RECEIPTS FROM MAY 11TH TO JUNE 6TH;

KENTUCKY. *Georgetown*—M.—M. V. Thompson for 6 nos. of 6 vol. and 6 of 7—H. Ready for 6 and 7—*Versailles*—Mrs. Susan Caldwell for 7 vol—*Canerun*—Mrs. Wood for vol. 6; Wm. Coyle for do.—*Bethel*—Js. Burch for 7; I. Lewis do.; H. Lindsay do.; Jesse Beauchamp for 6 and ½ of 7.—*Claysville*—Geo. Williams, for A. Duncan for 6—*Union*—Eld. T. M. Allen for A. Rice, for 7—*New-Castle*—By Eld. T. M. Allen for I. Owens for 6—*Shelbyville*—By Wm. Samuel for 7—*Falmouth*—By P. M. for Tho. Demoss, 1 25.

TENNESSEE. *Isom's Store*—By G. Cathey 5 00 in full for all vols. in his agency.

OHIO. *Felicity*—Edwd. Satts vol. 6, Eld. I Powel 700; *Greenville*—A. Scribner 5 00—*Georgetown*—Js. Clark for 7th in full 5 00.

INDIANA. *Rising-Sun*—Jac. Fisher for 7—*Madison*—by L. Jameson, for R. Blair, for 6—for A. L. Bailey $2—for R. Hart $1 for 6 and $1 for 7—Js. Agan for 7—J. Floyd do.25—*Honey-Creek*—Rees Morgan for 7—*Paoli*—By Eld. L. Byram for 7, 10 00 in full for all his agency.

VIRGINIA. *Giles C. H.*—By A. Stewart for L. Duncan for 6 & 7—for P. Lucas for 7—for D. Hall do.—for Js. Straley do.

SOUTH CAROLINA. By Eld. I. L. Davis 15 00 for 7, in full for all his agency.

MISSOURI. *Fayette*—By Henry Burnam for Jason Harrison 00 for 4, 5, 6—for H. Chrisman for 7, for Wm. Newcomford.

NOTICE.

Our Agents and Patrons have our warm acknowledgements for what they have done for the Messenger; yet we wish them to remember that punctuality is important to the work. There are many, very many, who have negected to pay—many are yet in arrears for former volumes. We earnestly solicit our friends toremit us their dues immediately. Our subscribers ought to remember that for a less term than one year they cannot discontinue: the loss to usis great and forbids it to be done. Postmasters should remember that they are liable for the numbers sent to their offices, and not taken out by subscribers, unless they give us timely information of it. We intreat our agents to exert themselves to us justice. EDITORS.

NOTICE.

The awful severity of the Cholera, in this place, will furnish an ample apology to our patrons for the delay of this and the next No.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY

BARTON W. STONE & JOHN T. JOHNSON,

ELDERS IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. VII. { GEORGETOWN, KY. *JULY*, 1833. } NO. 7.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers, if paid on the reception of the first number—or $1 25, if paid within six months. They who procure eight subscribers, and remit the money to the Editors, 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.

WHY DID CHRIST DIE?

The world would have been content to look upon the spectacle of a crucified Saviour, with a vague feeling of wonder and mystery, instead of seeking in the calm and grateful contemplation of this important event, those salutary influences, which it is calculated to convey to the serious and devout mind.

The subject is divested of mystery, if not of all difficulty, by the brief account of it, given by the Apostle Peter: "For Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, *that he might bring us to God.*" "Christ hath suffered for sins." *On account of sins*, is evidently the apostle's meaning, not as a punishment for sins, since Christ we know was without sin.

It was because sin was in the world, that he came "to bless mankind by turning them from their iniquities," and it was the sinfulness of men that closed his mission of mercy with death upon the Cross. Christ, then, suffered on account of sins. He suffered "the just for the unjust." Yet not *instead of* the unjust. The Apostles language implies no such idea. They are not exempted from suffering by his endurance: they are not authorized to sin by his obedience; he has not, he *could not* release them from their individual responsibility to the laws of God.—The parent who practises self denial for the sake of his children, does it not in *their stead*, but for *their* benefit. Christ then suffered "the just *on behalf of* the unjust," the good, for the benefit of the unworthy. God loved the world in spite of its wickedness; he pitied his creatures on account of their misery; and

"while they were yet without strength, Christ died for the ungodly."

He suffered "that he might bring *us to God.*" Where then was the object of his suffering; it was not to bring *God to us*; it was not to reconcile God to his creatures, but his creatures to God. The change to be effected, was to take place in *them* not in *Him*. It was they they that needed *reformation*, not he, that wanted mercy. He is *unchangeable* in his character and designs; but they must change from sin to holiness, if they would enjoy the light of his favour.

The Scriptures uniformly represent the plan of redemption by Christ, as proceeding from the fixed and unchanging benignity of God, and designed to operate with a benignant influence upon the state and character of human beings.

"God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us (the Apostles) the work of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did *beseech you* by us.—The sufferings of Christ evince with special force, the goodness of God and his love for a dying world. This love of God for his creatures must have been surpassingly great, when to enlighten and save the world, it was ordained that a being so pure, so good, so benevolent and so truly great as this Son of God, should be "the man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," and be "led as a lamb to the slaughter." Viewed in this light, surely the sufferings of Crist should "bring us to God." They should have the same influence, when regarded as exhibiting the earnestness of the Saviour's own love to mankind. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." That love was never daunted by the most appalling dangers, nor chilled by the deepest ingratitude, nor worn out by the severest suffering, nor overcome by the tortures of the cross. In this last act the love of Christ rose to its consummation. Compared to this, all the labours and supports of his life sunk into the shade. And for this, his love, are we not impelled to the grateful and affectionate love of Christ? Whatever sentiments, then, we are led to entertain towards the Saviour, by contemplation of his character, and life and death, are necessarily and naturally the *means* of "bringing us to God."

Hence "no man cometh unto the Father but by (him.)"—"There is no other name under heaven whereby (we) can be saved."

His sufferings also 'bring us to God,' by exhibiting the perfection of virtue in his example. A great part of the moral efficiency of the gospel lies in the efficacy of the Saviour's bright example. And it is in the circumstances of his death, that his example shines brightest, and his virtues gain their consummation.

What constitutes the *perfection of human virtue*? Is it a

strength of religious principle that never yields; a firmness of virtuous resolution which is never shaken by difficulty, danger or suffering! Behold perfection, then, in the closing scene of the life of Jesus. The prospect of death by torture could not divert him from his steady purpose.

He might have escaped the impending fate, by desisting from a course which was so obnoxious to the rulers of the earth, but he chose rather to be steadfast in his Father's work. He might, even in the last extremity, "have prayed to his father, and he should have given him more than twelve legions of angels."—"But how then," (his own pious reflection,) "should the scriptures be fulfilled, that so it must be." If it be the *perfection of benevolence*, to which few can attain not only to suppress the groan of torture, and the sigh of shuddering agony, but to be able effectually to rally the thoughts in the midst of exhaustion and suffering, and devote the last accents of expiring life to the protection of kindred, and the consolation of friends. Nor this alone—but to breathe forgiveness of insulting enemies, and invoke the pardon of God on those who are actually inflicting the tortures of death—to say "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do;" if this be the perfection of benevolence, it is found in the death of Christ. Where shall we look for the *perfection of piety* if not at the Cross of Jesus? There it ministered tranquility and peace in the midst of agony; there, while it inspired the prayer of forgiveness and love, it taught the sufferer to commend his spirit with pious trust into the hands of his father and his God. The example of Christ then exhibits the *perfection of virtue*, and particularly in the circumstances of his last sufferings.

And why should perfection be exhibited, unless to excite our admiration, and to animate our efforts, to be like our Lord?—The contemplation is assuredly designed and calculated "to bring us to God."

But, if we never approach the contemplation of this life, the character, the mission and the death of Jesus; if we do not put ourselves in the way of their beneficial influences of such a contemplation; if we do not subject ourselves to the control of the gospel, it must be all in vain to us, that God loved the world and sought to reconile the world to himself; it must be in vain to us, that Christ lived, and taught and suffered on account of sins, and rose again for the justification of true believers.

Through Christ, God draws us to himself by every cord of love; he reveals his own character; he puts his glory in the face of Jesus; he teaches us our duty; he inspires us with the hope of eternal life, and incites us to the imitation of him who has gone before us in the race of perfection and first reached the goal of blessedness—we must follow whither he leads; we must go in the path which Christ has trodden, if we desire to be with him where he is, at the right hand of God.

E. H.

INDIANAPOLIS, IA., 5th mo. 29th, 1833.

Dear Fellow-being—

One of thy numbers of 1 mo. 1833, was handed me, called the Christian Messenger. In perusing it I have found some things, that I thought ought to be corrected, and therefore request a place in thy paper.

First; Thee seems to have more confidence in Peter the Apostle, than thee has in his master (Jesus,) or the beloved Apostle John. We have many instances on holy record of Peter misunderstanding his dear Lord: one time he says, "thou shalt never wash my feet. But after he got his eyes a little opened he lets him wash his feet. In another case our Saviour had to rebuke him, saying, thou savorest not the things that be of God but of men. I have no doubt that Peter did for a while sincerely think that the outward ordinances were to continue, when he said, repent and be baptised, &c. But it seems he was on the decline when the Eunuch requested it, for Peter's answer was If thou believest thou mayest be baptised. And in the case of Cornelius, nine years afterwards, he says, "who can forbid water that these should not be Baptised." So that he seemed not to put that stress upon it, that he did on the day of Penticost, after he had seen such an eminent instance of the power and excellence of Christ's baptism of the Spirit in the house of Cornelius; and we find when Peter was drawn up by them of the circumcision, for this work in the house of Cornelius, he rehearsed the matter, saying when I began to preach, the Holy ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Now mind Peter's answer.—Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptised with water, but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost. Now, my dear friend, here is an eminent instance of Christ's spiritual power, displayed, fulfilling ancient prophecy, that when the spirit of truth is come, he will guide into all truth. So it appeared in this case, for he shewed Cornelius his duty; and also Peter his duty. Now here we see an eminent instance of love mingled by his spirit.

And this being led of the spirit makes a Son of God; for it is recorded, "As many as are led by the spirit are the sons of God. For Paul was purely arrested in his unrighteous course by the Spirit alone testifies against these works of the flesh, both of circumcision and of water baptism; for he says it is not the putting away the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience. And he declares in another place that the hand-writing of ordinances was nailed to the cross with Christ. And John's works seemed to be works of an outward nature, for he said, Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Adding, there cometh one after me that shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost. And John the Divine eighty years afterwards says, he saw that kingdom descend, and called it the holy Jerusalem, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels: on the east three gates, on the north three gates, on the south three gates, on the west three gates—and her light was like unto a stone most precious.

Now, my dear friend, here is an account of at least twelve gates into this kingdom, and all are spiritual; for there is an angel at each gate, while thee and thy followers seem to have but one gate and no angel; a dispensation that John said should decrease. Christ being the only foundation of his own Church, so Christ being the power of God, his members must be spiritual, for we find it is said, he that hath not the spirit of Christ he is none of his; so God being a spirit, and the word Christ a spirit and the members having the same spirit, here is a sweet intercourse from the Father to the Son, and from the Son onward to all mankind that will hearken to it. Christ said, I am the light of the world; and he was the corner stone; and my sheep hear my voice and follow me. Now, friend, this is all spiritual—how can any one profess to be a follower of Christ, and deny being led by the spirit? Some we find in Christ's day thought they had eternal life in the Scriptures. Christ rebuked them for this, saying, Read the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me. But ye will not come unto me that ye might have life. I find now that there are many so far departed from the knowledge of the true God that they call the Scriptures the word of God, a name that is contrary to its own plain language, for the Scripture does not call itself the word, but gives the word exclusively to God, and his only Son, or word, as thee may find in the first of John. And that was the word Paul said we preach. And, friend, it is lamentable to hear that the clergy of this day have so far lost sight of heavenly things, as to have nothing to preach to the people but what they find on record written eighteen hundred years ago, Moses and the prophets, and apostles in that dark day seem to have kept to that divine teaching of the Spirit of Revelation in the heart, which Christ and the Apostles and Prophets predicted should be more fully manifested in the latter days.—So, friend, farewell; live in peace, die in peace, and the God of love and peace be with thee.

JAMES RHOADS.

REPLY TO JAMES RHOADS.

Dear Friend—

We have attended to your correctionsof some points which you say are found in the Christian Messenger. We profess not infallibility, and therefore listen honestly to any objection made to any thing we advance.

1. You object; "Thee seems to have more confidence in Peter, the Apostle, than thee has in his master; Jesus, or

the beloved apostle John." We confess we cannot feel the force of your objection, because you have made no specifications, on which you base it. You have taken for granted what needs proof, and which we honestly deny. We do not esteem Peter more highly than the other inspired apostles of our Lord; but to insinuate that we esteem any of the apostles, or any man, more highlythan Jesus, is an outrage on our profession, which we are bound to repel. Lest we might esteem Peter too highly, and pay too much regard to his words, you give us a detail of his supposed imperfections, especially that of his misunderstanding his Lord. Hence you think that Peter misunderstood the commission given him by the Lord to preach and baptize—our Lord intending by the baptism, as you think, *that* of the Spirit; but Peter thought he meant *that* of water. And therefore he practised baptism by water at Pentecost, and for some time after, when he baptized the Eunuch. Then he began to decline from his faith in water baptism; but yet continued it for nine years afterwards, when he baptised Cornelius.

My friend is mistaken with regard to Peter baptizing the Eunuch—This was done by Philip the Evangelist. I can not, in any instance, find the faith of Peter wavering on the propriety of water baptism. The case you allege is by no means to the point. "Who can forbid water that these should not be baptised." Had they been Jews, none would have doubted the propriety of their being baptized: but they being Gentiles, many doubted whether they had any right to baptism, and of being thus inducted into the kingdom of Christ.

My friend is again mistaken when he presents Paul testifying that baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh,but the answer of a good conscience. These are Peter's words.—This baptism, Peter says, was the antitype or figure of the salvation of Noah and his family from the deluge of waters in the ark—this baptism, as there stated, refers to the resurrection of Jesus. How can these things apply to the baptism of the Holy Spirit? But you say that Paul testifies against these works of the flesh, circumcision and water baptism. You, my friend, are the first man I ever heard of, who has ventured to class the divine ordinances of God with the works of the flesh. Do read what are the works of the flesh as described by Paul in Gallatians. 5 chap and you will never indulge the sentiment another moment. But you still contend that Paul testifies against the outward ordinance of water baptism, when he declared that the hand writing of ordinances was nailed to the cross with Christ. Yes; and I ask, what were those ordinances contained in *hand-writing*, when Christ was nailed to the Cross? You are certain, and so are all the intelligent, that water baptism was not contained in hand writing *then*, nor was any part of the New Testament then written. The ordinances contained in hand

writing were in the Hebrew Scriptures, and to these the apostle plainly alludes.

You admit that John the Immerser baptized in water; and that the apostles did the same for 9 or 10 years after the resurrection of Christ; and that the christians for centuries after did the same. Now, my friend, in what part of the sacred record do we find that water baptism was to be done away? In the commission to the apostle the Lord tells them to preach and baptise. They had always understood baptism to mean to be immersed in water. Our Lord knew that this was their understanding of the word: had he intended a different meaning, would he not have declared it? and not have left them in error? The apostles practised according to this understanding at Pentecost, and ever after—for we never hear of them desisting from the practice. Now if they were in error, the promise of the Spirit, which was to lead them into all truth, has entirely failed.

If the apostles, as you say, misunderstood the Lord in this matter, and practised in error, what confidence can we have in any thing they have written? If your society has detected them in one error, it proves that they were not inspired and led into all truth by the Spirit—therefore their testimony cannot be received. In fact it is not equal to the light and inspiration of your society; for by your superior light you have convicted them of error. Did I believe that your society was inspired with more certain and greater light than the apostles possessed, I should sit at your feet and learn. But, alas! to which party of the Friends should I go? You are divided into two parties, very different of creeds yet each claiming to have the spirit of inspiration. Both cannot be right, unless we admit that the Spirit teaches different and opposite things—and both of your parties are unable to prove that you are baptized with the Holy Spirit—for none of you can work miracles to prove your inspiration.

But let us go to the record, and inquire what is the baptism of the Holy Spirit—and whether any one since the days of the apostles has received it. This baptism is described Acts 2, 2—4: "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house when they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." This baptism was afterwards administered to the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius in the very same manner. Besides these two instances we have no account of the actual baptism of the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures. Now my friend pleads for this baptism alone, and that every child of God receives it. We have given the true description of it from Acts 2 I ask you, did you ever witness a baptism like that des-

cribed, in any assembly or individual? Did you hear that sound from heaven, like a mighty rushing wind? Did you see the whole house filled with it? Did you see cloven tongues like fire sitting upon all those baptized by the Spirit? Did you hear them speak with other tongues? I affirm you never did; nor have we any account of any other seeing or hearing it since the day that Cornelius and family were baptized with the Holy Ghost; you may call something else the Baptism of the Holy Spirit; but if that *something else* has not the very marks of that divinely described in Acts 2, we have no right to believe it. I have no doubt that every child of God has the spirit of God; but this he receives through faith, and lives and walks in the spirit, and if any have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. But this was enjoyed by the saints of God in every age, before the Spirit was given, as at Pentecost, and this cannot without a perversion of language be termed the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

You grant that our Lord commissioned his apostles to baptize —but you are instructed (not by the Scriptures) to believe this to be the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Where did my friend ever find that the apostles or any other men were ever authorized to baptize with this baptism? No where. It is evident they did not on Pentecost—and it is equally evident they did not at the house of Cornelius; for Peter did not believe that the Gentiles were to receive this baptism till the fact proved it. This baptism was exclusively the prerogative of Jesus Christ. "I will baptise you with the Holy Ghost." But my friend may say, that the apostles conferred the Holy Ghost on others. This is not clear; for if they were authorized to confer it on others why should they pray to the Lord that the Holy Spirit might be given to the baptized Samaritans and others? The fact is, they never claimed authority to baptize with this baptism in any sense, nor was this authority ever given them.

Your speculations on the New Jerusalem with 12 gates in opposition to the one door into the Church of Christ on earth have no weight with me; because this event is yet future, and will not take place till the consummation of all things. We speak of the Church of Christ now existing. Your advice to me to read the Scriptures is good, and by me received. But why advise me to this, when you deny in the same breath that they are the word of God? and charge those as having far departed from the knowledge of God, who believe the scriptures to be his word? You say, the Scripture does not call itself the word of God. My friend seems not to have read the scripture as diligently as he ought, else he would not have made so many mistakes. Let him read Mark 7, 13. But did not God speak to the fathers by the prophets? Were not these the words of the Lord? And are not these words written for our instruction in righteousness? Did not God in these last days speak to us by his

Son? And are not these words recorded by the witnesses? are not these the words of God? Did not God speak by his apostles? Hence Paul to the Thes. 2, 13. "When ye received the word of God, which ye HEARD of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God," &c. These words are faithfully recorded. Deny the Scriptures to be the word of God, or infallible, then we are left like a ship on the wide ocean without compass or helm. We have no infallible rule by which to determine right or wrong—We cannot tell which of your two parties is right, or whether both are wrong —No certainty—all doubt—all confusion. This is Babylon— will my friend plead for Baal? Will you plead the cause of scepticism and infidelity? Will you lend your aid to destroy the foundations of the righteous?

You lament "that the clergy of this day have so far lost sight of heavenly things, as to have nothing to preach to the people but what they find on record, written 1800 years ago." Oh! my friend, you and I have very different lamentations respecting the clergy. I lament that they have so far lost sight of heavenly things, that they preach so many things not found on record—not found in the writings of the apostles. I lament that they preach any thing besides the things written there.— Happy world! were all our religious instruction confined to the things written by the apostles, evangelists and prophets. Before this desirable state of things takes place, all substitutes for the scriptures must be abandoned—all authoritative creeds —all spurious revelations, must be banished—We must revert to the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.

It does appear to me that there is a combination formed to destroy the Scriptures, or which is equivalent, to destroy the confidence of man in them. The Skeptics and Deists take the lead in rejecting them *in toto*. The Catholics use the weapons of infidels against the Scriptures, and yet profess to receive them as true, but not intelligible till explained by their infallible mother, the popes and councils. The orthodox protestants believe the Scriptures to be true; yet they cannot be understood by the ungodly man till they are brought home to the heart by some mystical divine impulse or operation—They are insufficient without a written creed or confession of faith to govern the kingdom. You and your brethren, I think, prefer the new revelations, you say you receive daily, to the scriptures. The Shakers, Mormons, and others think with you on this subject.— I have really thought that the great war between the world and us, is on account of the Scriptures. We hold them up as the only rule and guide to heaven—that they are words of God addressed to us—to believe them is to believe in God and his Son —and to obey them, is, to obey the Father and the Son—that

through faith and obedience we receive the Spirit, and become partakers of the divine natnre, and shall by perseverance in faith and obedience reap life everlasting.

Farewell, my friend.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

ON PRAYER.

Prayer in all ages has been the delightful exercise of the pious. It is a duty incumbent on all, and yet, it is among the highest privileges granted to man. By this we converse with God, and receive from his hand the promises of his abounding grace.—Whatever checks the spirit of prayer, must be anti-christian, and destructive to our soul's best interests. In order to avoid the snare, it should be shewn. I will endeavor to expose to view some things, which cut the very sinews of prayer, and thus debar us from all sweet communications with heaven.

A question was once agitated among the professed people of God, "Of what profit is it that we pray unto God."—God, say they, has boundless stores of grace and mercies—his benevolence inclines him to give to his needy creatures, and to supply all their wants. He knows all our wants—nor can our prayers affect him, and render him more kindly disposed towards us. This objection to prayer is ingenious, but sophistical. We grant, God is not rendered more benevolent and kindly disposed towards us for our prayers; yet his infinite wisdom has made it our duty to pray for those very stores he has for us; no doubt, to teach us our dependence upon him, and to produce in us the spirit of gratitude to him for the favors received. An earthly parent is rich in all things that are good—He has many children—It is the very pleasure of his heart that they should enjoy these good things; yet in order to teach them their dependence, and to excite in them that divine virtue of gratitude, he has ordained that they shall ask him for what they need. Will not every intelligent mind approve this course? Why should any object to the same conduct of the Father of mercies?

There is a sentiment of false philosophy now afloat in the world, than which nothing is more inimical to the spirit of prayer. The sentiment is this. In the kingdom of nature, God has fixt certain laws by which nature is governed. So in the kingdom of his grace he has ordained and fixt certain laws for its government. So far the sentiment is good. But though God is acknowledged the governor and ruler of the kingdom of nature; yet he is represented by some, as having left nature to be governed by the laws at first given it, without any farther interposition—like the pagan's God, he no more concerns himself about the affairs of nature. Now did we believe this, would we act consistently to pray God for fruitful seasons—or that he would avert judgments, the scourge, or pestilence from us—that he

would save us from impending dangers, &c.? We think not. Yet to pray, in regard to these matters this has been the constant practice of saints from the beginning, and, in opposition to this sophistical sentiment, has God granted these favors. So they reason that in the kingdom of his grace, or in his moral kingdom he has established fixt laws for its government. By these laws his moral or intelligent creatures are to be ruled. If they live up to these laws, they shall be blessed—if not they shall be miserable—God will not interpose to do more than he has done in giving those laws. In this faith, would it not be a perfect inconsistency to pray God for any blessing contained in the new covenant? It certainly would be folly as well as inconsistency.

It may be said, that prayer is among the laws ordained of God. Granted But how can a person pray, in the belief that he, to whom he prays, will not move to his help—that he will not interpose, but leave him to obtain as he can from the laws already given? It is impossible. The very sentiment destroys the spirit of grace and supplication.

The New covenant is made up of promises, and is therefore called the "covenant of promise" and emphatically, "The promise." Faith in these promises begets hope—by which hope we draw near to God in prayer and humble obedience, through which means God gives us the promised blessings? He will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. By which spirit we are made alive—are sanctified, and comforted. This is *the unction*, which obedient believers receive, and by which *they know all things*. In this spirit we learn more in an hour than we could in an age without it—Without this spirit a Doctor of Divinity knows nothing as he ought to know, and with it children are wiser than their teachers are. I speak not with regard to the FORM OF KNOWLEDGE; but to the spirituality and power of it. It is for the want of this unction, that christianity is so awfully caricatured by its professors, and never will its glory appear till they are filled with the Holy Spirit. We may apply and employ philosophy, oratory, and all the powers of logic in exhibiting the evidence and truth of christianity; yet without this spirit in the speaker or writer, but little effect is produced.

We are gravely told by some that prayer is solely designed to affect the person praying, or those who hear him. In this sentiment they think it useless to pray for those who are at a distance, or who may happen to be beyond the sound of their voice. Did not the great Redeemer, the pattern of perfection, pray for those who heard him not? Did not his Holy Apostles say to the church at a distance, "pray for us"—Did they not constantly pray for the churches though at a great distance from them? Did not the brethren with one accord pray for Peter and John when in prison, and were they not delivered? Let this opinion above mentioned be received for truth, and there is an end to

the spirit of prayer. It is a secret blow at the life of christianity.

There are others, who hesitate to pray for sinners who are in unbelief. They reason in a very specious manner, that God, or his Spirit will not operate in an unbeliever, and therefore we cannot pray that he would forgive or save them, till by attention to his word, and by the evidence of its truth, they believe and obey.—Against this sentiment we have no objection, but receive it as true; yet we are fully persuaded that it is our duty to pray for sinners, unbelieving sinners. Jesus has given us an example. He prayed for his unbelieving murderers, "Father forgive"—He prayed for the world that they might believe, through the unity of his people—His Apostle exhorts christians to pray for all men. This is the common sentiment of revelation. We are not to direct the Lord how he shall answer these prayers. We know how some of the unbelieving murderers of Jesus were forgiven and saved in answer to his prayer for them. The Lord sent his servants to them, who, filled with the Holy Spirit; so preached to them that they believed and obeyed and were forgiven or saved, and received the Holy Spirit of promise. So when we pray for unbelieving sinners. we are persuaded that the Lord can raise up men, who in the fulness of the same spirit, shall so speak that they may believe and be saved—He in his providence can make the winds and fire his messengers to bring sinners to faith and repentance. It is not our business to inquire how God can, or will answer our prayers. If we ask according to his word and promise, God will answer—before his promise shall fail, heaven and earth shall pass away. When a hungry child asks his father for bread, he believes that he shall receive it—and shall we doubt that our heavenly Father will give to his poor children whatever good they may ask him, especially when we have his faithful promise to give? Let us therefore, come boldly to the throne of grace—Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith. Let each christian be often engaged in secret prayer. Let each congregation often meet for prayer. If more time were spent in prayer, and less in public speaking, when we assemble together, happier effects would be felt and seen among us.

Christians, pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks. Be not contented with the form: but pray in the Holy Spirit—pray for sinners—pray for Zion's restoration, pray for the Lord's Kingdom to come in its full glory—pray for your ministering servants.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

TO ELDER THOMAS CAMPBELL, Senr.

Dear Brother; for such I esteem you, and such will call you till you deny the relation.

I have read with considerable interest your remarks on N. Worcester's book on atonement, in hopes that I should discover truth not before brought to view from the book of God. I was more elated with this hope, when I found your remarks approved of by your son. A. Campbell, and published in the Harbinger for the use of his readers. I have long since lost my pride of opinion. I would not knowingly hold a sentiment contrary to the truth of God, for a world. Willingly would I sink, and lose the esteem of all men, rather than hold to or propagate an error. With this mind I read your remarks; but must confess I was more surprised, than corrected and edified. I profess not to receive all that brother Worcester has written on this subject. He may have erred on some points. Nor can I receive as truth what you have written. You appear, when you entered on reformation, to have had your eye so fixt upon a few prominent principles, that you had not time to examine some doctrines, you had received before, as truth, and, therefore, have brought them along with you, from that vortex, in which you had been tossed for years. Not in the spirit, nor manner of a controversialist I write. If I am wrong, so are many others—we most sincerely desire to be set right—If I am right, I as sincerely desire others to receive the truth. I am sorry to find my old brother, who has so zealously, and successfully plead for reformation on Bible facts alone, now attaching so much importance to his opinion of the sacrifice of Christ—so much, that you believe it impossible that any of our race can be saved without the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, as you have explained it, for this must be your meaning—and that upon Mr. Worcester's plan, the manifestation and death of the Son of God were wholly in vain and unnecessary —Good men in allages have done what you have done—The council of Nice denied salvation to all who rejected their unintelligible jargon—Luther and Calvin did the same in fact, and every sectarian establishment proceeds on the same principles.

I shall now briefly notice your remarks. You say, "Noah Worcester, declares that his principal object in writing, was, to evince that, in the sacrifice of Christ, there was a display of love, not of wrath. If God has no pleasure in the death and sufferings of the wicked, he surely could have no pleasure in the sufferings of his Son." The coutrary of this sentiment you receive and defend, that is—that the death of Christ is a display of wrath, and that God takes pleasure in the sufferings of his Son. This you attempt to prove by scripture, and the texts you adduce shall be examined in order.

Ist. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief." Isaiah 53, 11—You take these words in their literal import—That God was the prime agent in bruising and smiting his Son; and that he took pleasure in the sufferings inflicted by him

on his Son—and all this, to display his wrath. A few appalling questions arise naturally out of this sentiment. Was the death of Christ a sinful action? This is not doubted. If God smote, and killed his own Son, why were the Jews charged with the crime? If they acted freely in killing him, how could the deed be attributed to God. any more than any other free act performed by them?—as well might we say that the free acts of the Jews in blasphemy, in adultery, in every sin, were the acts of God as that the death of Christ was his act; but none attribute their acts to God, why?—because he did not actively influence the Jews to commit them Had he by his divine agency influenced them to these sins, then he must be considered as the prime agent—and they only as the executors of his will. Can they be considered as guilty? It is easy to say to whom blame attaches.

You may ask, Do not the scriptures mean what they speak, and speak what they mean?—What, I ask. means this scripture—"Therefore they could not believe—because that Isaiah said again, He hath blinded their eyes. and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted. and I should heal them"—John 12,–39,–40—You, my dear brother do not take these expressions in their literal import—for if God by an active agency did blind their eyes. and harden their hearts, that they should not see, hear. understand. believe, nor be converted. and healed. how could they be justly charged with their crimes? How could God pass righteous judgment against them? I confess, I cannot see. Though God is represented as having exerted his agency in blinding and hardening the Jews, yet his inspiring spirit has explained the matter thus. "For the heart of this people is waxed gross. and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes HAVE THEY CLOSED; lest they should see with their eyes. &c. Acts 28. 27.—What means this scripture? "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah."—2 Saml. 24 1.—In 1 Chro: 21, 1, it reads, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." To take the first text literally, is to contradict the whole current of scripture, for God tempteth no man to sin. Many similar texts we find in the scripture, in which many things are ascribed to God, in which he had no direct or indirect agency.—Why they are ascribed to him we may not certainly know; but in his government they took place, nor did he see proper to prevent them. So when it is said, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief"—it does not mean that God by any direct or indirect agency did this, but it was his pleasure not to prevent it. For it was his purpose from this hellish deed of killing his Son that he would subdue the power of darkness, and destroy sin.

I presume, you understand the Hebrew language. Do, my

old brother, turn to Isai 53, 11, and read it as it literally stands in that language. "Jehovah inclined to humble him, he hath caused him to travail in pain." For love to the world, Jehovah chose his Son to be their Saviour—He inclined to humble him by his being born of a woman, suffering the hatred and persecution of the world; enduring the agonies of death, in being buried, and continuing for three days under the power of death.—"He hath caused him to travail in pain"—as a woman in parturition. Such were the sorrows of Immanuel on account of the sins of the world. Where, my dear brother, do we see the wrath of God manifested in the death of his Son? Where his pleasure in the sufferings of his Son? But you have adduced other texts to prove that God himself killed his Son, and took pleasure in his sufferings—as

2dly. Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd. and against the man, my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the Shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand on the little ones." Zech. 13, 7, with Matt. 26, 31.—

God smote the Shepherd in the same sense that he smote the little ones in the text. For *to turn his hands on the little ones*, means to smite or slay them. [See Acts 13, 11,—1 Sam. 24. 12, Deut: 13, 9.—Ezek. 38, 12.—Ezek. 6, 14.—1 Sam. 5, 6.—Jer. 6, 12, 51, 25.] Now shall we ascribe all the persecutions, afflictions and deaths of christians to God the Father of all? If so, surely we must clear the persecutors of the crime. I repeat it, God had no direct or indirect agency in either the persecution or death of his Son, or in the persecution and death of the christians.—

3dly. Another text you adduce in proof of your opinion is Rom. 8, 32. He that *spared not* his own Son, but *delivered him up* for us all, how will he not with him also freely give us all things." In this text I can discover nothing of God's wrath manifested in the death of his Son, or of his pleasure in his sufferings. I see nothing more than the greatest possible display of his love to the world, that he delivered up, or gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish. but have everlasting life. Surely the Apostle was in this text speaking solely of the love of God, and from it arguing our comfortable expectation of all good.

4thly. Another text you adduce is Matt. 26, 38, 39. "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death; and he fell on his face and prayed, saying. O my Father, if it be *possible*, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, not as *I will*, but as *thou wilt*." I inquire what, was the cause of this sorrow?—You doubtless will answer, it was the wrath of God which he was about to endure on the cross. I ask again: From what portion of the scripture have you learned this? Shew me this plainly taught. in the scripture, and I bow submission. Till this be done, I must

view it as a mere speculation, sanctified by antiquity. What but the cup of suffering an excruciating death inflicted by the powers of hell and earth, caused him thus to agonize in pain? If this cup were the wrath of God, then the poor disciples had to drink it too—For said Jesus, Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, Matt. 20, 23. You shall suffer as I do. This prophecy was literally fulfilled—If the disciples had to suffer the wrath of God too, of what avail were the sufferings of the surety according to modern divinity to them:—That the Father's will was, that his Son should suffer, I have no doubt; For, says the Son, for this cause came I unto this hour. "Had he not died, then the plan of infinite wisdom for the redemption of man would have been frustrated; the prophecies respecting his death would have failed—his own predictions of his death and resurrection would have been nullified—and the worlds last and best hope forever cut off. The word of God by the prophets would be proved untrue, and the testimony of Jesus and his Apostles false. This is the impossibility why the cup should not pass from him.

5thly. Your next texts in order are Heb. 9, 22. and 10 4. "Without shedding of blood is no remission" "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." That the blood of Christ does effect the remission of sin is an undoubted truth. But *how*, is the question—Does his blood effect a forgiving disposition in God to the guilty? This my brother will not admit; because he knows that forgiveness is an eternal perfection in his nature, and he is of one unchangeable mind Does the blood of Christ remove legal obstructions existing between the forgiveness of God, and the guilty? What are these legal obstructions to the forgiveness of God? Not sin, or the transgression of the law—for sinners or transgressors are the only subjects of forgiveness—Not the truth of God's word, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, or dying thou shalt die." for this word is fulfilled in all, whether forgiven or not. Does the justice of God stand in the way of forgiveness? This question depends entirely on the subject proposed for forgiveness. If the subject be an impenitent sinner, every perfection in God as well as justice would oppose his forgiveness; for though God is merciful, gracious and forgiving, yet he will by *no means* clear the impenitent. It is in King James' translation,—*the guilty*—the word is a supplement, evidently wrong; for none but the guilty can be cleared—none but the guilty are the subjects of forgiveness. To say he will by no means clear the guilty, is to seal the world in desperation,—none can be saved, seeing "all are guilty." Even they, who boast that Christ their surety has fulfilled all demands of law and justice against them, and therefore, they though guilty, are cleared: have forgotten that by *some means* this was done—they were cleared by the means of Christ's substitution, and therefore their doctrine fails—If they

were cleared from their debts by a surety paying them for them, then they ceased to be subjects of forgiveness—for they had nothing to be forgiven—they were forgiven independent of repentance, or any moral character whatever. Let this truth be admitted, and no christian will deny it, that God will by no means clear or forgive the impenitent, then it follows that the life, the death, the blood, the intercession, the word of Christ, or any other means whatever, can never effect remission of sins to the impenitent. We must repent or perish. These means just stated can avail us nothing farther than to lead us to repentance—and all have to acknowledge that all that believe in heart are led to repentance, and gospel obedience, and consequently to remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit—all acknowledge this, except such as believe that repentance is wrought in us by some mystic, physical operation of the spirit. This sentiment you reject equally with me; and acknowledge with Paul that the goodness of God leads to repentance, or reformation—but all this goodness of God revealed by Jesus Christ, and manifested in his life, death and resurrection, will never lead any one to repentance until believed in and acted upon.

My brother has heard much of forgiveness by the blood of Christ reconciliation to God by his blood—justification by his blood—sanctification, cleansing, purging, washing from sin by his blood—Can you conceive from scripture, how these things are effected by the blood of Christ, in any other way than that I have just suggested?—You will acknowledge with all intelligent scripturians, that these effects of the blood of Christ are produced in none but such as believe—Now you believe as firmly as I do that faith alone will not save, it must produce obedience, as reformation, baptism, &c. before salvation or remission can be obtained. Now, why does my brother condemn this doctrine of the moral influence of the blood of the Saviour?

6thly. You next introduce Heb. 9, 16. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of transgressions that were under the first Testament, that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." You in your quotation of this text have interpolated a sentence foreign from the Apostle's meaning—thus, "that the called—*namely, under that covenant*, might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Does my brother believe that the first covenant called any to an eternal inheritance? You cannot—I must have misapprehended you. But to the point. The Mediator by death redeemed from the transgressions of the first Testament? How? By his death he took that Testament out of the way, nailing it to his cross—it has waxed old and vanished away. If the testament is done away, of course its transgression is gone; and its curse also—for where there is no law there is no transgression and consequently, no curse,—

You combat another sentiment of brother Worcester, who refuses to admit that "any being in the Universe can be properly said to have a right to transfer a just punishment from the guilty to the innocent." You think differently, i. e. you think that God has that right, and has exercised it in transferring the just punishment of guilty sinners from them to his innocent Son. To prove this you quote Isai. 53, 6, and 2 Cor. 5 21. "All we, like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all. For he has made him a sin-offering for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made *the justified* of God by him." Your opinion is, that Christ was not actually guilty of our iniquities—but was treated as if he had been so, the Father inflicting upon him the just wages of sin; namely sufferings and death. He laid on him the punishment due to us all. Were I in this sentiment, I would boldly avow myself a Universalian—If Christ bore the punishment due to us all, for the purpose of making us *the justified* of God, who shall condemn one of the human family? I impute not the doctrine of universalism to my brother, but to the sentiment advanced by him. It is admitted that the government of God is perfect, and must be therefore, a perfect model for all governments on earth. Let it be considered as a principle in the divine government that it is right for the innocent to suffer in the room of the guilty—and that the guilty be released from punishment on this account; then should not the same principle be admitted in all civil governments? Now as Christ is the pattern of a holy life, whom we must imitate or follow; and as he under, the perfect government of God, though innocent, voluntarily suffered the punishment due to the guilty—Should we not under a similar government do the same?—Should we not feel it the highest virtue, and ourselves bound to do it? This admitted, what check or restraint would be imposed on sin? Would not law become a mere *brutum fulmen* "

On this subject I cannot in the present number give more room in our paper. In the next I will write more fully, if life and health permit. Your old brother and companion in tribulation for Christ's sake.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

REVIVALS.

We have seen many things called revivals—great revivals. We have seen congregations greatly excited—many crying aloud for mercy, and many praising God for delivering grace. We have seen this state of things continue but a short time, and then disappear for years. We have seen many of these converts soon dwindle, sicken and die, and become more hardened against the fear of God, than they were before—many of them becoming infidels, by thinking that all professors of religion are

like themselves, deluded by strong passion and imagination. Others of them cling to the church, held there, not by delight in God, his service, or his people, but from other reasons than such as are approved of God. Others, and lamentable to tell, the fewest number by far, manifest by their holy walk and conversation, that they are truly pious and accepted of God. All must acknowledge that some good results from such revivals; but all must acknowledge that great evil also grows out of them. Those, who under strong affections, believed they were born of God, and who made a public profession of faith, and fell from it, are of all people in the most pitiable situation, seldom do they ever after embrace religion—These by their example, discourage others, and fill their minds with prejudices against religion.

After a lapse of a few years, these scenes pass off forgotten, then another similar revival takes place, and similar events succeed—Such revivals are periodical—once in a few years; but of an evanescent nature; like a flash of lightning. Indeed, the people are taught by the public teachers, not to expect their continuance—by experience and observation they have found them to be of short duration.

The general sentiment has been that these revivals depend on the sovereign will of God, who at certain seasons pours out of his spirit on the people, as the Angel at certain times troubled the waters in the pool of Bethesda. This sentiment we think of dangerous tendency. It teaches that the means ordained for salvation are not always of the same efficacy—of no efficacy at all, till God by special, almighty power makes them so. "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." I ask,—Is it the power of God to save the obedient believer to day? Is it invariably his power every day to the believer! None will deny it. Now should I be taught that the gospel loses its power to save me, though I believe and obey it, untill God by some non-descript operation makes it powerful to this effect, should I not view the means inadequate to the end, and wait in death for this operation? Should I not be disposed to neglect the means, believing they cannot benefit me, till they are made more powerful by the power of God? Should I reasonably feel guilty that I am carnal, lifeless, and dead, believing that the means ordained by God were unable to meliorate my condition? This faith, and the legitimate fruits of it, appear evidently the reason, why true revivals of religion are so rare, or rather why they do not always continue.

Dare we say, that God does not will, and therefore does not continue revivals without ceasing? Dare we think that God is more willing at one time than at another to grant his favors, or give his Holy Spirit? Dare we impute the long, lifeless intervals between revivals to God's pleasure or will it should be so? Dare we impute to him the bondage, carnality and death expe-

rienced by his professed people—and justify these people in this state, because he willed it should be so? But few, if any, would be thus daring.

When in heart we believe and obey the gospel, God gives us his holy. quickening spirit; he gives us salvation, and eternal life—In this spirit we feel a tender concern for sinners, and are led to plead with them, and pray for them. They see our good works, and from conviction are led to glorify God—they see the light of Zion, and flow to it—they see the union of christians, and are by this means led to believe in Jesus unto salvation and eternal life. God has ordained that the unbelieving world are to be saved by the means of his truth, shining in his church on earth.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

Extracts from Professor M. STEWART of Andover, on Baptism, continued from page 186.

Such a sense of the word *Baptizo* is so well supported and illustrated by classic usage, that nothing further needs to be said upon it. I will only add, that G. J. Vossius, in his *Disputationes de Baptismo*, Thes. I, attributes such a usage of the word to the custom of the Hebrews, in designating great calamities by the image of overwhelming waters. Had he examined the classic usage of the word, he would have seen no need of this solution. To Hebrews and Greeks both, the idea of *an overwhelming flood* offered a very obvious image to designate great sorrows and afflictions. Both, therefore, employ it. Thus David: "Save me, O God, for the waters are come into my soul! I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me; Ps. 69: 1. Again, Ps. 69, 14: "Let me be delivered . . . out of the deep waters." Ps. 18: 16, "He sent from above, he took me, he drew me out of many waters." Ps. 32: 6, "Surely in the floods of great waters, they shall not come nigh to him." Ps. 42: 7, "Deep calleth unto deep, at the noise of thy waterspouts; all thy waves come over my soul." Inasmuch now, as the more usual idea of *Baptizo* is that of *overwhelming, immerging* it was very natural to employ it in designating severe calamities and sufferings.

There is another *figurative* use of *Baptisei*, allied in some respects to the preceding one, but distinguished from it in the mode of its application. I mean that usage of the word, which employs it to designate the idea of *copious affusion* or *effusion*, in a figurative manner. The basis of this usage is very plainly to be found in the designation by *Baptizo* of the idea of *overwhelming*, i. e. of surrounding on all sides with fluid. *Copious affusion* or *effusion* is kindred to this; and very obviously, the word which designates the preceding idea, may also designate these meanings.

E. g. Matt. 3: 11, *He shals* BAPTIZE (*Baptisei*) *you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*; i. e. he will make a copious effusion of his Spirit upon a part of you; and another part, viz. the finally unbelieving and impenitent, he will surround with flames. or plunge into the flames. Or perhaps *baptizing with fire* may here have reference to the descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, when there appeared to the apostles, "cloven tongues as it were of fire, and it (the fire) rested upon every one of them," Acts 2: 3. In Luke 3: 16, the same expression is again found; and in Mark 1: 33, and Acts 1: 5. 11. 17, is found the phrase, *He shall* BAPTIZE (*Baptisei, Baptizon,*) *you with the Holy Spirit.* In 1 Cor. 12. 13 Paul says: *For by one Spirit have we been* BAPTIZED (*Ebaptisthemen*) *into one body*; i. e. by the copious effusion of one and the same Spirit, have we been made members of one and the same church. So he aftewards explains it: "We all have been made to drink in one and the same Spirit."

Lexington cir., Ky. conf. June 17, 1833.

DEAR BRETHREN:—I have nothing very good to say of the state of religion on this circuit, and yet I want to say something. The cause of our Zion here has been for some years in a languishing condition. Here the Campbellites and Arians have united their forces, and become not only formidable opponents to us, but opposers of every thing that deserves the name of religion. The prevalence of Campbellism, I am satisfied, is one cause of that low ebb to which religion is reduced among us. This *ism* resolves every thing into the water; "immersion alone is the act of turning to God." "No man can enjoy the peace of God, or the hope of heaven, until he is immersed," is its language. In short, it is a species of *Materialism;* a substitution of rites and ordinance for spiritual things and spiritual enjoyments. This heresy has obtained considerable standing among the people; so that many professors who stand apparently aloof from it, have drunk into its spirit. Can you wonder then at the low state of religion of which we complain? And will you not, through the Christian Advocate f assist us in opposing this error which proudly exalteth itself against the truth? We are looking for, and think we see some buddings of better times. Our congregations have recently become much more serious than usual. God in wrath, is speaking to us. The Cholera is raging with great fatality in Lexington and the surrounding country. The most hardened sinners begin to tremble. Within a few days I have witnessed several conversions; and yesterday evening, after preaching in this place, (Versailles,) I admitted seven or eight persons on trial.

WM. PHILLIPS.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE LETTER.

He says, "The cause of our Zion here has been for some years in a languishing condition." We are glad that Mr. Philips has

attached the pronoun *our* to Zion—by this we understand the Methodist Episcopal Church—So when the Presbyterians use the term, *our Zion*, they mean the Presbyterian church. So other sects, using the same term, mean their peculiar, sectarian establishments Had he said the cause of Zion (unrestricted by adjuncts) has been for some years in a languishing condition, we must have contradicted the assertion; because this state of things does not apply to the church of Christ in these bounds.

Mr. Philips proceeds to give the reason why the Methodist church is in such a languishing condition. "Here, (say he) the Campbellites and Arians have united their forces, and become not only formidable opponents to us, but opposers of every thing that deserves the name of religion. The prevalence of Campbellism. I am satisfied, is one reason of that low ebb to which religion is reduced among us." What a pity! But it may be, Mr. Philips was too much excited when he wrote, to give a fair representation of things. Let us examine the matter dispassionately and we may arrive at very different results.

By *Campbellites* and *Arians* we *guess* whom he means—But we wish Mr Philips to know. that we do not so tamely submit to names of reproach imposed on us by our *enemies*, and wear them, and glory in them, as do the followers of John Wesley in the name of *Methodist* He says. "they are opposers of every thing that deserves the name of religion." Indeed?—Did Mr. Philips believe this when he wrote it? This he will have to answer to his final judge. We will not judge him:—But the charge we most positively deny, and feel bound to repel. This is unnecessary where we and our doctine are known; because the people who hear us and know us, are well assured, that the charge is false. I will ask a few questions on this point. Do we deny that the scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice? and under this conviction, do we substitute another rule in their place? Do we deny the one God, the Father, and the one Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and men? Do we deny the necessity of being renewed, or made new creatures by the Spirit of God through faith and obedience? Do we deny that it is the duty of christians to be diligent to do good works, and to obey heartily all the commandments of God? Do we deny christian experience—the fruits of the spirit—the resurrection of the dead—a future judgment—glory, honor, immortality and eternal life in heaven to the faithful believers? And—Do we deny that the wicked will be turned into hell, and suffer the vengeance of eternal fire?

Now Mr. Philips must have known that we do not deny these things; but do most assuredly believe them, and are laboring to prove our faith by our works. But none of these things deserve the name of religion." He must then have a very different view of religion from that stated in the Bible—We neither know

nor wish to know what his view is. We hove too favorable an opinion of Mr. P's intelligence to think for a moment that he believed what he has written; charity in vain searches for an apology. To his judge the matter is submitted by us.

"The prevalence of Campbellism, I am satisfied, is the cause of the low ebb to which religion is reduced among us." He means the religion of the Methodists. "This *ism* (he says) resolves every thing into the water." The expression is too obscure for us to form any definite idea from it—What follows he quotes from Bro. A. Campbell. He is able to defend himself; but Mr. P. ought to know that we claim not A. Campbell for our leader—nor do we attempt to defend all he has said, or may say, unless he speaks the language of revelation. In all our public addresses we endeavor to exhibit the truth in the language of inspiration. The people receive it and are blessed. Mr. P. has stated one reason why the Methodists are in such a languid rtate—We will suggest another and we think, the true one —Their preachers are so determined to destroy us and our influence, that they have turned the attention of the people from the Lord and his gospel to us, and our doctrine, distorted by themselves. Vain attempt! Truth will prevail!

EDITORS.

A PRECEPT OF JESUS, THE SON OF GOD.

Matt. 6. 1. "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise you have no reward of your father who is in heaven. Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues, and in the streets that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret; and thy father who seeth in secret, himself shall reward thee openly."

In a late Lexington Journal, we have seen honorable mention made of the benevolence of a number of wealthy men, in sending relief to the poor and destitute of that city—made so by the destructive ravages of Cholera. Beneficial to many sufferers was their liberality. But in these notices I discovered what was feared to be in opposition to the divine precept just quoted. The names of the benevolent and benificent men were publicly advertised, and they in their good deeds were spread before the public gaze in a very widely extended newspaper. If this was done at the instigation of those men, or by their approbation, they have got their reward, all they sought for any all they ever will get—they have got the praise of men. But I am persuaded that virtue is not sunk so low, nor the voice of heaven so disregarded, that this was done according to the wishes of these benevolent men. They do not thank the men, who handed to

the printer those pompous advertisemnnts. For the honor of our country we hope in future that such trumpets of fame will cease to be sounded.

It may be said in justification of such pageantry, that the clergy have taken the lead; and surely if the practice were wrong, and contrary to the precept quoted above, they must know it; and knowing it, they surely would be the last of men to practise it. We see in their wide extended reports, that A. B. has subscribed so much to some benevolent institution—that C. D. has sent them $100 or $500 far some other benevolent project, &c. These men are eulogized in high strains of panegyric, and their piety and benevolence are extolled to the skies. This is a temptation to others to rise in puolic estimation, and by this means vast treasure is acquired. This argument, though specious, as being founded on the clergy. has no weight to destroy the force of the precept,—it stands as a mountain of ages, unmoved and unaffected with the blasts produced by man. It condemns all such practices, whether done by the clergy or any one else. I am heartily ashamed to see heaven's precepts thus prostrated for the purposes of acquiring wealth. The old saying in this is fulfilled, 'Let us do evil that good may come. The good cause of God needs not such evils to its promotion. It will rise by means as far above these paltry things, as the heavens are above the earth. Let such as take the word of the Lord alone as their directory, diligently sit at Emanuel's feet and learn, and do whatever he has commanded.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

Bro. T. K. Milton's communication of July 2 is received.—We are left in doubt whether he designed it far the Messenger, or for private information. Judging from some expressions in it that he could not design it for the public eye; and knowing that the topics on which he treats. have been reiterated in the Messenger, w have thought it prudent to omit its publication. till better advised. We advise him to cut off from his pamphlet, that article of ours by which so many are offended, and which prevents the sale of his books. This will be no offence to us.

EDITORS.

REFORMATION.

Bro. H. D Palmer, of Carlisle, Ia. writes, June 3,

The cause of Christ Jesus our Lord is gaining ground in our country, and both men and women are confessing the Saviour and submitting to his baptism. Three confessed him yesterday at our meeting, and two were immersed. The prospect is good.

Bro. M. W. Matthews of Trenton, Tenn. writes, May 27,

That the people in that section manifested, a few months back, great indifference on the subject of religion, but a spirit of inquiry is now excited—the two last Lord's days he had immersed 4. In the conclusion of divine service on the last day three more confessed the Lord, and were to be immersed a few days after. Many more are expected shortly.

We have ceased to speculate on the word of the Lord in this section of country. We are perfectly satisfied with the sure word—it promotes peace, love, and union among us—it raises our affections above the objects of this world, and fixes them on things above. May the brethren every where cease from speculating.—May the Lord bless you, my dear brethren, in your labors to present the gospel to the world, stript of human sophistry.—Amen.

From bro. H. A. Cyrus, of Illinois, Franklin, Morgan Connty, May 25.

The brethren, united "on the foundation of the apostles and prophets," last week held a three days meeting in Jacksonville. Brethren from adjoining counties attended with us. Cheering information was given of the progress of truth and reformation. The gospel in its simplicity is, doubtless, gaining ground in almost every section of our country, the reports and declarations of our opposers to the contrary notwithstanding. The church at Jacksonville numbers 120—at Carrolton 140—at Springfield 30—at Rock-creek 40—at Jersey Prairie 50—at two places near Carrolton 40—on Apple-creek 50—in Pike 25—at Winchester 30—at Manchester 24—and many other places.

Bro. Jer. Savelle, of Florida, writes, May 18th, 1833,

Brother Mothershead is travelling among us. He has baptized about 30 since Christmas.

Bro. Henshall, of Baltimore, Md. writes, June 10th, 1833, that at a four days meeting near Hagerstown, 15 were baptized, and a church organized of 39 members, all immersed since February last.

Bro. John Wilson, of Bloomfield, Ia. writes, Jnne 8th, That in the congregation where he lives 6 were baptized a few days ago—at the same time, that near Washington many had been baptized since last fall. Truth, he says, is on its march in spite of all opposition, and reformation spreading in these parts.—Hewishes a union meeting to be published on Praire Creek meeting house, commencing Friday before 4th Lord's day in July.

Bro. Tho. Hudspeth, of Tenn. Maury Co. writes, June 10—that on 2d Lord's day of May, 5 were immersed in Lick-creek.

Bro. Zacheus Carpenter, of Shelby Co. Ky. writes, June 21, "In the midst of opposition we still feel bold to go on in the good way of the Lord. In the space of a few months past, I have baptized 13 at Chinoweth's run, and 4 or 5 at Floyd's Fork. The brethren have appointed a three days meeting at South Long-Run beginning on Friday before the 3d Lord's day of September. The place of meeting is 2½ miles South from Simpsonsville. Teaching brethren are particularly and pressingly invited to attend.

Bro. Js. McBride of Mo. Newport, wrote, June 10 that he had been lately at the constitntion of a Church of Christ in Montgomery county, to which an accession of 6 has been recently made. Bro. Sandy E. Jones is ordained their bishop. He also states that five have been lately added in his neighborhood.

Bro. John W. Roberts informs us, June 28, that since he was lately in Georgetown he has baptized a good many more in Williamstown, the number forgotten—he has constituted a church in Gallatin, and one in Liberty—Prospects are good.—The Cholera in the country prevents him from leaving his family.

We are informed that our good brother, and valuable servant of the Lord, Nathan Worley of Ohio, has been immersed at last. Thanks to our God!

Bro. J. P. Ellis, of Campbell Co. writes, June 20, since March 9 persons have been added to the church at Bank Lick, and 6 more have been received and baptised in other places around us. The good cause is evidently advancing in our section of country.

Bro. Washington Dunkeson, of Hopkinsville, writes, July 1st:
The cause of reformation is still advancing in many parts of our country. The gospel of the kingdom is triumphing over the doctrines and commandments of men. Within the last 6 weeks I have baptized about 20 in my own neighborhood.

Bro. James Clark, of Georgetown, Ohio, writes, July 1st,
That on the 3d Lord's day of June 32 persons made the good confession in the upper part of this country—and on the 4th Lord's day 8 more in Georgetown.

For the last four or five weeks to this date, July 8, the progress of reformation has still increased in our town and

neighborhood. We have not taken a particular account, but not less than 250 have been received and baptized in Georgetown, Ky. and the neighborhood around within that short time. Such firmness and determination to obey, cause them fearlessly to brave the terrors of Cholera by submitting to be immersed While Cholera was calling off scores around us—we do not recollect one fatal case among the many immersed. Our public teachers have nearly all been sick, and unable to attend to the calls of the congregations; yet reformation still increases. Almost every day we, who are able, have to preach and baptize. On yesterday we received 15 at one place. To him that sitteth on the throne, and to the lamb, be praise and salvation. Amen.

CARLISLE, June 10th, 1833.

The good work advances in spite of proscription.

Dear Brethren—

On last Wednesday I returned from a two week's tour, chiefly on the South of Kentucky river, in Garrard and Lincoln counties. I was with bro. Thomas and John Smith the greater part of that time. Other teaching brethren fell in with us occasionally at different meetings.

Something like thirty were added to the different congregations during the tour. Several of the number were from the opposition. Resolving to be free from tho traditions of the elders, they have put themselves directly under the authority of Christ. May the Lord sustain them, and may they never be entangled again with any yoke of bondage! The good cause is succeding on the south side of the river, beyond the most sanguine expectations of its friends. An immense field, white to harvest, is opening there. Truly, the harvest is great, but the laborers are few. Lord send laborers into the field, in thine own way;—men fearing thee, and hating coveoutness, who, panoplied with the armour of God, will meet, and put to flight the Allied powers!

Opposition runs high; but what think you are the weapons with which our opponents attempt to put down what they call *heresy? Huge iron bars, and bolts, and locks*; exclusions without cause, or trial; misrepresentations, &c. These are potent orguments used to support orthodoxy. So that the meeting houses of the opposers, with great Iron bars across their doors look rather like habitations of *criminals* than places dedicated to the worship of the living and true God! What a burlesque upon christianity!—what a shame upon its professors such a course as this! But it tells for itself; it speaks out;—what does it say? Hear. "Our people are badly instructed;—they cannot distinguish truth from error;—many of our favourite sentiments are untenable—therefore, we are afraid of investigation; these heretics are always reading their books and calling on us for

proof. Therefore, believing as we do in physical, as well as moral operations, we are determined to bar and bolt our doors against these innovators, and do all in our power to prevent our people from hearing them. And in order the more effectually to do this we will tell them, these people deny the operations of the spirit—the work of grace upon the heart—christian experience—heart-felt religion—that they say baptism changes the heart. But should they, after all our efforts to prevent it, presume to go and hear these people, and be friendly with them, we will exclude them from our congregations, as unworthy of our fellowship, and thus seek to sink them in public estimation."—Such is the languge of the conduct of our opposers, heard and well understood by all unprejudiced persons.

What want of confidence in their own cause do our opponents betray by such a course—and how much do they concede to the cause for which we plead! We have said our cause is opposed by exclusions without trial. Yes; inconsistent as it may appear, it is nevertheless true. I was at the house of father Helm and his wife in Lincoln county, who, not long since, were excluded from a Baptist Church (of which I. F. Higgins is pastor) at a meeting at which they were not present, and at which they had no intimation that their case would be taken up! So they informed me. The christian character of father Helm and his wife is unexceptionable. Father Helm had been a member of the Baptist church for near sixty-six years. Hence Mr. Higgins told sister Helm, subsequently to their exclusion without trial, that they were loth to give them up. But they were Campbellites, and were leading others astray—and sister Helm had gone to hear John Smith preach, after he had so completely defeated said Higgin, in a public discussion which took place at Stanford, on the 25th of last October; which controversy Higgins himself had provoked. And these were offences sufficient. And hence they were excluded! Can a cause which requires the use of such weapons as these, be a good one—and can it prosper? No—never. These slack-twisted tow-cords by which the public mind is attempted to be bound, are beginning to be broken;—the fire of truth is getting among them, and consuming them; and the people are hearing and judging for themselves. This state of things is always favorable to the truth, and this is all we want—an impartial hearing.—We stand upon the book, and it must triumph over every human institution that opposes it.

We have no use for iron bars and bolts and locks to keep our opposers out of our meeting-houses—they are welcome to the use of them—we fear not—nay we challenge investigation—open, candid, fair, and christian-like, investigation. We have no need of misrepresentation, or of abusive epithets, in defence of our cause. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal,

but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.

We do not wish to make offensive comparisons; but if the spirit manifested by our opposers be not *that spirit*, which has led to the persecution of God's people, in every age of the world, then I confess I have no just conception of the subject. What made the Jews (who were very religious in their way,) persecute the holy prophets of God? Because they cried aloud and spared not—and showed to God's people their sins, and the house of Jacob their transgressions. They could not bear to be told of their errors—their corruptions,—and therefore, to get clear of the prophets, they stoned and otherwise persecuted them. So, because we cannot recognize all the sects in christendom as churches of Christ, with all the corruptions and divisions and therefore, call for a reform, a return to primitive ground,—We are persecuted as enemies of God and men; as not fit to be countenanced. It is true we have not been stoned to death. But wherefore? Because that which hindereth has not been taken out of the way, and I trust to God it never will be. But why did the Jews persecute our Saviour to death?—Because he opposed their corruptions; he testified of their works, that they were evil; they, therefore, took him by wicked hands, and crucified him. So of the apostles and the first christians.

Why did the pagans rise up, en masse, and oppose the first christians? They worshipped their 30,000 Gods,—every one was permitted to worship his own God, in his own way, without offence to the rest. But they united in persecuting the Christians, because they would not permit the author of their religion to be put along side of their false Gods—he would make no compromise with them, but struck a fatal blow at the root of their systems. And why is it now that all the sects have united to oppose those, who are pleading for a restoration of primitive christianity, a union of Christians on the new testament of our Lord and Saviour? I leave this question for the unprejudiced to answer.

JOHN ROGERS.

P. S. On yesterday and the day before, there were added to the congregation here, one by letter and two by immersion, and five a few days before.

LEXINGTON, July 8, 1833.

Dear Brothren—

I sit down to give you some information, concerning the progress of our reformation, which has recently come under my own observation. At a three days meeting held at the Forks of Dicks-river, commencing on the Saturday before the first Lord's day in May, brethren present: John Smith, John Rogers, William Morton, G. Elley, with several others.—

Eleven were immersed and four or five united with the brethren at that place, who had been immersed. It was truly a happy season to the brethren who attended the meeting.

On the fourth Lord's day, and Saturday before, in June, I attended alone, at the same place, and had another refreshing season. By many I was not expected on account of the Cholera in Lexington, so that but few attended on Saturday. After a short address four came forward and made the good confession —a solemnity and feeling were manifested which were unusual. On Lord's day three more made confession of faith, and all were immersed the same evening, where there was much water.

I will now come nearer home. On account of Cholera I removed my little family to the neighborhood of Republican, where you know I have long labored. The good work in this neighborhood, since my arrival, seems to progress finely—fifteen have come forward to unite with the brethren at Republican—all—except one by profession of faith and baptism. Were it not for my feeble condition, I would exert more than I do. Pray good Lord save the people.

Your brother in gospel bonds,

THOMAS SMITH.

Bro. Doct. I. Sanders, of Indianapolis, writes, June 20—That a few weeks ago, bro. O'Kane had baptized 10 or 12 in that place, and at every visit more or less unite with the body of Christ. Occasionally bro's. Combs and Prater visit us, the the former of which is by the churches appointed an Evangelist. His route includes 20 churches, the greater part of which are in a flourishing and happy condition. The people seem alive to the necessity of turning to God. Bro. O'Kane is also engaged to ride in the eastern part of our state. The people there unite in their request that some of our Kentucky preachers would attend the following appointments:—At Indianapolis, beginning on the Friday before the 2d Lord's day in August; at the Bluffs of White river, 17 miles below, on Friday before the 3d Lord's day in August; at Bloomington on Friday before the 4th Lord's day of the same month.

At Indianapolis is a Church constituted of 20 members, and in a few days 15 or 18 more would join. The bro. doc. concludes, "It is useleless to speak of the opposition made against us at this place; as it is now no uncommon occurrence every where. But I trust we are prepared to meet it; not by opposing force to force, or by repelling violence by counter violence; but by *the obedience of faith*. We think the reformation in principle is quite too far ahead of the reformation in practice, which, to be successful, should be *pari passu* under the standard of Immannel.

Sister Rebecca Jones, of Wayne co., Ia., writes, June 3—The Church of Christ in this place numbers between 40 and 50. We meet every Lord's day to break bread, and perform other acts of social worship, Some of the regular Baptists have fallen in with us, and we are so much alike, that a stranger, coming in among us, would be led to conclude that we had all been cast in the same mould.

Extract from the letter of Bro. John Smith, dated 6th and 8th July, just received.

"On last Wednesday week I made the first attempt to preach since I saw you; (being sick during that time.)

Since that time I have immersed 65 persons for remission; 5 or 6 who have made the confession within that time are yet to immerse. On yesterday I immersed 31. I preach every day, although I have not got entirely clear of my complaint.

Monday, 8th.—On yesterday I set out for N. Middleton—13 made the good confession on that day and six the day before."

The Cholora then prevailing in Mt. Sterling and the country. Bro. Smith commends his love to all his friends about Georgetown.

EDITORS.

OBITUARY.

DIED—At his residence in Gallatin county, Ky. June 25th, 1833, James Lindsay, senr. in the 79th year of his age. He was amongst the first settlers of Kentucky, near Lexington. He endured the privations incident to tha settlement of a new country, and especially of this. Frequently have we heard him relate his meeting with the savage foe in the bloody contest, and how he witnessed their savage cruelties. He was beloved of his family almost to adoration, and respected—highly respected by all who knew him; and if ever a man deterved it, he certainly did. He was always found active in works of mercy and benevol ence—to do good to others, seemed to be the great object of his life—in the abodes of poverty and distress, and at the bedside of the sick and dying, he was rarely absent; there he was found, supplying their wants and administering to their comfort—like his divine master, he literally went about doing good.

In the last hour of his life he was perfectly tranquil, while death was engaged in cutting the last threads, which tied his happy spirit to the mortal body. He embraced his family, one after another, with a parental kiss, bidding them adieu till they meet in heaven. He often smiled and spoke of the blessed immortality to which he was hastening. The language of the poet was fully verified in him—

Jesus can make the dying bed
As soft as downy pillows are.

For the last 30 years of his life he was a pious, useful member of the Church of Christ.

Died, also, of Cholera, in Georgetown, our young and dear sister Lavinia Story fully resigned to her Lord's will.

—— Also, Our highly esteemed sister Polly Eastham, wife of Wm. Eastham of this town, of the same disease. She died most triumphantly.

—— Also, our dearly beloved brother David Cassell. His death was glorious and unappalling.

—— Also, Our dear brother, and young minister of Jesus, Robert Patterson—a brother of blessed memory, he died as he lived, a christian.

We cannot record the death of all who have been swept off by he devouring scourge. They are many.

RECEIPTS FROM JUNE 6TH TO JULY.

KENTUCKY. *Mayfield*—By Chs. Ware, for Tho. Winn, for vol. 7—*Sanders*—By Eld. Milton, for Brown, vol. 6—*Centreville*—By Eld. Gano; for Geo. Palmer, for 7.—*Georgetown*—By I. Crumbaugh for 7 —*Glasgow*—By Eld. J. Davis, for Wm. Logan, for 7; C. Howard, do.; Doc. Ford, do.; for W. A. Bush for 6; S. Bagby for do.—*Dry-creek*—By Eld. I. *G.* Ellis, for A. Culbertson, for 7; for I. Taylor do ; for F. Kleet do.—*Caneridge* —By Js. Houston, for C. Hall, for vol. 7; Jo. Wilson do.; and Jo. Hibler do.—*Hopkinsville*—Eld. W. Dunkeson, for Mrs. Shipp, for 7; for B Woodruff do.; F. Sharp 2, of which 1 is yet with Dunkerson.

TENNESSEE. *Bagdad*—By P. M. for self, I. Kearby and R. Ray, for 7.—*Readyville*—By J. Nichols, for E. Nichols, D. Hall, Wm. Travis, Jo. Youree, Doc. Gowen, all for 7.—*Snow-creek*—Tho. Hudspeth for 6 & 7.—*Brownsville*—N. Axley for 7.

INDIANA. *Greensburgh*—By Geo. McCoy, for self 40, for John Forsythe for 6, for A. McCoy for do.; for Js. Eward 6 & 7; J. Corbin 4 & 5.

NEW-YORK. Eld. Dan Wiers, for I. Wardell, I. Moote, A. True, Geo. Morris, for vol. 7, and Shavlier for vol. 6.

NORTH-CAROLINA. By I. Johnson 2.

MARYLAND. Js. Henshall, for Js. Knight 1 25—M. Alexander do.; John Sloan do-; Js. P. Henshall do. all for vol. 7.

GEORGIA. *Tyrone*—Sam. Jones for 7.—*Mulberry-grove*—I. Hubble for 7.

PENNSYLVANIA. *Waterford*—A. Smith for self and Mallery for 7.

VIRGINIA. *Richmond*—By B. Jones 10 00.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY

BARTON W. STONE & JOHN T. JOHNSON,

ELDERS IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. VII. { GEORGETOWN, KY. *AUGUST*, 1833. } NO. 8.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers, if paid on the reception of the first number—or $1 25, if paid within six months. They who procure eight subscribers, and remit the money to the Editors, 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.

NO. II.

TO ELDER THOMAS CAMPBELL.

My dear Brother.—In the close of my first letter, I was remarking on your exposition of Isai. 53, 6 and 2 Cor. 5, 21. "He hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"—this, in your view, means he laid on him the punishment due to us all. You think by this vicarious punishment we are justified. "Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him: Rom. 5. 9. You add a little to the text, "that being justified *by faith* in his blood."—Dear bro: What has faith to do in the justification of which you speak? If A is guilty of murder and is condemned to die; and if B becomes his surety, and bears the punishment due to A—then is not A clear, whether he believes or not that B has died for him? A's faith produces no effect whatever, in the matter of his justification. But, why talk of justification or forgiveness at all in A's case? The debt due was fully paid by B the surety of A, could the law, or executive now say to A, I forgive or justify you freely by my grace? Not freely, might A say; for my surety has paid my due, or debt, fully in my stead—I have nothing to be forgiven—I see no grace or favor shewn me, in this forgiveness or justification. In fact, there is none but in the surety—If there is I should be glad to see it proved by scripture testimony.

Has my old brother duly considered, What are the punishments due to us for sin? Have these punishments been really