sort of Jourdan Pead, and daughter of Captain Lewis Nuckols. She was young, amiable and pious; and in her illness and death, manifested an unusual degree of faith and assurance of immortality.

——Also, a few days before, died Miss POLLY DOWNING, of Bethel. Her sufferings were long, and unusually severe; yet the gracious presence of the Lord, whom she had long and faithfully served, supported her, and caused her continually to triumph to the last moment of her existence.

——Also, Mr. JAMES KELLY, July 31st. He had long suffered by a paralytic stroke, which greatly affected the strength of his body and mind. He had long been a professor of religion, the fruits of which we hope he now reaps in heaven.

——Also, Mrs. ELIZABETH BELL, on the 8th of August, in the 77th year of her age. She had been a member of the Christian church upwards of 20 years, and adorned her profession. She was beloved of all her acquaintance, benevolent and kind to the needy. She died in the faith, giving glory to God.

——Also, Mrs. KATHARINE GAY, consort of John R. Gay, about the first week of August. She professed faith before she died, and departed in peace.

——Also, NICHOLAS BITNER, August 29th. He was an early settler of Kentucky—advanced in life—and we hope died a Christian.

NOTICE.—It is hoped that my brethren and patrons will not continue the practice of sending me communications and letters without paying the postage. Their conscience cannot justify the practice, when they have been so frequently told how oppressive it is to me. My agents only are allowed this privilege, when matters of consequence are communicated by them. I wish my patrons and agents to remember the third volume of the Messenger will close with the next number. Many are largely in arrears yet for the first and second volumes. I wish all the accounts liquidated before I shall commence the next volume. My agents will remember my request in the last number, to send me speedily the names of those who wish to continue. This can be done with little expence.

Our Hymn Books are ready for delivery. We advise brethren to send or come and take them at a considerable discount, sufficient to satisfy them for their trouble. EDITOR.

Several communications on hand shall hereafter be attended to, unless pushed out by others deemed more important.

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. OCTOBER, 1829. [No. 12.

EXTRACT OF A SERMON

Delivered by JAMES MADISON, D. D. *President of the University of William and Mary, and Professor of Moral and Natural Philosophy, before the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the state of Virginia, May 26, 1786. The text is, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."* John iv. 24.

The object of this sermon is to urge the necessity of christian union, and the injurious tendency of creeds, &c. in originating and promoting dissentions and feuds among christians.

Permit me, then, to make some observations upon the means most likely to forward such an event. This I attempt with readiness, however imperfect the observations may appear, not only because it is, in my mind, of great importance that we should particularly attend to those means at this period, but also because the same means which would most effectually promote the ends just spoken of, will be the best guides to us at a time when we are forming, as it were, anew our own religious society; for without attention to them, we shall deprive ourselves of the inestimable privilege of worshipping God in Spirit and in truth.

Fortunately for christians, those means are altogether of the negative kind. They depend upon the *rejection*, not the *adoption* of those *human systems* of belief, or rules of faith, which have often *usurped the place of christianity itself.* They only require christians to *revert to the gospel*, and to *abandon every other directory of conscience.* I will then venture to recommend earnestly to all christians to reject every system as the fallible production of human contrivance, which shall dictate articles of faith, and *adopt the gospel alone as their guide.* Am I not sufficiently warranted, my brethren, in this recommendation? I trust there is scarce any one amongst us who will object to a recommendation of this nature, whether we attend to the fallibility, the ignorance, the prejudice of men, or to the truth, wisdom, and perfection of the Author of our divine religion.

I will take the liberty to advance a general proposition, the evidence of which, I persuade myself, may be established by the most incontestible proofs. The proposition is, indeed, simple and plain; it is, "that those christian societies will ever be found to have formed their union upon principles the wisest and

the best, which impose the fewest restraints upon the minds of their members, *making the scriptures alone*, and not human articles or confessions of belief, the *sole rule of faith and conduct*."

It is much to be lamented that the venerable reformers, when they burst asunder the cords of popish tyranny, ever departed from the simplicity of this scripture plan; and that, instead of adhering to it, they thought theological systems the only means of preserving uniformity of opinion, or of evincing the purity of their faith. The experience of more than two centuries has proved how far they are capable of producing either effect. On the other hand, the consequences which such insinuations have been productive of, have been more or less severely felt in every part of the Protestant world, from the Diet of Augsburg to the present time.

They have in former, as well as in later ages, caused a religion, designed to unite men as brethren in the sacred bonds of charity and benevolence, too often to disseminate amongst them *jealousies, animosities, and rancorous hatred.* They have nursed the demon of intolerance; nay, aided by the civil power, they have led martyrs to the stake, and have offered up, as holy sacrifices to the God of mercy, christians who had the guilt to prefer what they esteemed the doctrine of Christ to the commandments of men. Even in America, the effects which they have produced on the minds of christians, have been seen written in blood. But thanks be to God those days are past! May such never revisit the earth! So long, however, as we can trace within those human systems of belief, principles oppressive to christians and injurious to the cause of our holy religion, it matters not how small a degree, I shall esteem it my duty to raise a warning, though, perhaps, a feeble voice against them.

It is a maxim, self-evident to every one, and which was held sacred by the fathers of Protestanism, "that the scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, and are the sole ground of the faith of a christian." This maxim, the basis of reformation, and which is acceded to by all Protestants, is alone sufficient, independent of what *experience has taught*, to induce every Protestant church to reject all systems of belief, unless conceived in the terms of the scripture, not only as unwarrantable, and in the highest degree oppressive to the rights of private judgment, but as presumptuous, and as casting an unworthy reflection on the scriptures themselves. Yet many pious and worthy christians are apt to suppose that such systems of faith are necessary for the maintenance of true religion, or, for preventing that disorder which arises from a diversity of opinions. But do such christians reflect sufficiently upon the example which our Lord himself and his Apostles have placed before us? Did they, for this or any other purpose, prescribe or recommend summaries of faith? On the contrary, did not our Saviour constantly enjoin upon his followers to *search the scriptures themselves?* Do we not find that the Bereans were commended for their conduct in not

receiving even the *doctrine of the inspired Apostles*, until they had searched the scriptures to see whether these things were so or not? Doth not St. Paul expressly say, that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ?" Doth he not every where recommend to christians the duty of examining the grounds of their faith, "to prove all things and hold fast that which is good?" And St. John, doth he not exhort us to "believe not every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God?" Now, if summaries of faith had been necessary for the prosperity of our religion, can we suppose that Christ and his Apostles would have neglected, not only to leave such as must have been most proper to maintain the true faith; but that by their precepts as well as conduct, they would rather have taught us the duty of avoiding them! No, my brethren, we may be assured that Christ and his Apostles did not esteem any other summary necessary than the gospel itself; and that whatever is essential either as faith or practice, is there expressed with that clearness which a revelation from Heaven required. We are directed there to search and judge for ourselves; for religion, to be profitable to the individual and acceptable to God, must be the result of free inquiry and the determination of reason. This right of free inquiry, and of judging for ourselves, is a right natural and unalienable. It is the glory of our nature, the truest source of joy and triumph to an American, and constantly to recur to it, the indispensable duty of a christian. For should we neglect this duty, where then would be all manly rational belief? *where the sincere practice of piety and virtue?* where the *surest guide to moral and religious conduct?* In their stead, a *mean credulity* would prevail; *hypocrisy* would *usurp* the place of *true devotion;* religion and morality would degenerate into superstition and sanguinary zeal. To suppose then, that the gospel would authorize a *deprivation of this right*, or that such deprivation is necessary to its support and progress, is to *cast an unworthy reflection upon the gospel itself;* it is to suppose that a religion which utterly disclaims all dominion over the faith and consciences of men, which is the most friendly to the essential rights of mankind, and which indeed, cannot exist where they are invaded, still requires to be supported by their destruction.

Besides, the very attempt, in matters dark and disputable, to prevent diversity of opinion, is vain and fruitless. It hath existed and must ever exist among all christians, *even those of the same society*, so long as human nature continues the same. The God of nature hath for wise purposes bestowed upon different men, different degrees of reason and understanding; so that, if they think at all, they must necessarily think differently upon those dark, mysterious subjects, which however, are often reduced into the form of articles of faith. Nor can such difference cease, until the same *precise portion of intellect be imparted to every individual of the human race*, To attempt then to prevent diversity of opinions upon such subjects, is to oppose the very laws of nature, and consequently vain and fruitless.

But, in truth, that diversity of opinion, which most churches have been so sedulous to prevent, is neither any disgrace to a christian society, nor incompatible with its peace and good government; *unless it be disgraceful to men that they are men, and unless the christian dispensation is incompatible with the nature of man.* On the contrary, such diversity may be considered as most favorable to the progress of chritian knowledge, and should also be equally favorable to christian peace, by teaching us, that dark and disputable points instead of being made articles of faith, and standards of orthodoxy, should rather be considered as trials of our christian temper, and occasions to exercise christian charity; or that those things alone should be held as essentials, which our Lord and Master, hath fully and clearly exposed, and which, therefore, cannot require the supposed improvements and additions of men, So long as men agree in these essential, or fundamental articles of our religion, in those great and important truths and duties, which are so clearly expressed, that every sincere inquirer must readily apprehend them, where is the necessity, or reasonableness of compelling men to be of one mind, as to other matters of considerably inferior moment, and which we may suppose, were designedly less clearly expressed. That christian unity, so strongly recommended to us, as the bond of perfection, does not consist in uniformity of opinion upon abstruse, metaphysical subjects, but upon the great fundamentals of our religion, and in the unanimity of affections, love, peace and charity, which is enjoined on the brethren in Christ Jesus, who all walk by the same rule, and acknowledge one and the same Lord.

But still it may be thought that theological systems, or seminaries of faith are necessary to exclude from the bosom of a church men whose principles might endanger its very existence. But doth experience, or do just observations upon human conduct justify such a belief? He will not be retarded in the accomplishment of his designs, or in the gratification of an avaricious appetite, though 19, 20, or 30,000 articles were presented to him.—Trust me, articles will never prove a barrier to the advances of a secret enemy, or exclude from any church men of vicious principles, or no principles. Whom then will they be most likely to exclude? I answer with regret—*Men of stubborn virtue, men of principle and conscience, men of that rigid, tough integrity, which cannot be shaped and twisted to suit the system of the day, men who will not prefer the dictates and decisions of fallible mortals, to the infallible word of God.*

I conceive, moreover, that no Christian church hath a *right* to impose upon its members, *human systems of belief, as necessary terms of communion.* For what, I beseech you, do we understand by a christian church? According to the most general acceptation, "every christian church is a voluntary society of men agreeing to profess the faith of Christ, and stipulating to live according to the rules of the gospel." From this definition we

find the distinctive terms of union, or the fundamental laws of such a society, is to embrace the *scriptures alone*, as the rule of worship, faith and conduct. Consequently every act of church government, which contravenes this fundamental law, is from its very nature *void.*

How then shall it be pretended, that other terms of communion may be prescribed to the members of a christian church? But all human systems, imposed as articles of belief, must be held as introductory of other terms. It follows then that every christian church, so far as it introduces such terms, is to be considered as having *departed from its essential characteristic*, and consequently to have exceeded its right as a church. This conclusion is the more incontrovertible, as it coincides with the maxim before mentioned, I should say with that christian axiom, "That the scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation, and are the *sole ground of the faith of a Christian.*"—What then, it may be asked, shall not a church prescribe to itself, *terms of communion;* shall it not have its particular confessions or articles of belief, *provided they be agreeable to the word of God?* How is it possible, that all the members of a church should be sufficiently assured of this important point? Or is *private judgment to be entirely annihilated;* if so, to what end, did the benign Author of our being *grant reason to man?* Is the conscientious Christian to forget, that it is his *duty* to *search* the *scriptures* themselves, or are those human expositions to usurp the place of the word of God? But let us in the spirit of charity admit, that every church supposes, or firmly believes its articles or rules of faith to be agreeable to the word of God. What then is the consequence? The difference between them is surely a proof, that infallibility is not the attribute of all of them. Truth, like the Eternal, is one. In which church then shall we find it? I will presume to say *in none of them.* He who would search for the truth must search for it in the *scriptures alone.*

Let us then abandon all those systems, which, to say the least, can only involve us in error. Our venerable forefathers erred, or why a reformation? *Their descendants will err.* Nor shall the *resurrection of true christianity be seen amongst men, until it shall appear in the white garment of the gospel alone.*—*Herald.*

TO JAMES BLYTHE, D. D.

DEAR SIR:—I have read in the Western Luminary an address of yours, directed to all those, who believe in the *parity* of the clergy. The subject of your address is, the unity of the church; in which you have noticed us as a people—have denied us all claims to christianity—have ranked us among the German infidels—and in the zeal of Peter the hermit, have called upon all the orthodox to raise a holy crusade, in order to extirpate the infidels from the western world. Were we trusting on an arm of flesh, we might tremble and quake with fear. Your hosts are numerous, and your zeal is great. Wealth, learning and popu-

larity are on your side, yet we fear not. If the Lord be for us, who can be against us? For more than twenty-five years, your *orthodox* armies of every name, with their coadjutors, the Shakers, have, in vain, attempted our destruction. We yet live, and our members are greatly multiplied—we live in unity and peace under the banners of Immanuel, and see your orthodox ranks dividing and warring among themselves, and many of them uniting with us under the standard of king Jesus. He reigns, and we will rejoice, though in your esteem we be *as reprobates* and *infidels*.

I take the liberty to make a few plain remarks on your address, not calculated to irritate a free mind, but to convince you, and those under your influence, that you are mistaken, and have not given a fair statement of our sentiments.

You address all those who believe in the *parity* of the clergy. The phraseology is to me new, and being undefined by you, I must consider it in its literal import, as meaning *equality*. Your address then cannot be to Episcopalians, whether they be of the Episcopal High Church of America, or of the Methodist Episcopal Church; for among them a great inequality exists in grade among the Clergy. Nor can it be to the Baptists; for their clergy consists of ordained and unordained. Nor can it be directed to Presbyterians; for like the Baptists you have a clergy of ordained and unordained preachers. I am not concerned to know particularly to whom the address is made, but the substance of it calls my attention.

In your first letter you state, what you think to be the "radical principles of the gospel," in these words: "That man, in his present state, is dead in trespasses and sins—that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually—that to rescue man from this spiritual death, it became necessary that the second person of the adorable Trinity, should become incarnate, should obey and suffer, the just for the unjust—that by repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, and by these alone can sinners be justified—that the Holy Spirit is sent to work in God's people both to will and to do—that there is to be a final judgment, and a future state of unchangeable bliss or woe." These radical principles, you say, are simple and explicitly taught—that they are as universally believed among all christians, as the first principles of science among philosophers—nor can you conceive of a living church, or peculiar people, where any one of the above principles has been abandoned—and that "in the belief of these principles depends the unity of the Church." Hence you conclude that the Church is one, seeing all christians believe in these radical principles.

As to your radical principles, I have no material objection to them, after they are stript of their unscriptural dress. As when you say, "Man in his *present* state is dead," &c. Had you, instead of *present state*, used the term *natural, or unconverted state*, I should cordially acquiesce in the sentiment. The term

present stands in relation to *past and future*. *Man*, without the definite article, is equivalent to *all mankind*. Now to say all mankind, in their present state, are dead in sins, is not true; for believers are made alive and saved from sin. "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. II. 1.

Your second radical principle is, "that the second person of the adorable trinity became incarnate, obeyed and suffered."—Strip this *radical* of its unscriptural phraseology, and clothe it in the language of the Holy Spirit, as taught in the Bible, and it is the truth in which my soul has long rejoiced, yea, and in which I will rejoice. Had you said, "The word was made flesh," instead of saying the second person of the adorable Trinity became incarnate, all christians of every name would receive it. But in your dress of this doctrine, you make it unintelligible, self-contradictory, and opposed to your own creed and sentiments. This radical principle, you say, is simple and explicitly taught.—Where, sir, in the book of God, is this doctrine of a first and second person of trinity taught? Is the Son any where in the Bible called the second person of trinity, or the Father the first? Now, sir, see if this radical principle be not in opposition to your own creed. "There is but one only living and true God—a most pure spirit—without body, parts or passions." Conf: Chap. 2. Sec. 1. In your second letter you represent Jesus Christ as this one only living and true God; yet he became incarnate in the womb of Mary and born of her. See your Catechisms, Lar. Cat. 2. 37. and Short, 2. 22.—he, the second person of trinity—he, the one only true and living God, suffered and died." Now can you represent the only true God as without parts, when you say, that the godhead and manhood, that is, very God and very man, were united in one person, and this union is never to be dissolved? How can you describe the one only true God as without *body*, when he is now clothed in a body like our own in heaven, and will continue thus forever? How can you describe the one only true and living God as without passions or sufferings, and yet say he suffered and died? How can you describe him as unchangeable, and yet represent him as born of a woman, suffering and dying; once without body, parts or passions, but afterwards possessed of them all? You may say, it was not the essence, godhead, nature, or being of deity that became incarnate, was born, and suffered; but the second person. Does not your Confession state that it was the godhead and manhood that were united, the divine and human natures? Can the person of the Son become incarnate and not the person of the Father? If so; how can God be without parts? If the godhead became incarnate, was not the whole indivisible godhead, or divine nature of the Father, Son and Spirit incarnate? But I forbear asking more questions on this point. I know you feel irritated at this exposure of your system. You say, I have given a wrong view of your sentiments. I hope I have; but, dear sir, if language is the sign of ideas, these are the ideas of your system. You may

say it is a doctrine of mystery—if it is a mystery, let it alone. "Secret things belong to the Lord; but those which are revealed to us and our children." If the doctrine of orthodox trinity be a doctrine revealed, it ceases to be a mystery or secret. Do, sir, correct your second radical principle, as already suggested, in the language of scripture, and I cordially acquiesce in it. Do not, I beseech you, rank us among infidels, when we so highly value the scriptures, as to be unwilling to relinquish them for the dogmas of men. I would give worlds, if worlds were in my possession, to see this doctrine, if taught in the scriptures. I would not for worlds derogate from the least degree of glory from my Lord Jesus, my hope, my joy, my prophet, priest and king. In his laws, service and government I rejoice. My erring reason would bow submission to every doctrine of his word, however hard to be understood. My veracity may be questioned by man, yet God knows I speak the truth.

What follows of your radical principles I have long believed, nor have I ever doubted their truth.

But do you indeed denounce as infidels all who do not receive every principle of your little creed! This looks like the spirit of Athanasius towards all who rejected his creed on Trinity. I pray to be kept from such a spirit! But do you think that you have given us the radical principles of Christianity? You have omitted what by others are deemed most important—"This is life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."—"This is his commandment that ye love one another."—"These three, faith, hope and charity, but the greatest of these is charity, without which all knowledge, faith and works are vain," &c.—This is truly an essential, a *sine qua non*. But do you, indeed, think that the unity of christians consists in the belief of your radical principles? I hope not. Alas! a poor unity it would be! I wish you, dear sir, to read attentively the sentiments of Doc: Madison on the preceding pages of this number. How wide the difference between your views and his!

We rejoice that our feeble efforts have convinced Sectarians that division of christians is wrong, and that union of all is right. No longer will any plead for sectarianism in plain language; the N. Testament doctrine shines too clearly to permit such a violation of its spirit. You are well convinced of this fact, and therefore have taken the only alternative to support sectarianism, which is to teach that christians are not divided, but are one, because they all receive your radical principles of the gospel. It will be a hard work to establish this position in opposition to stubborn facts. That there are good christians in every sect is believed—and that they are of one mind and spirit, is admitted; but that there is no division among them, is contrary to matters of fact. No doubt, in the different sects into which the Corinthian church was torn, there were good christians, but were they not divided? and was not this division in opposition to the mind of God?

But enough of your radicals. I will now insert a lengthy extract of your Address in your second letter:

"The great body of christians among us believe in Christ, not as a *man*, nor as an *angel*, nor yet as a *God*. They believe in Christ, AS GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH. They consider a faith in the *proper divinity of Jesus Christ* as vital to christianity. When therefore they find a man who denies the proper deity of the Son of God, they say that man has broken the *unity* of the church. For this course they have a sufficient reason. They believe that upon the divinity of the sufferer is grafted the *efficacy* of his sufferings, and all the accompanying doctrines of grace. Therefore, dear brethren, with such persons I charge you not to eat at that table consecrated to Christ's friends. You must love them as men, you must pray for them as gross errorists, but you cannot "bid them God speed." It pains us to say this, because there are persons among these unhappy people, whom we once loved as brethren in the Lord; but we cannot accompany them to the crucifixion of the Saviour, to the manglement of the body of Christ.

"I am asked what becomes of the unity of the church now? Are not Arians and Socinians christians? I apprehend the only claim they have to that soul-animating name, is their having assumed it. The distinctive characteristic, and the grand distinctive characteristic of the gospel, is *justification by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ*. Does any Arian or Socinian admit this principle. They know as well as you do, that the justification of one creature through the obedience and suffering of another creature, angel or man, involves an absurdity; and for this plain reason, every creature is responsible for himself, and can only respond to the law for himself. To suppose him able to do more, supposes him to be superior to the law, that is, to be the lawgiver. Therefore every intelligent Arian or Socinian, deprives the sufferings of Christ of all vicarious character. Are any of you willing to venture up to the great Judge, expecting justification by the deeds of the law. Let such a man know, that "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Why is the doctrine of justification or atonement denied by all who deny the proper divinity of Jesus Christ? Why, but because its admission involves the admission of the divinity, and the denial of the divinity reduces the whole to what they call a *rational religion*. This brings down the gospel to a fearful level with the numerous religions that have cursed the world in past days.

"This is a subject we would warmly press alike upon our Episcopalian friends, and those who believe in the parity of the clergy. Brethren, Socinianism is not christianity. It is the form under which infidelity is at present assailing christianity. The assault has been made under different leaders at different times. According to Voltaire, our citadel was long since to have been taken by storm. According to German policy, the

wretch was to have been crushed before the close of the eighteenth century. These efforts have been made, and have failed. The plan now is to sap the foundation of our Zion. It is to be effected by philosophy and *rational religion*.

"I am well aware, this may appear harsh and untrue, to some who may peruse these letters. But let those who may deny the divinity of our Lord in the west, remember that they are a peculiar branch of this ancient family of heretics. In Germany and Boston, those great theatres of Socinian and Arian error, the system is attempted to be sustained by learning and philosophy. And no small degree of genius and talent is employed in in this controversy. In the west the same cause is upheld by a kind of religious enthusiasm. And it is no uncommon thing among us, to hear the same discourse contain a flat denial of the divinity of Christ, and also many things which breath much of the spirit of the gospel, all delivered in a strain of the most vehement rhapsody. We would not say that these people have it in view to undermine christianity, but we do say that their system ultimates there, and they must either abandon it, or fall into the ranks of their bolder brethren of Germany and Boston and fight against the Lord's truth, as they have fought against his divinity.

"We would fondly hope that the time for peace and concentrated effort among all christians has come. A time when trifles will be contested only by triflers. But if there is to be a conflict in the religious world, it is not to be about governments, nor yet about who shall be called Master or Bishop. The time for such toys is gone by. It is to be between the friends and the foes of our Lord's divinity. If this contest is to take place, Episcopalians are as much bound to take part in it as others, not only as lovers of vital gospel truth, but because the Church of England has given birth to some enemies of the divinity of Jesus Christ. The work of denying the Lord, that bought us, has not been left alone to those who hold the parity of the clergy.

"Let no infidel, while he travels through the eastern or western parts of America, comfort himself in his cheerless faith, by saying he has found another argument to strengthen his infidelity, in the irreconcilable hostility he sees manifested between the Socinian and orthodox churches. Every candid and true-hearted man of all parties, acknowledges the charge of irreconcilable hostility to Socinianism in all its forms. And infidel men have but to realize the strong bias they feel to the Socinian creed, the general desire they have that it may prevail, and the bitterness they feel to orthodoxy, to convince them of the affinity that exists between their belief and that of those enemies of the truth.

"*The preservation of the unity of the Church is every thing to the ultimate triumph of the gospel.* There are two ways by which this unity may be promoted. By acknowledging and loving all who crowd around the *cross*,—building along with all who build upon the rock Christ; and by denying the right hand of fellowship to all who deny the *blood of atonement*. Nor ought Socinians to complain of being deprived of the company and fellowship of all truly evangelical people. In room of these, they have the good wishes and good deeds of the whole infidel world, who fail not to cleave to them as kind does to kind. For the correctness of these remarks, we appeal to the history of Germany and Boston, these great fields of Socinian enterprize.

"Influenced by the same fraternal feeling, we would say to all friends of our divine Lord;—Let nothing divide you, that does not divide and mangle the great sacrifice—that does not wipe the blood of Christ from the cross, and in its room cover it over with the daubings of philosophy and rational religion."

Here, truly, is a rhapsody of declamation—we might as easily declaim against Presbyterians, and with more plausibility, as others are doing; but we are taught "to speak evil of no man." We revere our great Lawgiver and King, and therefore dare not render evil for evil. You, according the cant of the orthodox, represent us as Socinians and Arians who deny the divinity of Christ, and the atonement. We have again and again proved that we were neither Socinians nor Arians. We have as often shewn that we do not deny the divinity of Christ nor the atonement. But, Sir, we have good reason to think that you never read our writings, and to hear us would be a violation of that decree of Synod, in the formation of which you were prominent. You must have received your information from *fama clamosa*.—But, you say, we deny the divinity of the Son of God, because we we do not believe he was himself, the only true God. As well might you say that we denied the humanity of Abel the son of Adam, because we do not believe that Abel himself was Adam. That Jesus Christ was the Son of God, that he existed with the Father before creation, and was the agent by whom God made the world, and without whom was nothing made that was made, is a doctrine we firmly believe—that he was sent by the Father to be the Saviour of the world—that the Father prepared a body for him—that he took flesh and blood, or was made flesh—that he lived, died, and ascended to the Father and received the glory which he had with the Father, before the world was—this we most assuredly believe. But *how* and *when* he became the Son of God before creation, we are not informed. We simply believe the fact that he was God's *own Son*, his *only begotten Son*:—That he proceeded and came forth from the Father; hence we have concluded that he was divine. His existence before creation, as an intelligent agent, distinct from the Father, we have produced evidence from the scriptures, which we think—and thousands think with us—cannot be refuted. Your method of refuting them is the shortest, easiest, and most effectual, which is to declaim, denounce, rank us with the German and Boston infidels, and rouse the indignation, and fire the zeal of all against us, and call on all to unite in the holy war.

But you say, we deny the atonement. This charge is reiterated against us with imposing confidence—reiterated against

stubborn facts, and arguments as clear as day to any but such as close their eyes to conviction. True, we have denied the orthodox explanation of the word atonement, as anti-scriptural; but have substituted that, which the scriptures teach us. We constantly teach that atonement means reconciliation, and not satisfaction to the demands of law and justice, made by the blood of Christ, the sinner's surety in his room and stead. For our definition we have all needful authority; for yours you have none when closely examined. I speak boldly and confidently, because I am supported by the truth. I would *en passant* ask you who made this satisfaction for which you plead? and to whom was it made? Was it God himself that made it to himself in order to satisfy himself? But on this subject I have been sufficiently explicit in former essays.

With an evident design to apply it to us, you ask, "Does any Arian, or Socinian, admit this principle, that justification is by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ!" Indeed, Sir, I have but a very limited acquaintance with these people or their sentiments; but I never before heard that they denied this doctrine. But, Sir, this doctrine with us *Christians* is indispensable; we most assuredly believe it. Our directory, the New Testament, every where teaches it. But your ideas of this doctrine may differ widely from what that book teaches, as many others do.

It is not my design to notice your declamation farther. I leave you to your own reflections I have presented your letter as far as concerns us to the public. They must judge. There will be a reaction. You may become as famous as Peter the Hermit, by rousing the country to arms against a few dispised, humble Christians; yet remember Peter's zeal was vain and vastly injurious to the world; so may be yours. Persecutors never prospered but in acquiring wealth and power. These can follow no farther than the grave. What follows—eternity will disclose. Farewell.

My fellow Christians, we are in danger, not from the powers of man, for the battle is not to the strong; but from suffering our minds to be irritated with the abuse of our enemies. Let us watch and pray, and walk with our Lord all the day. Boldly, yet humbly speak for truth. Defend it from the aspersions of its opponents, yet with the meekness of wisdom. We have long pleaded the cause of love, peace, and union. Let us prove by our works that we are sincere. These are the weapons afforded by the spirit of truth, by which we shall gain the victory.—Firm and pure hearts can only stand the shock, which will soon be experienced by us. I pity those who so uncharitably oppose us. They know not what they do. Let the ministers of Jesus be active, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; not seeking for favor nor popularity, but to please your God, and to save souls. Let the servants of the Lord aid as his ministers may need. But let the idle drones be neglected as they ought.—Such are but a disgrace to the cause, and when persecution arise

they will disappear. A trying time is just ahead. The declaration of war is sounded in the east by a mighty people, as well as in the west. Keep your eye on Immanuel's standard and follow him. Fear not. Trust in the Lord: for they that trust in him shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be moved.

EDITOR.

REPLY TO ELDER JOHN POWELL'S QUERIES. NO. III.

In the two former numbers I gave a scriptural view of the sufferings of Christ, and their effects. I will now endeavor to give my views of the latter part of the text: "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison," &c.

The first idea, which is contained in this part of the text, is that the flesh of Jesus was only put to death. His soul or spirit survived the death of the body "He said to the penitent, dying thief, "Verily I say unto you, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Neither the grave, nor hell, the prison of the wicked, is any where called Paradise. The third heaven is expressly so called; 2 Cor. 12, 2, 4:—Therefore the soul of Christ did not descend into the grave, nor into hell, the place of torment; but it ascended to paradise, or *hades*, where it remained disembodied till the third day, when it was united again with the body before it saw corruption: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*, nor suffer thine holy one to see corruption." The spirit by which his dead body was quickened was no doubt the "spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead, even the Father." Rom 1, 11—Eph. 1, 20—1 Thes. 1, 10—2 Cor. 4. 14.

The second idea contained in the text is, "By which (spirit) he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which some time were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing."

We have shewn, that he did not descend to the prison of hell to preach to the wicked spirits there.—If he did, would it not argue great partiality in him to confine his preaching to those spirits only, who had lived in the days of Noah? If he did go there and preach, we are not informed whether he preached comfort or terror. These wicked spirits lived in the days of Noah. They are represented in prison. Whether this means that they were *then* in Noah's day prisoners under the power of sin, as the wicked are yet represented to be: or whether, after they were destroyed by the flood, their spirits are *now* in the prison of hell awaiting the judgment of the great day, is not easily determined; nor is it important to know. "By the spirit of the Father, Jesus went and preached to those wicked spirits in the days of Noah, which spirits, for their disobedience, are *now* confined in the prison of hell. The organ, by which Jesus preached, was Noah, a preacher of righteousness. The same spirit of mercy influenced him then, which brought him afterwards from heaven, in the end of the Jewish age, to be the Saviour of the world.

Y-r

The third idea in the text is, "Wherein (the ark) few, that is eight souls were saved by water." This translation has ever appeared to me obscure. I have paid particular attention to it, and am fully convinced that the Greek text should be rendered thus: "Into which (the ark) few, that is, eight souls escaped through water." The word *diasozo* is thus translated in the N. Testament: "And so it came to pass, that they *escaped* (*diasothenai*) all to land." Acts xxvii, 44. "And when they were *escaped*, (*diasothentes*)." Acts xxviii, 1. "No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he hath *escaped* the sea (*diasothenta*) yet vengeance suffereth not to live." Acts xx iii, 4. Thus should be rendered Acts xxiii, 24: And provide beasts, that having set Paul thereon, they might *escape* (*diasososi*) to Felix the governor.—Escape from those lying in wait to kill Paul. Parkhurst on the word has quoted a great many Greek authors to prove this to be the meaning of the word. Noah, previous to the flood, had prepared an ark, into which he and his family fled, and escaped the destruction which came upon the world. Some critics of note render the phrase "by water," *through water*. They have good authority for this translation, as *dia* with a Genitive is thus rendered, Luke vi, 1. "He went *through* the corn fields." I Cor. iii, 15. "He himself shall be saved, yet so as through fire." So Noah and family escaped through water, borne through the mighty flood in safety.

The next idea in the text is, "The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The ark, we have seen, saved Noah through the water of the flood. This is emblematical of baptism; which saves us from sin, and the destruction which shall come upon the world of the ungodly. The ark was the appointed means of God for the salvation of Noah and his family; baptism is the appointed means of the same being for the salvation of all believing penitents. For "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins." "The like figure whereunto baptism *doth now save* us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." By the resurrection of Jesus Christ we are said to be saved. "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life." Rom. v, 10. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Rom. x, 9. Faith and baptism are connected, and refer to Jesus who was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the scriptures. And thus by faith and baptism into him we are saved.

The last idea contained in the text is, "Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." "The putting away the filth of the flesh," no doubt refers to the doctrine of baptisms or immersions under the law,

The person carnally defiled was to bathe himself and become clean before he dare enter the tabernacle to worship. Such legal purifications would never save the soul from sin—"but the answer of a good conscience toward God." These last words have been construed to prove every form and practice of baptism to be right. One who has been sprinkled, or has had water poured on him, says it is right; because I have the answer of a good conscience. It is right, says another, to have my infants sprinkled; for I have the answer of a good conscience in having it done. Another says, immersion is right; for in being immersed I have the answer of a good conscience, having followed the example of Christ. Now all these people appear to me not to understand the expression, *the answer of a good conscience*. They mean that they have a good conscience in acting as they have; but this does not prove that they acted right, more than it proves that Paul acted right in persecuting to death the christians; for in this he says he had a good conscience. The answer of a good conscience conveys a very different idea. The word *answer* signifies a correspondence to, a likeness, or image. Prov. xxvii, 19. "As face answers to face in water, so, &c."—A person stooping down to drink in water unruffled, sees the image of his face in the water. This image exactly answers to, corresponds with, and is like to his natural face. It is the perfect image of it. So baptism is the correspondence, or image of something, which the Apostle calls a good conscience.

I think it is generally agreed by moralists that conscience is the mere creature of knowledge. According to our knowledge, right or wrong, so will be our conscience. Hence, from the inseparable connection between knowledge and conscience, the latter word is sometimes used by the inspired writers for knowledge. See Parkh. Eng. Gr. Lex. on the word. We may therefore say that the baptism that saves, is the image of a good knowledge towards God—which knowledge is, that Jesus was buried and rose again. To *this*, immersion corresponds, or bears a striking likeness. It is the very image. By being immersed we have immediately in view the saving article of christian faith, and obtain salvation according to the promise of God.

I submit these thoughts to you and the public, humbly hoping that they may receive that attention which the subject demands. Some of the ideas may be incorrect. I wish them not to be implicitly received, but examined with careful attention.

EDITOR.

P. S. On the subject of baptism enough has been written in the Messenger. My patrons and friends every where desire us to desist from writing more. They think as I do, that the scriptures are sufficiently explicit on the subject—that nothing more can be said that has not been noticed. Let every one act according to his conviction. Our bro: Adams, from whom we expected another communication on the subject, is in bad health and lives a considerable distance from us. The probability is,

that his bad health will prevent his writing. We do not promise to say nothing more on the subject. Circumstances may hereafter make it necessary. EDITOR.

Many have accused us of being sectarians; if they mean by it that we are united in one body to promote christianity, I readily acknowledge the fact; but if they mean that we are engaged in making divisions, and causing, and supporting party feelings, and thus creating strife and hatred among brethren, I must deny the charge, and call on our accusers for the evidences of our guilt. One argument used against us, is, that we have regularly organized churches, into which we are always ready to receive members. This charge is acknowledged; but that it does not show us sectional in our feelings, may be clearly seen from the following facts. When we embraced the doctrine of Christ we learned that *love* was the prominent feature and grand principle of the whole system. For Christ said to one, who asked him, which is the great commandment in the law, Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this is the first and great commandment: And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. Matt. XXII, 37, 38, 39, 40. Paul, after naming several commandments, says, If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt *love* thy neighbor as thyself. *Love* worketh no ill will to his neighbor; therefore, *love* is the fulfiling of the law. Rom. XIII, 9, 10. John says, we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we *love* the brethren. I John, III, 14 We not only knew these things, but we felt in our hearts *love* to all the people of God; and as we knew that he that hateth his brother is in darkness, and walketh in darkness, and knoweth not whither he goeth, because that darkness hath blinded his eyes. I Jno. II, 11. we were unwilling to do any thing that would lay us liable to this evil. We were now willing to serve our God at the expense of all that this world could give us. Feeling union with all christians, we could look around and see many members of the various denominations, for whom we had a warm *love*. We desired to live always in *love* and *peace* with them. But what could we do? If we joined the Presbyterians, by that act we shut ourselves out from the Baptists. If we joined the Baptists we shut ourselves out from the Presbyterians and Methodists. And if we joined the Methodists we deprived ourselves of the fellowship of both Presbyterians and Baptists. So we might say of all the parties existing; for it is well known that these sectaries have generally been hostile to one another, except in this one thing: Of late they have generally united to destroy our influence, and to stop the progress of that glorious liberty which we preach; for indeed it is fatal to man-made-mystery and ostentation. But vain have been their attempts. To determine upon a proper

course, it was necessary for us to examine the different creed-books, in order that we might know who was right, and for whose fellowship we could renounce friendship with all others: For to unite with one was to put a bar between us and others. We searched and found their creeds, covenants, disciplines, confessions, and other formularies, to be what their authors acknowledge them to be, *fallible;* and the greatest evil we saw in them, is, they bind the consciences of men, and cause them, *like sinners, to love those only who love them*, and believe as they believe. We determined that we would own no name but *Christian*, which we derive from our union with Christ; and that we would subscribe to no creed but the Bible; and that if we were deprived of the fellowship of any christians, it should be by an act of theirs and not of ours; and if partyism, and unfriendly disputes be a sin, let those see to it upon whom the guilt lies. But as we would subscribe to the creed of no party, we were not allowed privileges with any, nor would their ministers administer the gospel ordinances to us. What could we do? One of three things was unavoidable. We must either subscribe to a human creed, and become partisans, which we could not conscientiously do, or we must live without enjoying the ordinances of God's house, which we were not willing to do; or we must organize in gospel order, and attend to the ordinances, as we are directed in the scriptures. These are facts; who can deny them? Do these facts make us a party? If so, who is the cause of it? I will not answer these questions, for I believe that when sectarians, especially the leaders, read this, they will know from experience, that a guilty conscience needs no accuser; unless they have gone so far that they can put light for darkness, and darkness for light.

And though we now stand as acknowledged members of one body, we cannot justly be considered a party among christians; for all these parties are made up of persons professing peculiar dogmas in religion, which are contained in their creeds, or covenants; and they are all known by their different names, which serve as watch-words among them. These, with intolerance, which binds men to believe these dogmas upon pain of exclusion from church fellowship, form parties in religion, and from these we are free. We have no creed, but that to which all believers do subscribe: nor do we require as a condition of church fellowship any thing that is not clearly stated in the bible; nor have we any name but that which all the children of God are willing to wear.

Another evidence we have in our favor, which might satisfy all who know the fact, that we are not sectarians, is, that among those who are engaged in this work of *love*, are persons of various opinions with regard to scripture explanations, and yet these differences do not disturb our fellowship. Though the most of us believe that it is the duty of believers to be immersed, I could name a very influential and highly respectable preacher

among us, who has not learned that this is his duty. Does this create difficulty between him and his brethren? No; we highly appreciate his labors of love, and we feel in our hearts to live and die with him. Not only upon this subject do differences of opinion exist among us, but also respecting the person of Christ, atonement and some particulars concerning church government; but do these create quarrels among us? No; but while the Presbyterians are dividing into Cumberland and orthodox Presbyterians, with many other causes of division among them; while the Methodists are dividing into Wesleyan, Radical and Episcopal Methodists; while the Friends are separating; while the Baptists are dividing into many contending parties, and are quarrelling with one another about doctrine; we live in love and peace—not an unhappy division among us upon doctrine. If an unpleasant dispute, or any dissatifaction has at any time arisen among us, it has not been because of differences upon points of doctrine; but because the disturber has thought his worldly interest infringed, or that his conduct has been such, that his brethren could not fellowship him; and for that reason he has become dissatisfied. May I not ask, why it is that we thus live in love and union, while others divide and dispute? The answer is clear; it is because we are not a *party;* having no discipline but the bible, we have no authority to enjoin any thing upon men, except that which is clearly stated to them in it. In this way we have no power to Lord it over the consciences of any; nor can we be justly charged with being intolerant to sectarians. Do we refuse to sing, pray, and exhort with them? Do we refuse to commune with them? Do we refuse to preach in their houses? Every person who knows our practice, must answer these questions in the negative. But on the other hand, do we not invite them to worship with us? Are they not allowed in our meetings equal privileges with ourselves? Do we not invite them to commune with us? Are we not willing to preach in their houses? These questions must be answered in the affirmative. We do not think that men are to be condemned because they do not understand every particular upon which the scriptures treat; if they were, few if any would escape the condemnation; for the Apostles did not understand the whole gospel, even for a length of time after they had received the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. For though they were commanded to preach the gospel to all nations, they doubted the import of this commandment, which may be clearly seen by reading a few of the first chapters of Acts. If holy Prophets and Apostles did not fully understand the whole plan of redemption; if the Angels *desired* to look into it, what apology will I or any other person have to offer the Supreme Judge, for treating a fellow-being unfriendly, merely because we *thought* he was in error on some point of doctrine?—Are we authorized to dictate to our brethren in these things?—Or will our judgment be acknowledged infallible?

Another argument used to prove that we are a party among

Christians, is, that we are always ready to contend for our particular views of the Gospel. This is true; and if it be an error, it is one for which our opposers, no doubt, are sorry, as they are not able to prove them wrong. But does this prove us to be a party in Christianity? If it does, then are we many parties; for each one is at perfect liberty to coverse with his brother on these matters, and to use all the arguments he is master of, in contending for what he believes to be the truth. Nay, the Apostles and brethren must have been a separate party from Peter, for they contended with him. But why did not they and Peter each make a party? The same reason that we give to prove that we are not a party. They contended conscienciously, because they wished to know the truth. Peter did not expect to be accused of being a party, when he rehearsed the matter to his brethren; but he no doubt expected to convince them of their error. Nor did he bring railing accusation against them, but in love he instructed them. They heard him patiently, they ceased to contend, and glorified God. In this way we act. We call in question every thing that we do not understand, and by a friendly investigation of every subject, we try to learn the truth; not denying our fellowship to any who walk according to the gospel. In this cause of liberty we invite all who love the Lord, to unite with us. Thousands have united, and enjoy the benefits of the liberty of the children of God. Though he who possesses the spirit of Arnold, may, by the love of worldly gain, or what is worse, by intemperance, be influenced to forsake the cause and represent it as evil; yet conducted by the Redeemer of men, the cause must triumph.

THOMAS ADAMS.

REVIVALS.

Bro: David W. Morris of Park co. Ia. writes to the Editor, Sept. 8th, 1829—that at a camp-meeting at the Church of Christ, on Raccoon creek, between 40 and 50 were baptized—At Vermillion, during a communion season, 32 were baptized—At North-Arm, 27—and at several other meetings around, a number more. Within a small compass of country, in the space of six weeks, about 200 have been added to the church of Christ, and the prospect is yet glorious in those regions.

Our annual meeting at Berea commenced Friday before the third Lord's day of Sept. It was unusually well attended. A great many churches wrote to us by their messengers—the information conveyed was truly cheering. The good cause of our Lord is advancing gloriously in despite of all opposition, much of which is every where experienced. We continued four days together in worship, and were refreshed by the presence of the Lord. Never did I witness more love, union and harmony than was manifested among the many preachers and people present. Among the thousands that attended the meeting, no im-

proprieties of conduct were discoverable. Not a great number professed faith in Christ, but multitudes were pierced to the heart by the truth. The good effects of this meeting will be manifested in eternity. A more particular account we extract from the Clerk. EDITOR.

—

The Elders and Brethren of the Church of Christ, in the North of Ky. met in Annual meeting, at Berea, on Cane run, Fayette county, on the 18th Sept. 1829.

The following Elders were present, viz: Barton W. Stone, F. R. Palmer, Thos. Smith, John Rogers, John A. Gano, Leonard J. Fleming, Harrison Osborne, Stephen G. Marshall, Robert J. Patterson, John Longly, John G. Ellis, Fletcher Mavity, Saml. Ellis, John H. Hughes, Wm. Walters, Wm. Reed, and Thos. M. Allen.—Also, Eld. Washington Dunkerson from the South of Ky.—and Elders Joseph Berry and Richard Lane from Indiana.

After a discourse by Bro. John Longly, Bro. F. R. Palmer was called to the Chair, and Thos. M. Allen appointed Secretary. Letters and communications were then read and received from the following churches:—

1. Liberty Meeting-House,	Campbell	county.
2. Republican,	do.	do.
3. Indian Creek,	Harrison	do.
4. Leesburg,	do.	do.
5. Cynthiana,	do.	do.
6. Georgetown,	Scott	do.
7. Bethlehem,	do.	do.
8. Republican,	Bath	do.
9. Union,	Fayette	do.
10. Republican,	do.	do.
11. Mt. Tabor,	do.	do.
12. Lexington,	do.	do.
13. Berea,	do.	do.
14. Bethel,	do.	do.
15. Antioch,	Bourbon	do.
16. Paris,	do.	do.
17. Mt. Carmel,	do.	do.
18. Cane Ridge,	do.	do.
19. Carlisle,	Nicholas	do.
20. Cabbin Creek,	Lewis	do.
21. Union,	Boone	do.
22. Minerva,	Mason	do.
23. New Castle,	Henry	do.
24. Harrodsburg,	Mercer	do.
25. Round Top Meeting-House,	Madison	do.

Elder Augustine Easten and Bro. Wm. Stamps presented a corresponding letter from the "*Baptized Church of Christ at Cooper's run and its connexions*," which was received and read with pleasure, and Bros. Thos. Smith, John A. Gano and Harrison Osborne were requested to write and bear a letter to their next yearly meeting.

A letter of correspondence was also received from the Miami Conference in Ohio, and Bros. B. W. Stone and F. R. Palmer were requested to write and bear a letter to their next annual meeting.

The church at Georgetown in her letter uses the followin language: "Brethren, can we do nothing to aid the good cause of colonizing the free blacks? We wish you not to legislate as a Conference, but can you not, among other matters, converse on this subject, and agree to aid the good cause? Let others give their money to Education Societies, Tract Societies, Missionary Societies, &c. &c., but let us try to do justly and mercifully in aiding the cause of oppressed humanity;" with which sentiment we heartily accord—and earnestly recommend the subject to the immediate and serious consideration of the Brethren, and fondly hope they will do all in their power to aid and advance a cause so glorious.

Appointed our next Annual Meeting to be held at Cane Ridge, Bourbon county, on the Friday before the 3rd Lord's day of September, 1830.

Attest, FRANCIS R. PALMER, *Chair'n.*
THOMAS M. ALLEN, *Sec'ry.*

As stated above, the meeting commenced on Friday the 18th, and continued until Monday the 21st, much to the edification, joy and comfort of the people. The assemblies were unusually large and solemn from the commencement to the close of the meeting. The word of the Lord appeared to reach the hearts of a great number, who were weeping in the crowd, and were solicitous to join the people of the Lord in prayer; and during the meeting a small number publicly professed faith in the Lord Jesus, and united with his people.

A more interesting meeting I seldom, if ever attended. On the Lord's day, when the Lord's table was prepared, it was thought that from 5 to 700 believers took their seats, and participated in that solemn ordinance; among whom we had the pleasure to see christians from other societies, and particularly our Baptist brethren. The meeting was truly a joyful one to those who attended from different parts of the country, and a great blessing to the neighborhood in which it was held. But a small number of the churches in the North of Ky. was heard from; but the accounts were cheering and very encouraging. New churches, in different parts of the country, have been planted; and very considerable additions made to others. But few of the churches gave either their increase or strength; but from the few who did, we learn that 69 have been added to the church at Cabbin creek—41 at Republican, in Bath—25 at Republican, in Fayette—25 at Carlisle—22 at Cynthiana—15 at Union, Fayette—15 at Paris—15 at New Castle, &c. &c. The church at Carlisle is upwards of 300 in number—at Republican, Fayette.

upwards of 200—and many others upwards of 100. During the last year 7 excellent brick meeting houses have either been finished or commenced by our brethren in different places, and the cause of the Redeemer is rapidly spreading and prevailing in our country. The letters generally breathed a free and liberal spirit—and we are inclined to believe that the prejudices of the people against annual meetings of this kind, would have given way if they had been present and witnessed our proceedings. After reading the letters from the churches, and hearing from them, we then proceeded to engage in the social worship of God, and thus continued to the end of the meeting. May love, harmony, peace and steadfastness prevail among the children of the Lord. THOS. M. ALLEN.

Elder JOSEPH BERRY from Ia. passing through the settlement of Blue river, learned that very lately the Baptist Association there had rejected 17 Baptist churches, because they had taken the scriptures alone for their foundation and guide, and rejected all human creeds. He heard of several more churches which would shortly share the same fate in those bounds. We have heard of similar conduct in the Licking Association in this state, but have not received correct accounts. This period we hail as the dawn of the day of the Lord, so long expected. All human establishments must and will fall, and the scriptures will prevail to the destruction of sectarianism, and every thing in opposition to the will of God. *Talia sacla, currite,* Roll on ye joyful days.

OBITUARY.

Died—On the last of August, in Fleming co. Ky. BETSY ORRICK, a member of the Church of Christ at Union. She was united with the church about two years ago, and continued a bright and shining light till her death. She died in the full assurance of future happiness.

Also, Sept. 13th, JOSHUA COOPER, son of Wm. Cooper, of Fayette co. Ky. aged 15 years. He died of a short, but severe illness. Like too many of our youth, he had lived carelessly with regard to religion, till confined to the bed of death. He then became much alarmed at his unprepared state, and fervently engaged in prayer, and urged all around to pray for him. In the morning of the day he died, he professed to receive pardon from his Lord—his mind was calm and happy. He called for his father, and fervently prayed for him, and urged him to a speedy preparation for eternity, telling all around he was no longer afraid to die.

I have now finished the third volume of the Christian Messenger. I am urged, from every quarter, to continue the work. Did I not believe it was profitable to the cause of truth, I should desist from publishing another volume. The pecuniary profits

of the work are very inconsiderable; very far from a remuneration of my labors and time.

In a former number I requested my patrons and agents to purge their lists of such subscribers as had removed, and of such as would not pay. Great loss have I sustained by this neglect. I also requested them to forward their new lists of subscribers for vol. 4, against the middle of September. Some have complied, and others have not. I have determined to omit issuing any number of vol. 4th for one month, in order to give time to my friends to convey to me their lists of subscribers. If they forward them by mail, my request is, that each one of my patrons and agents will pay the postage, and the agents will deduct this from the monies they have received, or may receive for me. My reason for this is obvious. They who shall not inform me within six weeks from the first of October of their discontinuance of the work, will be considered as subscribers for vol. 4. The first number of vol. 4 will be issued in December, provided it be sufficiently patronized. EDITOR.

INDEX FOR VOLUME III.

	page.
Introduction,	1
Blakely's speech in the Synod of Ulster,	2
The communion of Christians at the Lord's table,	11, 33
Remarks on Mr. S. Steel's sermon,	14
Revivals,	19, 42, 72, 95, 118, 166, 227, 258, 283
Elder Joseph Thomas' address,	20
Obituary of Elder George Shideler,	21
Elder T. M. Allen's address,	22
Protest in the Synod of Ulster,	26
State of religion in France,	29
The printing establishment to be engrossed,	32
Christian Union,	37
Elder John Flick's letter,	40
Elder S. Kyle's letter,	41
Elder S. Duncan's answer, &c.	45
Hint to mothers,	46
Obituary notices,	47, 96, 209, 286,
30,000 Methodists withdrawn,	48
Mr. Montgomery's speeches,	49, 73, 97, 121
Saml. Brown to Editor, and Editor's reply,	55
Timothy's strictures on a sermon,	66
Universal religious freedom,	70
Extract from Boone's Creek Association,	79
A prop of impenitence removed,	80
Strictures on Mr. Hall's sermon,	83, 145
The Baptist church at Oxford, O.	89
Sabellianism in the west,	92
Letter of Elder Jas. Challen and reply,	94

Editor's apology, - - - - - - 102
Answer to Elder Flick's queries, - - 104
The design and effects of the death of Christ, - - - 107
Philip's strictures on W. Abernathy's circular, - - 110
The book of Jacher, - - - - - 116
Gospel plan of saving sinners, - - 125, 150, 211
Human depravity, - - - - 129
A competent ministry, - - - - - - 131
Elder C. Sine's strictures on a sermon, - - 133
Letter of Jas. Garrard and reply, - - - 136
The Creed of the Baptist Church in Owenton, - - 141
Elder L. Purviance's letter, - - - - 154
Extract from D. Phelps, - - - 155
I John, v, 7, - - - - 157
Wm. Nash's letter and the reply, - - - 161
Oration on the Colonization of free blacks, by S. G. M. 163
Infallibility by Doc. Chalmers, - - - 167
Presbyterian Statistics, - - - 187
Sectarianism, - - - - - - 190
Heresy, - - - - - 195
Address on colonizing free blacks, - - - 198
The Pedobaptist, - - - - - 200
Elder T. Cocherill's letter, - - - 202
Desultory remarks by A. Campbell, - - - 203
The Greek prepositions *dia* and *hupo*, - - - 204
A letter and answer on partyism, - - - 206
W. Selby's query, and Editors answer, - - 208
Reply of J. O'Kane to J. Matthew's & Editor's strictures, 213
Baptism by Thos. Adams and Editor's reply, - - - 219
An old Baptist to the religious public, - - - 224
Minutes of the C. Conference S. E. of Kentucky, - 229
Compendious sermon, - - - - - 230
Excellent rules, - - - - - 233
The Sabbath, - - - - - - 217
Elder McGauhy and Editor's reply, - - - 223
Eld. Jno. Powel's queries & Editor's answers, 229, 242, 277
Letter of J. A. Reeder and Editor's reply, - - - - 236
The Lord's supper, by Thomas Adams, - - - - - 239
Love to God, - - - - - - 246
Terms of communion, - - - - - 247
Orthodox dictionory, - - - - - 248
James Clark's letter and Editor's reply, - - - - 251
Elder T. Adam's queries and Editor's answers, - - 256
L. Bruen's letter, - - - - - - 260
Answer to a query proposed, - - - - 262
Extract from Doc. James Madison's sermon, - - - 265
To James Blythe, D. D. - - - - - - - - - - - 269
Elder T. Adams on Sectarianism, 280
Editor's Notice to Agents and Patrons, 286

LITERATURE
OF THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER by Barton W. Stone consists of 14 volumes, clothback binding, gold stamped, indexed and a total of 4,653 pages. It is a reprint of the famous restoration publications of this illustrious Kentucky reformer during the years of 1826-1844. #1844 (Complete Set) $125.00.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER by Alexander Campbell. 41 volumes—from 1830 to 1870. Index in each volume. Over 600 pages in 2 color hard-cover binding stamped in gold. #1529 — $350.00

T. M. ALLEN (Pioneer Preacher of Kentucky & Missouri) by Alvin Jennings. A biography of this great man of the Restoration Period. A good reference book or just an interesting story for your enjoyment. 224 pages. #1740 — $6.95.

THE SEARCH FOR THE ANCIENT ORDER. A two-volume work on the search for the landmarks of primitive Christianity covering 1849-1865 and 1866-1906, 358 and 468 pages respectively. By Earl Irvin West. Cloth $11.50 each.

16-Page Tracts
$5 per 100 — $45 per 1,000

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL — WHO WAS HE? by James Willcutt. The man and his cause. #269.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY by Alexander Campell. The biblical and reasonable justification of honorable public religious debate. #268.

ADD-RAN COLLEGE by Don H. Morris. The late long-time president of Abilene Christian University reviews incidents that led to division in the movement. #152

THE RESTORATION PRINCIPLE by Bill Humble. Unity and strict adherence to the Bible as the pattern for life and religion. #131

Star Bible & Tract Corp.
Fort Worth, Texas 76118