PROPOSALS BY EPHRAIM A. SMITH,

FOR PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION

THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

From the Birth of Christ to the Eighteenth Century; including the very interesting account of the Waldenses and Albigenses.

BY WILLIAM JONES.

In consequence of the frauds that have been practised upon the public, by persons publishing Books by subscription, I deem it necessary to state, that the contemplated edition of Jones' History is not to be published for the purpose of realizing a profit by the sale, but solely with a design to extend the circulation of this valuable Work among those who have not the means to procure the great number of voluminous works from which this is compiled, or leisure to examine them all, if in their possession. In order to effect this object to the greatest extent, the Work, containing 576 large 8vo pages, will be delivered to subscribers, well printed on good paper, and in excellent binding, for TWO DOLLARS A COPY. (The same work is sold in this State for *Five Dollars.*) ☞That the public may be assured, respecting the mechanical execution of the work, it is only necessary to state, that it will be printed at the "*Transylvania Press,*" *Lexington, Kentucky,* and will be bound by *Mr. Benjamin Keiser* of the same place.

March, 1830.

I hesitate not to pronounce this the best work I have read of the kind. It should certainly be possessed by every one who wishes information of the past events of the Christian Church; especially should it be read by public teachers. Mr. Jones, in a few instances, has shewn a partiality for a few *orthodox dogmas,* and thus far has wandered from the path of a historian; but in the general his works exhibit more impartiality than any I have read. EDITOR.

NOTICE.

Our patrons and agents will please to remember us. We need their pecuniary aid in carrying on the work. I entreat my agents to use their best endeavors to collect for the former volumes, before they be forgotten, and lost. If possible, remit to me by private conveyance; for of late I have lost much by default of the P. O. department. Some send me from a distance one dollar; the postage of which is one half. I wish them to send small sums to the nearest agent, who will remit to me.—EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. IV.] GEORGETOWN, KY. JUNE, 1830. [No. 7.

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.

From the Christian Register.

RESPECT FOR THE SCRIPTURES.

'The cloak that I left at Troas, with Carpus when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.'—2 Tim: iv. 13.

It is to be greatly feared that the heated controversies on religious subjects, which have done so much mischief already, may end, more injuriously still, in a great increase of infidelty. It is natural for the human mind to fly from one extreme to another. After believing too much, the transition is very easy to believing too little. There is danger that the public mind will be left entirely afloat. Even those, who are more rigid appear to be quite unsettled. They evidently have become convinced that the more absurd opinions of ancient Theologians, just emerging from the dark ages, are such as can no longer be defended before the thinking part of the community. We begin to hear a great deal about '*modern* orthodoxy,' as being more rational, implying that the ancient orthodoxy is too absurd to find advocates, now. Yet any essential change of opinions is a change of the system. The orthodox are tied down to *one* peculiar set of doctrinal sentiments. When we used to ask, what is *orthodoxy*, we were referred to the institutes of John Calvin and to the catechism of the Westminster divines. Orthodoxy does not admit of any 'modern' innovations. As a system, it must keep exactly where it is. Any advance, any new light, or any improvement, would be heresy, as being a departure from the ancient faith. The system must be as fixed as fate.

When the orthodox system first began, it was not in a period of the world, nor under circumstances favorable to researches after truth. Mankind had been passing through the dark ages

of a thousand years. John Calvin, the head of the reformers, needed himself to be reformed: he was nothing more than a fallible individual; whose talents were not able to consecrate his authority; whose memory comes down to us loaded with great errors and defects. It was no better with the Westminster assembly of divines. They were the creatures of a turbulent civil faction, trying to establish themselves in perpetual power. These divines were allowed to discuss no subjects but at the dictation of their superiors. They were intended to subserve the purposes of the faction, who created them; and, in whose election, ministers and churches and people had no voice. After all, there was nothing like unanimity among them, either in their opinions or results. They were made up of the three prevailing sects of that day, the Presbyterians, Erastians and Independents; the two last named quitted the Assembly, the moment they discovered there was likely to be no such thing as religious toleration. The remnant continued to dwindle, till they found it difficult to keep together members sufficient to make a quorum for business; while these *few* took quite as much care about senseless ceremonies, as about the doctrines of truth. Among the *people* also of those times, there never was any general agreement in religious opinions. For ages, nothing could be more changeable than their creeds. Both divines and people altered, almost as often as they changed their civil and Ecclesiastical Rulers. What was orthodoxy in one reign, was heresy in the next. After a lapse of 300 years, it is not strange, that persons, who feel they have no interest but in the truth, should now desire to examine anew the creeds of ages gone by; to try them by all the lights of this informed age; to adopt whatever is true and useful, as well as to get rid of errors, which have been accumulating for centuries. Nor is it easy to discover, why the men, who are celebrated as the 'Reformers,' had any more right or authority, than *we* have still, to reform the errors, which they left uncorrected. Wisdom did not die with them. It is error, not truth, which dreads critical investigations. Let us have the truth, though all the systems of erring mortals go to ruins.

This exclusive spirit which withholds Christian fellowship, on account of honest differences of opinions; this bigotry, which pronounces the rest of the community unclean; these efforts to create enthusiastic excitements, which cannot last, unless they end in permanent alienation of mind, as is, very often, lamentably the case; all these evils cannot fail, in the minds of many, to lessen respect both for religion and for its advocates. It is true, as it is strange, that sects, who are nearest in their faith, hate one another most heartily, for those things wherein they differ; while the greater the difference, the greater the forbearance. They, who believe in the metaphysical distinctions of three persons in one divine nature, cannot endure those who believe in the plain, first principle of all revealed religion, 'the Lord our God is *one* God;' yet the same persons will express the utmost kindness and

missionary zeal for the whole world of *idolators*, though they believe in their three hundred Jupiters and thirty thousand Gods.

I began with expressing fears, that the faults of the times and the follies of exclusionists might end to the discredit of all religion and piety. In the most populous city of the United States, most noted for the seat of orthodoxy only ten years ago, periodical publications have been got up recently, openly avowing the intention to advocate the cause of deism and infidelty. After seeing sentiments carried to extremes, there will be a propensity to distrust or to give up every thing sacred. *One* desires 'that the religious denominations that differ so widely, and quarrel so fiercely, and violate that charity which is the first and greatest rule of the religion, would first agree, respecting what the religion is, before they proceed to teach it to others.' *Another* asks, 'what is the use of a system, which begins with undeviating human reason, and trusts in the efficacy of human creeds; which perceives great excellencies in the faith of unintelligible mysteries, and sees great dangers from good morals.' A *third* does not 'understand, when the Gospel demands of every believer the law of love, the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace, how it comes to pass, that the teachers of the "most straitest sect" make war on their brethren, pastors leave their flocks to climb up into folds not their own, invite the restless to sudden revolt, and break up settlements, which have been quiet, friendly and united for ages.'

We may now expect that infidel opinions will be on the increase, after witnessing the intolerant spirit and follies of the passing age, and the wars, which Christians of different principles are waging on each other, with a barbarity of manners scarcely exceeded in the combats between modern Turks and Russians. Infidelity, too, does not differ from orthodoxy in its zeal to make converts. Lately, I had occasion to call in at a country store, where were collected about a dozen men and boys, listening to the discourse of a man who was trying to persuade his hearers to give up all revelation, as being nothing more than a 'cunningly devised fable.' He had got on to the last topic of his impious harangue, which was, to show that Revelation contained '*trifling matter*,' not worthy of a divine origin. He gave, as an instance of this, the verse placed at the head of this article. 'Of what use, said he, can such a passage be to us! Or did an Apostle need inspiration to tell us about his *cloak* he had carelessly left behind, or his musty books of Theology, and his yellow parchments of old sermons? Is this the important matter, which is to fill up the volume of revelation?'

To make a mock of things sacred is a very easy way to dispose of an argument. It is not the reproach, but the excellence, of divine Revelation, that it comes down to our daily duties, to the ordinary concerns of life, to 'men's bosoms and business.' It is possible that such a passage as this may be a useful record. Paul was then passing through very great persecutions. He had

appealed to Cæsar; was brought before Nero a second time; called on to make an apology for himself and for his religion; the result of this trial was his martyrdom at Rome. It was his duty to make his best efforts to save his life. He had done this, more than once, by showing that he was 'a *Roman* citizen,' on whom certain corporeal punishments might not be inflicted. The question was this, how was he, in a foreign country, and unbefriended, to *prove* that he was a Roman citizen. He proves this in three ways. One was by his *dress;* his common clothing was a Roman habit; while youth, at 17 years of age, put on the 'toga virilis' or manly gown, and their distinguished men wore the 'Stola' or long robe, he too wore the '*Cloak*,' the dress of citizens of a high order. The second way to make his defence was to appeal to his '*books*,' which might be volumes of the decrees of Cæsar, to show that certain infamous punishments might not be inflicted on any, who were, either by nativity or adoption, Roman citizens, while he himself was entitled to all those rights and privileges. The third way to prove the same fact, was by his 'parchments;' which might be diplomas, or certificates, on vellum, of his being a citizen of the 'free city' of Tarsus, which was no 'mean city,' but had a high rank for population, wealth and fame. If any defence could save his life, this would, in a trial before the Emperor Nero, the most cruel monster of persecution, who favored nothing which was not Roman.

Were these few hints extended, as they easily might be, with great probability of truth. they would render the passage, in 2 Tim. iv. 13, not frivolous matter, but of great historical interest. Revelation then contains beauties, which the eyes of ignorance and unbelief cannot see. Foolish, impious mortals fancy they find defects in the very wisdom of God. In the midst of difficult investigations, the fault-finding infidel would do well to reflect, that he has not yet *known* all things. Whatever else may be obscure, it is enough for us, that *our* DUTIES *are most plain*, to every honest mind. PHILOS ALETHEIAS.

EXCLUSIVE ORTHODOXY, A DANGEROUS SYSTEM.

We believe that a system founded upon the assumed infallibility of its advocates, claiming to present the only way of salvation, and presuming to judge men who sincerely and honestly differ from it, as guilty of a crime in the sight of God, is dangerous to the best interests of religion and morality. Such a system is the orthodoxy which a few popular leaders would fain support, but which, we are persuaded, has but a slight hold upon the feelings and affections of the majority, by whom its doctrines are nominally received. In opposing this system we are convinced that we do not oppose any thing which in reality is held dear by many in our community. We oppose the love of power, the thirst for pre-eminence, the grasping at religious domination, which are displayed by the modern sons of Diotrephes.

We hardly think it necessary to complain of the Orthodox doctrines as dangerous. We believe that though they have no foundation in truth, they are generally so neutralized by their connexion with the vital doctrines of the Gospel as to produce little or no injury, on those who adopt them. Some exceptions, of course, must be made to this remark, especially in instances of their reception by illiterate men and weak females, who possess nothing to counteract their influence, whose characters we have known to be very unhappily affected by their Orthodox impressions. But, as a general thing, we believe it probable that many enlightened men and cultivated and amiable women hold the technical doctrines of orthodoxy, without any bad influence on their feelings, or their understanding. If then, our Orthodox brethren were content with enjoying 'the fragrance of their own belief, without disturbing others with its thorns,' we should have little occasion to descend to popular controversy. Clear and calm discussion of theological points would be all that was necessary. If they were satisfied with appealing to Scripture and to reason for the correctness of their doctrines, we should see no danger in their efforts, since the truth would ultimately be made clear, and the minds of the inquiring would repose in its possession.

It is the spirit, which the leaders of Orthodoxy labor to diffuse, of which we complain. The exercises of an assumed right to condemn our brethren for differences of opinion, cannot be otherwise than dangerous. This is what we oppose. It is at war with independence of mind, with rational inquiry, with the love of truth, with peace and charity, and thus places the interests of religion and morality at fearful hazard. We are no enemies to a comparison of different systems of faith. We hail, with gladness, every legitimate effort to elucidate truth. We would cheerfully give the right hand to our Orthodox brethren, or to any number of serious inquirers, whose object was to ascertain and promote the truth by fair and humane methods. We would not utter a word by way of reproach, were we allowed the same liberty; which they claim and use—the liberty to think and judge for ourselves what is right. But when it comes to this, that we cannot study our Bibles, without being stunned by the noise of the warrior, it is time to look about us. When we cannot enter the pleasant paths of religious inquiry, without encountering a swarm of venomous animals, who would bite and devour us, it is high time to take heed to our steps, lest we be destroyed.

We cannot, then, view the ambitious encroachments of Orthodox leaders without raising our warning voice. We ought to do this. The present generation, if they know what belongs to their peace, will thank us for it. Posterity, most assuredly, will thank us for it. We shall then cry aloud and spare not. We shall enter into no compromise, we shall give no terms to the spirit of bigotry and exclusion. We are willing that the Orthodox should maintain the waning lights of their faith, as their consciences shall dictate; but their measures to compel others to

see by their lights, and thus to quench the spirit of free inquiry, we shall fearlessly expose, and zealously contend against them.

[*Christian Register.*

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT, A SUMMARY OF CHRISTIANITY.

By. Mr. E. Butcher.

'Now in this discourse, delivered to such a multitude, and in so formal and solemn a manner, is it probable that our Lord should confine himself only to the subordinate and inferior parts of his religion? Would he omit any important article of his commission? Is such a supposition consistent with any just notions, either of his wisdom or faithfulness? Is it for a moment to be imagined that in the longest of our Master's discourses, which has been handed down to us, there should be nothing or but little truly evangelical? But if there be any thing evangelical in it at all, it must be entirely so, for it is all of a piece. Here, therefore, we may expect to meet with every thing that is essential to our practice, as disciples of Christ and candidates for eternal salvation. That every thing of this kind is actually contained in this sermon, Christ has expressly assured us, for he thus closes the whole; "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a *wise man who built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock.*"—p. 8. 9.

'Great, however, as these advantages of meekness are, the exercise of it, upon many occasions, requires so much resolution and self denial that very few make the attainments they might in this divine temper; and the common excuse is, that by their very constitution they are so inclined to hastiness and passion, that they really cannot help it. This is not only a poor, but a false apology, for where these people have any *interest* to serve; they can keep their tempers well enough.'—p. 62

THE PERSECUTED.

'Into what a multitude of sorrowful and aching hearts has this beatitude darted consolation and joy! Ye howling wildernesses, ye kens and caves of the earth, the habitations only of savage beasts, till persecution peopled you with the sons and daughters of integrity, bear witness with what a glistening eye, with what a transported spirit, many a trembling forlorn disciple has uttered these words of his Master: "Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake!"—p. 135.

CONSEQUENCES OF BAD EXAMPLE.

'*A city set on a hill* CANNOT BE HID. If our conduct be careless and criminal, it will be of no importance that our general conversation and manner be grave and serious. Men will judge of us, not by what we *say*, but by what we *do*. What an awful thing will it be in the day of judgment, to have many, perhaps, ascribing their everlasting ruin to our conduct—saying to the Judge

of the universe, *That* was the man, *that* was the woman by whose example I was drawn aside into the paths of folly and sin! They taught me that under the cloak of religion I might indulge my impure and unholy passions, and that if I preserved a fair outside, it was a matter of little consequence what was my real character! O my fellow professors! never, *never* let such a charge as this lie at your doors.'—p. 195.

NATIONAL SOCIETIES.

We noticed an article in the last Southern Religious Telegraph, a Presbyterian paper published at Richmond, Va. entitled 'Campbellism in the West.' It is an extract of a letter from Kentucky, in which great complaint is made of Mr. Campbell, (the late antagonist of Mr. Owen, we suppose) as exercising an extensive and unfavorable influence upon the minds of the people in regard to their religious views and practices. 'Mr. Campbell has spread his notions to a great extent in Kentucky,'—says the writer. 'As far as I know he continues; 'they, [his followers] are opposed to all the great national institutions,' &c.

By the great national institutions we suppose the writer means, the national Tract Society, Sunday School Union, Education Society, &c. Now with what face can any one complain of opposition to institutions so decidedly sectarian as these must be acknowledged to be? We know nothing of the peculiar views and principles of Mr. Campbell. We suppose him to be a Baptist, and beyond this we know nothing. If he be honest and practically upright, why may he not express his doubts, and impart them to his followers if he can, respecting the beneficial influence of institutions which though nominally national, are not so in reality, but are evidently, and as is believed, designedly, tending to give a monopoly of influence to a sect? A sect, too, which not contented with an almost gigantic strength, is complaining of every thing which stands in the way of its continued increase. Do not these very complaints show its craving thirst for an unlimited authority; and convince us that it is time some counter influence were opposed to its progress?—*C. Register.*

THE IRISHMAN.

In the Christian Baptist for 1830 we have read a letter to the Editor of the C. B. dated, Londonderry (Ireland) Nov. 5th 1829. In this letter the writer justly appreciates the merits of the C. B. proposes a number of objections to some of the doctrines advanced in that work. The 9th objection is in these words.

"You call those weak-headed Baptists, who blame you for calling that creature named *Stone* a brother. I must class myself among those weak heads; for I cannot conceive how any man can be a Christian, and worship a created intelligence, no matter how exalted. "Neither theories (you say) are worth an hour." What! not worth an hour's reflection to consider whether we are worshipping God, or one of his creatures? Oh! think

of this. If Christ be not God, he could not have made an atonement for sin. His obedience would have been circumscribed by his own individuality. How, then, can we call them Christians, who would degrade him to the rank of a mere creature? The best kind of Arianism I consider as bad as the worst Socinianism. Both strike at the root of Christianity. Besides, I consider your answer to Mr. Stone very uncandid. Why did you not vindicate that unanswerable dissertation upon John I. 1? If it be right to make assertions, it is right to defend them; or if you consider speculation upon the incomprehensible Jehovah wrong, why did you attack the Trinitarians at all? and is it not of infinitely greater consequence to vindicate what you term "the proper divinity of the Saviour," against the Arians and Unitarians, (these worst of all sects,) than to prune the redundancies of the Calvinists."

Knowing that Mr. Campbell was from home when this letter was printed, we determined to await in silence his return, fully believing that he would at least express his disapprobation of its insertion in the C. B. or apologize for the unprovoked attack on an individual character, and the foul calumny upon an unoffending people, who deserved better treatment. Mr. C. has indeed apologized for the insertion of the Post-script, which is a fulsome eulogy of himself and works; but his silence with respect to this article is variously construed. I attach no blame to Mr. C. for passing it over in silence; his reasons, no doubt, are good, nor am I concerned to know them; nor can he blame us for defending ourselves from the attack made upon us by the Irishman.

The Irishman contemptuously speaks of that creature named Stone, and denies him all claim to Christianity. What does he know of Stone, his character or doctrine? At once he has betrayed his ignorance, when he represents me as worshipping "a mere creature." This charge we have repeatedly denied, and it is thought, have fully proved to be incorrect. We on this subject have received Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."—This truth will stand unshaken by the feeble efforts of puny mortals. Destroy this the foundation of the Church, and the gates of hell will prevail against it. If the Son of the living God, be the living God himself, words have lost their meaning. Were I to say the Son of Abraham means Abraham himself, should I be believed? When it is said that Jesus is the Son of David, must we understand, he was David himself, the King of Israel? But when it is said, he was the son of David according to the flesh, but the Son of God, according to the Spirit—must we not understand the terms in the same relation? that which is flesh proceeded from David in his line, and that which is spirit proceeded from God, and this is the Son of God or the word which was made flesh, for whom a body was prepared by the Father; who took flesh and blood such as the children had, and was born of a woman. From this plain scriptural account, the Son of God had but one spirit or soul, and one body—and that

this spirit existed independently of, and prior to the body, for it took flesh and blood, and therefore existed before it acted in taking them. This divine spirit, Son or Word existed an active agent with the Father before the world was, and (*di' hou*) by whom instrumentally all things were made (for this the phrase signifies.) On this subject we have written and spoken much,—and so effectually have we proved the pre-existence of the Son of God, from the Bible, that we think this point should rest from controversy. In fact the orthodox themselves admit this doctrine; for they tell us that the Son existed from eternity, and therefore self-existent and independent, consequently the only true God—That this only true God became man, by taking unto himself a true body and reasonable soul in the womb of the Virgin, and was born of her, and suffered, died, rose again from the dead, and was exalted (by whom?) above all principalities and powers!! Whoever can believe that the only true God was born of a woman, and yet was not born—that he is without body, and yet inseparably united to a body—that he is without parts, and yet a compound of divinity and humanity—that he is without passions, and yet suffered—that he is unchangeable, and yet changeable—Whoever can believe these pointed contradictions, is prepared to believe that bread and wine, when consecrated by a priest are the real body and blood of Jesus—he is prepared to believe any thing. Will any think they honor the scriptures and their author by torturing them to speak in defence of such contradictory assertions? Can any conscientiously call those infidels, who honestly reject them, from a conviction that they are not taught in the word of God? It may be possible.

Some of the orthodox seeing dimly these contradictions in their system, have labored to soften their hard repulsive features, by denying that the Son of God existed from eternity; that the Son never existed till conceived and born of Mary. Yet they acknowledge that the Word existed from eternity, and was made flesh, or born of a woman. That the Word was united with the manhood, and born of Mary, and then and never before was called the Son of God. But no doubt these same men declare that the Word was the only self-existent and eternal God? Yes: Therefore all the former contradictions equally attach to their system. The two systems are one. "Neither of which is worth an hour."

Some seem so determined to defend their system, that at the expense of the glory of the Bible and of its divine author, they exhaust their zeal in declaiming against the *infidels*, who believe not their dogmas; not considering that they are the very people, who are really making infidels and skeptics by their course. O that they would wisely consider this!

The Irishman adduces two arguments in proof of the Son being God (the only true God, no doubt, he means.) "If he be not God, it is idolatry to worship him." I would ask the transatlantic gentleman, and all who believe with him Who was that

person, called the first begotten, and brought into the world by the Father, whom all the angels of God were commanded to worship? Heb. 1. Who was that person, called the Lamb that was slain, and who redeemed sinners to God by his blood; and who was worshipped by all the redeemed in heaven? Rev. v. Who was that person that emptied himself—humbled himself to the death of the cross, and was highly exalted by God, and to whom all in heaven, on earth and under the earth, were to bow the knee and confess him Lord, to the glory of God the Father! Phil. II, 10. I might multiply questions of a similar nature. But if these are answered satisfactorily, I shall have no difficulty in understanding others. Will the Irishman say, it was the only true God! If he can read the connection of those texts, and then unhesitatingly say so, I envy not his faith nor understanding.—We have so frequently explained ourselves on this point, that we must refer to those articles, and proceed to notice the Irishman's second argument that Jesus Christ the Son of God is the only true God; as follows.

"If Christ were not God (the only true God) he could not have made an atonement for sin." By this I suppose he understands, that none but an *infinite* being could make an *infinite* satisfaction by an *infinite* suffering, for *infinite* sin against an *infinite* law!! What folly! Yet is such stuff gravely called a fundamental of Christianity! Infinite law! which of all the sacred writers taught the Irishman that the law was infinite? If infinite, it could not be justly given to finite creatures—for they at once would be laid under the absolute necessity of transgressing it. As well might God have commanded each of the human family to create a system of worlds, and govern it by fixed laws, as to require him to obey an infinite law. Condemnation, and punishment in either case would be infinitely unjust, as well as infinitely unmerciful. The equity of God's law appears in this, that it requires nothing more nor less than the whole heart, mind and strength of his creature; and all know or ought to know that these are not infinite.

Infinite sin! Did the Irishman or any body else learn this from the Bible? No: But he might have learned that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." If sin were infinite, how could grace be much more than infinite? I say not this to extenuate sin, it will forever ruin the impenitent transgressor.

Infinite suffering, or punishment!! This must either mean *infinite* in duration, or in degree. If *in duration*, it then means that Jesus, the only true God will be eternally suffering to make satisfaction; therefore the satisfaction cannot be made till the debt of eternal suffering is paid, and this cannot to all eternity be done. If by the suffering or punishment be meant, that which is infinite in degree, we boldly say that this is an unmeaning expression; the idea of which is unknown in the universe, and inapplicable to any being in heaven, earth or hell. It cannot apply to finite creatures, and to make the application to the impassible Deity appears to be but one step short of blasphemy, if not the thing itself. Yet the Irishman contends that Christ must be God, or he could not have made an atonement for sin.

Infinite satisfaction!! Another link of the chain of infinites! Where in the Bible is taught the doctrine of satisfaction made by the death of Christ, to law and justice! We have often asked the question, but have never received an answer. It is not there. Atonement, we have proved, signifies reconciliation of sinners to God by the death of his son. But it no where means that God was reconciled to the sinner by the death of Christ. What miserable props to support the systems of men! What Protean forms are assumed, as contradictory as fire and water!

But the Irishman is not alone in the notion, that the only true God suffered and died. In the protestant Methodist Magazine for Sept. last, are these lines, among others, "On the agony and death of the Saviour."

> Let all creation blush at her *Creator's* anguish:
> I ask no more! a voice from yonder skies
> Reveals the cause divine, *Why great Jehovah dies!*

Again from the Gospel Magazine for October:

> To the rich fountain of *thy* blood;
> Thou great incarnate, precious God,
> My soul desires to fly.

This same doctrine is unblushingly vindicated by my neighbor in the Baptist Chronicle. I view it an error, and so I view the Calvinistic system. If it be considered useless speculation to state the truth in the one case, so it is in the other. I should rejoice, were controversy on all those subjects dropt; and that all unite in the good work of saving souls. But while we are held up to the public as intolerable heretics; and while orthodoxy and religion are claimed exclusively by them we must and will defend the truth—we will examine their assumed claims, and expose their fallacy to the extent of our ability.—EDITOR.

ORTHODOX BICKERING.

An advertisement of a book to be had at the principal Presbyterian Book-store in the city of New York, entitled, "The Spirit of Methodism;" has lately appeared. We give a few extracts, taken from the Christian Advocate, from which it appears that the Presbyterians have declared an exterminating war against the Methodists, as well as against us.

"These denominations (the Presbyterians and Congregationalists,) have treated the Methodists with peculiar lenity, and have showed even an undue solicitude to secure their co-operation, in support of charitable institutions."

"The Methodists deny at leatt one half of the Gospel."—"The Methodists err in almost every respect. All religious sentiments that deviate in any direction from the Calvinistic

meredian, tend to infidelity, as their common and ultimate thule. The Methodists, when they pretend to show what are the sentiments of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, always misrepresent them, and then undertake to confute what no denomination believes. How much better it would be for the Methodists to become reconciled to divine decrees, than to endure so much pain on account of them, or to take so much pains to prove that they do not exist; for by denying divine decrees, and admitting God's fore-knowledge, they virtually adopt the same absurdity,—(the heathen doctrine of fate.) There is no difficulty in understanding the fact, that God fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass. The Methodists seem unwilling to deny the Bible directly, but they are determined at all events to reject the humiliating doctrines it contains, and to belive that the salvation of sinners is placed in their own hands. The Methodists, to make their scheme appear consistent with divine inspiration, have altered the meaning of almost every term that relates to theology. They confound the distinction which Paul makes between faith and works, taking it for granted that God has no more right to dispose of his creatures than the devil has; the ninth chapter of Romans is a direct refutation of this impious tract. They (the Methodist preachers,) form an aristocratical hierarchy, as absolute as Popery. Their churches have no voice in admitting, disciplining, or excluding members, nor respecting what preaching or preachers they are to have from time to time. Their preachers oblige them to submit silently to their dictates, on pain of excommunication." "Their influence, and the circumstance that they have reclaimed some of the openly vicious, tend to conceal the abominations" (mark that soft word, gentle reader,) "of Methodism, and give it a false splendor." "On seeing a drove of youths returning from a Methodist meeting, one might suppose from their appearance and conduct, that they were just let loose from a licentious theatre."

"Thus the Methodists unintentionally occasion a rank harvest of heathenism: and many become incurably hardened by having been once heated in their forge."—"If the Methodists have, as they claim, roused the New-England churches to action, it is doubtful whether they have done more in this way than was previously done by Voltaire and his associates;" "In hundreds of instances they have had the honor of showing their influence in revivals, like the locusts of Canaan; *Before them was as the garden of Eden, and behind them a desolate wilderness;*" "Their young men virtually receive a bounty for every proselyte they make." "If they are successful in making inroads upon other denominations, they are promoted, furnished with a fine suit of clothes, a good horse, and a good sum of money, and sent forth to repeat with great volubility the common-place sentiments and phrases of John Wesley, and a number of Scripture passages, with his perversion of them. They are generally too ignorant to feel the force of any arguments that can be adduced."

"It does not follow that the Methodists are free from idolatry because they make use of the sacred names by which the true God is known, nor because they profess" (Is it not very doubtful whether their profession is sincere?) "to believe the Bible, and often quote passages from it. They certainly deny some of the essential attributes of God." "It is not supposed that the Methodists designedly aid the cause of Satan, nor that they know what manner of spirit they are of." "That absurd and sophistical manner in which they speak about the doctrines of grace, arises, it is hoped," (Did you ever witness such a stretch of charity!) "not so much from direct enmity against the true God, as it does from a bewildered state of mind."

"The foundation of God standeth sure. He will, therefore, check, and ultimately ABOLISH METHODISM." God "will do it by means, and he virtually calls us to come up to his help for this purpose, as much as he does to arrest a pestilence or conflagration."

"We might, and in many cases would give up our private rights for the sake of pleasing them and avoiding a quarrel with them." (What a generous sacrifice!) "But we must not make any compromise respecting the cause of Christ, which we are under oath to defend." "If truth and duty offend them, we are not answerable for the consequences. We have long been acquainted with them, and witnessed their operations through numerous and extensive regions; we have been entertained at their houses, familiar with their books, and many of their preachers. We have often engaged with them in friendly conversation on doctrinal and experimental religion; we have been generally treated kindly by them, and are not aware that we have any personal enemy in the connexion."

REMARKS.—These few extracts show the spirit of the times.—While hope was indulged of amalgamating the Methodists in the benevolent institutions of the day, as the American Sunday School Union—of monopolizing the presses &c.—the Methodists were then embraced as orthodox; but when the Methodists saw the end of those schemes, and refused to unite in them, they are no better than infidels, idolators, and tyrants. They must be put down! Yet Dr. Blythe, for reasons best known to himself, calls upon them to join the crusade against *the Christians* of the West! In vain is the boasted union of Presbyterians and Methodists; it is only in appearance, and not in heart. Party spirits can never unite with each other. We are sorry to say this; nor should we expose it were it a secret. But it is too plain not to be seen by all. Infidelity and Idolatry are imputed to us by Methodists, and the Presbyterians impute them to Methodists! O! when shall this confusion cease? When shall Babylon fall? When shall God's dear children be delivered? The means are devised by infinite wisdom; but alas! they are overlooked by attention to the present *benevolent institutions*, so called—institutions good indeed; but we fear, are prostituted to the base purposes of obtaining power, wealth and human establishments.—

L—L

"All things work together for good to them that love God." Let us "hide ourselves for a little moment in the chambers, till the indignation be overpast. For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." EDITOR.

QUERIES PROPOSED TO THE EDITOR.

Q. 1. By Elders Jo: Baker and Js. Kinkennon. "Is it proper to make a record of the transactions of a church, of a conference, and of the names of church members?

A. Luke has given us a record of the transactions of the Church at Jerusalem, and of churches at other places. This was right, or it would not have been done. That a record was made of the names of church members at Jerusalem, appears plausible from this fact, that Luke wrote his history some time after the constitution of that church, and stated that it at first consisted of 120 names (not persons.) This information, it appears, he got from adverting to the records of that church. He counted the names and found them to be 120. I have seen nothing in the scripture forbidding us to do the same; nor have I heard one argument from the scriptures, advanced against the practice. It is not safe to substitute our notions and prepossessions in the place of scripture.

Q. 2. By Elder E. Goodwin. "Is it right to try members of the church of Christ, by the scriptures of the Old Testament?

A. If by the Old Testament is meant, the law of Moses, I answer, no: "for we are not under the law, but under grace. If by the Old Testament are understood the Psalms and the Prophets, I answer, yes: for many cases are mentioned in these, which occur in every age, concerning which cases the divine will is plainly expressed, and from which we may safely judge.

Q. 3. By the same. "Is it right for one Christian to take usury from another?

A. "Usury is a certain gain or profit, which a person makes of his money or goods by lending them." It was forbidden to the Israelites from one another. Usury properly signifies *biting*; as the biting of a serpent; whose poison gradually pervades the animal system, and destroys life. So by degrees usury brings on distress and poverty. Parkhurst forcibly reasons that the Hebrew *nesheck* (usury) properly means compound interest, or extortion, which is judged unlawful in every civilized country: and that simple interest. or a reasonable profit from the loan of money or goods is lawful and right. I will state a case. A father dying bequeaths to his three sons A, B and C 1000 dollars each. They are all Christians, and wish to live on the profits of their money. A with his portion purchases a farm, which he rents to a Christian brother for 60 dollars per annum. B purchases goods with his portion, and vends them for a reasonable profit. C, not disposed to purchase lands, nor to trade in goods, lends his money to a Christian for as much as A got for the use of his farm. Can this be wrong? If so, is not A equally wrong to take profit or interest for his farm? Extortion is certainly forbidden, and should not be practised towards saint or sinner by Christians.

Q. 4. By the same. "Is a church in Gospel order without an ordained Elder?

A. With one, it would certainly be in better order, else elders would not have been ordained in every city in Apostolic times. From the scriptures it appears to me that every church should have a bishop, whether he be an ordained elder or not. For the want of such many flourishing churches have sunk into disorder and ruin.

Q. 5. By the same. Who has authority to forgive sin?

A. 1st, Jehovah, the God and Father of all. Psal. 130. 4.—"Forgiveness is with thee that thou mayest be feared." Exod. xxxiv, 7. Dan. ix, 9.

2dly, The Lord Jesus Christ. Matt. ix, 6. "That ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, &c." A distant province rebels against their sovereign, the sovereign sends his son to them, grants him the power to forgive such as repent and submit, and gives him authority to execute judgment on the impenitent. This power to forgive *belonged* to the father, but the son granted pardon in the name, or by the authority of the father. The application is easy.

3dly, Every Christian has authority to forgive, "If he, (thy brother) repent forgive him." Matt. xviii, 21–35. Luke xvii, 3.

4thly, The Church has authority to forgive 2 Cor. ii, 7–10. "Ye ought rather to forgive him; to whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also."

5thly, The Apostles had authority to forgive sins. "Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted. John xx, 23, as the Apostle in the case above.

Q. 6. By the same. "Is it right to pray to Christ?

A. Neither Christ nor his Apostles have given us any directions to pray to any but the Father. Says Jesus, when ye pray, say, Our Father who art in heaven—and John xvi, 23. "And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask and receive that your joy may be full. In that day ye shall ask in my name &c." From these and similar passages it is plain that we must pray to the Father in the name of Christ, or on his authority. A rich father make the promise of abundant provision, and all needed good to a village inhabited by a people reduced to want and starvation. He sends this promise by his son to these poor people. He makes them the promise. They hear and believe the Son, and go to the Father and pray or plead for the fulfilment. We come, say they, authorized by thy son to expect that whatever we ask of thee thou wilt give it. Thy son has said it and we believe he is true. Should they be denied the son

would be dishonored, and proved to be a deceiver. But should the promise be granted them, the Son would be glorified by the Father.

Q. 7. By Elder L. Purviance. "How can Js. II, 9–11. 1 John III, 4. Rom. III, 31 and VII, 14 comport with the abolition of the law of Moses?

A. We have in former No's. shown that every article of the old covenant or constitution, which the Lord saw proper to bind on Christians, is embodied with the new, called by James the law of liberty, by which we shall be judged. John XII, 49. Rom. II, 16. "Do we make void (*useless*) the law through faith? God forbid; yea we establish the law." The Jew hath concluded that if God justified both Jew and Gentile by faith without the deeds of the law; then was the law rendered useless, or made void, seeing it had no part in this justification. The apostle was far from thinking the law was made useless, though excluded from our justification. We establish the law as holy just and good, and fully adapted to the purposes designed by him who gave it.

Q. 8. By A. Miles. "Does Matt. XVIII, 15 refer to private or public offences?

A. The whole connexion confines it to private offences.

Q. 9. By the same. Did Christ in person baptize any?

A. John IV, 1–2 plainly shews he did not.

Q. 10. By Elder Tho. Johnson. "Is the name *Christian* as much a party or sectarian name as any other?

A. Every name is a party or sectarian name which does not include the whole. *Man* is not sectarian because it includes the whole of human kind. *Jew* is sectarian because this name includes but a part of mankind. So *Christian* is a party or sectarian name, because it includes but a part of mankind, and excludes the Jews, the Pagans, the Mahomedans, in a word, all who do not believe and obey the Saviour. Thus far it is sectarian. But as a denomination given to the disciples of the Lord by divine authority, it is not sectarian; for it was designed to be the name of the one body, or church of the Lord. Every division from this one body is a sect; and every name, by which such a sect is called, is a sectarian name, or a name of a party. While these sects and sectarian names exist, the unity of the body cannot be restored.

Q. 11. By the same. Is any one lawfully a subject of the kingdom of Christ, before he is immersed into his name?

A. I think that in a former number it was proved, that to be baptized or immersed into a person, or into the name of a person, or into a body of persons, signifies union or incorporation with that person or body of persons. As 1 Cor. X, 2. "And were all (*the Israelites*) baptized unto (*eis* into) Moses in the cloud and in the sea." All agree that this means, that all Israel by this baptism were united in Moses as their head and leader, and that all were incorporated or united in one body. We frequently find that the people of old were baptized *into* Christ, and *into* the name of Jesus. Acts VIII, 16, "only they were baptized in (*eis* into) the name of the Lord Jesus." Rom. VI, 3. "As many as were baptized (*eis*) into Jesus Christ, were baptized (*eis*) into his death." To be baptized into Jesus Christ, or into his name, signifies our union with him as our head, and leader; and each member united with him the head, is united with one another, and all constitute the one body, of which Christ is the head, the life *the all in all* Hence Paul in 1 Cor. XII, represents Christ and his people as one body; and compares this one body to the head and members of the human body. This body of Christ is so completely one, that it is called by his name, "So also is Christ." Is not this equivalent to the name Christian? and is not this the most suitable name for the body to have? By this union of the members with the head, by baptism they are considered as dead with Christ—buried with him; risen with him; and sitting with him in heavenly places. Rom. VI. By being baptized into Christ, we thus become united with him, and with one another. 1 Cor. XII, 13. "For by (*en* in) one spirit we are all baptized (*eis*) into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one spirit." On this text I remark, that we are not to understand that spiritual baptism (as it is termed) is intended by the expression, *by one spirit we are all baptized.* The learned well know that, *in one spirit we are all baptized*, is the more proper reading. One spirit, the spirit of repentance or reformation, and faith qualifies us for baptism, and when in this spirit we are baptized, we become united with Christ and his people, or incorporated with the one body; then they are all made to drink into one spirit and receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. The graff does not partake of the spirit nor life of the stock, before it is ingrafted and united with it. Rom. XI. Paul makes baptism into Christ an argument against schism or division. "Were you baptized (*eis*) into the name of Paul? If so, you are united under another head and leader, from those who are baptized into the name of Christ. You would be a sect from the body of Christ. But as all were baptized into the name of Jesus Christ, the cause for division is cut off. To be baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, signifies our union with the Father, Son and Spirit. From these remarks it is evident that we become united with the one body, or become members of the church or kingdom of Christ on earth, by baptism. This is the doctrine of the scriptures; this is the doctrine of the fathers of the first centuries; this is the doctrine of the reformers of the church of England—of the Methodist—of the Presbyterians, and of the Baptists. This, it is believed, will be disputed by none.

But the query is; "Is any one lawfully a subject of the kingdom of Christ, before he is *immersed* into his name." It is already seen that all those named above, agree that none are lawfully subjects of Christ's kingdom, before they are baptized. But a great many receive even unconscious, unbelieving babes into

Christ's church by sprinkling; and call sprinkling baptism. This, to me and many others appears to be unlawful, or not found in the law of Christ. I cannot therefore view such, as lawfully and properly the members of the kingdom or church of Christ on earth.

Objection. You unchurch all who are not immersed.

A. If the Baptism instituted by Jesus be immersion, then any thing not immersion is not Christian Baptism. This from full conviction I believe, and must conclude that all who have not been immersed are not lawfully members of the church of Christ. The Pedobaptists do not admit the Friend Quakers, to be lawful members of the church, they do not admit that a pious man, who has not been baptized, and who has attached himself to no body of Christians, is lawfully a member of any church. Yet they esteem many of the Quakers, and others not baptized as Christians. So we view Pedobaptists—there are many among them, as well as among the Quakers, who are bright examples of piety, whom we love and enjoy the followship of the spirit, and hope forever to dwell with them in heaven. In this as in other things, we believe such pious persons honestly err;—and who can claim infallibility?

Objection. You cannot commune with them at the Lord's table.

A. With such we can pray, and praise, and perform every act of divine worship; and I have no authority from scripture to forbid me to commune at the Lord's supper with them. I know pre-possession, and long tradition plead against this; but the scriptures alone are my directory. If the Apostles were themselves baptized, we have no account of it, Paul excepted. If they were baptized, it was not done under the New institution. John's baptism, we know was not considered the Baptism ordained and enjoined upon the members of his kingdom by the Lord Jesus; yet they communed with the Lord at his table. The first church of Christ was established at Jerusalem, after the resurrection of Jesus from the dead—for it was necessary that the foundation should be complete before the building could be reared. This building was carried on by faith, reformation and baptism. Before this the supper was instituted, as a memorial of the sufferings and death of Christ, as baptism was of his burial and resurrection. Let a man examine himself; and so let him eat of this bread and drink of this wine. Let me not act the inquisitor—leave the matter between his own conscience and his God. He believes that Jesus suffered and died; so do I. He believes that this supper was instituted as a memorial of his sufferings and death; so do I. He believes that his Lord and my Lord enjoined on all his followers, to eat and drink at his table in remembrance of him; and he honestly desires to obey him; shall I debar him? Shall I push him away from performing his duty? By what authority should I act in thus doing? Nothing less than plain scripture can satisfy the inquiry. Why cannot I enjoy fellowship with him in the supper, if I cannot in his baptism? If I make baptism a term of fellowship at the supper, why not in prayer, praise, and every other religious duty? Why should the supper be made a religious engine of discord and division of Christians? I cannot tell, but should be glad to know the authority, if it be divine.

Q. 12. By A. Kirkpatrick. "What does Paul mean, But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence?" Tim. II, 12.

A. If it means any thing not expressed in the text, I do not know it. It is hoped that some qualified brother will answer this query.

A number of other queries not deemed important are omitted.

EDITOR.

Extract from Mr. Sessing, the Swiss Missionary's speech.

"All those that love our Lord Jesus Christ with all their heart, and keep his commandments according to his will, are acceptable to God, and are called the children of God. This ought to be our only denomination:—Followers of Christ—Christians. But that there are Catholic Christians, Lutheran Christians, Protestant Christians, and so many more, is a matter of regret and shame, as we all know very well. However. it is now so, and I cannot alter it; and if I am asked, To what denomination I belong? I must answer, to the Evangelical Protestant church of Baal.—*Chris. Adv.*

GEORGETOWN COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

At a meeting of the citizens of Georgetown, upon the 21st April, 1830, held at the Court-House, for the purpose of forming a Colonization Society, the Rev. BARTON W. STONE was called to the Chair, and JAMES F. ROBINSON appointed Secretary. The meeting was addressed by the Rev. *John Bryce, B. W. Stone* and Doct. *D. Nelson*—and then adopted the following Constitution, section by section:

1st. This Society shall be styled the Georgetown Colonization Society, and shall be auxiliary to the Kentucky Colonization Society at Frankfort.

2d. The objects of this society shall be exclusively devoted to aid the Parent Society at Washington, through the Kentucky Colonization Society, in the Colonization of free people of color of the United States on the Coast of Africa; and to do this, not only by the contribution of money, but by the exertion of its influence to promote the formation of other Societies.

3d. An annual subscription of Fifty Cents shall constitute an individual a member of this Society, and the payment, at any time, of Five Dollars a member for life.

4th. The officers of this Society shall be a President, first and second Vice-Presidents, a Board of eight Managers, Secretary and Treasurer, to be elected annually by the Society—five of which board of Managers shall constitute a quorum to do business

5th. The President, Vice-Presidents, Secretary and Treasurer, shall by virtue of their offices, be members of the Board of Managers.

6th. The Board of Managers shall meet twice in each year, to transact the business of the Society; but may, at any other time, be convened by order of the President, or, in his absence, by either of the Vice-Presidents.

7th. The Treasurer shall keep the accounts of the Society, as well as take charge of its funds, and hold them subject to the order of the Board of Managers.

8th. The Secretary shall keep a just and fair record of the proceedings of the Society, conduct its correspondence, under the direction of the board, both with the Parent Institution and other Societies.

9th. This Constitution may, at any time, be changed, altered or amended by two thirds of the members of the Society present at any meeting thereof.

The Constitution having been adopted, a number of persons signed their names as members of the Society.

The Society then went into an election of its officers, when BARTON WARREN STONE was elected President, JOHN BRYCE 1st Vice-President, BENI. B. FORD 2nd Vice-President, N. L. FINNELL Secretary, M. A. FERIS Treasurer, and the following gentlemen Managers—*R. M. Ewing, J. F. Robinson, S. F. Gano, F. R. Polmer, Job Stevenson, William Brown Jr. M. W. Dickey* and *U. B. Chambrrs.*

Attest, B. W. STONE, *Pres'dt.*

J. F. ROBINSON, *Sec'y.*

As many of our patrons are anxiously expecting to see Mr. A. Campbell's method of removing Unitarianism from the church, which method he promised to exhibit in the April No. of the Harbinger, I now insert it without any remarks.—EDITOR.

MILLENNIUM.—*NO. II.*

WILL sects ever cease? Will a time ever come when all disciples will unite under one Lord, in one faith, in one immersion, in one hope, in one body, in one spirit, and in adoring one God and Father of all? Will divisions ever be healed? Will strife ever cease among the saints on Earth? To these questions all who pray for the millennium, all who long for its appearance, answer, *Yes.* How, then, shall the union be accomplished? Will all be converted to any one sect? Will all become Unitarians, Trinitarians, Arians, or Socinians? Will all become Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists? Will all become members of any one of the hundred sects of this century? I presume no person of common intelligence will say, *Yes.* All sects know they have some opinions, or some customs, which must be dispensed with. How then shall it be introduced? I answer unequivocally in one sentence, By abandoning opinions, and founding all associations upon the belief of gospel facts. Let every sect give up its opinions as a bond of union, and what will remain in common? The gospel facts alone. Every sect, Catholic and Protestant, admits all the historic facts recorded in the *five* historical books of the New Testament. Their various interpretations, additions, subtractions, and new modifications of opinions concerning these facts, and not the truth or falsehood of the narratives, create all the confusion, build the whole Babel, and set all the machinery of the contending interests in motion. Now, will not the slowest to apprehend see that, if, by any means, they could be induced to abandon their opinions, and retain the plain incontrovertible facts, the strife would be over?

But men cannot give up their opinions, and, therefore, they never can unite, says one. We do not ask them to give up their opinions—We ask them only not to impose them upon others.—Let them hold their opinions; but let them hold them as private property. The faith is public property: opinions are, and always have been, private property. Men have foolishly attempted to make the deductions of some great minds the common measure of all christians. Hence the deductions of a Luther, and a Calvin, and a Wesley, have been the rule and measure of all who coalesce under the names of the leaders. It is cruel to excommunicate a man because of the imbecility of his intellect. I have been censured long and often for laying too much stress upon the assent of the understanding; but those who have most acrimoniously censured me, have laid much more stress upon the assent of the mind than I have ever done. I never did, at any time, exclude a man from the kingdom of God for a mere imbecility of intellect; or, in other words, because he could not assent to my opinions. All sects are doing, or have done this. Their covenants and creeds are deductions, speculative and abstract, from the crucible of some strong skull, and those who would not or could not subscribe them as the oracles of God, have been given over to Satan. The Baptists are doing this now, in many parts of the country, with an unrelenting hand. They will make a sect, another sect, if they can. But they will not be able to make a sect of those who advocate the ancient order of things; provided they who are now contending for the gospel, will be true to their own cause.

I will now show how they cannot make a sect of us. We will acknowledge all as christians who acknowledge the gospel facts, and obey Jesus Christ. But, says one, will you receive a Unitarian? No; nor a Trinitarian. We will have neither Unitarians nor Trinitarians. How can this be? Systems made Unitarians and Trinitarians. Renounce the system, and you renounce its creatures.

But the creatures of other systems now exist, and some of them will come in your way. How will you dispose of them? I answer, We will unmake them. Again I am asked, How will you unmake them? I answer, By laying no emphasis upon their

opinions. What is a Unitarian? One who contends that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God. Such a one has denied the faith, and therefore we reject him. But, says a Trinitarian, many Unitarians acknowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a sense of their own. Admit it, Then I ask, How do you know they have a sense of their own? Intuitively, or by their words? Not intuitively, but by their words. And what are these words? Are they Bible words? If they are, we cannot object to them—if they are not, we will not hear them, or, what is the same thing, we will not discuss them at all. If he will ascribe to Jesus all Bible attributes, names, works, and worship, we will not fight with him about scholastic words: but if he will not ascribe to him every thing which the first christians ascribed, and worship and adore him as the first christians did, we will reject him, not because of his private opinions, but because he refuses to honor Jesus as the first converts did, and withholds from him the titles and honors which God and his apostles have bestowed upon him.

In like manner we will deal with a Trinitarian. If he will ascribe to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, all that the first believers ascribed, and nothing more, we will receive him—but we will not allow him to apply scholastic and barbarous epithets to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. If he will dogmatize and become a factionist, we reject him—not because of his opinions, but because of his attempting to make a faction, or to lord it over God's heritage.

And will you receive a Universalist too? No; not as a Universalist. If a man, professing Universalist opinions, should apply for admission, we will receive him, if he will consent to use and apply all the Bible phrases in their plain reference to the future state of men and angels. We will not hearken to those questions which gender strife, nor discuss them at all. If a person say such is his private opinion, let him have it as his private opinion; but lay no stress upon it; and if it be a wrong private opinion, it will die a natural death much sooner than if you attempt to kill it.

I hope I may be permitted to say that I feel a certainty amounting to assurance, that this is the only practicable course to usher in that glorious day of union, peace, and love, which all desire, and many expect, to be the discriminating character of the Millennial age.

Reason and experience unite their testimony in assuring us that, in the same proportion as individuals labor to be of one opinion, they disagree. The greater the emphasis laid upon opinions, the more rapidly they generate. The nearest approaches to a unity of opinion which I have ever witnessed, have appeared in those societies in which no effort was made to be of one opinion; in which they allowed the greatest liberty of opinion, and in which they talked more and boasted more of the glory and majesty of the great facts, the wonderful works of God's

loving kindness to the children of men, than of themselves, their views and attainments.

I am greatly deceived in all my reasonings, and observation has misled me, if any society pursuing the principle we have suggested, will ever be troubled with Unitarians, Trinitarians, Universalists, Arminians, Calvinists, &c. &c. and under such a course of procedure as that recommended here, all will see that such systems and such schismatical tenets could never originate. If I were to attempt to produce the greatest uniformity of opinion, I would set about it by paying no respect to opinions, laying no emphasis upon them, admiring and contemning no opinion as such. But if I wished to produce the greatest discrepancies in opinion, I would call some damnably dangerous, others of vital importance; I would always eulogize the sound, and censure the erroneous in opinions. We all know that strife is like the bursting forth of water—it always widens the channels; and many a broil in churches, neighborhoods, and families, would have been prevented if the first indication had been sympathetically attributed to the infirmity of human nature.—EDITOR.

Extract of a letter from Elder John Longley, Rush co. Ia. April 2, 1830.

"The spirit of reform is among the Baptists here as in Ky. A church in this neighborhood has lately exploded on the creed question. When the vote was taken 36 were against the creed, and 31 for it. The majority have Elder John P. Thompson, the former pastor of the church on their side. His warm zeal in preaching a free gospel, and in opposition to creeds is the cause of the split. One year ago he was among the stiffest Calvinistic Baptists. I have preached both at his own house, and in his meeting-house. Last Lord's day he told me he had learned more within the last six months, since he had laid aside his creed, and had turned his attention to the Bible, than he had in all his life before. He is now going on to organize the Reformed brethren on Apostolic ground, or as nigh the ancient order as possible."

Extract of a letter from Elder John M'Intyer,

WHITNEY, UPPER CANADA, April 7, 1830.

BROTHER STONE:—Of the times and seasons I need not write unto you, for you yourself know that the world is in great confusion at present about religious affairs. In these Northern climes there is much contention about religious tenets. The Methodists are divided, and the contention between the two parties is severe, almost to blood. The Quakers are also divided, and the contention has been very sharp. The two parties hold separate meetings. There is also trouble among the Baptist brethren. One of their preachers has thrown off the sectarian yoke, and is walking in the liberty of the gospel. The Christian cause is prospering in this country. Our meetings are large. I

am almost worn out. For four years I have travelled and preached in Canada, through much labor and opposition. Brother Solomon B. Rose has been taken up and tried for his sentiments, but was honorably acquitted, much to the confusion of our enemies, and much to the glory of God. We are often threatened with imprisonment. Your Christian Messenger is read with pleasure by many in these parts, and it is doing good. I expect to get more subscribers for the next year. Brother Campbell's is also well received."

Extract of a letter from Elder James G. Mitchell,

RUTLAND, OHIO, April 8, 1830.

BROTHER STONE:—Elder Rathburn and myself with several unordained brethren, held a two days meeting at this place, last Saturday and Lord's day. I immersed 2 on Lord's day, and bro. Rathburn one; at night I immersed 4 more into Christ. We had a good time. Many could with Peter, and with as much understanding, say, it is good for us to be here. We have much opposition in this part of the world, yet truth is fast gaining the better of error. People are reading the scriptures for themselves, which are well calculated to make them wise unto salvation. There is a number in this country, who have been made free by continuing in the word of Christ. He has made them free indeed. They object to any and every erring individual, who would trammel their conscience, or bind any thing on them besides the truth of the gospel. The Dialogue in the Messenger, got into this country in the right time to do good, and many good disciples here, would be glad you would continue it a little longer. You have answered many objections that Anomos and his brethren make, against the word of God being the means of saving sinners. The brethren of Anomos have one creeping-out-place. They say the word of God mentioned in Rom. x, 17, is not the letter of the gospel, but it means the same word mentioned in John i, 1. When this word (God) comes by hearing, the sinner will and shall have faith. This you can answer, and their sandy foundations must fail.

Extract of a letter from Elder D. H. Hethaway,

BROWN CO. OHIO, April 16, 1330.

"On the second Lord's day of this month we had a communion on Eagle creek. We had a good meeting; 5 were immersed and 8 or 10 were added to the church. The work of the Lord is still progressing in many parts around us."

The Editor thanks Elder S. Clack for his short answer, to the query proposed him. It is in perfect accordance with the spirit of the times—the Bible must be understood according to the creed—and the creed must be understood according to the notions of its maker. Truth expressed in plain language, whether it be found in the Bible or in a creed, must be clothed in other language to suit the opinions of a party.

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. JULY, 1830. [No. 8.

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 1 cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

In the Gospel Herald, a periodical printed in Lexington, Ky. for May 1830, is a lengthy dissertation on the doctrine of Trinity taken from the Protestant Episcopalian.

We have carefully examined it, but have found nothing different from the *orthodox* faith dressed in an imposing garb. We have wondered why trinitarians are so tenacious of a doctrine, so feebly supported by scriptural authority. A few scriptures of doubtful interpretation are introduced, on which is their entire reliance. The antiquity, and the popularity—the many, and the great names to support it—the strong, and the bold assertions of its truth—and the zealous and anathematizing denunciations against its rejectors, are their most potent arguments.—We should let them enjoy peaceably their notions and speculations on this doctrine, were it not made by them a *sine qua non* of religion: the test of Christianity, by which they judge and anathematize all as infidels, who cannot receive their unscriptural, unintelligible dogmas on this point. In this we think they are wrong. To produce this conviction in them, and to promote better and more Christian feelings to those who differ, we have labored, and shall yet labor, confident that the time is not far distant, when a better state of things shall take place in society. Our remarks on the article alluded to, are designed to effect this object.

The writer commences, "Why should it seem strange to us that God is enveloped in mystery." We would ask, What of God is enveloped in mystery? Did not the Saviour plainly declare and reveal the Father to the world? If so; how is God enveloped in mystery? As to the Being of God we know nothing more, than that he is a spirit; and of a spirit we know as much as we do of matter; we know nothing of either, but by their pro-