit the long lost homes of their fathers; and hundreds more waiting on our shores, and longing to follow, yet cannot, for the want of pecuniary aid?—The mother society supplicates help—humanity pleads for help—and justice with mercy joins the prayer.—Shall we not hear and lend our aid? Much is already done, yet much remains to be done.

We have lived to see a day of religious and political liberty. Bigotry, that always grows best in the soil of ignorance, is fast withering under the light of liberal men, and liberal principles. The poor bigot has but a few barbed arrows left to throw at his adversary, and when thrown, they fall harmless at his feet. Denunciation is no longer esteemed as argument.

A storm appears to be gathering in the political horizon—the very heavens are shaking—every day is big with events—a revolution in church and state seems to approach. But let us as a nation teach the world the lessons of freedom and happiness—let us practise the holy precepts of our religion, which teach us to do justice, to love mercy, to walk humbly with our God—to break



every yoke and to let the oppressed go free. Though we in this happy state of the union have none to emancipate, we can assist in making happy those, emancipated by the good and benevolent in our sister states.

The subject of colonization already inspires hope in the bosoms of the poor Africans of our country. They are men, and with strong desire turn their eyes to the land of their forefathers. The natives of that ill-fated land are beginning to hope that America is their friend. See on the sea beach the venerable old father, leaning on his staff, and the hoary-headed mother, bereaved of their children by the hand of injustice, turning their dim eyes to the land of liberty. They descry a vessel approaching their coasts—joyful hope warms their breasts—the hope, that that vessel may be bringing back to their embraces their long lost sons and daughters. Happy! thrice happy America! if she not only rivals other nations in arts and science, but also equals and excels them in the great cause of humanity, which has already begun its never ending course. While the spirit of benevolence is seen marching with increasing strength from Maine to Louisiana—while the general government is becoming deeply interested in the subject of colonization—while many of the state governments have extended their fostering patronage, shall Indiana?—shall Indianopolis be the last to rouse from her slumbers, and extend the hand of mercy? I hope not. Let us unite our energies in the mighty work. Africa is not forgotten by him, who feeds the sparrows—The earth itself is destined to come under the reign of the Prince of peace; but man is not to be inactive in the work. We, humble as we are, and far removed into the western wilds, have our parts to perform. Let us do our duty—Let us speedily constitute ourselves into a society auxiliary to the mother society at Washington, to forward the plan of colonizing the free blacks. S. C. Mitchell.

## REMARKS.

To these sentiments my heart responds *amen*. O that the spirit which runs through every vein of this oration, were more generally felt by the children of America! O that my eyes might be blessed with seeing, and my ears with hearing, tens of thousands of our countrymen engaging in this benevolent plan of forming societies for colonizing the free people of color in Africa! Thousands of the benevolent who weep at the sight of oppression, but know not how to free themselves from the evil, would find an asylum in the colonization society, and into its bosom roll the burden of their hearts—a burden, borne with pleasure by the society, and soon conveyed to the fertile shores of Africa to share the blessings of liberty. With the apostle of the Gentiles I speak to all whom I can influence to right: "*Be imitators of me*," in this respect—Unite, as I have done, with this benevolent society, and unite speedily. Editor.

## REVIVALS.

Elder JOSEPH BAKER writes to the Editor, April 6, 1829—That in the churches to which he preaches, in Ross county, Ohio, there are good appearances in regard to religion—20 have lately united with the Christians. He wishes some of our preaching brethren to attend a camp meeting, to begin on Friday before the second Lord's day in August next.

Elder DANIEL LONG writes, March 19, 1829—That the cause of God is gaining ground in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania, as far as his knowledge extends.

Elder JOHN A. HURST writes, dated Forsythe, Ga. Feb. 1, 1829—That in the counties of Monroe and Crawford, God is abundantly blessing the people with an outpouring of his spirit. He earnestly solicits the aid of spiritual preachers.

JOSEPH SPALDING writes, dated Rochdale, Pa., March 26, 1829—That the Lord is carrying on a good work in Conneautee. He concludes his letter in these words:—"O that God would raise up laborers, and send them forth into his vineyard!—men fearing God, and having his cause at heart!—who may go forth like flames of fire, bearing the glad tidings of a free gospel; regarding none as their master but Christ; disclaiming all creeds but the Bible; receiving no other name than the one given the disciples at Antioch, *Christian*; who might teach the followers of Christ his laws—might themselves possess the very temper and spirit of Christ, and teach their flocks the same! Thus would christianity flourish, and be presented to the world in an amiable light. I must draw to a close by wishing you success in the west, in your endeavors to advance the truth. I am your brother in the Lord. JOSEPH SPAULDING."

Elder MATTHEW GARDNER, of Brown co. Ohio, writes to the Editor, March 26, 1829.—Within 12 months I have baptized, in this county, 135—about 25 or 30 more, having professed faith in Christ, are waiting to submit to the same ordinance of baptism. In other places, within the same period, I have immersed about 70 more. Bro: John Powel and myself have lately visited two small towns on the Ohio river, Chili and Nevel. There about 20 persons have professed faith in Christ and joined the church, and are waiting to be baptised.

We are glad to hear of the progress of the revival in the City of New York. The Gospel Luminary noticed it some months ago, and states it as gradually increasing.

In Rochester and Farmington, it is also stated by the Christian Herald, there is a glorious work. Within three or four months about 60 have been added to the C. Church.

---

A Christian Conference was held on Buck creek, Ia. Sept. 12, 1828. The Elders present were Hugh Cole, E. Gunn, Sherman Babcock, Josiah Smith, John Wright, Peter Wright, Js. Dohorty, Wm. Tracy, John Rogers, Dorsey Scott, P. Hatchitt, Josiah H. Yager.



Unordained preachers—Barzilla Wilie, Wm. Ellis, Ben. Wire, Danl. Asbury, John Heddin, and John Condre.

The Conference agreed to correspond with the Nolin Association of Separate Baptists by letter and messengers—Also with the Christian Conference in Jefferson co. Ia., to meet on Thursday before first Lord's day in Sept. next.

Our next Conference will be on Middle Creek, Hardin co. Ky. on Friday before second Lord's day in September, 1829.

The Editor remarks to his brethren in Indiana, that he had not room to insert all the minutes of their Conference. He hopes for their indulgence.

---

In the Christian Baptist, for April 1829, we have read with pleasure an article, including a letter from Doc: Straith of Va. headed, "Immersion and not Sprinkling, another Presbyterian doctor testifies." The reasoning of this venerable and learned doctor of Virginia, we think is irrefutable on the word baptisa, as meaning immersion. His letter is so full of instruction that we cannot forbear transferring it to our columns. In the next No. it shall appear, unless our mind may change its purpose. EDITOR.

---

The long looked for debate between Mr. A. Campbell and Mr. Owen, has eventuated, as we anticipated, in the complete triumph of Christianity over scepticism and infidelity in Cincinnati. Mr. Campbell deserves much from our country. We feel thankful for so able a defender and supporter of the faith once delivered to the saints, and we pray that his useful life may long be preserved a blessing to the world. EDITOR.

---

## INFALLIBILITY.

*Extract from Doctor Chalmers' Sermon on "the Doctrine of Christian Charity applied to the case of Religious Differences."*

"IT is said of the Papists that they ascribe an infallibility to the Pope; so that if he were to say one thing, and the Bible another, his authority would carry it over the authority of God. And, think you, brethren, that there is no such Popery among you? You all have, or ought to have, Bibles; and how often is it repeated there; "Hearken diligently unto me!" Now, do you obey this requirement, by making the reading of your Bibles a distinct and earnest exercise? Do you ever dare to bring your favorite minister to the tribunal of the Word, or would you tremble at the presumption of such an attempt, so that the hearing of the word, carries a greater authority over your mind than the reading of the Word! Now this want of doing, this trembling at the very idea of a dissent from your minister, this indolent acquiescence in his doctrine, is just calling another man Master: it is putting the authority of man over the authority of God: it is throwing yourself into a prostrate attitude at the footstool of infallibility; it is not just kissing the toe of reverence, but it is the

profound degradation of the mind, and all its faculties; and without the name of Popery—that your bosoms, your souls, may be infected with the deadly poison, and your consciences be weighed down by the oppressive shackles of Popery. And all this in a noon-day effulgence of a Protestant country, where the Bible, in your mother tongue, circulates among all your families; where it may be met with on almost every shelf, and is soliciting you to look to the wisdom that is inscribed on its pages."

## NOTICE.

The Christian Hymn Book, compiled by Barton W. Stone and Thos. Adams, at the request of the Miami Conference, will be ready for delivery in a few weeks. We have spared no pains nor expense to make it complete. We have rejected many hymns of the former editions and added others. We hope that our brethren will not be disappointed, and that they will not disappoint us, but actively patronize the work, and make as quick sales as possible, as we depend on the sales to pay the expenses very soon.

## NOTICE.

Elder M. Gardner, of Ohio, has just published his last edition of the Christian Hymn Book, revised and corrected. They are to be had in Ripley, Ohio.

## TO AGENTS.

To my agents I am constrained once more to appeal. My friends, trusting in your goodness, I have sent the Christian Messenger to nearly 2000 subscribers for almost three years. From these I have received very little more than what has paid my printer and paper maker for the first two years. I am now greatly in arrears with them for the present year. Could I get as much as would pay the expenses of the work, I could cheerfully give my labor to promote the good cause. But my family is large and needs my service, and cannot spare that and money too for the public good. If you do not exert yourselves in making collections speedily, I must stop the work at the end of this volume, with great loss to myself. I am flattered from every state to which the Messenger is sent, with accounts of its favorable reception. This induces me to believe that the subscribers are willing to pay, if the agents should only require it. To a few of my agents I am greatly obliged; but many have let their subscribers move away, without receiving a cent, and have not apprised me of it till many numbers had been still sent on and lost to me entirely.—Many have let their subscribers discontinue, and have not received payment. What shall I do! Let my friends realize my situation, and answer the question. EDITOR.


# 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. III.] GEORGETOWN, KY. JUNE 1829. [No. 8.


[*From the Christian Baptist, for April* 1829.

## PRESBYTERIAN STATISTICS.

AN EXTRACT OF DOC. E. S. ELY'S REPORT.

"There are probably fifteen baptized members, who are pewholders, supporters of, and attendants on, public worship in our Presbyterian churches, for every communicant in our conexion; and if so, then our body in the United States contains 2,194,620 persons. If our denomination should be kept from disunion, and the blessing of God should be continued as it has been for the last twenty years, in 1848 there will be at least 5,000,000 of persons under the care of the General Assembly; for we have more than doubled in numbers in the last twenty years. At that time, to give every thousand people in our connexion one pastor, we shall need 5000 ministers. Of our present preachers 600 will probably decease before that time, leaving of the 1479 no more than 879. To these add the 1528 which may be gained in twenty years at the rate of our increase during the last ten years, and it will give us 2507, and will leave a deficiency of 2593 to make up the 5000: so that 2,593,000 of our people, or more than our present whole number, will then be without one man in a thousand to show unto them their transgressions; if our increase of preachers shall not exceed that of any former period, in the proportion of about *three* to *one*. How wide is the field which is opening before us! Truly our portion of the harvest is great and the laborers are few. If we consider the relative strength of the Presbyterian church in the United States, every candid mind will be satisfied that we ought to perform more services in the building of Zion than any other two denominations of christians in our country; for, of those to whom much is given, much will be required.

"*Two thirds* of the colleges, theological seminaries, and other academic institutions in this country are under the control of Presbyterians. The Congregational churches of New England and the Presbyterian church together have the charge of more than *three fourths* of all these fountains of literary influence.

"Baptist and Methodist churches in the United States, contain not far from 1,500,000 people in each; but they are comparatively poor, and contain a larger proportion of slaves than any other denominations.