fall; if therefore, any mistake is discovered, I request some member to correct it, as it is not my intention to deceive, but to present facts alone. I humbly, and earnestly request brethren in different parts of the state, to forward me information of all churches of which they may have any knowledge, embracing the particulars given below—and I fondly hope that some brethren will collect similar information in each state of the Union, that the public may be correctly informed of the progress of religious liberty in our country in a few years. T. M. ALLEN.

Number and strength of the church of Christ in Kentucky.

Name of the house, or place of worship.	The county in which it is situated.	The year the church was planted.	Number of members
1. Republican (Wood)	Fayette	1803	205
2. Bethel (Brick)	Do.	Do.	85
3. Union (Do.)	Do.	1823	84
4. Berea (Do.)	Do.	1827	40
5. Lexington (Do.)	Do.	1816	24
6. Mt. Tabor (Stone)	Do.	1803	20
7. Cane-Ridge (Wood)	Bourbon	Do.	115
8. Rockbridge	Do.	unknown	45
9. Flat Run	Do	1820	55
10. Mt. Carmel (Brick)	Do.	1816	45
11. Antioch (Do.)	Do.	1827	48
12. Millersburg (Wood)	Do.	1824	42
13. Paris (Brick)	Do.	1828	66
14. Clintonsville (Do.)	Do.	1830	15

In the above churches, embracing only two counties there are 10 preachers, and 889 members.

Receipts from distant places since Nov. 1st 1830, to the present time Jan. 26th 1831. Those near us are omitted.

A. Henderson, $15; P. Hatchitt 10; C. C. Moore 9; Sam. Shivel 7; Elder W. Dunkeson 5; H. Wilson 5; M. Ashford 2; H. Martin 1; D. Hazlerigg 1; P. Grimes 1; A. Vickrey 1; Doc. Million 1; Tho. Hauser 1; J. Rogers 1; Sam. Ross 1; Doc. Sanders for J. Wright 1; Wm. Read 8; E. Groves 1; W. H. Rochester 1; L. I. Fleming 3 for C. Ware, B. Gains and S. C. Scott; Js. Terrill 13, 50; G. Ellis 2, 50; D. Stewart 5; M. Combs and Js. Graham 15; Js. Arnold 6; J. Scott 5; Js. Kinkinnon 5; L. Bruen 5; J. Miles 2; Elder D. Hathaway by Js. Shackleford 17, 50; Wm. Wray 5; A. Kirkpatrick 5; Js. Young 2; Josh. Nichols 10; A. Crawford 5; G. Cathey 6; Wm. D. Jourdan 5; Js. Anderson 10; C. Gist 3; Wm. Cowden 5, of which 2 for B. Moore; J. T. M. Duke 5; Js. Shelton 15; Tho. Simmons 5; Jer. Savell 5; A. Stewart 5; M. P. Willis 11, 50; J. M. Thomas 2; Robt. Grimes, orders 8; J. Mulherrin 11; Jac. Callahan 12; T. M. McGauhy 8; H. Bryant 1; V. T. M. Elder 1; Js. M. Vey 5; C. Holland 5; M. M. Stackhouse 5.—Others may have been omitted.—Much of this is for volumes 1, 2 and 3.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. MARCH, 1831. [No. 3.

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 Gospel Luminary.

SPLENDID TRIUMPH.

"The accuser of our brethren is cast down."

In the last number of the Gospel Luminary, we noticed that Mr. M'Calla of Philadelphia, a minister of the Presbyterian denomination, and Mr. Lane of Ohio, a minister of the Christian connexion, had agreed to hold a public debate at Milford, N. J. on the following question, viz. "Is Jesus Christ the Supreme and Eternal God?" Mr. M'Calla to sustain the affirmative, and Mr. Lane the negative of the question. Mr. M'Calla arrived at Milford on the 6th ult., and the parties for the first time were introduced to each other, for the purpose of signing the rules of conference. After some slight alterations were made in the rules of debate, by mutual consent, which principally consisted in agreeing to hold but one meeting a day, which was to commence at ten o'clock, A. M. and close at three o'clock, P. M. they were signed by both the parties.

On this interview, in the course of other observations, it was proposed by Mr. Badger of West Mendon, N. Y. as the disputants were both of them ministers of the Gospel, and the debate was to be holden in a Christian assembly, to open the discussion on each day by prayer. To this proposition, Mr. M'Calla replied, "I suppose you know, sir, that I am a Trinitarian; I could, therefore, no more join with this man in prayer than with a Mohammedan or an infidel." "It appears, sir," said Mr. Lane, "that you are willing to enter into a dispute with me, and why not pray with me?" "I came here, sir," replied Mr. M'Calla, "to take you by the throat, and not by the hand." Thus it appears that Mr. M'Calla came to the place, not in a spirit of meekness to elicit truth, but with a mortal hatred rankling in his

heart, and with a fixed and full determination to proclaim upon the house top. It is extremely difficult for a man under the influence of such a temper of mind *to perceive* the force of evidence, much more to acknowledge it. It was, however, at length agreed that Mr. Lane, on those mornings in which he should commence the discussion, might open the meeting by prayer, provided that the time consumed in prayer by Mr. Lane be included in the thirty minutes allotted for his first speech.

On the following morning, Mr. Badger, in company with Mr. Clough of N. Y., called upon Mr. M'Calla, and stated to him, in the presence of a number of Presbyterian ministers, that "he must inform him, in behalf of the Christian connexion, that we consider the debate which is to be commenced this morning between yourself and Mr. Lane, an unfortunate affair, and we shall not consider the character of the connexion at stake in this contest, for you have not one of our talented ministess to contend with; you are at war with one of our boys." Mr. M'Calla appeared much surprised at the foregoing remark, and said, "that he thought it not a little extraordinary after the young man had been bantering and vapouring through the country for months past, when he was met and about to have his comb cut, that an effort should be made at this late hour to back out." To which Mr. Badger replied, "I do not wish to have it understood that we are desirous of backing out; but, sir, I wish to have you understand that there are men among us who are able to cut your comb, and who will do it if you will give them an opportunity. We wish for the present debate between yourself and Mr. Lane to proceed, and wish you to confine yourself to the received translation of King James, and for Mr. Clough to be excused from taking any part in it, and that at some other time and place you meet a man who is your equal." Mr. M'Calla said, "that he could not in conscience confine himself in the debate to the received translation of King James; but if any other man would meet him, let him have the invitation in writing, and he would reply to it." Mr. Badger then requested Mr. Clough to present Mr. M'Calla a written invitation to meet him in the city of New York, and discuss the question now pending between himself and Mr. Lane. Mr. Clough then wrote and presented Mr. M'Calla the following note:

Mr. M'Calla,

My Dear Sir,—I invite you to meet me in the city of New York, in the first Christian chapel, on the fourth Tuesday of March next, to discuss the question now pending between yourself and Mr. Lane. SIMON CLOUGH.

Milford, N. J. Dec. 27th, 1830.

I agree to meet Mr. M'Calla upon the rules of order agreed upon between himself and Mr. Lane, with the omission of the 9th and 10th articles, and the alteration of the rest so as to date, and the names of persons and places, SIMON CLOUGH.

Mr. M'Calla accepted the challenge, and endorsed on the back of it the following words, to which he affixed his name:

"With the permission of heaven, I will comply with the invitation herein contained. W. L. M'CALLA."

After the above mentioned debate between Mr. M'Calla and Mr. Clough was concluded upon, the Board of Moderators were chosen, which consisted of Mr. Kirkpatrick, a Presbyterian minister of Amwell, and Mr. Wiggin, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by Mr. M'Calla; and Mr. Badger, and Mr. Goff, ministers of the Christian connexion, by Mr. Lane. The Moderators, who were chosen by the parties, made choice of th Hon. C. Ludlow of Milford, to be President of the Board.

PUBLIC DEBATE BETWEEN MR. M'CALLA AND MR. LANE.

The discussion commenced on Tuesday morning, at about 11 o'clock, A. M. and closed, for that day, at 3 P. M. Mr. M'Calla opened the debate. He spent the whole of the first day in reading select passages and sentences from Elder Kinkade's book, called "Bible Doctrine," in commenting upon them, in burlesqueing his antagonist, and attempting to sink him in the estimation of his audience; in stigmatizing, reproaching, and defaming the whole Christian connexion, and endeavoring to bring the whole body into disrepute among the people. Thus Mr. M'Calla spent the time allotted for his four first speeches, without producing one evidence, or advancing one argument in support of the doctrine he had engaged to defend in the debate. Mr. Lane came at once to the subject, and offered a few plain, forcible, and conclusive arguments, to prove that Jesus Christ was not the Supreme and Eternal God, but his Son. Mr. Lane repeated his arguments, and endeavored to bring his antagonist to the subject, but without success.

Mr. Lane opened the discussion on the second day. The principal part of this day was consumed as was the former day. Mr. Lane repeated the arguments which had been advanced on the previous day, and frequently called upon Mr. M'Calla to answer them. Mr. C. in reply, stated, that he should answer the gentleman's arguments at a proper time, and so passed them by for this day. During this day, Mr. M'Calla attempted to show that Jesus Christ was truly and properly a man, in all respects like other men. He then attempted to prove that he was the Supreme and Eternal God. The argument by which he attempted to prove this position was, that the names and titles of the Deity were given to Christ; therefore, he inferred that he was the Supreme God. This argument was answered by Mr. Lane. Thus closed the second day's debate.

Mr. M'Calla opened the debate on the morning of the third day. On this day he brought forward but one argument to prove his doctrine; which was, that the works of God were ascribed to Jesus Christ. This argument he regarded as an evi

dence of his Supreme Deity. Mr. Lane answered this argument of Mr. M'Calla, and repeated his arguments which he had formerly advanced, and which Mr. M'Calla had not attempted to answer. During this day, several topics, foreign from the subject, were introduced, which was the means of consuming considerable time.

Mr. Lane opened the debate on the morning of the fourth day. During this day's discussion, Mr M'Calla brought forward one more argument to prove his position, which was, that the attributes of God were ascribed to Jesus Christ; therefore, he inferred that he was the Supreme God. This Mr. Lane denied, and showed that Jesus Christ, with his own mouth, disclaimed the possession of these attributes, ascribing them to his Father *only*. Towards the close of the day, Mr. M'Calla gave an explanation of his views of the doctrine of the Trinity. To this explanation Mr. Lane made a most happy and powerful reply, and showed, beyond all refutation, that Mr. M'Calla was a believer in three Supreme and Eternal Gods, each of whom possessed all the attributes and perfections of Deity. Mr. M'Calla rose to make his closing speech for the day, and after a few feeble and desultory remarks, he closed by stating, that he should withdraw from the debate, and Mr. Lane could proceed as long as he pleased.—During this last speech, he also publicly stated, that he should decline meeting Mr. Clough in the city of New York, as he had previously engaged. Thus the debate ended on the fourth day.

Mr. Lane, on the morning of the fifth day, met the board of moderators, when he concluded his argument: Mr. Lane had the field now entirely to himself. He commenced by observing, that Mr. M'Calla had not attempted to answer one of the arguments which he had advanced on the part of the negative; that he promised to do it at a proper time, but had finally withdrawn without doing it; while on the other hond, he believed he had answered every argument the gentleman had brought forward to sustain the affirmative. He said, he considered that they had but just entered upon the merits of the question, but since his opponent had left the ground, it was not his intention to detain them an unreasonable length of time; he should, therefore, call their attention to a few more arguments, and close the subject He then advanced fifty-six arguments to prove that Jesus Christ was not the Supreme and Eternal God, but his Son. He then closed his argument, and the meeting was dissolved.

Mr. M'Calla is about forty-two years of age, of slender frame, and about middling stature. He possesses great fluency of speech, and is a good speaker. He is a classical scholar, and a man of respectable acquirements. He is not what we should call, by any means, a sound reasoner, or a good logician. He is every thing but fair and honorable in debate. He can abuse, revile, defame, satirize, and misrepresent an opponent's doctrine, statements and arguments, equal to any other man. These traits of character were rendered conspicuous during the whole

of the debate. We do not recollect of ever hearing so much abuse drop from the lips of any man, as dropped from the lips of Mr. M'Calla during the four days of the debate which he attended. When he spoke of Mr. Kinkade, author of the Bible Doctrine, he called him "the blasphemous, heathen, infidel Kinkade." When he spoke of Dr. Channing, he called him, "the blasphemous infidel, Dr. Channing." When he spoke of the Unitarians, he denominated them, "the infidel Unitarians," "the heathen Unitarians," and "atheistical Unitarians," &c. And when he spoke of Elder Lane, he called him, "my blasphemous opponent," "my atheistical opponent," &c. He represented the whole Christian connexion, to a man, without an individual excepted, as being the disciples of Simon Magus, who was, as he declared, the first preacher of their doctrine, "a set of hypocritical, atheistical deceivers." He asserted, that he did not admit that there was an individual christian in the whole body. In this strain of defamation and abuse, Mr. M'Calla went on, day after day, till, finally, he abandoned the argument.

Mr. Lane is a young man of about twenty-six years of age. His literary and acquired abilities are quite inferior to Mr. M'Calla's. He, however, posesses more native talent and more strength of mind, than Mr. M'Calla, and is by far the best reasoner. He treated Mr. M'Calla with much more respect and politeness than Mr. M'Calla treated him.

So far as my information extends, it was understood by all the unprejudiced part of the congregation, that Mr. M'Calla, at the time he relinquished the debate, was fairly put down, and that it was impossible for him to rise again. The day before he declined, he gave the congregation to understand, that he intended to prosecute the debate till the close of the following week; but, alas! his race, after such boasted pretensions, was but short.

I was happy in learning, before leaving the place, that the debate had been the means of rooting and grounding the Christian church, at Milford, in the faith; and that several who had been halting between two opinions, had now become established in the doctrine preached by the Christian connexion. We think the debate will result in doing good.—*Ib.*

For the Christian Messenger.

BALTIMORE, DEC. 28, 1830.

DEAR BROTHER—I am aware of the general manner which controversialists take in debating: when one has advanced his position, and in some measure defended himself, the other, to show how invulnerable are his conclusions, says, that his opponent has made no impressions on his mind, unless, for sooth, he is more confirmed than he was in his own opinion. I have no pretensions to this kind of Logic, I wish the impartial to decide as to what I may advance, and they only are impartial who are not known to either you or me. You say in your reply, "one sense of the term *Christians* is *anointed ones*, such as have an

unction from the Holy One." Admitting with me, that in the full and proper sense they are not Christians, who have not been baptized into Christ, and so have "put on Christ." Now if it should appear that we question your right, for applying the passage in 1 John II, 20 to persons unbaptized, what then? to the Law and to the Testimony, say you; well, your honesty causes you to fail, in attempting to advocate your own practice in this way; for you say, page 275, "when we are asked for our divine authority from the New Testamet, we have none that can fully satisfy our own minds." Now I must here make you answer yourself, here is your frank and honest confession that you cannot find in the New Testament, a warrant for associating with unbaptized persons, then you must receive the force of the following remarks, although coming from your own pen, which are found in the II No. p. 252, "Can you expect that the church will ever be reformed according to the ancient order, by instituting a new order, unknown in the New Testament;" I for one do by no means expect it. God's own plan is the only effectual plan, and that is fully and clearly developed in the New Testament, but we will attend a little to what the apostle had in view when he wrote the verse you quote. If the apostle did not write it in order to console men in their neglect of plain duties, then I say it is very unlawful for any Christian to make that use of it—and that he did not, will appear very plain if we read the context. When the apostle had been speaking of some disaffected ones, who as he says "went out from us because they were not of us," he consoles the true disciples, by telling them they have "an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things," but these whom you say receive the unction, do not (according to your own acknowledgement) know all things, for you say they are "ignorant of it as a command." Again the apostle says, "I have not written to you because ye know not the thruth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth." Here it will be perceived, that there is a manifest difference between John's application of the passage and yours.

So far was this apostle from tampering with the pretensions of any, he says "We are of God, he that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." Now had the apostle conformed to the indefinite language used in the religious world at this day, he would not have used such positive, plain, definite language as he here employs. No, he must have said whatever the people shall think is right, and act in conformity with their views, is accepted; because the test is not "if ye do this," or, "if ye hear us," but if ye are pious, and holy this will be sufficient. This is a modern apostle; old John had to learn the first principles of this doctrine, therefore as we follow the primitive apostles, we must be excused from receiving such charitable, hospitable views as these modern apostles hold out to us. You next ask me, if "I really think there are no pious and holy people among Pedobaptists and Quakers, and even among Baptists, and those who immerse but not for the remission of sins." I really am at a loss how to answer the latter part of this question, because if I have written any thing which would lead you to think, that I confined the name Christian to them alone who had this understanding of the ordinance when they submitted to it, I must confess I did not so mean it to be understood, while at the same time, I am not authorised to look upon Pedobaptists and Quakers as Christians. My understanding of a Christian is, one that is a follower of Christ, one that has publicly confessed this name, and that too, as Christ said his disciples must confess him. To talk of a man being converted to Christ when he had only conformed to the custom of some sect, to the rule of some leader, whether it be Calvin, or Wesley, would be as incongruous as to say, that because I had joined myself to the Masonic society that therefore, I was an odd fellow, or a member of Congress. Does a man become a Calvinist by attaching himself to the Methodist? No, say you; and why? because, say you, there is a difference between the two societies; just so in respect to Pedobaptists and Quakers. This for the present shall suffice, until we see these few arguments logically and Scripturally refuted, for we do not mean to exhaust ourselves all at once, we have long been reading and thinking on this subject, (yea we were settled in our minds long before we left England.) We have looked upon the Christian world as destitute of the spirit which was in Christ Jesus, and those who kept the "Commandments of God, and have the Testimony of Jesus Christ," as the only seed or witnesses against the apostacy. We are aware that in this age, the best way to ward off the force of an argument, is to draw some dreadful looking conclusion from it, and then appeal to the existing prejudices of the people, this generally will overturn the strongest and best of arguments. I feel sorry my brother has done this in his reply to my last; the most charitable construction we can put on it is, that it is resorted to only when all argument fails. To give an explanation of myself respecting those who have been baptized, but not with the understanding we now have, that in it we have the remission of sins. I have no difficulty on my mind, with respect to them. It is understood by them, that God for Christ's sake will forgive their sins, and believing in his name, and seeing it is their duty to be baptized on a profession of this Faith; I believe they are accepted by God, and are truly the disciples of Christ, and if when they are entered in the school of Christ, they discover that remission is connected with faith, reformation, and Baptism, it will cause them to rejoice that they have believed, reformed, and been baptized, and that they now can have the fullest confidence, that their sins were forgiven them for Christ's sake. I see no necessity for them to be baptized again, for it cannot be supposed that the primitive Christians understood all that their baptism meant when they were baptized; if they did, why did the apostles teach them in their epistles the things that were contained in

their baptism? Paul to the Romans, says that because they had in their Baptism, professed to become dead unto sin, how should they "live any longer therein"—to the Corinthians when he had been speaking of the spirit which animated every member of the body, tells them that, "by one spirit they were all baptized into one body." The Galatians although they had swerved from this profession by circumcising, forgetting it was by Faith in Messiah as come into the world, that they had received the Spirit, and after stating to them the use of the law he says, "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Further when a man or woman is married, if they shall find in a certain time afterwards that there was more connected with the contract than they at the time understood, is there any necessity for the party to be married over again? I should think there would be none, neither do I think a baptism invalid, if the person should not fully understand the whole that was connected with the ordinance. You further say that "zeal for a favorite sentiment, has carried many beyond the boundaries of truth, charity and forbearance," and instance the Trinitarians and their opposers as considering it the "sum of all truth." This I know to be true, but what relation has this to the case in hand. I hope my brother does not look upon the ordinance of baptism as my sentiment, or to be compared to the Trinity which is human. Whatever the Bible teaches on this important subject, it teaches nothing concerning a Trinity, therefore it is human; but baptism is the ordinance of God, and as you well say p. 276 "On Facts, not on opinions should our Faith be fixed, and for disobedience and not for opinions, should we reject any called a brother." It would be impossible for you my brother to state the impressions of my own mind clearer than you have done above; yes, it is for disobedience and not for opinions that I can reject any called a brother, nay if any man can say, that Natural ties should influence him not to think so, I more. Educated according to the church of England; sprinkled when a month old, taught my Catechism so soon as I could read, and confirmed by the Bishop of Chester; my Father at this present time, in England, a class leader in the Methodist society. I have however, learned that whatever I did, it was done ignorantly in unbelief. I have received that capital saying of our Lord and Master, that if any man love Father and Mother more than me, he is not worthy of me,—Again you say "Let us calmly and honestly examine for the truth, and nothing but the truth; and follow it wherever it may lead." This is what I have long been doing; but my brother will not (I am afraid) abide by his own rule, because although you cannot find truth to justify you in holding fellowship with people unbaptized, yet if truth shall lead you to say that disobedient people are not Christians, then you look to your "feelings and present experience, and the experience of thousands" I hope my brother will yet see that his feelings have led him aside, and thas he will have respect enough to his own excellent rule,

as to abandon a practice for which he says he has not, a thus saith the Lord. "May the blessing of the God of Jacob, rest upon you in your declining life," is the sincere prayear of your brother,

J. HENSHALL.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

Bro. Henshall:—It is not for victory that we write, nor to have our names registered in the records of fame. It is hoped truth is our object, and to know and do the truth, our supreme aim. I am sorry to see any thing like the spirit of controversy between us. I am unconscious of it, if it exists in me. The point at issue between us, is not the meaning of the term *baptism;* nor the design of this divine institution; for in these we agree; but whether a person can be a holy, pious believer, who has not been immersed, and whether with such, the immersed believer should have any fellowship or association. On these points you deny, and I affirm. I am glad my bro. has at length yielded to the sentiment advanced by me in a few numbers back, that a person might be a Christian (an anointed one,) but not a Christian in the full sense of the term, till he be baptized into Christ, and so put on Christ. Yet you say, "We question your *right* for applying 1 John II, 20 to persons unbaptized." By *right* I suppose you meant *correctness;* for surely you do not wish to deprive me of the *right* of thinking and of making applications for myself. Your exposition of that text confirms the position in which we profess agreement, that is, that a person may be a Christian but not in the full sense of the term; for those who went out from the church of old, must have been previously brought in by being baptized into Christ, and so put on Christ. So far they were Christians, and so was Simon Magus, and Ananias and Sapphira, yet they were destitute of the anointing, and therefore were not Christians in the full sense of the term. You strongly intimate that all those who receive the unction, know all things, and therefore you blame me for asserting that a Christian can be ignorant of the command to be immersed. Does every Christian then know all things without limitation? If so, where can they be found? not on earth I am certain. It is readily admitted, they know the truth; but do they know all the truth, without any exception? Did the pious, holy Christians, the apostles themselves, know all the truth even after the establishment of the kingdom of Christ? No: They knew not that soul reviving truth to us Gentiles, that it was their duty and divine command, to preach the gospel to the Gentile nations. Who will deny that they had received the unction? and yet they knew not all things.

You notice my "frank and honest confession in that I cannot find in the New Testament a warrant for associating with unbaptized persons." I dare not impute to you a design to pervert my language, and make it speak what I never intended My expression conveys an idea entirely different; it is this. "When we are asked for our divine authority from the New Testamen

(for receiving into the kingdom by immersion, and yet admitting the unimmersed to the blessings of the kingdom) we have none that can *fully satisfy* our own minds. To be *fully satisfied* excludes all doubt, and uncertainty. Are you, my bro. freed from all doubt respecting the meaning of every truth in the Bible? Are you freed from all doubt respecting the proper course to be pursued in every case? And will you not always pursue that course, in which there is a preponderance of evidence?

Who, my dear sir, in this day of apostacy shall presume to speak as an inspired apostle, and say, "We are of God; he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error?" I am willing that the old apostle's doctrine stand as it is. Your modern apostle's doctrine is to be sure very different, which is, "whatever the people shall think is right, and act in conformity with their views, is accepted; because the test is not, "if ye do this," or "if you hear us;" but if you are pious and holy, this will be sufficient." Such an apostle is truly latitudinarian in principle. With such I have no acquaintance among the professors of Christianity. "*Whatever*" is a very indefinite term, and may include every sceptical and infidel notion now afloat in the world. Never did I hear of a modern or ancient apostle intimating that a person could be pious and holy without hearing and doing the will of God, as far as he understood his will. Such innuendos as these, my bro. are rather calculated to stir up strife, than to edify. But waiving this, we will at once come to the points of difference between us.

You will not admit any to be pious or holy, or to be Christians, who are not immersed; for, besides what you have asserted in former numbers you now say, "I am not authorized to look upon Pedobaptists and Quakers as Christians;" and then define your understanding of a Christian to be one that is a follower of Christ, and has been immersed into his name. Therefore, you exclude all the unimmersed from being Christians; you take from them all claims to piety, to holiness, and to the remission of sins. This is inded a sweeping sentiment, and by it, if true, countless millions of the fairest characters in the profession of Christianity for many centuries back, have been swept from joyful hope to gloomy despair. If it be true, the Baptist church with her innumerable converts have from olden times been in awful delusion; for her members all professed that they believed, repented, were regenerated and pardoned before they were baptized. If it be true, then I acknowledge that I was also deceived; for years before I was immersed I lived a life of communion with God and his people; I delighted in his ways, and rejoiced to know and do his will. I experienced the scriptural evidences of pardoned sin. If I was then deceived, I am still deceived; for if I was not pious and holy then, I am not now. Should the sentiment be true, and should I ever be convinced of its truth, I shall in honesty relinquish my profession of religion, and abandon all pretensions of being any longer a tercher of it. The clouds of desperation would forever cover my mind, and the ghosts of skepticism would forever haunt me, and whisper in my ear that religion is a dream. Should you succeed in convincing the world that your sentiment is true, that the unimmersed are not Christians, that they are not pious nor holy, then you must exhibit in its stead a religion of glowing piety, and superior holiness, of apostolic Christianity, or you will drive the world to infidelity and skepticism—to the rejection of all religion.

I will suggest a few things for your consideration. Was the kingdom, which Daniel prophesied should be set up in the latter days. Was this kingdom set up anterior to the resurrection of Jesus from the dead? You will, doubtless, say, No: because John the Baptist, and Jesus, throughout their ministry on earth, preached that the kingdom of God was at hand—was nigh. This proves that it was not then set up. Again; Did the baptism, practised by John and the Saviour anterior to his resurrection, induct the persons baptized into the kingdom of heaven, or church of Christ? You will answer, no; because the kingdom of heaven was not then set up, and they could not be inducted into that which did not then exist. I ask again, did John and the Saviour baptize in the name of Christ? You will doubtless answer, no; because Paul rebaptized the twelve Ephesians, who had previously been baptized by John. Paul baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, which certainly implies that they had not been baptized in this name before. It will be conceded by you without doubt, that none of the saints, baptized before the resurrection of Christ, were in the kingdom of heaven; not even the apostles themselves; yet to them the Lord administered the supper, and taught them to pray and to praise. This is proof irrefragable, that the supper was administered by the highest authority to such as were not members of the kingdom according to the present existing law of Christ. Granted they had the spirit of the kingdom. Did my bro. ever learn from the scriptures that a person must first be immersed into Christ before he shall partake of the supper? You may say, That they who were baptized on Pentecost, are said to have continued in the apostle's doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking bread and in prayers. Does it therefore follow that these acts of worship are confined to the immersed into Christ? Did not Christ teach his disciples to pray, to break bread, and have fellowship one with another, before they were immersed into his name, or became the members of his kingdom under the New Institution? It is farther evident that the 120 including the 12 disciples were not baptized into the name of Christ. We have not the most distant hint of it. Were they not of the kingdom, and did they not partake of all the blessings of the kingdom? With regard to the church at Jerusalem, "You see says James to Paul, how many thousands of Jews there are who believe, and are all zealous of the law." They believed in Christ, and were immersed into his name, and were members

of his kingdom; yet they continued zealously in the observance of the law, in circumcision and in other rites. The apostles were reformers; but they have set us an example worthy of imitation—an example of forbearance with the prejudices and ignorance of the Jews. They did not at once reject all, who did not come fully into the gospel plan.

I view the professors of religion now & for 1200 years back to be in a very similar situation to that of the Jews in the day of Christ. They were blinded by the tradition of the elders, and so effectually blinded, that even the disciples could not be taught to understand the doctrine of God, as taught by the great Teacher from heaven. Yet who will dispute their piety and holiness, though so ignorant. "Now ye are clean, through the word I have spoken unto you"—"Abide in my love."—"Except ye abide in me." How many thousands of Gentiles are there who believe, and yet are zealous of human traditions! Yet ignorant of many truths of the gospel! Shall we in opposition to apostolic example, deny their just claims to piety and holiness, because they are ignorant that immersion is their duty? Shall we reject them from our fellowship, and refuse to join them in any act of worship, as my bro. does! In passing, I remark, that in refusing to associate with them in any act of worship, you are perfectly consistent, and the only person I know, who has followed the doctrine to its legitimate end. I remark again, that the modern doctrine, that baptism came in the room of circumcision was unknown in ancient times; for had the church at Jerusalem been taught this doctrine, they certainly would not have continued circumcision as they did.

My dear bro. you insist much upon the impropriety of any being Christians, who are disobedient; and in not submitting to immersion is the great point of disobedince with you. A disobedient Christian is a strange character. Yet, strange as it appears, how many there are to whom it attaches! They are disobedient, because ignorant of the command; but as soon as that command is made known to be their duty, how soon do they obey. Our duty is to endeavor to enlighten the ignorant, and not reject them. Who, believing the church to be in Babylon, will not like Jeremiah weep day & night for them? Who can lightly speak of them? Who will not use all his powers to rescue them?—EDITOR.

P. S. Our paper is small, and short communications are requested. Should bro. Henshall feel disposed still to communicate on this subject, it is hoped that he will compendize his ideas, and confine himself to the particular points at issue. If he has any arguments to sustain his positions, which he has not yet advanced, they shall be inserted in the Messenger; but repetitions are unnecessary. This hint I hope my correspondents will attend to. An editor is almost certain to offend some of his most valued friends by refusing to publish their communications; and should he publish them, he is certain to offend a great many others. If I continue to be an editor, I must continue to be free, and to publish only what I may judge most useful.

Dry creek, Campbell co. Ky. Feb. 18, 1831.

BROTHER STONE:—In looking over the last No. of the C. Messenger, I came to a piece written by bro. J. A. Gano, headed *The Lord's Supper*. This is a subject, that has, in these latter days, much agitated the Christian public; and many and various are the conclusions, and opinions of the persons engaged in this investigation, though all Christians consider it a high privilege, and Christian duty. The Lord's supper has been a subject of research and inquiry with me for some months past, in consequence of seeing and hearing so much written, and spoken on that subject, and some things, I consider dangerous to Christian liberty. Brother Gano asks the question "how often is it the privilege and duty of the Christian to attend to the Lord's supper!" and then answers unhesitatingly, "every first day of the week." But Paul says 1 Cor. 11, 26 "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." I cannot find the place where Christ or his apostles, make it my duty to attend to the Lord's supper on the first day of the week, more than the second. For instance; suppose I was to say, Mr. Stone, as often as you come to my house, I will treat you as well as I can. I am persuaded that Mr. Stone would not think it obligatory on him to come every first day of the week to receive my kindness; but on the contrary, he would be fully in the opinion that any time he came, he would receive my kindness, according to the proposition I had made him. Bro. G. to impress his views of first day, or weekly communion on our minds, presents us with the following figure: "Suppose I should say on the 22d of February, when the Lexingtonians assembled to celebrate the birth of Washington, Mr. Clay addressed them, would not such an expression signalize that day of the year?" &c. I answer, yes; but my bro. will here recollect that the time is here specified and definite, and that to the 22d Feb. Now to apply this figure to first day or weekly communion, is truly strange to me, when I hear Paul say "for as often as ye do this &c." Let us apply Paul's language to the celebration of Washington's birth day, and see if it will specially point to the 22d of Feb. Ye Lexingtonians, as often as ye do this &c. Now if the words *as often* do specially refer to the 22d of Feb., I acknowledge that I am at a loss how to use the expression *as often*.

But an objection may be made here, and we may say that bro. Gano has adduced special scriptural time in Acts the xx, 7, which says, "and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread." If this passage of scripture means first day or weekly communion, bro. G. will be bound to acknowledge that the Lord's supper was celebrated by the disciples, that met on the first day of the week, with bread only. This, I think, he is not prepared to do; for in the above passage of scripture, neither wine nor cup is once named.

It may be said then, if Acts the xx, 7 does not mean first day or weekly communion, what does it mean? I answer; it means

precisely what it says, and let us prove it. Acts xxvii, 35, it is said, that Paul "took bread and gave thanks to God in the presence of them all; and when he had broken it, he began to eat." If Acts xx, 7 means taking the Lords supper, then Acts xxvii, 35 means the same; for the breaking of bread is named in each passage, and that without cup or wine.

Brother G. brings forward Acts ii, 42, to prove the emblem of the Lord's body, because the writer speaks of acts of public worship. Might I not with equal propriety, bring forward Acts xxvii, 35 to prove the Lord's supper? For it says, Paul gave thanks to God in presence of them all. I would ask, is it not an act of worship to give thanks to God? If the premises, assumed by my bro., be correct, he is bound by the same reasoning to admit that Paul administered the Lord s supper to the ship's crew, before they were cast on the Island of Melita. This I think he is not willing to do. He makes Acts ii, 49 refer to temporal affairs, although it has the breaking of bread without wine or cup, the same as the other passages referred to in Acts. He next proceeds to ask the question, "did they solemnly meet as a church at Troas to eat a common meal one before the other? or for what purpose, if not the one proposed?" and refers to Heb. x, 25, where Paul exhorts his brethren not to forsake the assembling themselves together &c. I would answer his question by saying, that if they celebrated the Lord's supper they did it with bread only; as neither wine nor cup is once named in Acts the xx, 7, and I would further say, that Heb. x, 25 neither mentions day, week, bread, nor wine. He proceeds further to make some remarks on first day or weekly communion, and then refers to 1 Cor. xi, 20, 21, 33. I would again request my bro. to read these three verses above quoted, and see if he can find first day, or week, in them: but on the contrary, the 33 verse rather makes it unlimited, and says, when ye come together &c. but does not say, when you meet on the first day of the week. No: this language is not there. Permit me here to notice bro. G's imagination, in which he represents a congregation 'having gone to meeting, specially to hear preaching; but it so happens that some sleep, some laugh, and some talk; this figure is used to shew similarity of language with Paul in 1 Cor. vi, 20, 21, 33. Certain it is, that Paul in these verses specially refers to the Lord's supper, but not to a special day, or week, as may be seen by referring to the 26 v. of the same chapter. I might here pay some attention to *the* historical evidence adduced, but I deem it unnecessary, as there are so many opinions in the different church histories, that it would only be a war of words between us to no profit. I would here ask leave to suggest an idea, which I believe is received as good and valid by all civilized nations, and by all deliberative bodies, both civil and ecclesiastical. is this, that where there is a multiplicity of evidence, which positive to one point or fact, that surmise or supposition has the shadow of bearing in the case. Therefore I would desire

to bring all the reasoning of myself and bro. to the infallible word of God, and try it by that unerring standard of eternal truth. When we come to the above named rule, (the scriptures) and there examine in respect of the Lord's supper, we have the testimony of Christ and his apostles. See Mat. xxvi, 26, 27. Mark xiv, 22, 23. Luke xxii, 19, 20, and 1 Cor. xi, 17 to the 34 v. I invite all the lovers of our lovely Jesus to read attentively the above passages of God's word, and see if they are not specially on the subject of the Lord's supper, and the first day of the week is not once named in either of them. Seeing this is the fact my Christian brethren, let us be careful not to take the suppositions of poor erring man, though he may possess all the acquired knowledge in the world. I should like to say something about the Sabbath, or first day as it is called; but I forbear, lest I should be too tedious and lengthy.

In the close of this communication, permit me to say with candor, that I have not written one sentence to hurt or embarrass the feelings of any person on earth; but on the contrary, to elicit information on the subject of the Lord's supper, and such information as will more closely unite the children of God in Christian love and union throughout the world. I assure my Christian brethren, that I am firm in the belief that the observance of the Lord's supper is a duty, and command, to which all Christians should attend. I am also as firm in the belief, that if I were honestly and conscientiously to celebrate the Lord's supper every day in the week, there is not a passage in the good word of God, that forbids it. On the contrary, it tells me "as often as you do this &c." I wish well to all mankind but I am bound to acknowledge my partialities for all those Christians, that take the lovely Jesus for their lawgiver, and his law for their only rule of faith and practice. I am certain that this Lawgiver, and his law will ultimately prevail over human wisdom, self aggrandizement, and tradition of fallible man. My prayer day and night is, Lord, unite thy children together in love, that all men may know that they are the disciples of Jesus, because they have love one to another. JOHN G. ELLIS.

For the Christian Messenger.

NO. 2.

REMISSION OF SIN.

While I claim to myself the right to controvert all that I deem erroneous in the religious sentiments of others, I concede to them the same right, to controvert any that I may entertain.—And while this is assumed and yielded as a mutual right, I desire it to be distinctly understood; that, on my part, the exercise of it, does not proceed from an unfriendly disposition towards those whose opinions and views are opposed. I do not believe that the word of God authorizes, in any degree, the belief that the sins of the Gentiles are, or ever have been remitted in the water, or in the action of baptism. Feeling confident of the truth

of this sentiment, and the error of the opposite one, I feel it to be a duty to adduce proof of the truth of the one, and of the fallacy of the other.

I would define remission of sins, as others have done, to consist in forgiveness, or pardon; that is, the giving up of the punishment due to them. Justification is of the same meaning in the Gospel, and consists in remission of sin, and obsolution from guilt and punishment; or an act of free grace, by which God pardons the sinner, and accepts him as righteous in the account of the atonement of Christ. Meritorious justification is predicable only of sinless beings, while gratuitous justification is that alone, which is suited to the state of sinners; it is an acquital from condemnation by free forgiveness, and an acceptance of him into a state of favor. The instrument of gospel justification is faith alone. Thus God is said to justify the ungodly by faith—his faith is counted to him for righteousness, Rom. iv, 5; and being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into the grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God. Rom. v, 1, 2. The meritorious ground or cause of the remission of sin, made so by the grace of God, is the blood of Christ: "this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins" Mat. xxvi, 28. All having sinned "the righteousness of God is by the faith of Jesus Christ unto all, & upon all them that believe—we are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, Rom. iii, 22–25. The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself: in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace. Eph. i, 3. v, 7. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, Col. i, 14. If there be a single principle in the doctrines of grace, among those taught by the Apostles, which can be considered fundamental, it must certainly be that of the remission of sin through the death of Jesus Christ—upon this subject there is no difference of opinion between the Baptist Reformers and myself. The only question between them and myself is this: Is the efficacy of the blood of Christ, in the remission of the sins of believing Gentiles, by divine appointment, suspended upon their being baptized or immersed in water? They take the affirmative side of the question, and I the negative. Peter must determine this question under the infallible direction of the Holy Spirit.

To Peter was given the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, to open the gospel and to pronounce the order of the Kingdom to the Gentiles. He had, moreover, the qualifications bestowed upon him by the King and the Judge of the living and the dead, so infallibly to bind and loose on earth, as to oblige him to ratify his declarations and decisions in heaven. Let us turn then to

the tenth chapter of the acts of the Apostles, and other passages, to learn the truth on this subject. I pass by at this time the account of the conversion and Baptism of the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and of Saul of Tarsus, on account of the circumstances by which they were distinguished from the Gentiles. They shall be attended to in my next number.

After the great preparation had been made by the revelations of the spirit, and the supernatural appearance to Peter, and the communications and instructions of the Angel to Cornelius which were sent to Peter, Peter set out to visit the town of Cornelius, at Cesarea who was an officer, a centurion of the band called the Italian band. As he approached it, Cornelius met him and told him that he had sent for him, "now said he we are all here before God" (Cornelius, his kinsmen and near friends) "to hear all things that are commanded thee of God. Then Peter opened his mouth and said, "of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:) that word I say ye know which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem: whom they slew and hanged on a tree: him God raised up from the dead the third day, and showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God, to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

"While Peter was yet speaking these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify or glorify God. Then answered Peter, "Can any man forbid water that thee should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we. And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days" Acts x, 34–48.

Now I ask, were these Gentiles *in their sins* when they received the Holy Ghost, spake with new tongues and glorified God, both of which were done before they were baptized? Or, were their sins not remitted through faith? and were they not received into the divine favor, the moment they believed what Peter said concerning Jesus Christ? and were not the gifts of the Holy Ghost

a seal and confirmation of these facts, both of which occurred before they were baptized? After that they believed, (before they were baptized) they were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise which was the earnest of their inheritance, Eph. I, 13, 14. Being the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, God sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts crying Abba Father. They were then baptized into Christ, and put him on, Gal. III. 26, 27, ch. 4, 6. We will let Peter explain this matter. In Acts 11 we are informed that when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision, contended with him for going in to the Gentiles and eating with them. But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it in order unto them. Peter told them that the angel directed Cornelius to send for him, (Peter) who shall tell thee (C.) words, whereby thou and thy house shall be saved. And, said Peter, when I began to speak, (that is when he had already spoken what was stated in the 10 chap.) the Holy Ghost fell upon them, as it did upon us (the 120 Acts I, 15,) at the beginning, Acts II, 1–4. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, Acts I, 45. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gifts, as he did unto us who believed; what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace and glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life, Acts XI, 2–18. It deserves notice that although *Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it by order unto them* that were of the circumcision, so as perfectly to satisfy them, that God had granted to the Gentiles repentance unto life, for which they glorified God, he said not one word to them about his having baptized them—nor did he, when telling the Gentiles *all things that were commanded him of God to tell them*; and even the *words whereby they should be saved*, tell them that they were to be baptized for the remission of their sins, or in order to obtain their remission. The reason he did not tell them this, was, that it was not included in the words which God commanded him to tell them, whereby they should be saved. A proof of it is, the Holy Ghost fell upon them as he did upon Peter, and the rest of the one hundred an twenty disciples who believed at the beginning, by which God testified that he had remitted the sins of the Gentiles, and received them into his favour before they were baptized. There can be no mistake here, because the gift in a miraculous way of the Holy Ghost, or the baptism of the Holy Ghost was given to them, to prove that God had purified their hearts by faith, and given them repentance unto life before they were baptized, and the apostles, and they of the circumcision who contended with Peter, received this testimony as conclusive in the case. We will turn to the 15th chapter of the Acts, and hear Peter further upon this subject. Here, before the council at Jerusalem, composed of the apostles, elders and brethren, over which the Holy Ghost

presided—a council to be sure, very different from the ecclesiastical councils and associations of this day. Peter rose up and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospl and believe. And God which knoweth the hearts bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, having purified their hearts by faith. I use the new translation. Acts xv, 7–9. That is, God having purified the hearts of the Gentiles by faith, he baptized them with, or gave them the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost as his witness or proof of it; and after he had thus purified their hearts, and sealed them with the Holy Spirit of promise, after they believed, which was an earnest of their heavenly inheritance; Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord, Eph. I, 13, 14.

The baptism or the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, which were bestowed upon these Gentiles, did not give them faith or save them, for they had faith and were justified before they received this gift, and the gift of tongues &c. was bestowed upon them as God's witness, seal and confirmation, that what Peter had said was true, and that he had through the Faith of Jesus Christ, imparted to them, by the words of Peter, given to them eternal life.

The quotations that I have made from the Acts of the Apostles, are the only divinely authenticated narrative of the order and plan of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles. All that is said in the Epistles relative to this subject, is by way of allusion, and must be interpreted and explained agreeably to the order of faith, remission of sin and baptism, as stated in their connection and order of succession in the Acts of the Apostles.

We have now seen in what sense Peter and the rest of the apostles, and the Jewish converts understood God's plan or method in the gospel, by which he pardons or remits the sins of the Gentiles, and purifies their hearts, which I confidently believe justified me, when I said that, baptism as administered to the Gentiles, is wholly misapprehended as to its design and use, when it is regarded as the *action by, or in which their sins are remitted*, and justified me also when I said, "that it is the doctrine of the New Testament, that God justifies the Gentiles by faith alone," I mean Gentile enemies and sinners. Such cannot be justified in any degree by works, till they are justified by faith without works. Till then they are in a state of guilt and under condemnation, and the wrath of God abideth on them. This was their state and character when Christ died for them, and so their actual deliverance from that state through faith in Christ's blood, is God's justifying the ungodly, Rom. IV, 5. This is the principle of justification for which Paul argues. But James treats of the justification of *the righteous*; that is, of persons who are not only justified in Paul's sense, but who in consequence of this are

righteous, by doing good and righteous works; for he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous, 1 John III, 7. They are not forgetful hearers but doers of the work, James I, 25: they practise pure and undefiled religion v. 27: they are Christians—but more of this hereafter. "Ye are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, Gal. III, 27; 1 John v, 1. The great principle of Christian fellowship is faith.—by faith we are justified from all things, and hold fellowship with the Father and the Son, and with the apostles; and by it Christians hold fellowship with one another. If I ever have known *feelingly* and *experimentally* the pardoning grace and love of God, it was several years before I was immersed, and it was during the period that I had no thought of being immersed; being justified by faith, I had peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ. Notwithstanding this, I consider it the duty of all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, to be immersed, as soon as they do believe, with the approbation of the heart. I have intentionally omitted saying any thing about the design and use of baptism, in this number; neither have I attended to the baptism of the 300 on the day of Pentecost, or to Saul of Tarsus. I will take up the subject in my next number, and endeavor to show the reason of the difference between the baptism of the Jews, and of the Gentiles, or the difference in the account of them, so as to reconcile them in reference to their baptism, and maintain the principle that there is one God, who justifies the Jew by faith, and the Gentile through faith.

ARCHIPPUS.

N. B. Errata for the 1st No. of Archippus. In p. 43, 6th line from the top put a comma instead of a period after "transubstantiation". In the 23d line, for "saving love," read saving laver. In page 45 21st line from the top, for "Jesus' disciples and Christians," read John's disciples, and Christ's.

At the request of our worthy correspondent; Archippus, we will give him a patient hearing, before we make any remarks on his numbers.

EDITOR.

INFANTS IN HELL.

BROTHER STONE:—Having seen an abusive article, in the Presbyterian Advocate of October 1830, against a piece published by you, in July last, in the C. M. on the subject of infants being in hell; I am induced to submit a few remarks to the public, if you deem them worty of your columns.

I do not undertake this, because I conceive you unable to meet the arguments of your opponents; (for in fact you have substantially answered all they can say, in opposition to the positions, taken by you;) but my object is, to show that you have a friend, who honestly believes with you, that the Calvinistic system, impartially viewed, and followed to its legitimate consequences, involves the damnation of many unoffending infants in hell.

I do acknowledge, I see little but abuse, in the article in question. We may infer that you have the talents and learning of the Presbyterian Clergy enlisted against you, on this, as well as other subjects; seeing that the P. Advocate is published by an association of Ministers. That such a combination of ministers, should write under the influence of such a bitter spirit, as is manifested in the article to which I refer, is truly alarming to the pious; and to say the least, renders their own election somewhat doubtful: "for if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his," saith an apostle. The apology must be, that they have a bad cause; and find a difficulty in supporting it.

To these gentlemen the damnation of infants, seems to be a very unpleasant doctrine. The terms, *infants in hell*, they call, "horrifick." They call the doctrine an "odious sentiment." They say, "we explicitly disavow for ourselves, and our Calvinistic friends generally, if not universally, that infant damnation makes any part of our creed, either in the confession of faith, or in our public ministry. It is no where to be found as a doctrine of the Presbyterian church" &c. From these quotations it is evident, that the writers of the Presbyterian Advocate, wish the public to understand, that the damnation of infants, forms no part of their creed, or faith. That the contrary is true, from their own creed, which they pledge themselves to maintain, at the time of their induction into office as ministers, I think, every plain man, may easily know.

In support of what I here assert, I will make a few quotations from their creed. Chap. v, 3. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his own glory, *some men* and *angels* are predestinated to everlasting life, and *others* foreordained to everlasting death." The creed further asserts, that the *number* of these *angels* and *men* is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished. From the same creed, we read the following, Chap. x, 3. "*Elect infants* dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit." Is it not strange, that ministers should deny, or be ashamed of their own doctrine? how can they expect others to support it, when they deny it themselves?

What ideas can the terms, Elect infants convey, but that there are some elect and some non-elect? If those fallible men, who made the confession of faith, had thought otherwise, how easily could they have expressed it. They could have said, every infant, dying in infancy, will be saved.

But this they knew would have ruined their system, and destroyed the chain they wished to be preserved throughout their book. Just before they introduced the subject of infants, they described the elect, as the only ones effectually called; that they are wholly passive in coming to Christ, making them as helpless as infants, in obtaining a knowledge of their election. The confession further asserts, that when the elect are brought savingly to the knowledge of the truth, that it is without regard to faith

or works in them; so that elect infants, and elect adults, are put upon the same footing, as to ability, or agency. If this be the Presbyterian doctrine on the side of the elect, it follows, with irresistible clearness, that no differance ought to be made on the other side. the side of the non-elect, whether they die as adults or infants.

The doctrine of non-elect infants, is deducible from the certain and definite number of the elect, which the confessions says, cannot be either increased or diminished. In this, there is no word of comfort respecting infants. If when they die, they should not be of this certain or definite number, they must be lost. This is the natural conclusion, from the words of the confession. If the makers of it had thought otherwise, how easily could they have inserted it.

A weak attempt is made, in the article in question, to show that elect infants may mean all infants; and in support of which, the *elect angels*, and the elect lady, mentioned in the scriptures, are adduced as proof; whereas to every plain man, these passages prove the contrary. If there were no angels not elect, nor any ladies not elect, the argument might have some weight, but as this is not the fact, the argument is worse than nothing.

Indeed, throughout the confession book, a partial election is urged; and, as there is no exception made, it is to be understood in a partial sense, wherever it occurs.

The alarm, which these gentleman, Presbyterians take at their system's involving the *damnation* of *infants*, I think, a very favorable indication; because this, I believe, to be much the mildest part of their system; and if they are so much alarmed at this. they ought to be much more so, at the damnation of the non-elect adults, seeing that by their system, they are placed without their agency, in a much worse condition.

Let some of the well known doctrines of the Presbyterian church be stated, viz: That Adam's sin is imputed to the non-elect;—that they are accountable for it; that no more of the non-elect ever did, or ever will exist, or can be born into this world, than their Maker appointed: that not one of them, can ever die, sooner or later, than the time fixed by the Almighty; that Christ did not die or suffer with a view to eternally save one of them; and that notwithstanding these facts, their Maker holds them accountable for all their own sins, as well as that of Adam, in the final day of judgment

According to these views, let me ask every plain man, if it would not be a great favor, for all the non-elect to die, when infants, and be punished for Adam's sin only. rather than be compelled to live until they are twenty, fifty, eighty, or a hundred years old. and then forced to die. with all the weight of their actual sins. in addition to that of Adam's, and for which sins, (Adam's and their own) to be punished in hell to all eternity?. It will be further admitted by the Calvinists, that these non-elect souls, never could, during their lives, for a moment, have lived

as Christians; of course, they go to destruction of necessity.—Now I do say, under the views just given, that the damnation of infants, is by far the mildest part of the Calvinistic system. Better to perish for one sin, than a thousand; this every one can understand.

Brother Stone, the writers of the article before us, have done you great honor, (tho' not intentionally) by saying that their creed has been so offensive to you, that you have been disgorging it, in different portions, &c. If they would follow your example, I think it would add greatly to their moral and religious health. And as these preachers are now so much troubled about the damnation of infants; I do hope, they will continue awake to the consequences of their system, till they abandon it altogether. Yours in gospel bonds.

S. T.

REPLY TO AN "OBSERVER."

A correspondent under this name, appeared in our last No., requesting our views of dancing, balls and theatres, and asked, whether such practices were compatible with the profession of Christianity? I answer.

Of all the fashionable amusements of the world, these stand pre-eminent to captivate the mind, and to destroy all serious and religious impressions on the heart With this sentiment universal experience accords. The pious, the spiritual man feels no disposition to engage in such diversions. His affections are attracted to nobler objects, being set on things above, and not on things on the earth. He feels no disposition to associate with such company as attend such places, for such amusements. I would wish no better evidence of irreligion, in any person, than his attendance on such places. This is considered good evidence against such a person's piety by all Christian societies, which possess and maintain the power of religion in the soul.—Therefore the members of such societies, are forbidden such practices, and exclude from fellowship, should any after admonition engage and persist in them. Should any church suffer such offending members to continue among them, it plainly proves, that such church is in a bad state—it brings reproach upon the profession of religion, and disgrace upon the cause which they have espoused—it becomes a derision to the world, and a stumbling block to the weak. In such a church the Spirit of God never dwells, darkness, bondage and death are their portion.

I have known parents, even professors of religion, who pleaded the propriety of sending their children to a dancing school, (impudently now called, a dancing Academy!) in order to learn them good manners, a neat walk, and such other *charming* accomplishments. But who, generally, are the teachers of these fine arts? Dancing masters are commonly of the lowest class of society, or men once in better circumstances, but who by extravagance, intemperance and gambling, have dissipated their money. They having learned to bow and step gracefully, and to caper monkey-like in a ball room; being indisposed to labor

for an honest support, and too proud to beg, they undertake the art of politely forming the walk, steps, and external manners of the young. Will parents, religious parents, encourage such drones of human society, by putting their children under their tuition? What do they learn but pride and extravagance, folly and trifling? Such parents betray their destitution of religion, and should not be retained in any Christian church.

Did we ever see a pious dancing master, or stage actor? Are such ever found engaged in the holy exercises of prayer? Is it not as rare to find a dancing master in a church, as to find his grave in a church-yard? No tomb-stone covers him with this inscription, *Here lies the dancing master.* This would be thought a burlesque in death, and why should it not be considered such in life?

In olden times, parents taught their children themselves to better purpose. They taught their daughters to step neatly at the spinning wheel and their sons at the plough—such children were a blessing to society, and no pest to physicians, to restore health impaired by corsetts, thin dresses &c. Such children added to their country's wealth, and respectability, and were no charge nor burden to it. Till the return of such days, better hopes can hardly be indulged. A few years ago, during the revival in our town, the ball rooms were neglected, dancing masters unknown, stage actors forsook us, and a dancing party could not be collected. As soon as our religious (rather irreligious,) contentions banished religion from amongst us, then the ball rooms and theatres were crowded—dancing masters were encouraged, and parties of pleasure, and gambling increased. This is an evidence that these amusements and religion are incompatible.

EDITOR.

☞Several advertisements of bad men have been sent me to publish in the Messenger. In one or two instances I at first did publish such; but have long since declined. The subject is of too delicate a nature, and by no means suited to a religious journal. Several communications have been also sent me, for the purpose of correcting slanderous reports. My correspondents must excuse me for not publishing such things. If I publish for one, impartiality would compel me to publish for another; and thus the Messenger would become the degraded bearer of libels, war, and strife.

EDITOR.

RECEIPTS FROM FEB. 1ST TO MARCH 1ST.

New York—Elder Ira Brown, 3, for S. Marvin, E. Ensley, and Maj. Lyon; Js. Steers 3. Elder F. R. Palmer, for Mrs. Downs and H. Ewatt, 2; Elder L. Flemming for N. Graves, 2. *Canaan, O.*—JohnMiles, 2. *New Paris*—Elder L. Purviance, 2. *Georgetown Ky.*—T. Johnson, 1; Js. Gains, 1. A. Roberson, 1. *Georgia*—Elder Jac. Callahan, 2. *Bryant's Station*—Josi. Gayle, 3. *Bethel*—Mrs. Ford, 1. *Mt. Carmel*—Eld. Palmer for A. Keller and N. Spears, 2. *Dry Creek*—J. G. Ellis for Mrs. Matthews, 1.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. APRIL, 1831. [No. 4.

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

THE CONFERENCE IN TERRA CONFUSA.

(CONTINUED.)

The Conference met according to adjournment. After prayer, The Report of the Committee, appointed to draft a summary of doctrine as a bond of union, was called for. Bishop M——, the Chairman of the Committee, rose and addressed the Conference as follows:

Bishop M——Your Committee met for the purpose of their appointment. But though several summaries were proposed, in not one could we all agree. We therefore resolved to present to this Conference the several drafts exhibited in the Committee hoping that in your collected wisdom, one might yet be formed, and adopted unanimously by us all. He then presented the drafts to the Moderator, who delivered them to the Clerk to read. He then read the first as follows:

ART. 1. That there is but one God, existing in 3 persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of one substance, equal in powpr & glory.

2. That the second person of trinity was the eternal Son of God. That he became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul in the womb of the Virgin, and born of her; that though he has two natures, yet his person is one.

3. That he, as our surety, lived and died to satisfy the demands of law and justice against the sinner, which righteousness is imputed to the sinner for justification.

4. That, faith, which is the gift of God, receives this righteousness, and enables us to perform acceptable obedience to the commands.

5. That faith, repentance, and regeneration should be urged on all—and that whoever shall profess faith, and manifest it by repentance and an unreserved obedience to all the commands of the gospel, should be baptized, together with his household and thus be inducted into the kingdom or church of God on earth.