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-

perties. The properties of a spirit are intelligence, will, acuvity, &c.; the properties of matter are length, breadth, thickness, &c. Are the properties or perfections, or character of this infinite spirit enveloped in mystery? No: For if God were thus enveloped in mystery, we could not possibly know him, and therefore could not possibly enjoy eternal life; for the Saviour teaches that to know God is eternal life. What of God, we again ask, is enveloped in mystery? It must be answered, the mode of his existence is enveloped in mystery. This is tantamount with saying, The mode of his existence has never been revealed; if not revealed, how did trinitarians learn that he existed in three coequal, coeternal, coessential persons? Even were this revealed, the mode of his existence would cease to be a mystery. The mystery would then consist in the mode of the union of three equal persons in one infinite intelligent Spirit, which Spirit is without parts. Were this revealed in the scriptures we would humbly receive it; for we will never reject a revealed doctrine because we cannot comprehend it fully. It is plainly revealed every where in the Bible, that there is but one God, the Father; and one Lord Jesus, the Son of the Father; and one Holy Spirit, which procedeth from the Father. That these three are one is also admitted to be plainly revealed, so plainly that we cannot misunderstand this truth; for Jesus prayed that his disciples might be *one*, even as he and the Father were *one*. Now the *oneness* of believers consists of a unity of spirit, purpose, design, affection, and testimony to the truth; and not a *oneness* of substance or essence. They are one *even* as the Father and Son are *one*. If the *oneness* of the Father and the Son was one substance or essence, as the *orthodox* say, then the prayer of Jesus has never been answered, and never can be, till all believers become one individual being without parts; and till this takes place the world can never believe and be saved! Awful doctrine! and yet the very doctrine of boasted orthodoxy! If it is not, we confess our ignorance of the doctrine. Yet we cannot believe that intelligent trinitarians will deny this to be their understanding of it.

The writer says "The doctrine of trinity is to be regarded as the digest of scripture, on the deep and vital subject of the nature of God. It is the soul and centre of the Christian faith." This truly is hightoned orthodoxy! *The doctrine of trinity is a digest of scripture.* If a digest, certainly the passages of scripture, from which the digest is made, can be shewn. To refer us to the whole scripture without any particular specification, to prove a doctrine, is an easy method, but a latitude of argument inadmissible with the intelligent inquirer after truth. This the writer has done. In this mode of arguing we confess we discover ingenuity; for by reference to particular texts for proof of this doctrine, the inadequacy of the evidence might be detected and seen, to the injury and ruin of the doctrine. This is not an uncommon case. But "the doctrine of trinity is the soul and centre of the Christian faith." Hence, all are infidels who deny it! All

such are sinking to hell! If the doctrine be so important, is it not very strange that it had not been so explicitly taught by the great Head of the church, that at least, its advocates could state the doctrine in some form, in which they themselves could agree?

The writer thinks that the terms used in this doctrine should be well guarded. "The word *person*, for example is to be allowed no more meaning than scripture will clearly warrant." This is certainly correct Now, what idea of *person* does the scripture clearly warrant? If there be any other than this, that a *person* is an intelligent agent or being, we should be glad to learn it. We except the personifying of inanimate objects. But the writer rejects the idea of the personality in men, as the standard to determine divine personality. "What we principally assert (says he) of the divine persons, is, that *actions* are ascribed to some one of them, which are not, and must not be ascribed to either of the others: thus, the Son reconciles men to God, the Spirit sanctifies them, the Father accepts them: thus, also, the Son died in human nature for sinners, the Father and Spirit did not." The writer evidently shews that he is better acquainted with human catechisms and systems of divinity than he is with the scripture. In the article just quoted he betrays his great ignorance of scripture. He tells us gravely that the *action* of sanctifying is ascribed to the Spirit, but not to the Father, nor Son, and indeed must not be ascribed to either the Father or the Son. Let the scripture itself reprove this bold assumption. Jude 1. "Jude the servant of Jesus Christ—to them that are sanctified by *God the Father*." John xvii, 17. Jesus prays to the *Father*, the *only true God*, "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." See Heb. ii, 11. Eph. v, 26. "Even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that *He* might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Heb. xiii, 12. "Wherefore *Jesus* also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." These are sufficient to show that the action of sanctifying is ascribed to the Father and the Son, though the writer asserts it is not, and must not be done. I have found but two texts (Rom. xv, 16. and 1 Cor. vi, 11) where the action of sanctifying is applied to the spirit; on which is founded the system to the exclusion of many plain passages in opposition to it.

Again, the writer teaches, that the action of reconciling sinners to God is ascribed to the Son, but not to the Father, nor Spirit. This opinion is in pointed opposition to the scripture. 1 Col. xx. "For it pleased the Father, that in him (Christ) should all fulness dwell, and by him to reconcile all things unto himself." 2 Cor. v, 18, 19. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ—"God was in (or *by*) Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

Again; the writer asserts that the *action* of accepting the sinner is ascribed to the Father, but not to the Son nor Spirit, and must not be ascribed to them. Let us hear what the scripture says.

I cannot find one text, which positively ascribes the action of accepting the sinner to the Father, and not to the Son nor Spirit. We read of God accepting the sinner that works righteousness: but as trinitarians believe that the Father, Son and Spirit, are God, and as the scriptures do not determine which of the three accepts the sinner, is it not merely arbitrary, and presumptuous for them to determine? If it be admitted that the action of receiving and accepting be the same, (and it is presumed, none will deny it,) then it will be also admitted that the action of receiving sinners is as often and far oftener ascribed to the Son than to the Father; in fact I know of not one text that ascribes this to the Father exclusively, according to the sense of trinitarians. "Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God." Rom. xv, 7, also John xiv, 3. Luke xv, 2, &c.

The writer is at as great a loss to define the persons in trinity as Professor Stuart, or St. Austin were. He would have done himself more credit, by acknowledging with the latter that there were three "*somewhats*;" but no body knows *what* they are! They are not three proper persons, or intelligent beings, else they would be three distinct eternal beings—they are not three improper persons, or nonintelligent beings, or they would be no God. What confusion! and yet this doctrine the soul and centre of Christianity! Thus *unguardedly* the writer has guarded the term *person;* and the arguments are so anti-scriptural that all must suspect the doctrine not to be divine.

The writer adds, "We maintain the doctrine of trinity as giving consistency to the grandest of all scriptural doctrines, that of the atonement. It is declared that Christ was made a sacrifice for sin; by which sacrifice, the stern and uncompromising indignation of God against sin, was put in force and made manifest; his mercy towards the sinner being thus justified, i. e. vindicated in his own estimation, and proved to the intelligent world at large, to be reasonable and consistent with his pure character. Now, such an infliction of divine wrath must have been *real*, not a mere ceremony, but the full weight of his vengeance: all this the victim for sin must have endured. And could any *creature* have borne such vengeance? does not a created being sink into perdition unending, the moment the creator sends "judgment without mercy?" If so, our faith instinctively declares, that the victim for sin must be an uncreated being, that Christ is divine."

The writer had just before declared that the doctrine of the trinity was the soul and centre of Christianity. Surely none can be greater. Yes: The atonement is the grandest of all scriptural doctrines! He had just before remarked that God was without body, parts or passions; and afterwards states that the Son was this very God, the uncreated Being. He stated before that the Son died in human nature, therefore the conclusion is irresistible, the very God died—the very God endured a *real* infliction of divine wrath; the full weight of vengeance!! Could the very

God suffer really thus and die, and yet be "without passions?" If the very God suffered and endured this real infliction of divine wrath, who inflicted it? Could the Son, as the very God suffer and die, and not the Father and Spirit also? If they are one substance without parts, how could this one substance suffer and yet not suffer? Could a part suffer, and yet there are no parts? To what extremities are men driven in their wild speculations!

Even the father of trinitarians, Athanasius himself rejected with abhorrence the doctrine of God dying. He says "Our scriptures no where mention the blood of God; such impudent expressions are only used by the Arians." Were this old father to raise from the dead, how would he blush for his degenerate children! his children, who now use the impudent expressions of Arians!

If they were as industrious to read the Bible, as they are to send it to the heathen and destitute, they would become wiser and better. But alas! many are very zealous to send the Bible to others, who never read it at home. They appear to have more relish for a tract, than for the word of God. Not suspecting themselves in error, they are disposed to denounce every man, who believes not as they believe. I sincerely pity the mass of the professors of religion—I mourn for the world who are in darkness and death, and there must remain while religion is so degraded in its doctrine and practice. We indulge the cheering hope of better days.

We did design to pursue the writer to the end of his dissertation; but we find so little interesting to any, except to those who read without examination, that we have declined the intention. We are more inclined to this, because in former numbers we have written a sufficiency on this subject. Willingly would I suffer the subject to rest from controversy, if all would use Bible language, and live in unity and in the bonds of peace. But while this, or any other speculation is set up as a test of Christianity, and as a device to divide the family of God, I must and will exert my feeble powers to remove it. May the Lord aid every honest soul in the same cause! To temporize, and to compromise on the great subject of truth, I feel no disposition; yet to bear and forbear, to love, to live in peace and unity with all the saints, are the warm aspirations of my heart. EDITOR.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal.

To the Presbyterians and Congregationalists.

I rejoice to know that the editors of your principal papers, except the Christian Spectator, have resolved on a more worthy course in regard to the Methodist Episcopal Church. I infer that they have, because they observe silence lately. If they shall continue to be respectful, (even silence is respectful in this case,) we shall rejoice. I wish to continue my remonstrance until every respectable paper shall come to terms of peace, respectful and safe to all concerned. You can scarcely touch any

man more sensibly than to touch his interest. I say, then, it is the interest of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches that their leading papers be less severe and less acrimonious in regard to the Methodist Episcopal Church. I assure you, they have done much to awaken the jealousy of the public against your operations, and to turn the attention and hope of the community towards other denominations, especially the Methodist. This fact even many of your own people and ministers of the wiser sort do know, and feel alarm and regret. And this alarm and regret have grown astonishingly the last few months. The great religious festival and anniversary week in New-York, just past, will have a powerful tendency to quicken the impulse of alarm with regard to the *tendency*, if not the *design* of these great American national benevolent societies. I spent the week in New York. I found this matter a subject of much and earnest conversation, both in the city and on the steam boats, among the grave and the gay, the sober and the profane. Several eminent ministers of the *Calvinistic family*, in common fellowship with your Churches, expressed more fear and alarm, in regard to this matter, than I had heard before. They said they feared, and had good grounds too, that it was a struggle for religious ascendancy in the nation; and they said they saw the inevitable tendency of the plans, policy, and operations of these great national societies to be the formation of *one grand American Church*, to which, of course all the other minor Churches must bow, if indeed they *lived* to bow. These venerable men, however, did expressly except the American Bible Society. So do I. And were it not for the fear that this society also is or may be made subsidiary to the other great moving societies. all the Churches in the land would come to its aid in mass, participating equally of its benefits. This I am assured of on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church. I wish here to acknowledge that I was partially under a mistake in one of my former communications, when I said your papers had not assailed others for not favoring these great national societies. They have, though not so severely as the Methodist. I find from actual conversation with some eminent ministers of churches in fellowship with you, that these societies show hostility to all other societies, though of precisely the same nature, and, as they said to me, do every thing in their power to break them down. The great body of the Methodist Episcopal Church are not the only ones which stand opposed to these great national societies. Many distinguished individuals, both clergy and laity, in the Dutch Reformed Church, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and even in your own Churches, are very much alarmed on this matter; and their number is increasing daily. I write these things here principally with this design, namely: your leading papers supposed the Methodist Episcopal Church the only opponents of consequence, and expected to put down her opposition, and silence her periodicals, by a simultaneous, vigorous, inflammatory, and satirical attack. I do not intend to taunt them for their failure, but would simply add, if they could succeed against the Methodist, there is a rising host to contend with. I believe it is becoming a pretty general wish, that these great national societies should assume their proper denomination, and be declared Presbyterian, as they really are in effect. Then the country would understand it. The benevolent institutions of other Churches would stand forth distinctively, in proportion to their interest, and all taken together, operating in harmony with each other, but according to their own peculiar plans, would, when taken aggregately, amount to more than the amount of the national societies, and be free from the tendency to which they inevitably lead. In these remarks I expressly except the American Bible Society. D.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal.

INFIDELITY.

It was this honest conviction by which they (the apostles) were influenced, and under which they acted, that enabled them to despise the threats of their enemies; to treat with suitable indignation their taunts and sarcasms; to condemn the wickedness of a wicked world with such boldness; to encounter dangers with so much intrepidity, and to maintain with such unimpeachable integrity and persevering industry, a life of unspotted purity. Their religion lived in their hearts, shone in their conduct, dwelt perpetually on their tongues, and it was this which gave the finishing touch to all their arguments. It was in consequence of their having the truth thus embodied and presented in this visible and palpable form, that Christianity took so deep a root in so short a time, that it spread with a rapidity which astonished and confounded its enemies, while it delighted and confirmed its friends.

What else could have silenced the illusive oracles of heathenism, refuted the cavils of Jewish infidelity, and carried away captive the philosophers of Greece and Rome? This victory was not achieved by human power, nor won merely by the force of argument—of the argument which is based upon the external evidence in favor of Christianity—but it was gained by the strength of Omnipotence exerting its mighty energies in the hearts and lives of the first disciples of Jesus, and by the influence of that eternal Spirit which inspired them with an eloquence at once so bold and commanding as to sway the minds of their auditors to the side of truth and righteousness. Here was a display of the omnipotence of truth. Here was an evidence of the irresistible influence of love—of *Divine love*. Here was the silent, bloodless triumph of that religion which enlightens the understanding, and mends the heart, over those false and corrupted systems which left mankind under the dominion of all their darkness, and disordered passions and appetites. This was a triumph worthy to be celebrated in all ages!

Had this pure system of religion been permitted to stand on its own basis, and to recommend itself to mankind by its own intrinsic excellence, shining by its own light, some of the most plausible objections of infidelity had never been made. When its holy influence became enfeebled by mixing its truths with worldly policy, and its peculiar glories obscured by the false glare of human glory, it soon became an engine of state, and was made subservient to the ambitious views of wily politicians. Hence originated doubts of its divine authority. Infidelity was generated from this unholy union of church and state. And from that inauspicious era it has been fed and fattened by feeding itself on the manifest defects of those mongrel Christians.

This very plainly shows us our duty. Let the pure truths of Christianity live again in our hearts and lives, and the same results shall be witnessed. But let the professed advocates of Christianity give evidence that they are hankering after the honors of the world—that they are laboring more for political importance and influence than they are after the advancement of Christ's kingdom that the accumulation of wealth is at the bottom of their plans and the object of their pursuit—and a host of infidels for the next generation will be the fruit of their doings. Those who persuade themselves that there is no danger of this, evince a want of acquaintance with human nature and the history of events. A desire for pre-eminence, for political and ecclesiastical dominion is common to man; and unless this desire is checked, restrained, or entirely subdued by the grace of God, it will be perpetually plotting schemes for its gratification. The history of the world confirms the truth of this observation. What is the history of the world? Is it not made up chiefly of the plots, the intrigues, and the efforts of men thirsting for dominion? And to satiate this thirst, has not every principle of honor, of justice, of plighted faith, been sacrificed? And shall we vainly suppose that human nature has changed its character? As well might the "leopard change its spots." It may indeed modify its plans of operations, merely to suit them to the different views and states of society. Its objects are still the same. To gratify *self*, to aggrandize *self*, to exalt and deify *self*, is the ultimatum of all its pursuits. This ever has been, and ever will be the object and pursuit of all whose hearts are not renewed by the Spirit of holiness. It is, in fact, nothing more nor less than the carnal mind exerting itself in various ways to "exalt itself above all that is called God," until it "sitteth in the temple of God, showing itself that it is God."

It is preposterous, in our humble opinion, to apply this text of Scripture exclusively to any one denomination of Christians. Though it unquestionably depicts, in very striking colors, the heart of the Pope of Rome in his sacrilegious attempts to clamber into the temple of God, and to be exalted above all the potentates of the earth, yet this *man of sin* dwells in every unrenewed heart, actuates all the carnally minded, and will ever

distinguish them as the enemies of God and his truth. We care not by what name they are called, how loud and splendid their pretensions to piety and to philanthropy, nor how magnificent may be their schemes of benevolent enterprise; if they are under the dominant influence of debased, corrupted human nature, *self* is at the bottom of all their doings, and the lust of dominion is the secret motive of all their actions. And until this little and lordly, contemptible and haughty, impious and Heaven-daring animal, SELF, is enchained, put down, and destroyed, nothing good can issue from the work of our hands. A Pope of Rome, a metropolitan of England, a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal or Methodist Episcopal Church, a Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Dutch Reformed, or any other clergyman; a doctor, lawyer, merchant, artificer, manufacturer, or farmer; a shoemaker, a sweeper of the streets even down to the most menial and despicable of our race; while under the influence of the polluted passions and appetites of our nature, are one and all characterized by the same predominant desire and motive, and all exhibit the sad and mournful evidences of enmity against God and his Christ. Whether they act alone or in concert; whether religion, wealth, political dominion, honor, or glory be their professed object, it matters not: they are, one and all, while held down to the earth by the iron grasp of this selfish principle, abetting the cause of infidelity, and helping to people the regions of blackness and darkness for ever!

This is human nature. And it is to change its principles of action, to purify it from its native contaminations, and to bring it under the dominion of grace, under the government of that God whose laws are "just, holy, and good," that we now write. O God, help! If thou shalt speak, even though it be through these columns, the heart shall feel.

It is to raise up an army of holy souls, that we now plead. If we can succeed in enlisting all our readers, and all the professors of the religion of Jesus Christ, in this holy warfare, we we have no fears of driving infidelity, however it may be armed, with whatever weapons it may fight, from the field. The light of truth shining in the faces of these true soldiers of Jesus Christ will dart conviction to the hearts of their enemies, and they shall go "backward, and fall to the ground." This, therefore, is the crusade that we would proclaim. This is the character of the war we would wage. Let peculiarities respecting the mottos of our respective flags, the color and shape of our uniform, and the particular dialect in which we speak, be "given to the moles and bats," while with firm phalanx, with our hearts fired with love to God and men, having the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and no other sword but the sword of the Spirit, all marshalled under the Divine Captain, we breast the enemy, march into his territories, strip him of his armour, and bring him a willing captive to our Immanuel.

To achieve this bloodless victory, we call upon all the friends

of Jesus. To conquer this rebel by such means, we would enlist every lover of God, every well wisher to the human race, and every man in whose breast a spark of humanity remains to be kindled up with this holy enthusiasm. Let our hearts be warmed at this holy altar of God, and our sword be tempered in this fire, and we may bid defiance to the enemies' darts. They will fall pointless and powerless at our feet, while the hand that hurled them will brandish in the serene air of universal benevolence that very weapon with which he has been conquered.

REMARKS.

The sentiments contained in the above article we consider excellent, and deserving particular regard by all the lovers of truth. What a severe, but just argument is here advanced against much of the religion of the day! What an awful warning against the growth of infidelity! What an animated exhortation to the saints is given, to engage in a holy crusade (not as Doct: Blythe would have it, against Christians, but) against infidels and despisers of the cross; not with carnal weapons, but with the sword of the Spirit, tempered in the fire of divine love! We cordially wish success to the writer in the future numbers he has given us reason to expect. May his labors of love be amply rewarded in time and in eternity EDITOR.

LIBERIA.

Extracts of a letter from Mr. John Russwurm, to A. R. Plumley, Esq., agent of the American Colonization Society, dated Government House, Monrovia, Nov. 18th, 1829: communicated for the Recorder.

At the invitation of Dr. Mechlin, I am staying at the agency's house. I am not sorry that my feet now rest on "terra firma," and in the land of my fathers, believing as I do, that it is decreed by Him who reigns above, that the descendants of Africa in America must return and assist in the great work of evangelizing and civilizing the land: the decree has gone forth, that "Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands unto God;" and were you here one sabbath, you would believe that the commencement of the prophecy was taking place. Ah! it is so pleasing to behold men who formerly groaned under oppression, walking in all the dignity of human nature, feeling and acting like men who had some great interest at stake; but still more pleasant to behold them assembled in the house of worship, rendering thanksgiving and prayer to him who ruleth the nations, in this land of heathen gods, surrounded by millions of immortal beings who are immersed in the grossest superstition, "with eyes that see not, and ears that hear not."

I cannot describe what were my first sensations upon landing. The town contains double the number of houses one would expect, and I am informed of Caldwell and Millsburg, that each contains nearly as many. The colonists here at Monrovia appear to be getting ahead fast; their principal dependance is trade with the natives, either in stores or at factories established in the interior. The health of the colony has been quite good; deaths but two the last six months.

INFANTS IN HELL.

Never was there an opinion more justly and universally reprobated than this. All, except a few who boldly avow their creed, and honestly receive their system, reject it, and are offended, if it be insinuated that it is a doctrine of their creeds. It is not my purpose to offend, but to expose a doctrine, which involves the spotless character of God and his institutions in black, awful, repulsive shades. I shall therefore show that this is a doctrine of boasted orthodoxy, its claims to truth shall be examined, and its bearings made manifest.

1. We shall take notice of the orthodox covenant, said to be made with Adam in innocency, in the words following. "God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which he bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact and perpetual obedience; promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the break of it." This covenant being made with Adam, as a public person, not for himself only, but for all his posterity; all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in that first transgression." The miseries brought upon all mankind by Adam's sin are described by them to be "all miseries spiritual, temporial and eternal, both in this world and the world to come—The punishments in the world to come, are, everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell fire forever." This covenant is described by the orthodox to be "the law delivered by God on mount Sinai, and written in two tables." See the Presbyterian Conf: of Faith, Chap's. 7 and 19. Lar: Cat: Ques: 20–29. The same doctrines are contained in the Baptist Confession.

Now, who can be so ignorant of the use of language, but must conclude from these articles that God made a covenant with Adam, involving all his posterity "in most grevious torments in soul and body without intermission in hell fire forever!" If God made this covenant, it must have been agreeable to his will, holy, just and good—therefore, to punish unoffending infants in hell forever, is agreeable to the will of God, and holy just and good!! But the orthodox have endeavored to soften the features of this God—dishonoring. soul—repulsive doctrine, by declaring that all infants are not damned; but that some are sovereignly and mercifully elected and saved. They thus declare (Chap: 10. sec: 3.) that, "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit." But what is the fate of the non-elect or reprobate infants? eternal torment in hell fire forever! There is no possible salvation for them, because they with all the

non-elect part of mankind are involved in the transgression of the first covenant; not being represented by Christ in the covenant of grace! See Chap: 10.

This is the doctrine of orthodoxy. Let us now examine its claims to truth.

2. The covenant as law given to Adam, is said to be the same as that given to Moses in Horeb, written in tables of stone.—What says Moses on this subject? Hear him, "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our *fathers*, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. Duet: v, 2, 3. If this covenant had been made with Adam, and in him with all his posterity, Moses must have been ignorant of it. But in the spirit of inspiration he declares it was not. With such authority we are obliged to reject this doctrine of the orthodox.

3. "By Adam's disobedience was brought upon all his offspring, the curse of most grievous torments in soul and body without intermission in hell fire forever." The scriptures brought for proof in the Presbyterian Conf: of Faith are the following. Gen. II, 17. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die; or dying thou shalt die." We ask, what was this death? This we learn from the sentence pronounced by his Maker upon Adam. Gen. III, 19. "In the sweat of thy face shall thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Not a word here hinted, that his posterity should suffer grievous torments of soul and body in hell fire forever, because Adam had sinned: and how the body, when returned to dust could suffer grivous torments, is one of the mysteries inscrutable. But the inspired Paul confines the death for Adam's transgression to temporeal death in 1 Cor. xv, 21, 22. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead, for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." See also Rom. v, 12. to the end. Another text adduced to prove the doctrine is 2 Thes. I, 9. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." But I ask, who are these to be thus punished, and for what sin? Only read the words in immediate connexion, and though a child, you cannot mistake—"The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven; taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Is this the sin of Adam, and the punishment inflicted on his posterity for that sin? If the makers of the confession of Faith knew no better, they are to be pitied, rather than followed as unerring guides. Let the reader but attend to their other proofs collected together on the 29th question of the larger catechism. and he will find not the most distant hint of the doctrine they are introduced to prove. They are Mark IX. 43, 44. Luke XVI, 24–26. Matt. XXV, 41–46. Rev. XIV, 11. John III, 36. I cannot but wonder at the credulity of the world, in receiving a fundamental of a system without

proof, or what is worse, with what is entirely opposite to the matter attempted to be proven.

We will now notice the bearings of this doctrine. It bears hard upon the character of God as just, good and merciful. Surely this needs no proof in this day of inquiry. To say that God is good, merciful and just in giving a constitution, dooming unoffending infants to unremitting tortures in hell fire forever, would be spurned by every rightly informed mind, and pious heart; yes, by those too in whose creed the doctrine is found. The doctrine also bears hard upon the character of the Bible. It cannot be found there, but repelled on every page. The orthodox talk of elect infants, and to prove that God has elected some, they quote only Luke XVIII, 15, 16, and Acts II, 38, 39. Do examine these texts, and think what a stretch of faith it must be, to receive them as proofs of infant election, in the Calvinistic sense of the term. It may be asked, why I meddle with the creed of others? My reasons are, because I desire to have all the collected filth and rubbish of ages, which has by man been imposed on the Bible removed, that the truth may again shine forth for the illumination of the world in darkness. I also desire to turn the attention of my fellow creatures to the creeds of those, who claim orthodoxy exclusively, and denounce all others who differ from them. This we hope will cut the chains of ignorance, with which myriads are bound. EDITOR.

A SHORT METHOD WITH UNITARIANS—*By J. Whitsitt.*

Under this head I have read a dissertation in the Baptist Chronicle for May, 1830. It is not my design to defend the Unitarians more than any other sect; but I am ever moved to advocate truth under whatever name it may be assailed. I have seen short methods and long methods of attacking supposed errors but the best method, I think, is truth and good sense. We will briefly attend to Mr. Whitsitt's arguments to prove that Jesus Christ is the only true and living God, and, therefore, not the Son of the living God. The very proposition carries in it an anti-christian appearance; yet it is the very doctrine that so much labor is expended to establish.

Arg: 1. "'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' Gen: I, 1.—John informs us that it was the Word that was made flesh, who made all things, and that this Word was God. John I, 1–14.—and that this is the true God and eternal life. 1 John v, 20." Where does John inform us that it was the Word *who made all things*? No where. Mr. Whitsitt, nor any other man has ever been thus taught by John. Does he not see the difference between the two expressions, the Word *who made all things*, and the Word *by whom all things were made*? The difference is very great; as great as there is between the prime and instrumental cause of any work God the Father is the prime cause; Christ, the Son of God, is the instrumental cause. God created all things, the heavens and the earth; but God cre-

ated things *by* Jesus Christ. Eph: III, 9. God made the worlds; but God made the worlds *by* his Son. Heb: I, 2. Of the one God, the Father, are all things; but *by* the one Lord Jesus Christ, are all things. 2 Cor: VIII, 6. God Almighty created the heavens and the earth and all things therein; but all were created *by* the Son, whether they be angels, principalities or powers, things in heaven and things on earth, things visible and invisible—all were made *by* him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. How plainly distinguished are the prime and instrumental causes in these cases. The learned will know that *dia* with the Genitive in Greek, almost universally signifies the instrumental or secondary cause, and in no case I have seen, ever signifies the prime cause. This was the sense of the Greek Fathers. The prime cause is generally, if not always expressed by *hupo* and *ex*. Thus, "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken (*hupo*) of the Lord (*dia*) *by* the prophet." Matt: II, 15. "All things are (*ek*) of God, who hath reconciled us to himself (*dia*) by Jesus Christ." In like manner he saves, redeems and judges the world *by* Jesus Christ. The inquirer after truth may consult my letters to Doct: Blythe on this subject. Till Mr. Whitsitt shall prove that these things are incorrect, his argument is as light as air. The trinitarian sense of 1 John v, 20, has been so often refuted that I think it useless to repeat it. I refer such as wish to know to my letters to Doc: Blythe.

We will try Mr. Whitsitts second argument. "The Son is the brightness of his glory, and express image (Gr. character) of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high." Heb. I, 3. Who would have thought that any one could seriously introduce this text to prove that the Son of God, was God himself? that after the only true God had purged our sins with his own blood, he sat down at the right hand of himself—that he was the image of himself—that he appointed himself heir of all things? Read the context and the matter must forever rest, that this person was the Son of God.

John XIV, 9. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father," *the Almighty*. What of the Almighty Father did Philip see in the Son? Not his being, substance, or essence—This none hath seen or can see. It was then the character or Glory of God shining in the face of Jesus. This was what the disciples saw manifested in the flesh of the Son of God.

Matt. IV, 7–10. "Jesus said unto him (the devil) thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." quoted from Deut. VI, 16. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan. For it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Without a perversion of plain truth these texts cannot be referred to the deity of the Son of God, but to the Father alone.

Js. II, 19, Could only be quoted by Mr. Whitsitt to express a little vulgar wit; too low to notice.

He next introduces Matt. VIII, 29–31, and IV, 3. John V, 18, to prove the equality of the Son with the Father. Strange that he should talk of the equality of one iufinite being, one Almighty God. Equality, we have ever thought implies plurality; and to say that one is equal to itself is too absurd to be admitted. It is still more strange to introduce the testimony of devils, and of the Jews who were the worst of commentators on our Saviours words. They once testified that he had a devil and was mad. If their testimony is good in one case, why not in the other? A good cause needs not such supports.

He next quotes Eph. I, 17 19, and II, 1–4. V, 10., to prove that the Father Almighty quickens dead sinners; and then cites us to John V, 21–25, and XII, 25, to prove that the Son does the same; therefore he must be the only Almighty God! Let but the verse following the 25, which he quoted, be read, and then what will become of his argument?" For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority &c." How could life be given to the only Almighty God!

His next argument is that the Almighty is every where, and so is the Son; therefore the Son must be the Almighty. Matt. XVIII, 20. Rev. I, 13–19, and III, 20. It is admitted that the Son of God is every where on earth, and in heaven itself; yet will this prove him infinite? It is thought by many that an intelligent agent, the Devil is in Europe, Asia, America, in all the inhabited earth at the same time; will this prove him to be infinite? We betray our ignorance of the greatness and power of intelligent beings, when we measure them by our littleness.

Again he says, The Almighty searcheth the hearts, and so doth the Son. Rev. II, 18–23. John II, 24, 25. Therefore do I ask Mr. Whitsitt, Whence did the Son derive this knowledge? Did not the Father give him, according to promise, the spirit of knowledge, wisdom and understanding? Isai. XII. Did he not receive this spirit without measure on the day of his baptism?—Did not the Father anoint Jesus with the Holy Ghost? And did not the Father by this anointing or unction teach him all things; even to know the hearts of his creatures? Had not Peter and others the gift of discerning spirits? Must they therefore be the Almighty?

Again, he says, The Almighty is the only potentate; this potency is manifested in the Son: 1 Tim: VI, 14–16. Rev: XIX, 11. John XII, 15. I would ask again, Does this title, *the only* potentate, apply to the Son of God independently, or was it given to him with the power, rule and government, by the Father? Was he not made Lord of All? If indeed the title be applied to the Son at all, how can the apostle say of this potentate, "whom no man hath seen or can see?" Could this be true of the Son? Was he not seen before and after his resurrection by many? To me it is plain without the aid of criticism, that the Father is here declared to be the only potentate; he shall shew or manifest the

appearing of Jesus Christ—he shall shew it, who is the only potentate, &c.

The Almighty, he says, existed from everlasting; the same of the Son. Prov: VIII and XXX, 4. Mic: V, 2. Heb: XIII, 8.

The text in Prov: VIII, 22 to the end, is an unhappy passage to prove the Son of God to be the only Almighty God, for he is said to be set up and brought forth. How can this be said of the Almighty God? Who could have set him up? Who could have brought him forth? But this was done from everlasting—this is defined, beyond mistake, to mean before the creation of the world—"I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was; When there were no depths, I was brought forth," &c. If the text refers at all to the Son of God, it simply proves his pre-existence as Son. As to Mic: v, 2, the 4 verse shows that the Almighty Jehovah was not intended, for "he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord, his God."

Because the Son of God will raise the dead and judge the world, Mr. W. thinks he must be the Almighty. I answer—The power to quicken and raise the dead was given to him by the Father, as it was to Elijah and the Apostles—The authority to execute judgement also was given him, because he is the Son of man. See John v. With regard to 1 John v, 7, enough has been said to convince the serious inquirer after truth. Even admitting it genuine, it can never establish the doctrine of trinity. "These three are one," does not prove that they are one God—but *one* as the apostles were one, according to the words of our Lord. John XVII.

The Father admits the Son his equal, says Mr. W. "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts." Zech. I answer—The Father also admits the angels to be the fellows of his Son. Will Mr. W. conclude that the angels are also equal to the Son? He also introduces Phil: II, 6-9, to prove the Son's equality with the Father; by which he means that the Son is the same being with the Father; or else, instead of having *two little Gods*, (I use his own language,) he will have two infinite, eternal Gods. If not, how can he reconcile the expressions, "God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name," &c. He attempts to argue that because Jesus was in the likeness of sinful flesh, therefore, he was a proper man. Will he admit that the angel Gabriel, who appeared to Daniel, and the three angels that appeared to Abraham, were proper men, because they appeared in the form or likeness of men? Because Jesus was in the form and image of God, he argues that he must be the Almighty God. Will he also admit that Adam was the Almighty God, because he was created in the image and likeness of God? Will he admit the same conclusion respecting the saints, who bear the image of the heavenly? We think not. He further argues, that because the angels were commanded to worship him, therefore, he must be

the Almighty God, or he commanded idolatry. Will Mr. Whitsitt accuse the apostles and primitive saints of idolatry, because they worshipped the Son of God? Will he accuse the heavenly hosts of this sin, because they worship the Lamb that was slain, and who had redeemed them to God by his own blood? They worship God and the Lamb, and yet are not idolaters; and if Mr. W. ever joins that company, he will lose one doctrine of his system.

As to 2 Cor: VIII, 9, and John XVII, 5, I need not say one word. Let any one read the texts, and ask himself these questions—Did Almighty God become poor? Did he change from his glory, and pray for it to be restored, &c.? The text, Rev: I, 7, 8, most evidently refers to the Father, and not to the Son. Read 4 verse. It is strange that Heb: I, 7, 8, 9, should be pressed by trinitarians into their service, to prove the Son of God to be the Almighty God himself. The Father thus addresses his Son—"Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Mr. W. concludes, "Were he (the Son) not the Almighty God, he never would have been able to quiet an infinite law; to control a mighty devil; and save an obstinate people from their sins." This may pass for its worth. Yet I must express my fears, that for the defence of human systems and opinions of deicide; infinite laws; God dying to satisfy or appease his own wrath, and reconcile himself to sinners, &c. will fill the world with infidelity, and bring the Bible into contempt. If men would only act with Bercan honesty, there would be no fear. Posterity will wonder at the dogmas of this generation.

EDITOR.

For the Christian Messenger.

BROTHER STONE:—A few days ago, on my return from Harrison county, I was informed that Mr. C——— a Presbyterian D. D. of great celebrity as a scholar, divine, and controversalist, was to preach near the road I travelled. I concluded to give him a hearing. According to expectation he addressed the congregation. When he arose, he read 1 Cor. XII, 1, 2. From his reading so much of the paragraph, I was induced to believe that *even* in his old age he had been willing to learn the use and design of the sacred scriptures, and consequently had seen the imprnpriety of *text* taking, or *scrap* preaching, and would hereafter follow the current of truth, attending to the connection, without regard to system. But what was my mortification, when he said "our text will be found in the latter clause of the 3 verse," "And that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."

Having now taken his *text*, his ingenuity, with the aid of his theological dissecting knife, soon enabled him to divide this little *scrap* into two heads!! This *operation*, he no doubt felt free to perform, after he had detached this little part of a sentance from the context; feeling I suppose quite free to torture it as he pleased,

N—N

and as his system required. His 1st head was to prove the personality, and Deity of the Holy Ghost. His second was to show the necessity of the direct and immediate operation of the Holy Ghost in regenerating the human heart, (according to the Calvinistic view of the subject.) I may hereafter exhibit his proofs and arguments in support of his positions, when their importance and excellence will be made known, and duly appreciated. The object of this communication is to notice one position our preacher assumed. Having discovered some present, whom I suppose he desired to *drub*, he remarked, "*that some ignorantly denied that we were commanded to worship the Holy Ghost. But we can easily establish it.*" I acknowledge that when I heard this venerable man, who had grown grey in the kingdom of the clergy, and had acquired so much renown for his defence of *orthodoxy*, boldly announce that it could be easily established, that we were commanded to worship the Holy Ghost, I was not a little agitated, lest in my researches after truth, I had overlooked this important requirement of heaven. And now you shall have all his Bible proof in favor of his position, that the Holy Ghost was an object of worship, in the exact order he introduced it. Sol. songs 4. 16. Awake, O north wind, and come thou south, blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out: Let my beloved come into his garden, and eat his pleasant fruits." Ezekiel xxxvii, 9, 10. "Then said he unto me, prophecy unto the wind, prophecy, son of man, and say to the wind, thus saith the Lord God, come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live; so I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army." Mat. xxviii, 19. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."* 2 Cor. xiii, 14. The grace of the Lord Jesus Chrst, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.

Can you believe, when I assure you, that you now have all the Bible proof before you to establish a command to worship the Holy Ghost, that the able and zealous defender of the orthodox faith, and their boasted champion could adduce? Such, however, is the fact; and I surely concluded, that the people, after hearing the mighty effort of a *great* man, and witnessing so complete an abortion, would relinquish a sentiment in favor of which, that D. D. nor no other D. D. could, or can give one Bible precept or example. If he did, I will acknowledge myself under obligations to that man, who will show me in which of the previous quotations it is to be found, and how they *all*, when blended together, can sustain the position.

The mind of that man who could torture and *turn* the phrase,

*Was Moses into whom the Israelites were baptized—was the one body into which all believers were baptized, objects of worship?

"awake O north wind, and come thou south, into a command to worship the Holy Ghost, must certainly be warped by prejudice, poisoned by conceit, contracted by sectarianism, and destroyed by bigotry; the people, who would receive such a sentiment upon such proof, I regard more as objects of pity than contempt. Examine the other passages, and you will discover they go just as far to prove the position of the preacher, as the phrase *North*, or *south wind*. The people, however generally, appeared to receive it as sound doctrine, and I presume regarded all who denied it as heretics. "In vain do they worship me (said Jesus) teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

As the above proof was adduced by one equally as competent to do justice to the subject, as any other man, I regard it as all the proof the Bible affords in favor of the position, that the Holy Ghost is an object of worship; and therefore thought it important to lay it before the public, humbly trusting it will do much good, and be the means of inducing many to abandon a sentiment, that has not a shadow of Bible proof to support it. In the absence of such proof, and for the want of plausible argument, the congregation had to be content with bold assertion, and strong declamation, which are all the proof many appear to require, and which will, when emanating from certain partisans, go farther with bigots, than all the solemn sanctions of the Bible to the contrary. But in this way, by using strong language, and wresting in the scrap way, God's blessed word, the above position, and all other sectarian dogmas are vindicated, and maintained.

Will not such *operations* as the above, by the Rev. Doctors entirely annihilate the beast, and overthrow the man of sin?—Will it not open the eyes of a blinded people, and cause them no longer to receive or trust the daring assertions of their ministers, and promote a spirit of inquiry among them, that will completely free them from clerical thraldom? Can any one believe for a moment, that the foregoing scriptures contain a command to worship the Holy Ghost? Will the people receive as true, all the declarations of a man, who has ingenuity enough to make fundamental doctrines out of little detached scraps of scripture?—For one, I envy no man the fame he acquires from such a mischievous use of the blessed Gospel. I have no doubt, the people will soon turn from such *fables*, and *teachers*, and old woman will ere long teach college divines, and D. D's. the simple meaning and beauty of the scriptures. For the present I leave this D. D. with you and the public.

PHILIP.

For the Christian Messenger.

A SHORT SERMON.

MR. EDITOR.—I have looked upon the use of ardent spirits as exceedingly injurious to the well being of society; and have, therefore, condemned the making and vending it, in any shape; but especially in the retail way, as practised in our Groceries or *nurseries of drunkenness*. And I have been no little offended,

and mortified, to see religious persons standing behind their little counters, measuring out the intoxicating draught. But I have lately heard a text quoted by a preacher, which (if it be a correct reading,) removes all my scruples. And as my religious grocery-keeping friends, may themselves have some scruples, as to the propriety of their course, I have concluded to preach a short sermon for their benefit upon the text, with which I am furnished. The text, in King James's translation, reads thus; "Let him eschew evil and do good!" but my preacher's reading was as follows: "Let him issue evil and do good." As I am no linguist, I cannot say that this is a correct reading, but if it be, the grocery keepers, (and many others too) will be under great obligations to my preacher, for his *new light* upon the scripture, and to me for publishing it. For now they may go a head without any scruples. But without further introductory remarks we will come to the text, which we shall divide as follows:—1st. What is meant by issuing evil? 2d. What is meant by doing good! Let it be kept in mind, that this sermon is designed to explain the text, merely as it applies to grocery-keepers.

And 1. What is implied in issuing evil? It will be allowed that ardent spirits are evil in their tendency; therefore by a very common figure of speech they may be called evil, the cause being put for the effect. The meaning of this head of the text, then, as applied to retailers of ardent spirits, is this; "gentlemen, go on, issue your spirits by gills, halfpints, quarts and gallons; make all drunk you can—and thus prepare them to wallow in our streets with the swine, "issue your evil," and thus help your fellow creatures to destroy their property, their health, their own and their families credit and happiness; and finally to destroy their souls eternally. But, we come now to the second head, as it is not so agreeable to dwell upon the first, which requires such hard things of us. We are now, to enquire what is meant by doing good, in the sense of the text, as applied to religious grocery-keepers. And

1. It is doing *good*, to issue all the evil they can, that they may have somewhat to give to them that have need. To Tract societies, Education Societies, Missionary Societies, &c.

3. It is doing *good*, to give liberally of the proceeds of evil, to the preacher, that he may have all things and abound; that he may pursue his studies, and bring out of his treasury things new and old.

4. It is doing *good*, while they are issuing, evil to pray to the Lord to have mercy on those to whom they are issuing—to save them from evil—to turn them from sin, and make them christians. I do not pretend to say, that such a prayer, is consistent with issuing evil; but I know it is consistent with the idea of doing good, to pray thus; and I well know, that if I cannot reconcile the first and second heads of my discourse, I am not alone; that is one consolation. For the old confession of faith teaches both the doctrine of predestination and man's free agency: therefore, though they cannot reconcile the two sentiments, they are bound to believe them. So, then, if we cannot reconcile the ideas of issuing evil and doing good, this is none of our odds; we know the text teaches both, and that is sufficient. But as we do not like long sermons, we will close and permit you to fill up the deficiences at your leisure, by your own reflections.

A LOOKER ON.

From the Christian Register.

FAMILY PRAYER.

I fear that the neglect of family devotion, amongst the professors of the gospel, arises principally from erroneous views as to the *nature* of religion, and the mode of its operation on the mind. The present age is strongly characterized by loud, and but too often ostentatious, professions to benefit and Christianize the world. Excitement is the order of the day. The anniversaries of many of the religious institutions, have grown into almost mere public exhibitions; and the keen appetite of a crowded and excited auditory, is but too frequently satisfied with the wild and extravagant declamations of platform orators. I would by no means utter a single word that might damp the most ardent zeal, provided it was of the right kind. Constant and vigorous efforts in the cause of Christ and of God, are required and ought to be made. But I may be allowed to say, that the present tone of religious feeling, as it exists in England, does not appear to me to be favorable, to the cultivation of the social affections and the observance of domestic religion. The spirit of the age seems opposed to the growth of a retired and unassuming piety. Publicity—a desire to attract the notice of the world—is not one of the least among the errors which characterize the proceedings of Christians. The practice of family prayer, which has been sanctified by the example of the best and holiest of men, is alas! of too retiring a character, for those who love to pray in the market-places and at the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. And where family prayer is neglected, is there not a danger of neglecting also *private individual prayer?* In short, that parent who never prays with his family, how often does he pray by himself? If he does not pray *with* his family, the inference seems to be, that he seldom if ever prays *for his family*. However this may be, the subject demands the most serious attention; and I hope that no parent who may read this letter, will so awfully neglect the advice and warnings which it contains, as to endanger the salvation both of himself and family.

Religion never appears to so great an advantage, never so attractive and amiable, as when she sheds her light and influence on the minds of a Christian family, gathered around the domestic altar. How truly inspiring is a scene like this! How powerful are the aids, and how consoling the influences of true religion! My friends, let me entreat you, with all the earnestness I can command, to avail yourselves of them. You may have already

enjoyed no inconsiderable portion of comfort and happiness in your families. I hope you have. But the question is, have you enjoyed *that kind* and *that degree* of happiness which the religion of Jesus Christ is so pre-eminently calculated to bestow? Families, Christian families, would do well to consider, what amount of happiness they possess, attributable solely to religion? We have reason to fear, that the followers of Christ, do not, in their domestic and confugal relations, sufficiently evince the *spirit and temper of Christ*. We fear, that too many Christian parents are remiss in their religious duties at home: that they do not instruct their chrildren and servants, and watch over their spiritual interests as they ought to do: that they do not, in short, welcome and cherish religion in their families, *as a family religion*—as a religion that is calculated to develope the social affections—as a religion that sweetens the temper and subdues the boisterous passions—as a religion that spreads a cheering and hallowing influence around the domestic hearth, and which unites, by the strongest and tenderest ties, a family on earth, preparatory to its union with the more exalted and happy family in heaven.

Excuses against any practice of religion may easily be made, but we cannot well conceive any more groundless than those which have been already noticed against the performance of family prayer. For what, my friends, can be more natural and rational—more becoming the privileges of our superior and exalted nature—so conducive to peace of mind and joyfulness of heart, as to kneel with our offspring, around an altar erected in the midst of our habitation, from whence ascends in grateful fragrance to heaven the morning and evening sacrifices! God has revealed himself under a *domestic* relation and calls himself 'the God of all the families of the earth.' And will you refuse him in this endearing character? Will you rob yourselves and your families of your greatest mutual honor and blessedness? An angel, in his intercourse with this world, sees nothing so uninviting and dreary, as a house, though rich as a mansion, and splendid as a palace, devoid of the service and presence of God. 'But what so lovely, so attractive as the family altar, '*garlanded by the social feelings*,' and approached, morning and evening, by the high priest of the domestic temple and his little train of worshippers? There, the master's authority is softened, and he feels respect for the servant who is kneeling at his side, and '*free indeed*.' There, the servant's submission is sweetened, and he loves, while he obeys, a master who is praying for his welfare. Here, the father, worn down with the labor of the day, is cheered and refreshed. Here, the anxious mother hushes her cares to rest. If any thing in the day has been diverted from its course, now all finds its place and glides along its wonted channel. If the relative affections have declined during the day, the evening service, like the dew of heaven, revives and enlivens them. If offences have come, they are easily forgiven, when all are asking pardon for themselves. Every angry word, every wrong temper,

every petulant feeling, flies before the hallowing influence of social devotion.'

That you may enjoy the peace of God in your bosoms, and the peace and happiness of religion in your homes, is, Dear Friends, the earnest wish of, Yours truly and affectionately, G. B.

We are sorry that Mr. Chambers cannot find room in his numbers for the piece he has prepared to establish his charges against me. It is hoped he will insert it shortly, as the public are waiting to see it. If he fails to establish them, his situation must appear awkward. We are by him informed that some benevolent person has written an article, over the signature of *pacificator*, and kindly handed it to him for publication. I wish not peace at the expense of truth or character. We have waited in silence sufficiently long; we wish Mr. C. to come forth with his testimony, or acknowledge his error. EDITOR.

My agents and patrons are informed that the price of the present volume is now due. They are solicited to collect and make immediate payment. If they cannot send by private conveyance, they must send by mail; I must risk the loss. Let them be careful to have the money sealed up in the presence of the post master and a witness. Let not the bills be small, for it is well known that the postage will be too high to justify it. I once more intreat my friends who write to me to pay postage. I have good reason to complain that many letters and communications are sent me, which cost me more than they are worth.—Agents are excepted. EDITOR.

DUBLIN, OHIO, June 7th, 1830.

DEAR BROTHER STONE.—This will inform you that the cause of Christian liberty is gaining ground, righteousness is going forth as brightness, and salvation as a lamp that burneth. In Liberty Knox County, Ohio, there have been about seventy members received in about four months; on Lake Fork about twenty, and four other places from fifteen to twenty. The cause is rapidly spreading. O that it might spread far and wide! I have baptized in twelve months one hundred and twenty converts. I have lately been a tour to Virginia. The cause is progressing slowly, and if there was regular preaching, sectarian establishments would soon explode, and the inventions of men would fall to *rise no more*.——Your brother in Christ,

ISAAC N. WALTER.

Extract of a letter from Elder Mansel W. Matthews,

M'NAIRY CO. TEN. May 12, 1830.

The church in my neighborhood is in a flourishing state at present; from six, *it* has grown in about one year to upwards of sixty, who are living in love, peace and union.

When I first came here it was a *wilderness;* but the blessed Gos-

pel has transformed it into a fruitful field. Union prevails, creeds and party names are becoming unpopular: at our communions we have the pleasure of beholding Christians of every name surround the table of the Lord, regardless of difference of opinion. This happy state we ascribe to the Gospel's being proclaimed free from the jargon of schools. Many churches have been planted recently in the Western District. I visited many of them last winter in company with Elder A. Anderson, who is riding in this country, and found them in a growing state. In a word, truth is prevailing in this country, and error hiding its deformed face. May the Lord assist us in the great work of reformation! Our Camp-Meeting commences on Chamber's creek in McNairy county Ten. on Friday before the 3rd Lord's day in Sept. next. We earnestly invite our brethren generally to attend, who can. For the present I must desist, Yours in hope of immortality. M. W. MATTHEWS.

Extract of a letter from Elder C. Sine,

TIMBERRIDGE, VA. May 27, 1830.

"The work of the Lord is still prospering in this and the surrounding country. Light is beaming forth as the brightness of the morning. Man made creeds, and covenants are losing the esteem of their former advocates. We look forward with a pleasing hope that the man of sin will soon be dethroned. and victory be declared on Emanuels side." C. SINE.

NOTICE.—The brethren of the Miami Christian Conference at their last meeting, agreed to meet annually, on the Monday after the fourth Sabbath of August. Accordingly they will meet next August at the Franklin Union Meeting House, in Warren county, Ohio. Meeting for preaching and other parts of Divine worship is expected to commence on the Friday preceding. THO: ADAMS.

On the Thursday before the second Lord's day in August next, the Western District Christian Conference, will sit at Gordon's Ferry, on Duck River, Hickman County, Tenn.

I. M. BARNETT.

[Bro. Barnett states that in a few month's past he has baptized between 20 and 30.—EDT. CHR. MESS.]

NOTICE.—The Flat Rock Christian Conference of the State of Indiana, will hold their first meeting in August next, on Blue River, Shelby County, about six miles above Shelbyville, commencing the Thnrsday before the last or fifth Lord's day of that month. JESSE FRAZIER, E. C. C.

NOTICE.—The White River Christian Conference will meet at Elder LEWIS BYRAM's, near Orleans, Ia. on Monday the 16th of August next. Meeting to commence on the Friday before

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. AUGUST, 1830. [No. 9.

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.

DR: CHANNING'S ELECTION SERMON.

In order that religion should yield its full and best fruits, one thing is necessary; and the times require that I should state it with great distinctness. It is necessary that religion should be held and professed in a liberal spirit. Just as far as it assumes an intolerant, exclusive, sectarian form, it subverts, instead of strengthens the soul's freedom, and becomes the heaviest and most galling yoke which is laid on the intellect and conscience. Religion must be viewed, not as a monopoly of priests, ministers, or sects, not as conferring on any man a right to dictate to his fellow beings, not as an instrument by which the few may awe the many, not as bestowing on one a prerogative which is not enjoyed by all, but as the property of every human being, and as the great subject for every human mind. It must be regarded as the revelation of a common Father, to whom all have equal access, who invites all to the like immediate communion, who has no favorites, who has appointed no infallible expounders of his will, who opens his works and word to every eye, and calls upon all to read for themselves, and to follow fearlessly the best convictions of their own understandings. Let religion be seized on by individuals or sects, as their special province; let them clothe themselves with God's prerogative of judgment; let them succeed in enforcing their creed by penalties of law, or penalties of opinion; let them succeed in fixing a brand on virtuous men, whose only crime is free investigation; and religion becomes the most blighting tyranny which can establish itself over the mind. You have all heard of the outward evils, which religion, when thus turned into tyranny, has inflicted; how it has dug dreary dungeons, kindled fires for the martyr, and invented instruments of exquisite torture. But to me all this is less fearful than its in-