ally now acknowledged among the brethren. There is a great enquiry in the minds of the people in this country after truth. Bigotry, superstition and prejudice are giving back in these parts, and the free sons of religious liberty are gaining ground as fast as possible in the present state of things.

MICHAEL COMBS.

PETITION.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

The subscribers, belonging to the several religious denominations, known by the names of Baptist, Tunkers, Quakers, &c. humbly represent that they are deeply grieved at the transportation of the Mail; on the *seventh* day of the week commonly called *Saturday*, which is the true and holy Sabbath of the Lord; as we read in the ten commandments, "the *seventh* day is the Sabbath." They would humbly represent to your honorable body, that the Lord has never appointed any other day as a Sabbath; that this commandment is obligatory on all men, till time shall be no more; and that no other than the *seventh* day was kept *as the Sabbath*, until the days of Constantine. In proof of this, we beg the liberty to refer your honorable body to the admirable work of Mr. Cornthwaite on this subject, written in 1740, a new edition of which, we propose to to have printed immediately. Thus conscientiously believing according to the fourth commandment, that "the *seventh* day is the Sabbath," and that the Lord rested on the *seventh* day, and blessed it, and hallowed it, (Exodus xx. 10, 11.) it is with the greatest sorrow we see this holy day so irreverently kept. We dread the judgments that will fall on this once happy land, if these things continue: we shall become a nation of Atheists and Deists, all religion will be lost, and our meeting houses be pulled down.—*Trumpet.*

Mr. STONE—I inform you that a number of the Christian brethren, some in Indiana, some in Ohio, and some in Kentucky, have agreed to hold a conference in August next, at the Republican Meeting-House in Campbell county, Ky., to be called the Union Conference, and to commence the Friday before the first Lord's day in August next. You are requested to give notice of the above named conference in the Christian Messenger; and also to request that yourself, Brothers Smith, Palmer, Allen, and other brethren, should attend with us. I am yours in christian love,

J. G. ELLIS.

NOTICE.—WM. D. JOURDAN wishes all communications to him, after this, to be directed to *Locust Shade, Tenn.*

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. IV.] GEORGETOWN, KY. MARCH, 1830. [No. 4.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

THE TRINITY.

We are perpetually told, that the trinity and atonement are the essence of all true christianity, that without a firm faith in them no one has the least claims even to the name of christian, nor any well grounded hope of the mercy of God, and the rewards of salvation. To deny the trinity and atonement is represented to be the same thing as to deny the Saviour himself, to reject the Gospel, to renounce the authority of divine revelation, to cast off the laws of God, to be a heretic, infidel, deist, atheist any thing, in fact, but a good man, and a sincere inquirer after truth. If a denial of these doctrines be fraught with consequences so alarming, it must be an object of the very first magnitude to ascertain what the doctrines themselves are. It is impossible, that any articles of faith should have such power over the character and destiny of men, unless they are truths of the most obvious and positive kind, approving themselves instantly to the understanding, and written with beams of heavenly light on every page of the Gospel.

At all events, it would seem absolutely necessary, that they, who profess to have the true and saving faith, should agree in reporting and explaining what they believe. If any faith in a trinity be essential to salvation, must not this faith be the same in all? In the nature of things there can be only one true faith, and if there be not an agreement, how is it known that any person has this true faith? Or, in other words, how is it known, that any one has the faith by which he may hope to be saved? If a hundred persons have each a separate opinion, which they respectively call the trinity, it is evident, that only one opinion out of the hundred can be true, and even this may be false. Are all these persons orthodox, and blessed with a saving faith, because

they embrace a set of notions, in many respects contradictory, to which they give the name of trinity? If not, who out of the one hundred is truly orthodox; who has the fundamental doctrine; who is in the way of salvation?

A proper method of testing the accuracy of the assumption, which has been made with so much confidence, respecting the value of the doctrines named trinity and atonement, as articles of faith, is to ascertain the fact, whether the persons themselves, who have been most zealous in believing and defending them, have harmonized in their belief. If it shall appear, that the same thing, which one calls a trinity, or atonement, is the trinity, or atonement of all the rest, I allow, that it will make an argument strongly in favor of the assumption. But if, on the contrary, it shall turn out, that there are no uniform and fixed principles by which the professed believers of these doctrines are guided, that they break into parties and form systems radically different from each other, and that no two persons will agree in defining their own conceptions, it will follow, that no such importance as has been pretended can be attached to a faith in certain dogmas, to which any one may at pleasure give the names of trinity and atonement. Whether the dogmas themselves are true or false, the consequence will be the same, and will prove, that the importance with which some persons would clothe a *mere faith* in them is imaginary.

Let us proceed to this inquiry, and, in the present case, employ ourselves with the question, *What is the Trinity?* What are the conceptions, or ideas either separately or combined, which form the object of faith, to which this appellation has been given? For the sake of form, this question may be asked, but no one, who has attended to the subject, will flatter himself that it can be answered. To bring together a small number of the leading opinions of those professing themselves Trinitarians, is all that will be attempted. It would be no difficult matter, perhaps, to determine in some general sense how the trinity is set forth in particular creeds, and the notions of individuals; but to find out any thing like a system in which all Trinitarians would unite, or to enumerate the parties into which the advocates of this doctrine have been divided, from its origin to the present day, and the opposing schemes invented to bring it within the compass of the human faculties, would be as impossible in itself, as fruitless in the attempt

Trinitarians themselves have not yet approached so near to a similarity of views, as to agree in a definition, notwithstanding many of them profess to regard faith in this indefinable doctrine as absolutely essential to salvation. One of the heaviest censures affected to be passed by the orthodox on Unitarians, is, that they do not agree in explaining their own opinions. Before this point is insisted on any further, we should be glad if Trinitarians would unite in some common explanation of the doctrine, which they profess to think the most important in religion; or, at least, show some good reason why we are to reverence as a fundamental article of faith, a doctrine, which cannot be defined in Scripture language, and which is confessed to be unintelligible and inexplicable The truth is, that no plan has been devised, which was not encumbered with so many insurmountable difficulties, that few minds could be induced to receive it in that shape. Hence, plans have been multiplied, the powers of invention and combination have been put in requisition, till the theories of the trinity have become as numerous as the writers by whom it has been attempted to be explained.

Bishop Stillingfleet speaks of five different trinities, radically distinct from each other, which the opposers of that doctrine had detected in the writings of its defenders. *First*, the Ciceronian trinity, which represents the three persons, as three relations of God to his creatures; *secondly*, the Cartesian trinity, in which the three persons are three infinite minds; *thirdly*, the Platonic trinity, which consists of three coeternal beings, two of which are subordinate to the other, *fourthly*, the Aristotelian trinity, in which the three persons are one numerical substance; *fifthly*, the mystical trinity, which no conscientious believer should presume to explain. Another writer has discovered forty particulars in which Trinitarians are at variance among themselves in their sense of this doctrine. Had he chosen to take the trouble, he might have found forty more.

Some of the wiser sort of divines have been more cautious how they committed themselves. They have taken care to talk in such a way, as either to mean nothing at all or any thing, which should suit the taste and fancy of their readers. Instead of defining, or explaining, they tell us of three *differences*, or *diversities*, or *subsistencies*, or *properties*, or *somewhats;* of three *internal relations*, or *external relations*, or *modes of existence;* of any thing, indeed, but plain rational facts from which you can gain a single idea, or form a single conception.

As an example, suffer me to quote a paragraph from Cheynel's book of the divine Trinity.

'We may best resemble all that difference,' says Cheynel, 'which is between the essence of God, and the divine subsistences, by considering the transcendent affections of *ens simpliciter*, and the attributes of God; who doth infinitely transcend, not only a predicamental substance, but a metaphysical entity; as the most metaphysical men, who are sound in the faith, do honestly confess. Concerning the transcendental affections of *ens*, which are *unum verum bonum*, we say, these three affections, and *ens in latitudine*, do not make four things really distinct; and yet we say, they are real and positive affections.'

This, in the language of the learned Henry Taylor, is called explaining; and it is just as clear as the explanations, with which other divines have darkened this subject, although they may have been less skilful than Cheynel in using the dialectical weapons of the schoolmen. Witness an elaborate volume recently

published by a professor of oriental languages in the College of Aberdeen, in which the acute professor attempts to prove the doctrine of the trinity by 'Reason and Demonstration founded on Duration and space.' Witness Sherlock's Vindfcation, by the reading of which Emlyn and Manning were driven to the Unitarians. They were tempted to suspect, that a doctrine which the ability of such a man succeeded so imperfectly in explaining, and so poorly in vindicating, most have something defective in itself. Witness the writings of Barrow, South, and Waterland, and behold men of great genius and learning uttering themselves on the trinity in phrases of such unmeaning import, as they never would have ventured on any other subject of the most trivial kind. Look where you will, and it will invariably be found, that the more the defenders of this doctrine say about it, the less intelligible they become, and the farther they recede from the principles of common sense.—*Spark's Inquiry.*

There are many in the present day, that seem to take a strange pleasure in stripping the Christian of those precious truths by which he is enabled to bear up, under the heavy load of affliction in passing through life; and in removing from the sinner, those barriers against vice, and incentives to virtue, given by infinite wisdom. Some are endeavoring with a bold front, to overthrow the whole revelation of God to man. Others in the same sceptical spirit and faith, but with less honesty, and manliness, are afraid to venture so boldly to deny all revelation, but object to certain portions of it; as one lately in a pamphlet, has labored to destroy the authenticity of Matthew's Testimony. Others in the same spirit, profess to receive all the Book of God as divine, but employ all their ingenuity, to destroy the force of its doctrine.—They persuade the sinner, that all his actions are necessary, and fixed by fate: that his sins (falsely so called) are all right in the great plan—there is no future judgment; no future punishment; no hell; no devil; and to be consistent they should say, as some of the quondam leaders in this system have said, There is no God. To me it is surprising that men of morality, and men who wish to see morality in their families, and neighborhoods, should in any way support and countenance such principles: principles directly calculated to demoralize society, and which are the very hotbeds of infidelity and scepticism. There are others, some of whom we believe honest, yet wrong, who maintain with much zeal, that the souls of men die or sleep with the body when dead, and remain as unconscious as the dead body, till the morning of the resurrection. I am far from thinking that this opinion is of so serious a nature, that a good man cannot believe it; but I am confident that it takes from the Christian much comfort in life, and makes death an unwelcome messenger when it comes. In order to support the Christian's hope, and arm him against the terrors of death; I shall collect a few pertinent texts, to show that the soul does exist, in a state of consciousness after, and when the body is dead.

I shall content myself, with the definition of death, as given by Moses. Speaking of the death of Rachel, he says, "And it came to pass as her soul was in departing (for she died) that she called his name Benoni." Gen. xxxv, 18. According to this definition, death is the separation of the soul and body by disease, or some disastrous incident.

1. In the days of our Lord, there existed a sect, called the Sadducees, they denied the resurrection of the body, and the existence of spirits. They believed that when a man died, the whole of him, soul and body, crumbled into unconscious dust forever. They received nothing as authoritative in the Bible, except the five books of Moses; and supposing that the doctrine of the resurrection, and the separate existence of spirits, was not to be found there they denied them. They came to our Lord and proposed to him what they deemed an unanswerable question, see Matt. xxii, 24—33. Jesus appeals to the very books they acknowledged; saying "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; God is not the God of the dead; but of the living." Therefore Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are alive, though their bodies are yet under the power of death. This establishes the doctrine that the soul or spirit exists when the body is dead.

2. Moses and Elijah, previous to the resurrection of Christ, appeared with him on a certain mountain. Whether this Elijah was John the Baptist, who had just before been beheaded, is not very necessary to the argument; though to me it is probable that it was John; because, he as well as Moses, may be considered, as the two great leaders in the two dispensations, which preceded the dispensation of Christ. And therefore the voice from heaven directed the disciples to hear the Son; the dispensation of Moses and John (called Elijah) being ended. It cannot be denied that Moses died and was buried, and his body at that very time was confined by death.

3. An angel was sent to John in Patmos to make known to him the revelation, which God gave to his Son. This angel was one of the old Prophets Rev. xxii.

4. John in vision saw the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and they were all alive; for they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? Rev. lxii, 11.

5. Paul in Rom. viii, 28–31, is very decisive, when giving the reason why he knew that all things work together for good to them that love God; he refers us to the merciful acts of God to his saints of old, in whose history it is plain, that all his providences eventuated in good. "For whom he foreknew (or whom he of old approved, as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses &c.) them he also predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren, (he predestinated his saints from the beginning to rise from the dead; to bear

the immortal image of his Son. 1 John III, 2,–3,) moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called justified and glorified." The words glorified, justified, predestinated, and foreknew, are all in the same past tense, and therefore refer to the same period of time; not to the present or future (as some have strangely perverted the text) but to the past. If then the saints in past ages were called and justified, so were they then glorified, as were Moses and the old prophet, that appeared to John in Patmos; and as are the martyrs whom John saw under the altar.—Not their bodies, but their spirits or souls.

6. The Saviour, to arm his disciples against the terrors of impending persecution, which he saw would befall them after his exit from the world, thus spoke, "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him that is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Mat. x, 28.

The persecutors of Stephen killed his body; but his soul or spirit evaded the stroke of death; it lived when the body was dead. This comfortable doctrine Stephen had learned and believed; for when kneeling on the verge of eternity he said "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts VII, 59.—The Jews killed the prince of peace and the penitent thief at his side; yet the strokes that killed their bodies, did not kill their souls; for Jesus answered the praying penitent, "Verily I say unto thee; To day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Luk. XXIII, 43. That day the bodies of both were dead, and buried; and the tombs or graves of the dead are no where called paradise; yet the soul or spirit of Jesus and that of the thief were alive, and taken to paradise on that day, while the body was dead. Paradise Paul defines to be the third heaven. 2 Cor. XII, 2,–4. That the soul of Jesus, lived in a state of separation from his dead body is farther evident from Ps. XVI, 8, and Acts II, 26,–27,–31.

"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, (*hades*) nor suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell (*hades*) neither his flesh did see corruption." Some have from this text, supposed that the spirit of Christ went to hell, the place of torments, and preached to the spirits in that gloomy prison. The fallacy of this idea I have shewn in a former number. This supposition, is equally opposed to the doctrine, that the soul dies with the body. One objection against the supposition is, that the hell of torments is no where called paradise or the third heaven, into which the Saviour declared, that he and the penitent thief, would enter on the day of their death. I have already shown in the former volume, that *hades*, rendered *hell*, means the invisible state, in which all departed spirits are, from death until the resurrection. In this invisible state was the soul of Jesus, till the third morning after his death, then his soul was no longer left in *hades*, but was forever freed from it—then his flesh which was held under the power of death till that morning, was delivered from death; then his soul and body were reunited forever. The

soul of the penitent thief, was also in *hades* on the day of his death, and is yet left in *hades*; and his flesh still remains in the tomb, under the power of death. But in the morning of the resurrection at the voice of Jesus, death and *hades* shall deliver up the dead, which are in them, and then shall the judgment take place. Rev. XX, 13. After the souls of both the righteous and wicked are delivered from *hades*, and the bodies from the power of death—then death and *hades* shall be cast into the lake of fire. No more to eternity shall *hades* hold the soul, nor death the body. But soul and body reunited shall forever exist in heaven or hell, in happiness or wo.

7. That the soul does exist after the body is dead, is farther evident from Rev. XIV, 13. 'And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth; Yea, saith the spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." The Christian is the character to whom this blessedness attaches, the Christian who dies. When is he happy or blessed? Now; happy *are* the dead—in the present tense—and not, happy shall be the dead, that die in the Lord, at some future period, when the soul with the body shall be raised from death to life again. If the soul dies with the body, then it is as senseless, and as unconscious, as the dust of the earth. It is incapable of bliss or wo. With equal propriety we might say the rocks and trees are happy. Nothing but living, conscious beings are happy; therefore if Christians are happy when their body is dead, their souls are alive and capable of enjoyment. They are happy from henceforth; from the time of their departure from the body forever. But this happiness will be increased by the union with the immortal body.

8. That the soul of the righteous does exist in happiness, in a separate state from the body, is farther evident from 2 Cor. V, 8. "We are always confident, that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord—We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." Paul viewed the body as an earthly house, as a tabernacle, as a garment in which we are clad. There was a something dwelling in this house or tabernacle, which was burdened, and longed to be absent from this body, and to be present with the Lord in heaven. Paul believed that the soul could exist in happiness in a separate state from the body; or his great desire to be absent from the body and present with the Lord must have been extreme folly. In verse 2, he says, "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven, if so be we shall be found clothed, and not naked;" (so it should be rendered.) *To be clothed* is to be in the body—to be *unclothed* is to be out of, or separated from the body. Paul did not know whether, at the coming of the Lord to judgment, he might yet be living in the body, or in a state of separation from it, which is equivalent to being naked, or disembodied.

9. Paul in Phil. I, 21–23, said, "to die is gain." Then

declared that he was in a strait betwixt two, one was the desire he had to depart or die, and to be with Christ, which is far better; the other was, to abide in the flesh, and be profitable to his fellow creatures. Now had he believed that his soul would die with the body, how can we account for such language? To me it is impossible. What gain could he receive in death, when he is as unconscious and as inactive as the rocks on the earth!

I have no hesitation to say, that the doctrine, that the soul dies with the body, is contrary to the doctrine taught by inspiration of God. Christ taught this doctrine for which we plead, to arm his people against the fear of persecution and death; the opposite tends to fill the mind with fears of death, and to rob it of that comfort Jesus designs his people to enjoy. The progress of this doctrine leads to another, which is the denial of the existence of an intelligent spirit, which is called the devil—this is the second step to scepticism or atheism.—EDITOR.

Dialogue between a Preacher and Anomos,

(CONTINUED FROM p. 58.)

Ano: I am truly glad to meet my friend once more. When I last parted with you my mind was much agitated, and continued so for some days. I was almost persuaded that an unconverted sinner had sufficient capacity to receive the testimony of God, and to believe the gospel of his Son. This admitted, I felt condemnation for my unbelief. I went to my favorite old minister to learn the truth. He quickly relieved me from my fears, by convincing me that an unconverted, or unregenerated man could not believe unto salvation.

Pre: Had you gone to the Bible and the throne of grace instead of going to your preacher, you would have been more profitably employed. Do, my friend, let me know the arguments, by which he convinced you that you could not believe, and let us calmly investigate them by the word of God.

Ano: His first argument was drawn from the depraved state of the fallen sinner—that he was dead in trespasses and in sins. Now, said he, a dead man cannot act, but *to believe* is an act, therefore a dead sinner cannot believe. Hence it follows that he must be quickened, or made alive, before he can believe unto salvation.

Pre: The argument at first view appears plausible; but when it is brought before the truth of God it flies away, as darkness before the rising sun. It is a lamentable fact, that the sinner is dead in sin, yet not so dead that he cannot hear; therefore the Lord addresses him, "Hear, and your soul shall live." "Behold! I stand at the door and knock, if any man will hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me," Rev. III, 20. Were you to see me standing at a neighbor's door and knocking, what would be suggested to your mind?

Ano: I should certainly conclude by your standing at the door and knocking, that your intention was not to force it open, but to give a signal to those within that you desired to go in, and that they would open the door.

Pre: Would it not also imply, that I believed those within could hear the signal made by knocking, and were able to rise and open the door?

Ano: Certainly: for if you knew they were all dead within, and could not hear, nor rise to open the door, you would act foolishly by standing and knocking there.

Pre: Now if God stands and knocks at the door of sinners, and well knows that they are so dead that they cannot hear, nor move to open the door—what shall we say? You would tremble to make the application. He knows they can hear, and open the door to him, else he never would represent himself as standing and knocking for entrance. This also proves that he will not use force or violence. If the unregenerated sinner can hear, he can also believe, for "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," Rom. x. Your minister's doctrine subverts the very plan of God in the salvation of sinners. These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name," John xx, 31. This teaches that the scriptures are the foundation of faith; but your minister teaches that some *nondescript*, mysterious operation of the spirit is the foundation of it. This teaches that we must believe before we are made alive; your minister teaches that we must be made alive before we can believe. Jesus teaches that, "he that believeth not shall not see life;" but your minister teaches the reverse. Paul and the prophets say, "The just by faith, shall live." He teaches that we are justified by faith, yet he says Rom. IV, 5, "God justifies the ungodly—therefore the ungodly can believe."

Ano: I confess I am not able to controvert your arguments.—They appear plausible, and are certainly scriptural. But my minister adduced another argument against your doctrine, which has considerable weight on my mind: It is this; Mankind are in darkness and ignorance—that they must be enlightened by the powerful operation of the spirit, or have a spiritual perception given them, before they can believe the Gospel, so as to be profited by it.

Pre: By this is meant, that the sinner must have a new revelation to understand the written revelation; or new light to see the old light: therefore the old revelation or light is useless to any until God is pleased to give the new light! This doctrine puts the scriptures in the back ground indeed! They can no longer be considered the power of God unto salvation—no longer can it be said, "The entrance of thy word giveth light, it giveth understanding to the simple"—no longer can they be considered as the means of life, light and salvation to the world—they answer no better purpose to the unconverted, than a sundial in a cloudy day, as a learned Doctor once observed. Why then so much trouble and expense to establish Bible societies, and send the

scriptures to the benighted heathen? God can enlighten, quicken, regenerate and save them without the Bible, and on your principles he actually does it even in the land of Bibles, without faith in the gospel! This doctrine has destroyed in a great measure, the sanctity and divine authority of the Bible, in the minds of thousands; they do not view it as the word of God to them; but are waiting for a greater and more powerful light to be mysteriously communicated. I view this doctrine more destructive to the souls of men, than any other in the whole system of *orthodoxy*. Faith depends on testimony, and not on sight. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed, said the Saviour of men. Faith and sight are very distinct ideas; for said inspired Paul, "We walk by faith not by sight." He defines faith to be "The evidence of things not seen." Heb. xi, 1. He proves his position by many and irrefragable arguments, as; "Through faith, we understand the worlds were framed by the word of God" Paul and others believed what they did not see, for they were not present when God made the worlds. They believed from testimony. Noah was warned of the approaching flood 120 years before the event. He believed, and was moved with fear to prepare an ark to the saving of his family. He therefore believed what he had not seen. Had he acted on *orthodox* principles he would have reasoned thus, I cannot believe till I see the flood; and then it would have been too late to provide an ark. Abraham had never seen the land of Canaan, yet he believed the testimony of God that there was such a land, and left his country to seek it.

This truth is confirmed by innumerable occurrencies among us. A jury is empannelled to adjudicate upon a murderer. Several witnesses depose to the same fact, that they saw this man, at such a time and place, with such a weapon, and in such a manner, kill their neighbor B. The whole jury believe the fact, yet not one ssw it. I never saw Philadelphia, yet from abundant testimony I believe there is such a city. I never saw God, angels, nor spirits, nor heaven nor hell, yet I believe they exist. I have never seen the Saviour and judge of the word, nor the day of judgment, nor the events of that day; yet I, from testimony, believe them all. Like Noah, I am moved with fear to prepare for those future events. Would to God, my friend would do the same. If you wait for what you call a spiritual perception to enable you to believe, I fear you will die in your sins. "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation. To day if you will hear his voice harden not your heart." Believe and obey the Saviour; then shall you receive the Holy Spirit, the anointing, whereby you shall know all things.

Ano; The scriptures declare that faith is the gift of God, and that he is the author and finisher of faith. How then can I believe unless God give me faith.

P... It is not certainly declared in the Bible that faith is the gift of God; yet I admit it as true, and that God is the author and

finisher of faith. But how does he give faith? I have already quoted Paul's answer, "Now faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Should A tell B a certain fact, and B believe it, who was the author and giver of that faith to B? Surely A was. So is God the very author and giver of faith to those who hear and receive his testimony.

Ano: But the Saviour said, "No man can come unto me, except the Father who sent me draw him. It is written in the prophets, They shall all be taught of God; he therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh to me." I have ever been taught that believing and coming are the same. If so, it is plain that God must draw them by his Spirit to Christ before they can come or believe in him.

Pre: If you have been taught that *believing* and *coming* are the same, you have been wrongly taught; for Paul says, "He that comes unto God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. xi, 6. *Coming* is an act of faith, and this must first exist in the mind. We believe God is merciful, and therefore come to him. We come to Jesus because we believe he is able to save us; and it is an undeniable truth that no man can come to him except the Father draw him. But how does the Father draw? "I have drawn them with the bands of a man, with the cords of love."; Hos. xi. "With everlasting kindness, have I drawn thee." Thousands, millions have been drawn to him by the force of truth, as the New Testament every where shows, and which this very text declares. For it is added, "They shall all be taught of God, as it is written in the prophets—God spoke by the prophets, and foretold of his Son, who should come into the world, all the remarkable incidents of his whole life, death and resurrection. When the people saw the accomplishment of these prophecies in the Son; they believed, when they heard the words of grace from his lips they were drawn to him. "He therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh to me." Those who had learned of the Doctors, who had made void the word of God by their traditions, could not believe in Jesus, because their traditions were not fulfilled in him.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

BROTHER S. CLACK'S CREED.

Article 1. The Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and conduct.

2. Man has sinned.

3. Christ died to save sinners.

4. All who believe in Christ, the only begotten Son, will be saved.

5. Immersion only is baptism.

6. None but baptized believers have any right to be accounted members of Christ's visible church on earth.

7. The dead will rise—the righteous to everlasting life—the wicked to condemnation.

—

If the churches will have creeds, besides the Bible, we rejoice to see them simplified and compendized as the one above. Will brother Clack receive into fellowship, union and communion, all who believe the articles of his creed, and whose life is according to the rules of christianity? We are interested—deeply interested, in receiving an explicit answer.—EDITOR.

GEORGETOWN FEB. 1, 1830.

Mr. Stone. The object of this short communication is to know if you have not asserted, that many Trinitarians, eminent for their learning and piety, are of opinion that the 7th verse of the 5 chap. of 1 John, as we have it in our version of the New Testament is an interpolation,—And that it is omitted in some of the best authenticated original manuscripts of the New Testament. Will you state who those Trinitarians are? I wish you to select such as will be admitted by all parties. The reason I am so particular is I heard it denied yesterday in the Baptist pulpit, that the above sentiments were ever promulgated by a Trinitarian—not only the congregation, which was numerous, but the whole world challenged to produce one instance. Now be particular whom you call a Trinitarian. We were told by a Rev. gentleman of reputed great talent, who followed after and closed the meeting, that Doctor Watts himself was claimed as a Trinitarian. But by a reference to a Hymn of the Doctor's composition, which was read and sung in concluding the meeting, his character as a Trinitarian was clearly established. That people have and will continue to differ in *opinion*, is to be expected, but when ministers of the Gospel make different statements as to simple matters of *Fact*, who is to be believed? If you have already noticed this subject in the Messenger you will please to refer me to the number; if you have not, you may yet think the subject of sufficient importance, to occupy a part of a page in some subsequent number, for the benefit of such of your readers as are willing to welcome the TRUTH.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE COMMUNICATION.

DEAR SIR:—I was not a little surprised at the contents of your communication—that popular preachers—preachers reputed as learned, and experienced, should deny before a numerous congregation that 1 John v, 7 was ever promulgated by a trinitarian as an interpolation, or a spurious text, and that they should challenge the *whole* world to produce one instance! We have really thought that no theological scholar, who has the shadow of a reputation to lose, would presume to defend the text as genuine; much less to say that no trinitarian ever denied its genuineness! Bold assertions may pass for arguments with some; but proof is necessary for rational conviction.

I have noticed this text before both in my Address, and in the Messenger, and have affirmed that learned and pious trinitarians have rejected it as spurious. I now fearlessly advance to the proof. Griesbach was the *trinitarian* Editor of the standard edition of the New Testament. He thus speaks of this text, 1 John v, 7.

"I could defend six hundred readings, the most worthless, and rejected by all, by testimonies and arguments equally numerous and strong, nay, far more so, than are those on which the advocates of the genuineness of this passage rely. Nor would the defenders of the genuine text, have in those instances so many and weighty arguments to oppose to my vain attempt, as have been produced against the supporters of this verse."

The calvinistic editors of the Eclectic Review speak of it thus. None we presume will deny that they were trinitarians.

"Upon this we need not speak many words. It is found in no Greek manuscript ancient or recent, except one to which we shall presently advert;—in no ancient version, being interpolated only in the later transcripts of the Vulgate. Not one of the Greek Fathers recognizes it, though many of them collect every species and shadow of argument, down to most allegorical, and shockingly ridiculous, in favor of the doctrine of trinity, though they often cite the words immediately contiguous both before and after,—and though, with immense labor and art, they extract from the next words the very sense which this passage has in following times been adduced to furnish. Of the Latin Fathers, not one* has quoted it, till Eucherius of Lyons, in the middle of the fifth century; and in his works *there is much reason to believe that it has been interpolated.*

"Under these circumstances, we are unspeakably ashamed that any modern divines should have fought *pedibus et unguibus*, for the retention of a passage so indisputably spurious. We could adduce half a dozen or half a score of passages of ample length, supported by *better* authority than this, but which are rejected in every printed edition and translation.

"One Greek manuscript we have said contains the clause.—This is the Dublin, or Montfortianus; a very recent MS. glaringly interpolated from the modern copies of the Vulgate, and distributed into the present division of chapters."

That Bishop Lowth was a trinitarian admits of no doubt. He thus writes to Michaelis.

"We have some wranglers in theology, sworn to follow their master, who are prepared to defend any thing, however absurd,

---

*It has been attempted to be shown that Turtullian and Cyprian have cited the last clause of v. 7. Our readers may be satisfied on the subject, by referring to Griesbach Nov. Test. vol. 2 app. p. 12–15: or Porson's letters to Travis 240–282: or Marsh's Michaelis vol. 4. 421–424. See also, for a lamentable contrast, Travis' letters 3d Edit. 53, 75, 82–128.

should there be occasion. But I believe there is no one among us, in the least degree conversant with sacred criticism, and having the use of his understanding, who would be willing to contend for the genuineness of the verse, 1 John v, 7." Mich: Lit: Cor: part 2, p. 428.

I have given the translation of the original latin, which I have in my possession.

The British critic is the high church periodical. Its title (Quarterly Theological Review, and Ecclesiastical Record) indicates its character. It is decidedly trinitarian, yet honestly rejects this text (1 John v, 7) as spurious. The British critic speaking of Bishop Burgess' vain labors to prove 1 John v, 7 genuine, 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 hopelessness of the cause which he has attempted to maintain—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." Ch. Reg. vol. 8, p. 50.

It will never be denied that Horne was a trinitarian; yet Horne has given it up as spurious. He was for some length of time inclined to retain the verse (1 John v, 7,) and was disingenerous enough to assert, that though "it is not to be found in a single Greek manuscript written before the 16th century," yet this fact should be qualified by a regard to the number of unexamined MSS. "In the Library of 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 British 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 of Florence! Mr. Horne should *know* there is not a twentieth part of such MSS. in all the libraries of 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, 1 John v, 7, 8, we perceive that he has given it up as spurious." Ch: Reg: vol. 8, p. 50.

A late number of the Glasgow Pioneer, contains a summary of the evidence against the genuineness of this text, 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." He says, "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 Newcomb; 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 Strasburgh, of Colinæas, and in those of Harwood and Matthæi—It is rejected by Griesbach, the most eminent biblical critic of modern times; by Porson, the unrivaled Greek scholar; by Charles Butler, the Roman Catholic, and Adam Clark, the Methodist; by the Quarterly Reviewers, by the Eclectic Reviewers, by Wardlaw &c. &c. The reasons why these excellent and learned men have rejected this text, are briefly these. It is found in no Greek MS. older than the 15th century, and in no Latin one older than the 9th. It is not found in any of the ancient versions; it is not cited by any of the Greek ecclesiastical Fathers, some of whom 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 the sense is more complete without it." Ch: Reg: vol. 8, p. 50.

Doctor Adam Clark on this text says, "It is wanting in every manuscript of this epistle written before the invention of printing, one excepted. It is wanting in all the ancient versions, but the Vulgate; and even of this version, many of the most ancient and correct manuscripts have it not. It is wanting in all the Greek Fathers, and in most even of the Latin." The Dr. has a learned and lengthy dissertation on this subject, to which I refer you. This with what I have now stated will convince you, and the public, that I was correct in asserting, that many learned trinitarians have rejected the text as spurious.

My charity forbids me to indulge the thought, that your preachers in the Baptist pulpit knew that their statement was false; I must impute it to their ignorance of the fact. The exposure is not to me agreeable, but truth and self respect compel me to do it. They no doubt will be profited so much by it, as to be more guarded in future.

With respect to Dr. Watts being a trinitarian, I refer you to the Christian Messenger vol. 2 p. 128–9. There you will find it proved that he was not a trinitarian in the latter part of his life.

You ask, "When ministers of the Gospel, make different statements as to simple matters of fact, who is to be believed!" I can easily tell you, who is most generally believed by the majority—the popular, who can make the loudest and most positive assertion; this will pass current for prostrating argument, however destitute of truth. But that man should surely be believed, who ventures to assert nothing without giving evidence of its truth. The time is at hand when declamation and positive assertion will lose its weight, and truth only be respected. May God hasten the day!—EDITOR.

BROTHER STONE:—I have been a constant reader of the Christian Messenger from its commencement. I have admired the

sentiments it contained, and have often been consoled under the belief, that the religious information, communicated through this periodical, would be a means of building up thousands of Christians in the faith of the Gospel, and of confirming them in this important truth, that the word of God is all sufficient for faith and practice, for the rule, guide and discipline of the Church of Christ. But there is one subject, which seems to me of very considerable importance, which I have long hoped to hear mentioned in the Messenger, and upon which I have anxiously waited to see some well written essay appear. But fearing that many of your friends and patrons, have overlooked the subject, and others viewing it as too delicate to name, I have concluded to relieve my own mind, by bringing it into view, and by making a few remarks to elicit information from our brethren, who, although they have said but little, must have thought much upon the subject. I allude to the qualifications of teachers or preachers of the Gospel. I could have wished, that a more able pen than mine had introduced this subject, which might be able to do ample justice to its merits.

If the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit have ceased, and men are neither favored with new revelations, nor endowed with power to work miracles, what must be their qualifications and what must they teach? I am well aware that these questions appear to many trite, and the solution at hand. "They must be able to teach others, and they must preach the word." But before we are content with these answers, it would be well to understand in what this ability consists, and what our friends understand by this word. Is there not an host of teachers in this Western country, in several religious societies, who are not merely destitute of a classical education; but who are really so completely illiterate, as to be unable to read intelligibly one ch. in the New Testament? I am ready to admit that much good has been done, and that great reformations have been wrought by men of very limited information. We have seen men, whose zeal for the cause of Christ, whose humble and harmless life, have stopped the mouths of gainsayers, and have won souls to Christ by scores. But have we not seen these same men, when they attempted to teach, disgust their audience, and make themselves subjects of ridicule! Have we not seen men, who came to us professing to have the messages of heaven, roar and storm and foam, who say nothing but nonsense, consisting in some vain frantic imaginations of their own, or in ridiculing men, who cannot see all they see, and do all they do? Have we not seen others, whose pretensions are not quite so high, but whose information is but little superior, after a few zealous harangues, find their biblical store exhausted, themselves neglected by their brethren, and ridiculed by the assemblies? Now have these men a liberty to teach, and do they preach the word? surely not. Is it not a fact, that many preachers have zealously opposed learning in every shape? counted it vain and superfluous, and have

actually interfered so far as to prevent young men from qualifying themselves for usefulness? It is difficult *now*, to make us believe that God instantaneously fills the minds of preachers with ideas, and then opens their mouths to utter them.

The sun of science begins to shine brighter and brighter, the light of truth begins to illuminate the path of the sons of Zion, coming out of Babylon—and we wish our teachers not to be found in the rear. We see the great literary world with rapid strides in its march. We see men of learning and talents armed against Christianity; and Scepticism aiming its deadly blows against all we hold dear on earth, and but here and there found an individual with the ability to teach. Shall our teachers from a belief that their cause is good, hide themselves from the sun of science, rest secure, and vainly imagine that a zeal without knowledge, will effect all the wonders of which they dream. We hope from them better things.

Now Brother Stone, I have not been induced to make these remarks and inquiries from publications. I have seen Sectarian institutions of learning, Theological school colleges, to build up parties; but I view a good education all important, and a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, indispensable to a Preacher of the Gospel. No doubt, but some of my brethren have matured the subject more than I have, and are prepared to inform us the best plan, for affording to teachers of the precious Gospel, the means of attaining this information. If they have, we would be happy to see it in the Messenger; but if they should delay, we view the subject so important, we must hazard our opinion on this also. I have made these remarks with all tenderness. Many precious and good men, destitute of learning, have undertaken to teach the people from the best motives. Their labors have been blessed in a good degree, and without their labors, many congregations of Christians, would have been entirely destitute of gospel instructions. But I feel confident, that many of them begin to feel the want of that mental improvement, and biblical information, for which I contend. Now if I am wrong, will some of my brethren, in the spirit of meekness open my eyes? If I am correct, will they lend us their aid in suggesting a plan, to supply the Christian Congregations with able Ministers of the New Testament.

JONATHAN NICHOLS.

"ANCIENT GOSPEL."

Ancient Gospel, is a phrase that is now frequently used by many in our country, people are exhorted to teach, believe in, and obey the ancient gospel. It is a phrase, the meaning of which I do not distinctly apprehend, and evidently implies that there is, or has been a modern gospel—when, where, and how was this modern gospel introduced? And are those brethren who use the term ancient gospel, prepared to admit that the cheerless, lifeless, unmeaning and anti-scriptural notions are

H–H

whims of men, as set forth in their party creeds, is gospel? If not, (and who would slander the author of our religion, and reproach his blessed gospel by admitting it) where is the modern gospel to be found? If there be no *modern*, why talk about ancient? It was as long from the time of Abraham, to the days of Paul, as it has been from the time of the apostle to the present. Yet the great apostle to the Gentiles, did not use the word ancient, when speaking of the gospel preached 430 years before the law, to the father of the faithful. Let us imitate his example, and speak of spiritual things in spiritual words—they who profess to use the pure language of Canaan, should not themselves indulge in that of Ashdod. If you, Bro: Editor, know the meaning of *ancient gospel*, please let us know something about it.

PHILIP.

(COMMUNICATED.)

I joined the Methodist E. Church in 1812, and lived among them in peace, with a trivial exception until 1828. With great difficulty I appeared in public, to warn sinners to flee the wrath to come. Having matured the importance of the calling, I ventured forth predisposed not to participate in, nor enforce any rule, law, or discipline, but what is found in the gospel. This resolve, I soon found to be at war with the disciplinarian party; but still I was braced with the hope, that my brethren would allow me that liberty of conscience. But when application was made to Quarterly conference for preaching license, I soon learned the reverse of my views. Boniface the 8th, boldly decreed, that no human flesh could be saved, unless he became subject to the See of Rome. My Methodist brethren in part have done the same, for they in conference virtually decreed, that no man shall preach the gospel, by authority of conference, unless he first acknowledge the discipline without exception. This I cannot do conscientiously, and feel clear before God. My reasons for rejecting the discipline are, 1st. Because I view it opposed to the free institutions of our republican government; and, 2dly. Because I believe that God, in the New Covenant, has given us a complete rule of faith and practice.

My object is truth, and the exposition of error. I rest assured that nothing but the word of God, can buoy up the soul in the article of death, and give it admittance into the paradise of God. On his word we would never divide, for it enjoins all to read and understand it for themselves. But the discipline is not so tolerant. If my brethren love it, let them enjoy it. From them I must dissent. I have no doubt but the church is hastening from the wilderness—when the mists long since raised by men and devils, shall be blown away by the breath of the Lord of Hosts—the church then will know no rule for her guidance but the word granted her by the inspiration of God.

ADAM VICKREY.

FEB 7th, 1830.

To brother Vickrey I must apologise for not inserting his entire communication. It was too lengthy in detail of circumstances not deemed necessary for the public to know; and our work is too limited for many and lengthy dissertations. I would farther remark that the M. Conference in refusing you license because you would not subscribe to their discipline, is nothing new, nor singular. Presbyterians, Baptists, and all other sectarians do the same. This is deemed necessary to keep up, and establish their various systems and parties, and without this precaution those systems and parties could not exist. Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists, all believe that particular men are called of God to preach the gospel. A man of piety, talents and respectability thinks he is moved by the Holy Ghost to preach. He applies for license to a Presbytery. They deny him license, because they find that he is Arminian in his sentiments, and will not subscribe to their confession. He applies to the Methodist conference, they receive him because he is an Arminian, and willing to subscribe their discipline. The Presbyterians think he is not called of God to preach, because he does not believe their confession; and to be consistent, they ought to disown all other preachers as running unsent and uncalled of God. For did they believe that God called any to preach, who could not receive and subscribe to their confession, as honest and good men they dare not reject him *for this reason*. So, the Methodists for refusing license to any man, *because* he cannot receive and conscientiously subscribe to their discipline, virtually deny that God calls any to preach but Arminians; and therefore they should reject all other preachers as impostors. The same things apply to all other sectarians.

I believe that all whom God ever called, from the incarnation of his Son, or even will call to preach, were called; not to preach Calvinism, nor Arminianism, nor any sectarian system, but the gospel of peace. But, say the Presbyterians, calvinism is the gospel. Nay, say the Methodists, arminianism is the gospel. One or other most evidently is wrong; for they are directly opposite to each other. We think the safest way is, to take and preach the gospel as delivered us by inspiration of God, untrammelled by the systems and notions of men.—EDITOR.

"HUMAN CREEDS."

We have read a lengthy dissertation on Human creeds in the 2d No. of the Baptist Chronicle, published in Georgetown Ky. The very point of debate we think is omitted, whether any creed formed by fallible men should be authoritatively binding on others—so authoritative that unless they believe and subscribe to it, they must be excluded from church fellowship. This is the principle against which we have contended—a principle, which from the introduction of such creeds, has rent the church of Christ in pieces; and is yet rending and subdividing the par-

ties. We need only refer to the present state of the Baptist churches for proof. The writer of the article seems to have his eye principally on Bishop Campbell, against whom an overwhelming flood of words is poured, not calculated to convince, because of its destitution of argument; but well adapted to rivet the prejudices of bigots, and awe them into subjection to their leaders and creeds. When argument shall take the place of declamation, and sober, scriptural reasoning the place of zealous dogmatizing, the writer shall be noticed by the EDITOR.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS AND TRACT SOCIETIES.

To the Editor of the Baptist Chronicle.

DEAR SIR:—In the 2d No. of your Chronicle, I have read your strictures on an article in the Christian Messenger, headed "Sunday Schools." Your warm expressions of regard to me I feel glad to acknowledge, and reciprocate. I do not impute to you a design to do me injustice, yet injustice is done me. Had you informed your readers, how highly I approved of Sunday Schools in their first institution and management, and what great blessings I viewed them to the poor children of our country, as stated by me in the very article to which you object, you would have evaded the very suspicion of such a design. Such sunday schools I yet highly approve of. Against the abuse of them I only object. So I superlatively approve of the Bible Christianity as there taught, and pure undefiled religion, but to the abuse of these I object.

You remark, "Because he has found one tract embracing sentiments differing from his peculiar notions, he at one fell sweep, denounces the whole, as *engines to support the most anti Christian monster in all its various forms.*" Here you have left your readers to conjecture what this anti-Christian monster is. Had you added the following part of the sentence, *I mean sectarianism*, they would have seen the propriety of my remarks. My hostility is not against sunday schools as originally instituted and managed; but against the American Sunday School Union and all its branches, not because of ungrounded prejudice, as you plainly insinuate—not because I have found *one* tract, which contains sentiments contrary to my opinion—(Had you designed to do me justice, you would have said, *three tracts*, for *three* are quoted by me,) but because I have good reasons for believing that they are abused, and made the engines of promoting sectarianism; and because I have feared they will ultimately destroy our civil institutions, which now guarantee our liberty. Has not Dr. Ely, the organ of that society, given sufficient cause to alarm our fears on this ground? This we have before noticed. The general conference of Methodists, alarmed at the tendency of this society, refused to unite with it. Their reasons, recorded in their periodical, the Christian Advocate and Journal, you have doubtless seen. They plainly express their fears that such societies endanger our civil liberty. Why so much ado, and so

loud cries to get money for this society? Cannot poor children be taught to read on Sunday by benevolent individuals without money, as at first? Why so much activity to enlist as many children as possible under party banners? Why did the American Sunday school union, make application for an act to incorporate them? Could not the poor children be taught on Sunday without such an act? You are pained that I have expressed any thing so opposite to such benevolent institutions. I am sorry to inflict unnecessary pain upon my fellow creatures; it is far from my heart. But I am not the only one who has thus afflicted you. The spirited resolves of Baptist associations in N. Carolina, Virginia, Missouri, &c against such institutions, have no doubt, first inflicted the wound, which my few remarks have caused to bleed afresh.

My dear Sir, I do not yet know whether the Baptist Sunday school in our town, is a branch of the American Sunday school union, or not—whether it is founded on money, or benevolence pure—whether the children are taught to read the Bible, or drilled into the system of the party. If your school is according to the first institution of Sunday schools, it has my best wishes, and it is my earnest desire that every neighborhood, town, and congregation would have such.

I pass over your remarks on my sectarian spirit. As no sectarian can impute it to me as a crime, or as dishonorary, seeing it closely attaches to them all; and as no argument is adduced, capable of producing conviction in my mind, I am willing that they pass for their worth. But I am not so willing to let pass unnoticed the last paragraph. It is what I could not have believed your honesty and self respect, would have permitted you to write. Your words are, "And as to the monstrous doctrines of the Trinity: and that God the Son was made a curse for sin and sinners" &c. Where, Sir, did you ever find in any of my writings, that Christ was not made a curse for sinners? Surely there is nothing like this in the article from which you profess to have received the idea. "In the tract I found the Clergyman asking his pupil, "For what reason do you suppose he (Christ) was cursed of God?" My remark was, that in the scripture, it could not be found that God the Son was accursed by God the Father—or that God was cursed by himself. In justice to yourself you are bound to retract this error, and you are requested to do it in your next No. to prevent false impressions. You are also requested to correct an error which immediately follows, That these doctrines found by me in *one* tract, all at once changed my love into hatred of Sunday schools. These tracts I never saw till a few months back, and the C. Messenger is a witness of my opposition to the American Sunday school union long before. You plainly say that the difference between my views and yours, are as an impassable gulph between us. Then I must conclude that we must feel all hope of fellowship forever cut off. It is important, Sir, to us to know this difference. We are acquainted

with our own opinions, but yours we honestly confess we know not. Your confession is as a nose of wax in your society. Some reject it, some partly hold it, and some honestly acknowledge the whole. We repeat it. We do not know your opinions of Trinity, nor of the atonement, nor of the doctrine of imputed righteousness, nor of the forgiveness of sins. Please inform us in your next number. We are more than willing, to investigate these points in the spirit of meekness, and divine wisdom with you, or any of your brethren, who may feel disposed to write for the Chronicle. By this means we may understand each other, and our readers may be profited. You may affect to treat us as unworthy of notice; yet, Sir, the conduct of sectarians respecting us, proves to us and to men of discernment, that we are awfully feared. Before I conclude I repeat my request, that you publicly correct your errors as mentioned above respecting me, in your next number.—EDITOR.

Extract of a letter to the Editor from Elder John Roberts, dated Winchester Ky. Feb. 1, 1830.

BROTHER STONE:—I am now in Winchester on my return from Madison. On the fourth Lord's day of Jan. I preached at bro. Jackson's, where I received and immersed four. On the same evening I preached at John Hawkins' and received seven. On Monday at Maj. Tho. Burgans, and received him also, and on Wednesday at bro. Silas Tribbles, and immersed those received on Sunday. There are a great many more in this neighborhood, who appear to be deeply impressed with the truth, and importance of the religion of heaven, as taught by Jesus and his inspired apostles. The prospect is truly good. Though persecution rages, truth is prevailing, and the foundation of the clergy's kingdom is shaking. Present appearances indicate that "the night is far spent and the day is at hand," when party names and creeds will fall like lightning from heaven.

On last Thursday, by request, I attended an appointment of elder J—— S——, a Baptist preacher of note, at Indian creek meeting house in Clarke co. We found the doors locked against us. At length the congregation consented to open the door to bro. S—— on condition that he would not invite me to preach. We entered, and he preached us the New Testament doctrine, in a masterly manner. He contended that it was contrary to the genius of the Christian religion, to submit to any other creed than the word of God, or to wear by consent any other name than *Christian*. On Saturday we both preached at bro. Jackson's to a large and solemn congregation. That night bro. S—— lodged at the house of a Baptist preacher, D—— S——, in sight of his meeting house, where we were to preach next day. Brother S—— could not persuade the preacher to go with him to meeting in the morning. We met at the meeting house with a large and respectable congregation, but found the doors locked, and the windows nailed. We kindled a fire, and stood shivering around

it, till a leading member of the church demanded, and obtained the key. Bro. S—— preached, and we sang a song and went out.

REMARKS.—We are sorry to make more public the improprieties of the professed followers of the meek and lowly Saviour. Such conduct as above stated we think, degrades religion, and strengthens the bands of infidelity. So far is it from answering the purpose designed to keep the church from heresy and division, that it is the very way to effect them. The day is come when the leaders of the people cannot keep them from hearing and thinking for themselves. Truth must prevail over all its opposers.—EDITOR.

Extract of a letter to the Editor, from elder John M'Carty, dated Calloway co. Ky. Jan. 13, 1830.

The gospel of Jesus Christ has of late prevailed in these regions. About 40 have united in society within three months.

Extract from elder J. Flick, Confield, Trumbull co. O. Jan. 12 1830.

"The cause of Jesus is fast gaining ground. I can truly say I never saw nor felt such a refreshing winter as this. Truth is spreading, and the power of the gospel is felt by many, and leads them into the water. Some are continually stepping into the kingdom."

Extract. from Bro. J. P. Andrew. Cincinnati Feb. 10, 1830.

The prospects in our church in this place are good. In the last four weeks about 20 have joined, & we expect more will shortly."

A correspondent from Indianapolis Ia. Jan. 30, writes; "yesterday the Legislature adjourned. They passed a joint resolution, requesting Congress not to interfere in stopping the transportation of the mail on the Sabbath.

OBITUARY.

We have to record the death of two of our Elders, who died very recently about the same time, ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, of Bracken co. Ky. and SAMUEL KRATZER, of Edgar co. Ill. They both died with entire composure, and joyful hope. Bro. Alexander had been a preacher for 25 years in the Christian church. He died very suddenly and triumphantly.

PROSPECTUS OF THE

NEW-YORK AMULET,

And Ladies' Literary and Religious Chronicle.

The primary object of this work will be, to check the rapid progress of two alarming evils, so fatally prevalent in our coun-

try, viz: Intemperance and Infidelity—which, like the canker-worm, are stripping the green walks of life of all its flowers, and leaving the moral world a leafless desert. To do this the more effectually, we shall pourtray in the most vivid colors, the deformity and deleterious consequences of these most deadly evils, by interesting moral tales, sketches, fragments, essays, and scriptural illustrations. We shall endeavor to cherish in the hearts of our readers, the sublime and benevolent sentiments of the blessed gospel of Jesus Christ—to exhibit the beauties and rewards of virtue in all their captivating loveliness—to awaken the better feellings of human nature—to cultivate the SOCIAL and DOMESTIC affections—to lead the mind through the most delightful avenues, to the bowers of happiness and peace—to elevate and enlarge the conceptions—to imbue the understanding with the most exalted ideas of illimitable attributes and perfections of the Great Divinity—thereby leading mankind to "fear God and keep his commandments."

To accomplish these designs, we shall call to our aid all the eloquence of truth, clothed in the most fascinating forms—such as moral essays, simple or pathetic tales, varying "from grave to gay, from lively to serene"—poetical sketches—didatic articles in verse—and sometimes, to enliven our pages, a tale of fancy—a humorous story—an allegory—a ballad—or, a song, will receive an insertion. In each, and in all, the great end and aim will be, to convey moral and religious sentiments, through a pleasing medium, to the heart—or, in other words, to blend "the useful with the sweet."

In order to furnish our readers with the choicest articles both of poetry and prose—to encourage genius and to foster talent—generous premiums will be awarded, from time to time—for original articles furnished. The *entire services* of a distinguished literary gentleman, late from London, who has, for some time past, been a contributor to the English periodicals, are engaged for the New-York Amulet. With these claims for patronage, the work will be submitted to the consideration of a candid and generous public. Should we succeed in our endeavors to blend usefulness and instruction with amusement and delight, our object will be accomplished.

CONDITIONS.—The New-York Amulet—published semi-monthly, by an association of gentlemen—will be beautifully printed on fine white paper, 4to size, with entire new type. Its typographical execution shall equal that of any similar publication in America. It will be afforded to city subscribers in Philadelphia and New-York, who will receive them by a carrier, at one dollar and twenty-five cents the volume, handsomely covered for preservation. Mail subscribers, without covers, will be furnished with a volume, at *at the very low price of ONE DOLLAR*—payable in advance. Should the patronage warrant the expense, the work will be embellished with copperplate engravings.

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. IV.] GEORGETOWN, KY. APRIL, 1830. [No. 5.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

Dialogue between a Preacher and Anomos,

(CONTINUED FROM p. 82.)

Ano: My dear friend, I am truly glad to meet you. After our last conference I went home determined to read the scriptures honestly, and to labor to find the truth. I commenced the New Testament, with an humble petition to God for help. I was firmly convinced if your doctrine of faith was correct, that the majority of Christians were radically wrong. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke I found nothing in opposition to your doctrine, but many things to confirm its truth. In all these Evangelists I discovered that faith was based on testimony. Though John accords with them, as do all the inspired New Testament writers, yet in John I found a few passages I could not understand but as opposed to your views of faith. These and a few others I wish you to explain.

Pre: I am truly glad that you are searching the scriptures for information. These are an infallible directory to heaven, and these believed and obeyed will safely lead you there. Tell me, what are those difficult texts which appear to you in opposition to my view of faith. I wait to hear.

Ano: John XII. 39–40. "Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias saith again: He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them."

Pre: Does my Anomos think that God actually blinded the eyes of the Jews that they could not see; and actually hardened their hearts that they could not understand; and when they were thus [illegible] disqualified by his own agency, that he should require [illegible] and [illegible] them to eternal punishment for [illegible]! Can you attach such injustice and cruelty to God?