Bro. J. T. Johnson of Ky, writes Dec. 11. After giving an account of several meetings, noticed in our last, he says; "Bro. Stone, I cannot think that the parties fully believe what they preach in regard to the operations of the Spirit in conversion; because all their efforts prove the reverse. They put forth all their efforts, and then turn round and sneer at us, because we teach, that the conversion of sinners depends upon the efforts of Christians. The reconciliation was devolved on the Apostles, and by them, upon us; and the Lord will hold us responsible for a faithful discharge of duty.

Bro. J. Taylor of Mt, Sterling Ill; writes that 10 were recently added there.

OBITUARY.

The Journal of Christianity, has announced the death of our dearly beloved brother Jesse Mavity of Columbus Indiana. He departed this life the 5th day of November last. He had been a preacher of the gospel about twelve years--long enough to secure the unfeigned love and high esteem of all the dear brethren with whom he was acquainted. He was a good man, a useful man, a man deeply instructed in the word of God in a word, he was a Chrisrian. I knew him from almost his childhood, and loved him, He is called from his labors in the prime of life, being in his 34th. year; but his works follow him.

A short time before died the amiable and pious youth, William Henderson of Greene county Illinois, in the full and triumphant hope of immortality. He was the son of elder John Henderson.

We have thankfully received several very interesting communications; but must defer their publication to future Numbers. My correspondents must wait patiently. They shall not be neglected. I wish once more to say to my agents, that Post masters will frank all letters covering money for me: EDITOR

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

FEBRUARY, 1841.

LETTER III.

REVIEW OF BRO. BAMPBELL'S III LETTER.

(CONTINUED.)

Dear brother Campbell:

Hitherto our discussion has proceeded in the mild spirit of the gospel; nor do I fear that we shall depart from it, if truth be our object. If nothing more be effected by this discussion, I hope we shall convince the world of what has been deemed impracticable, if not impossible, that Christians can love one another, and dwell together in unity, and yet differ in sentiment. I hope also that we shall give an example of that moderation, and forbearance, which the scriptures teach, yet so uncommon among its professors in the present cavilling age. One thing is certain, that the Bible student will be more diligently engaged to understand the important things concerning which we write. But to the subject.

Page 46, I had said, "Those sins purged with blood came under one general name—*errors.*" You immediately ask, "And what were the sins purged without [blood]?" I have plainly shown what sins were purged by blood under the law; and I have as plainly shown what sins were not purged with blood by the law--But what sins, say you, were purged

without blood." I again answer, Not one sin of any class was purged without blood according to law. But that I may be understood; those sins, unpardonble by law, and not allowed to be purged by blood according to the law, yet to the penitent sinner were purged and forgiven by God, according to the law of faith without the deeds of the law of Moses. Can my brother deny this? Lev. xxvi. 40, 46.

Page 47, I had said, "that the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sins; but it did take away errors, sins of ignorance, and pardonable offences. You reply, "And does my brother Stone teach that the blood of bulls and goats had virtue to expiate sins of ignorance, errors, but no virtue to expiate other sins? Yes, brother Campbell, I thus teach, being instructed out of the law and the Prophets, and by Paul the Apostle. But you may remember that I acknowledge this blood to be the means, through which God expiates or purges from all such sins.

You again recur to Heb. ix. 27, to establish your assertion, that without shedding of blood there never was remission. It becomes necessary now that we fully investigate this text, "And almost all things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission." "Here, [you say,] are two propositions—a general one, and a universal one. The one respects things—the other respects persons. The general one is, that Almost all *things* are purged with blood—the universal one is, that without shedding of blood, there is no *one pardoned, or there is no remission.*" Now, neither you nor I are fond of scrap text preaching nor writing; without the connection with the text, it may be tortured, as is frequently done, to speak what the Spirit never designed. That Paul referred to legal blood alone to the purifying and remission of sins, is plain from the whole connection. The law of Moses was the subject of his discourse. "This is still more evident by adverting

to the law itself. Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35, &c. "The priest shall by blood make an atonement [*kaphar*) for him, (or cleanse or purge him,) and it shall be forgiven." The Septuagint constantly translate the Hebrew *kaphar* by *exhilaskomai*, which you acknowledge has the same meaning. If what I have written in my 2nd, No. be not sufficient to prove that *kaphar* signifies to purge from sin, I will add a few more texts Ps. li. 7—liii. 3—Isai i. 25—vi. 7 xxii 14—xxiv, 9. Ezek. xxvi, 1—1 Sam. iii 14. Prov. xvi 6, *cum multis aliis.*

In your general proposition you exclude persons from being purged with blood by law, and emphasize THINGS as only purged by blood. Now, my dear sir, this appears to me directly in contradiction to the scripture facts stated above. Is it not also contrary to your oft repeated idea, that men, guilty of all classes of sins, one sin excepted, were purged with the blood of sacrifice? Does not my brother know that the word *panta, all things*, includes persons as well as things? Read John i. 3. Acts xiv 15-1 Cor. i. 28. Eph. iii. 17, Col i. 16, 17. Heb. i. 2, 3, &c. I understand Paul in this text to mean simply, that almost all things, persons as well as the altar, tabernacle, &c. by the law, were purged with blood, and indeed, by the law, without shedding of blood, there was no cleansing, or purging, and consequently no remission or taking away of sin.

On page 48, I asked, "Could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all?" You reply, "And was Abraham saved by faith without blood, without sacrifice—by faith and works without a sin-offering. Surely my brother forgot himself here." If I have, I will thank my brother to bring to my remembrance, where it is written that Abraham was saved by blood—by sacrifice. I can find where he believed God, and it was ceunted to him

for righteouness, or justification. But you say, Abraham always worshipped through blood; hence Jesus said, "Abraham saw my day, and was glad." Does this prove that he always worshipped through blood? Does this prove that he saw that Messiah, who he believed would come in the latter days, should die? Was he by faith in this blood reconciled to God and saved? I would farther ask, Were not the Apostles sanctified, or clean through the word or truth before the death of Christ? Did they become clean by faith in the blood of Christ, when they did not believe he would die? But you believe that the patriarchal law of sacrifice was the same as that of Moses. If so we agree that it extended only to temporal life and temporal blessings, and not to spiritual justification and salvation. I requested my brother in a former letter to re-examine the xi. chapter of Hebrews, and see if the faith of one of the elders had the blood of Christ as its object.

I would remind my brother of an expression, frequently used by him, which he will in a moment acknowledge to be very improper. It is this, "But the sins were first *atoned for* by the slain goat, page 48. Sins *atoned for*, will very well agree with the old system, which insists upon a full satisfaction being made for sin by a substitute suffering the full penalty due the sinner; but it will not agree with what we both admit to be the meaning of *kaphar*, or *exhilaskomai*, to cleanse, purge, cover, &c. It would be very awkward to say, *sins cleansed for*, *purged for*, *covered for*. The word *for* is no part of the words *kaphar* or *exhilaskomai*, but it is a preposition, 'ol' in Hebrew, and 'peri' in Greek, which are generally translated *for* or *on account of;* thus to make an atonement for sin, means to cleanse the person or thing defiled on account of sin. This criticism, though it be considered of small moment, is of great importance in this discussion, as you will acknowledge.

You quoted Lev. xvi. to prove that all the sins and iniquities of Israel were cleansed by blood and borne away by the scape goat, on the annual day of atonement; and you again introduce it on page 48. You excepted one class of sins from being cleansed by blood on that day, The man who 'despised Moses' law; he must die without mercy—without the benefit of sacrifice, under two or three witnesses; Heb. x. 28. Now I have proved that the sin of despising Moses' included many classes of sins, and was not confined to that one class, which renounced his dispensation. Why you have singled out this one class as the only one excluded from the benefit of sacrifice, I cannot see any good reason. Paul said without exception "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses." Let us once more, in order to set this subject at rest, inquire more fully, who are those that died without mercy, or sacrifice. Lev. xxvi 15—43. But if ye *despise* my statutes, and abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my covenant; I also will do this unto you. Then follow the curses to verse 43, and the reason again given why these curses came upon them, Because they *despised* my judgments, and because their soul *abhorred* my statutes." To commit murder and adultery, was to despise the word of the Lord, or the law of Moses. 1 Sam. xii. 9. To give all the proofs of this subject would only be a repetition of what I have already written. To this I refer you. From these premises I conclude that the despisers of Moses' law, all wilful presumptuous sinners, as the idolator, murderer, &c. were excludeed from the benefit of sacrifice, on that day of atonement.

But you say, the character to which you allude, the despiser of Moses, i. e. the Apostate was not in the congregation on that day. How does my brother know this? Might I not with equal propriety say,

that none of the despisers of Moses, as the idolator, the blasphemer, &c. were there? I certainly believe with you that such characters were not there, unless clandestinely, because by law they had been previously put to death. Suppose a man under the law had been convicted of murder, or any other crime worthy of death, did the law allow any respite from the execution? If it did, does it say how long the judges may defer the execution? If no time be specified, might not mercy say, let it be deferred till the annual day of atonement, when his sin, and all others, shall be purged away by sacrifice and forgiven? Thus would the penalties of the law be evaded. Or, if those sins worthy of death could be purged by sacrifice, and such transgressros were allowed this privilege, would not every one make that sacrifice rather than suffer death? Thus again would the law be stript of its penalties, and license given to sin. I think, we should let this subject rest.

On page 49, You quote a query by me proposed to you, "Is propitiating and pacifying the divine Father, a scriptural idea?" My brother has evidently misquoted my words; they are "Is propitiating and pacifying the divine Father *by sacrifice*, a scriptural idea truly." page 49. You have left out the leading idea, *by sacrifice*, which I designedly emphasized. The scriptures no where say, that he was pacified or propitiated by sacrifice. But you think differently, and introduce again Ezek xvi, 63. "When I am pacified [*kaphar*] towards thee for all thou hast done." I ask again, Is it said in this text, that God was pacified by blood? I have before disposed of this text, I hope to your satisfaation, that it should read, When I have made an atonement or purification for thee, or when I have purged thee. To prove your position that God is pacified, you introduce those classes of texts, where it is said, "to turn away his anger—his anger endureth but for a moment—many

a time he turned away his anger." My dear sir, are these things said to be effected in him by blood? Again you say, in order to establish your proposition, that "Jesus is called our PEACE." I find these words in Eph. ii. 14, 15. But this has reference only to the peace which he established between Jew and Gentile, when by his death he removed the law, which had created the enmity between them. He is our peace in another respect, because by the same means, he reconciled both Jew and Gentile to God in one body. Surely this is a very different idea from that of removing the anger, and enmity from the mind of God, against sinners and producing peace there towards them; and all this by blood.

I will grant that God may be said to be pacified, to be pleased, &c. But I ask, With whom is he pacified and pleased? Is it with the impenitent sinner? Impossible; his holy nature must oppose sin. With whom then is he pacified and pleased? Surely, all will say with the penitent holy soul only; because God's holy nature is always pleased and pacified with holiness. I admit also that this pacification is effected between God and the penitent sinner by the means of Christ's blood. But this means has no direct effect on God to pacify him to the sinner; if it had, it must effect a mighty change in him—an hour before he was angry with the sinner, and not pacified to him; but as soon as the blood of Christ was shed, his anger was turned away—he was pacified, though the sinner remained unchanged. Can my brother believe this? "We are reconciled to God by the death of his son;" but not that God is reconciled to us by his death. "God was in [by] Christ reconciling the world unto himself"—not himself to the world.

On page 40, You say, "Jesus Christ is called a Mediator, our peace and propitiation, our mercy seat; and God sent him forth in this style to justify

him in showing mercy to sinners." I had always thought that Jesus Christ was God's mercy seat, and not ours. The text to which you refer reads thus, "Whom (Christ) God hath set forth to be a propitiation (mercy seat) through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26. It is agreed on all hands that *hilasterion* in the Greek text should be rendered propitiatory, or mercy seat. So have you rendered it in your version. Now the mercy seat under the law, was the covering of the ark containing the testimony, from which mercy seat God delivered or declared his oracles or words, and granted his favor to Israel through their high priest. The anti-type of which is Jesus Christ—he is the true mercy seat, from or by whom God speaks, and shews mercy to the world. One declaration he makes from this seat is, that he can be just, when he justifies him that believeth in Jesus. This idea is very different from the one you have given, "that God sent him forth to justify himself in showing mercy to sinners.

Of these verses in your former editions of the New Testament you have given McKnight's version, but in your last you have altered it according to what you deemed most proper. Thus you translate them, "Whom God hath set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of his own justice in passing by the sins, which were before committed, through the forbearance of God, for a demonstration, also, of his justice in the present time, in order that he may be just when justifying him, who, is of the faith of Jesus." I think my brother took greater liberty in this translation, than the Greek text fairly admitted. You have rendered the word *dikaiosune*, justice. Tho' this word is found near one hundred times

in the New Testament, it is every where translated righteousness in our version—and, I believe, in your version it is in every other place rendered righteousness. You have added the word 'own' to justice, which is not in the text. You have also added the word *also*. in verse 26, which gives an entirely different idea from that commuicated without it, as is apparent to every reader. The righteousness of God, which he declared from his mercy seat, Jesus Christ, is his plan of justifying the sinner through faith. This is the proposition made by the Apostle in the first Chapter to the Romans, and continued through all the argumentative part of the epistle. But as my brother intimates, that in its proper place he will speak more fully on this text, I will patiently wait

Grace, mercy and peace be with you,

B. W. STONE.

(For the Messenger.)

ESSAY—NO. II.

We see with our own eyes the accomplishment of this wonderful prophecy of Daniel, at least in part. Jesus, who came down from heaven to clothe in flesh and blood, in the sacred womb of the blessed virgin, is the small stone that came from the mountain without human aid. The prevailing characteristics of his person, of his relatives, his appearance, his manner of teaching his disciples; in a word of every thing, that relates to him, were "Simplicity, poverty, humility," which were so extreme, that they concealed from the eyes of the proud Jews the divine lustre of his miracles, how shining soever it was, and from the sight of the devil himself, penetrating and attentive as he was, the evident proofs of his divinity: Not-

withstanding that apparent weakness, and even meanness, the Lord Jesus will certainly conquer the whole universe. It is under this idea that a Prophet represents him to us. He went conquering and to conquer. His work and mission were to set up a kingdom, which is never to be destroyed; a kingdom which should never be left to other people; but which should break in pieces, and consume all the kingdoms of the world, and it should stand forever. The power granted to the Lord Jesus Christ, the founder of this kingdom, is without bounds, measure or end. The kings of the earth, who glory so much in their might, have nothing which approaches in the slightest degree to that of Jesus Christ. They do not reign over the will of man, which alone is true dominion. Their subjects can think as they please, independently of them. But all power is given to Christ, both in heaven and on earth; and he exercises principally upon the hearts, and minds of men. Nothing is done without his order or permission; every thing is disposed by his wisdom and power; every thing co-operates, directly or indirectly to the accomplishment of his designs. Whilst all human affairs are in a state of perpetual fluctuation; whilst states and empires pass away with incredible rapidity, and the human race vainly employed with these outward appearances, are also drawn in by the same torrent, almost without perceiving it; there passes in secret [unobserved by the world in general] an order and disposition of things unknown and invisible, which, however is pregnant with the eternal destinies of men. The duration of ages has no other object, than the completion of the number of the elect, which every day augments, and tends towards perfection. When it shall have received its final accomplishment, by the death of the last of the human race. Then comes the end, when Jesus Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to

God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. God grant we all may have a share in that blessed kingdom whose law is truth, whose king is love, and whose duration is eternity. Amen,

JACOB CREATH, Jr.

[*From the Journal of Christianity.*]

The Cross of Christ, or *his death* upon the tree, reconciled Jew and Gentile, because the enmity between them was crucified. Both were equally received by Christ. The pride of the Jew and the resentment of the Greek were slain by the facts that both had sinned, that Christ died for both, and received the circumcision and the uncircumcision on the same terms and conditions. Thus they were reconciled to God and to one another by the cross of Christ. And this same death upon the cross of this Divine Redeemer, does now, as it did at first, with freshness and a power that time can never wither nor impair, slay the pride of the human heart, its enmity aganist God, against man, and introduces to the heart a divine and heavenly peace and love, to which all earth-born sons of men are strangers, who have not been begotten by the Spirit and born from above.

A. CAMPBELL.

[From the Protestant Vindicator.]

A SKETCH OF POPERY IN MEXICO AT THE PRESENT DAY.

One of our subscribers, who lately returned from putting up furnaces for smelting silver and gold, in Guananato, in the Province of Mexico, relates to us the following facts, which he witnessed whilst there.

On All Saints' Day, the inhabtants,—men, women and children *are obliged* to congregate in the burying ground, for the purpose of doing penance for the touls of their relations and friends in Purgatory. On this occasion every individual is compelled to give the priest a sum of money' more or less.— He stands in the interior of the burying ground, at a kind of door way, with a *large tub* beside him, for the purpose of receiving the money as it is handed to him, any thing of lesser dimensions than a tub being quite too small to hold the large sum obtained from these degraded victims of superstition on this *holy occasion*. The penance consists in their tying a handkerchief or cloth round their bare knees, leaving a sufficient space to help about a handful or so of rock salt; about the size of peas, on which they are obliged to go about; kneeling and praying to several images, rudely carved in stone, and placed in nitches in the wall, a distance from each other. The pain is most excruciating, and indeed may be better conceived than discribed. Those persons in good circumstances, who do not wish to go through this torturing penance, can avoid so doing, by complying with the following indulgence:—Tables are placed at the corner of several streets, with an open book on each, and three human skulls, one in the centre, and one on each side. In these books they write their names; and pay down five dollars. This not only frees them from this degrading and tormenting penance, but is equally efficacious with the Deity,—as if they really did the penance themselves for the souls of their departed friends! Oh! Monstrous ignorance and idolatry! And yet we meet with persons every day, and sorry are we to say it, there are some clergymen who say,—"Oh it is better even to let Popery alone.'

At one end of the burying ground, is a large picture rudely painted, representing several persons emerging from Purgatory, and ascending up to the Virgin,

and our Lord!—The figures on this picture, are as large as life. It is inserted in the wall, to preserve from the weather. In the chapel attached to the burying ground, is a large picture, repesenting Luther *in the act of being driven into hell*!—The figures in this are also as large as life. To these pictures the dupes of priest-craft are obliged to pay reverence.

Another scene he witnessed, was on the occasion of the funeral of a respectable citizen, when' the host' was carried with great pomp, and lighted, &c. that a man [an American, lately a resident of New York,] for not complying with the rules, that of instantly falling on his knees, *out side of the door*, as the host passed, was stabbed dead on the spot;—he unfortunately having knelt down on the threshhold.

The workmen at these gold and silver mines are paid every Saturday. They meet in numbers to receive their money, and the priests who tyrannically claim a moiety out of their wages, are sure to be on the spot.—These priests wait not to be paid. They *help themselves*. They usually carry away a bag full, holding about a couple of hands full of silver pieces, and the use they make of it is to *gamble on the following Sabbath*; between masses, and get drunk! To those persons little acqainted with what Popery is in Catholic countries, these things will appear almost incredible, but such as have visited these lands of baptised paganism, and those who have studied the abominations of the Man of Sin, will not be surprised to hear of them.

Another scene of fraud practised on these priest-riden Mexicans, is,—that persons who are given over as incurable by the physicians, are immediately anointed by a priest. And if they should recover, which is sometimes the case, they are obliged to dress in female attire, and go about as *Pilgrims* begging from house to house. They are deemed holy, and like the priests, they have the privilege of dispensing

Holy Water, and get something from almost every person; they become very rich at this trade, if they live many years. And some of them commence when young. Such are a few of the scenes of brutalizing Romanism, witnessed by this person while a resident in South America.

C. K. M.

We commend to the attention of our readers the following article, from the work of Bishop Portius, on the evidence of Christianity. The extracts we propose making from this excellent work, is for the purpose of maintaining the divine claims of our holy religion, establishing the wavering—confirming the weak, and impressing the purity of its faith and excellency of its morality on the public mind. T. M. ALLEN.

PROPOSITION V.

The character of Christ, as represented in the gospels, affords every ground for believing that he was a divine person.

Whoever considers with attention the character of our blessed Lord, as it may be collected from the various incidents and actions of his life, (for there are no labored descriptions of it, no encomiums upon it, by his own disciples, will soon discover that it was in every respect, the most perfect that ever was made known to mankind. If we only say of him what even Pilate said of him, and what his bitterest enemies cannot and do not deny, that we can find no fault in him, and that the whole tenor of his life was entirely blameless throughout, this is more than can be said of any other person that ever came into the world. But this is going a very little way indeed in the excellence of his character. He was not only free from every failing, but possessed and parctised every imaginable virtue, Towards his heavenly father, he expressed the most ardent love, the most fervent yet rational devotion, and displayed in his whole conduct the most absolute resignation to his will, and obedience to his commands. His manners were gentle, mild, condescending, and gracious. His heart overflowed with kindness,

compassion, and tenderness to the whole human race. The great employment of his life, was to do good to the bodies and souls of men. In this all his thoughts and all his time were constantly, and almost incessantly occupied. He went about dispensing his blessings to all around him in a thousand different ways; healing diseases, relieving infirmities, correcting errors, removing prejudices, promoting piety, justice, charity, peace, harmony among men, and crowding into the narrow compass of his ministry more acts of mercy and compassion than the longest life of the most benevolent man upon earth ever yet produced. Over his own passions he had obtained the most complete command; and though his patience was continually put to the severest trials; yet he was never once overcome, never once betrayed into intemperance or excess in word or deed, 'never once spake unadvisedly with his lips." He endured the most cruel insults from his enemies with the utmost composure, meekness, patience and resignation; displayed the most astonishing fortitude under a most painful and ignominious death, and to crown all, in the very midst of his torments on the cross, implored forgiveness for his murderers, in that divinely charitable prayer; "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." Nor was his wisdom inferior to his virtues. The doctrines he taught were the most sublime, and the most important that were ever before delivered to mankind, and every way worthy of that God from whom he professed to derive them, and whose Son he declared himself to be. His precepts inculcated the purest and most perfect morality; his discourses were full of dignity and wisdom yet intelligible and clear; his parables conveyed instruction in the most pleasing, familiar, and impressive manner; and his answers to the many insidious questions that were put to him, showed uncommon quickness of conception, soundness of judgment, and presence of mind, completely baffled all the artifices and malice of his enemies, and enabled him to elude all the snares that were laid for him. It appears then, even from this short and imperfect sketch of our Savior's character, that he was beyond comparison, the wisest, and most virtuous person that ever appeared; and even his bitterest enemies allowed that he was so. If then he was confessedly so great and good man, it unavoidably follows that he must be, what he pretended to be, a divine person; and of course his religion must also be divine, for he certainly laid claim to a divine original. He as-

serted that he was the Son of God; that he and his religion came from heaven; and that he had the power of working miracles. If this was not the case, he must, in a matter of infinite importance, have asserted what had no foundation in truth. But is such a supposition as this in the smallest degree credible? Is it probable is it conceivable is it consistent with the general conduct of man, is it reconcilable, with the acknowledged character of our Lord, to suppose, that any thing but truth should proceed from him, whom his very enemies allow to have been in every respect, and of course in point of veracity the best and most virtuous of men! Was it ever known, is there a single instance to be produced in the history of mankind of any one so unblemished in the morals as Christ confessedly was, persisting for so great a length of time as he did in the assertions which, if untrue, would be repugnant to the clearest principles of morality, and most fatal in their consequences to those he loved best, his followers and his friends! Is it possible, that the pure, the upright, the pious, the devout, the meek, the gentle, the humane, the merciful Jesus, could engage multitudes of innocent and virtuous people in the belief and support of a religion which he knew must draw on them persecution, misery, and death, and unless he had been authorized by God himself to establish that religion; and unless he was conscious that he possessed the power of amply recompensing those who preferred his religion to every other consideration! The common sense, and common feelings of mankind must revolt at such a preposterous idea; it follows then, that Christ was, in truth, a divine teacher, and his religion the gift of God.

(From the Heretic, Detector.)

Bourbon County, Ky, August 18th, 1840.

BROTHER CRIHFIELD.

I reached home last evening from Bethlehem in this county. During a four days meeting we had the happiness of hearing six confess our Lord and Saviour. Brethren, Rogers, Williams, and Rains were present at different stages of the meeting. On the first day of this month I again visited Cynthiana. After five days almost incessant labor, having immersed 13 noble volunteers, I left

to see my family, brother Johnson having arrived on the day of my departure to carry on the meeting. I have since learned, that before he left, some 10 more were obtained, and choice spirits they were indeed. We felt much gratified at the order introduced while we were with them. Two elders and five deacons were chosen and ordained: and I do sincerely pray they may continue steadfastly, as we exhorted them, in the apostles' doctrine, in contribution, in attending to the Lord's feast and in prayers and praises first and last.

Bear in mind that this was effected in the midst of a hot-political contest; yet none of these things move us. The brethren stood with us, and a large audience was present even on Wednesday. Lord's day following I was at Georgetown, and early on Monday morning immersed an amiable lady in the clear stream that issues from the [large] Republican Spring—Spoke that day out at Dry-Run meeting-house, heard two young ladies confess the Lord, and proceeded to Elkhorn for baptism. Here was presented an interesting scene. An excellent young lady who had just risen from the watery grave, on reaching the shore was met by her sister. They mutually embraced, and sobbed aloud. O! it was enough to move a heart of adamant! I thought of the resurrection morn! May they walk together here in the service of the Lord, that there they may joyfully meet!

The next day I went on to Union in Fayette county, and there met brethren Brown, Williams, and Rogers. Some 15 had already come forward under the labors of Brown and Willams We continued the meeting three days longer, and nine others confessed and obeyed. Union is about two miles and a half from my residence. Here it was in April last. under the labors of brethren Rogers—the beloved and lamented L. J. Fleming was also with us—that some 15 were added.

In the letter I wrote you under date of June 12th, 3d, line from the end, through mistake I am made to say, that Kentucky first received among her believ-

ing sons the name Christian in the beginning of the present *county* instead of *century*.

I am sorry, brother Cribfield, to see the peculiar spirit that is being manifested in some recent pieces written on the name. I had hoped that investigating that subject, would rather be a reliance on solid scripture proofs and arguments, than a personal popularity and influence—that no personal strifes, collisions or feuds, would have any thing to do in the matter. It is properly an affair of the kingdom, and one, too, of great moment—I am not one of those who esteem names as nothing. They are all they import.—They who died for the name *Christian*, died for Christ and his cause. I am aware that a profession of religion under any name where it is not *lived*, will *avail* nothing; but does that prove it is unimportant by what name a real, sincere follower of Christ is called? No. When I hear the inspired Peter exhorting his brethren, by the *name Christians* and under that name to suffer patiently; let me not be told in the very face of the Lord's chief man, that the name is not of divine authority! Peter never nicknamed or reproached the followers of his blessed Master. James the servant of God, seems to have prized it more highly than all earthly riches. "Do not the rich," says, he, "blaspheme that worthy name (not title) by which ye are called?" 11. 7.

But why the recent attempt to stave off the force of all arguments adduced by styling us "exclusves?" Would it prove immersion not christian baptism to call its advocates exclusives? Certainly not. But what is in truth our position? This, that the writing or printing the words saint, brother, child, servant, or disciple, with a capital letter on the left, does not make and cannot make of either a proper name—that no man has a right in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus now to make proper names for us—and particularly where by so doing the Christians will be divided

into new parties. That the name *Christian* embracing all and meaning all that is good, given by divine authority, should be worn by all the followers of Christ, and is not to be thrown aside for a new made proper name; but should be acknowledged by every scholar of Christ—and that wearing and owning the name christian, does not set aside the use of the terms brethren, children, disciple, saints, servants or any other terms authorized of God and expressive of any relation in which we stand, but all embraced in the name of Christian. Where, then is this exclusiveness? Not with us most assuredly, but with those who, by singling out of a common name, and giving it great conspicuity; urge upon the brethren to receive it as their distinguishing appellative! to the *exclusion* of the name Chrstian because, forsooth, it has been abused? The real question, then which is now debated is this—Shall the blessed name *Christian*, sanctioned and used by the apostles, be *thrown aside* for an experiment—for something novel? Or shall we cling to it, and try by the Lord, to walk worthy of, and thus disabuse it?—

It is said that in Eph. iv. Paul says nothing of one name among the units. Neither does he speak of one Lord's supper or feast. Is there therefore neither a name nor a feast?—

Yours in Christ,
JOHN ALLEN GANO.

RIGHT OF PETITION,

The right of the people peacibly to assemble, and prepare and present petitions to their rulers, is seldom denied, except under the most despotic forms of government. As this is the fact in matters of a temporal nature, in things partaining to the present life, the same principle will hold at least equally good in spiritual matters, in things that pertain to the life to come, Most persons who properly understand their rights, will be at least as tenacious of them in religious as in secular concerns.

The right of the people to choose their own spiritual direc-

tors and teachers, to say who shall break unto them the bread of life, who shall hold to them the important relation of expounder of the Scriptures, who shall train their children in the elements of Christianity—who shall warn, reprove, exhort them with all long suffering and doctrine, and kneel at their dying couch in the hour of nature's last agony, point the sinner to the cross, and cheer and comfort the saint in his last conflict—these are matters of such infinite moment, that most considerate person would wish to exercise a deliberate preference to make their own selection, and not commit such a choice to others, who, to say the least, may be regarded as less informed of the peculiar circumstances of the case.

On these and similar grounds, most denominations of professing Christians concede to their several congregations the right to choose their own pastors, correctly supposing also, that they who pay 'the laborer his hire," should have a voice in determining who shall labor for them. The most remarkable exception to these common sense principles, is fond among our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal church. The bishops, it is well known, have in their hands the whole disposal of this matter. They apportion the lower "orders" of the clergy to the circuits according to their own will and pleasure. They say to this man, "Go, and he goeth," and to that one, "Do this and he does it;" and there is no appeal from their decision either by people or preacher. It is not supprising, therefore, that this practice which is so inconsistent with the prevalent spirit of Republicanism in the country, should give rise to many sad complaints against the appointing Power, especially on the part of the people, who sometimes are heard to murmur that the bishop sends them year to year such miserable preachers, while other charges are uniformly favored with the eloquent and talented members of the ministry. As regards the preachers, we have some reason to believe, that whilst not much is openly spoken against 'the rulers of the people," there is oftentimes a very considerable under current of dissatisfaction. It would be singular if it were not so.

Among the people of several congregations moreover, there had come into use to some extent a partial remedy for the evils of their condition. Though not allowed to choose their own preachers, they had ventured to exercise the right of petitioning the bishops to send them the men of their choice, and this indication of the will of the people was supposed to weigh somewhat with the bishops in distributing the lower "orders" of the clergy to their stations. It would appear, however, that the exercise of this right has given offence to the "Powers that be.' In a recent number of the Christian Advocate and Journal published at New York, a correspondent pronounces the practice of petitioning for the appointment of any particular preacher, to be not right, anti-methodistical, distrusting the

Providence of God, substituting our own selfishness and wisdom, &c. He further denounce it as an innovation upon the privileges of the other preachers. 'Is not the elegibility of the other preachers destroyed by the interference of the petitioners who have no right to interfere with the appointments?' The practice is further characterised as innovation upon the privileges of the other circuits and stations, &c. and as exhibiting a spirit nearly related to that spoken of in 2 Timothy, where it said of some, 'they will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears.' And finally it is viewed as savoring of that carnality, selfishness and contentiousness, which in the Corinthians merited an apostolic rebuke, saying—'I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas, and I am of Christ.'

The exercise of the right of petition it would seem, therefore, is a very, very bad thing indeed, an iniquity to be visited by the judges. After all these hard epithets have been heaped upon it from such a high and influential source, what congregation of Episcopal Methodists will hereafter dare to present their humble requests to the bishop? Or should they be guilty of such an anti methodistical piece of carnality, and contentiousness, they may expect forthwith to be put out of the Synagogue. We venture to recommend to our friend Dr. Banks, when he publishes a new edition of his remarks on the privileges of the members of our (Methodist) church, to add a chapter, setting forth the very special advantages enjoyed by Episcopal Methodists, in having the bishops to choose their pastors, and the preachers to fix the amount of salary to be paid them, but above all the inestimable privilege of being kept from the presumptuous, besetting sin, which has dominion over so many citizens of this republican land —viz: the carnal selfish and contentious sin of exercising the right of petition.

In sober truth, what a comment have we here on Mr. Wesley's oracle announced when laying the foundation of the Methodist Episcopal System; viz; "We are no republicans and never intend to be. It would be better for those who are thus minded to go quietly away.' Such is the progress of error, in its encroachments upon the rights of man. First it forsakes the primitive simplicity of the gospel, and establishes its hierarchy with its order of deacon, priest, or elder and bishop. Next the people are told they have no right to choose their own pastors or fix the amount of their salary, but must submit these matters to the bishops and other clergy, and then finally, they are forbidden so much as to offer an humble petition for the services of the man of their choice. We leave the reader to his own reflections upon these developments of the spirit of Episcopacy and Arminianism.

Presbyterian Advocate.

(From the Journal of Christianity.)

CHRISTIAN MORALITY.—It is a remarkable fact, that mankind cling with jealous tenacity to long cherished Principles and customs; and not unfrequently, from the force of habit, personal interest, and the prejudice of education, reject new and valuable discoveries, against the evidence of their own senses Hence it is, that in order to the sucess of all improvements in the arts — in science, and in government, their utility and soundness must be demonstrated by practical experiment. A blind devotion to the opinions and customs of our ancestors, and the known aversion of men to sudden and important changes in their views, principles, manners. and customs, however absurd, have always operated as powerful obstacles to the advancement of the world in knowledge, virtue, and religion.

The history of religious reformation shows, that the various efforts which have been made to improve the moral condition of mankind, have met with the same opposition from personal interest, habit, and prejudice, which have characterized the rise and progress of all others, Christianity enjoys no exemption from the common fortune o. human theories and systems whether true or false. All attempts to reform corrupt religious systems, and bring men back to the ground from which they strayed, have encountered the most furious opposition. The passions of the worldly minded votaries of a mere secular religion—the blind bigotry of the ignorant, and the sorded avarice of a hireling priesthood, have alike stood up in battle array, against innovation upon the established order of things. These obstacles exist at the present time in all their original strength, and cannot be overcome by theorising. Practice, by which the superiority of Christianity over sectarianism can alone be demonstrated, is indispensable to its reception with mankind generally. Its excellency, must be exemplified in the lives of its professors, Before the counterfeit can be detected, the true coin must be exhibited, that the contrast may be seen.

The smoke of the bottomless pit will never be dispelled from the moral horizon, until the light of the gospel shines upon the world, through the church—the city set upon a hill.

Reformation in conduct, is most needed now with Christians. We have got the theory. We have raised the expectations of our fellow men, and it is our duty not to disappoint them. As every tree is known by its fruit, so the spirit of christianity, its principles, and precepts. will be known by their practical results.

Brethren! awake to righteousness, and sin not. Put on the armor of light, and let the world see what pure, and undefiled religion is.

CHARLES G. FINNEY.

This celebrated revivalist gives testimony to the same doctrine. He is one of the leaders among the "New school Presbyterians," and one of the first who advocated the use of the "anxious seat." On the design of baptism, he remarks (in his 14th Lecture on Revivals, when advocating the necessity of something like the "anxious seat.") "The church has always felt it necessary to have something of this kind to answer this very purpose. In the days of the Apostles baptism answered this purpose. The gospel was preached to the people, and then all those who were willing to be on the side of Christ were called out to be baptized. It held the same place that the anxious seat does now, as a public manifestation of their determination to be Christians." page 248.

The Christian.

(From the Christian Herald.)

A WORD OF ADVICE.—Scarcely any other course in a preacher is so unwelcome to a congregation as throwing out hard or uncharitable expressions against other denominations of professed christians, This is a practice young and zealous men are apt to fall into. Particularly are those who have left one denomination and joined another, in great danger of throwing shafts back at the people they have left behind. Probably their intention is to do good, by exposing the errors, as they consider them from which they have made their escape; but long experience and observation have taught many, that such a course is generally useless, hurtful, disrespectful, calculated to sour the feelings, increase the spirit of disunion and disaffection among christians, and widen the already extended breach of party, and sectarianism:

Now for the advice. It is this: Hold all the light you have; but never try to put out your neighbor's lamp, that yours may appear to shine the brighter, Thats all.

S.

THE WORLD's END.—During the last two or three centuries, upwards of thirteen fixed stars have disappeared. One of them, situated in the Northern

Hemisphere, presented a peculiar brilliancy, and was so bright as to be seen by the naked eye at mid-day. It seemed to be on fire, appearing at first of a dazzling white; then of redish yellow, and lastly of an ashy pale color. La Place supposes that it was burned up, as it has never been seen since. The conflagration was visible about sixteen months.

(For the Messenger.)

"PURE SPEECH."

The division of Christians into opposing sects, and contending parties, is deplored by all saints; and is generally admitted to be opposed to the genius of christianity, the design of God in sending his son into our world, which was to "break down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, and to unite both in one body by the cross, so making peace." Many persons, eminent for piety, as well as for their intellectual, and literary attainments, about the commencement of the present century, saw the evils of partyism, and anxious to promote brotherly love, and christan union, determined to aid in accomplishing this desireable object, by abandoning human creeds, unscriptural names, and the doctrines, and commandments of men; and in addition, by contending for the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice—taking the name *Christian* as that by which to be called, and determining to receive each other "without regard to differences of *opinion*": that there should no longer exist divisions among Saints; but that all might be *one*, "standing upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."

Since then, many distinguished advocates have taken the field, in favor of the supremacy of the Bible, and the gospel principles of Chrisian Union.

Among them, none perhaps stand so distingnished as brother A. Campbell. In order that the great and leading principles of the reformation, with which he is identified, might succeed, he saw that it was not only necessary that human creeds should be abandoned, but he urged and contended, that "there must be, and there shall be an abandonment of the new and corrupt nomenclature, and a restoration of the inspired one."* In other words, Brother Campbell says, "we choose to speak of Bible things by Bible words, because we are always suspicious, that if the word is not in the Bible, the idea which it represents is not there; and always confident, that the things taught by God are better taught in the words, and under the names which the holy Spirit has chosen and appropriated, than in the words which man's wisdom teaches." †

As he states, "There is nothing more essential to the union of the disciples of Christ than purity of Speech," he proceeds to "specify a sample of those Babylonish terms aud phrases, which must be purged from the christian vocabulary, before the saints can understand the religion they profess, or one another, as fellow disciples." If the reader will turn to the second volume of the Christian Baptist, pages 25, 26 and 27, and Christianity Restored, 124 and 5. he will find the following *specifications* of *Babylonish phrases*, and *language of Ashdod*, enumerated by bro. Campbell:—

'The Holy Trinity,' 'Three persons of one substance power, and eternity,' 'Co-esential,' 'consubstantial,' 'coequal,' 'first, second, and third person in the adorable trinity,' 'God the Son;' 'and God the Holy Ghost.' 'Eternal Son,' 'The son eternally begotten of the Father,' 'The Holy Ghost eternally proceed-

---

* Christian Baptist, vol. 2, page 256.

† Christianity Restored page 125.

ing from the Father and the Son,' 'Humanity and divinity of Jesus Christ,' 'This he said as man, and that as God,' 'The Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son,' 'God's eternal decrees,' 'conditional, and unconditional election and reprobation,' 'God out of Christ,' 'Free will,' 'Liberty and necessity,' 'Original sin,' 'Total depravity,' 'Covenant of grace,' 'effectual calling,' 'Free grace,' 'Sovereign grace,' 'General and particular atonement,' 'Satisfy Divine justice,' 'Reconcile God,' 'active and passive obedience of Christ,' 'common and special operations of the Holy Ghost, 'imputed righteousness,' 'inherent righteousness,' 'progressive sanctification,' 'justifying and saving faith,' 'historic and temporary faith,' 'the faith of assurance, and the assurance of faith,' 'legal repentance,' 'evangelical repentance,' 'Perseverance of the Saints, and falling from grace,' 'visible, and invisible church,' 'infant membership,' 'elect infants,' 'elect world,' 'eternal sheep,' eternal justification,' 'christian Sabbath,' 'sacraments,' 'eucharist,' 'consubstantiation,' 'church government,' 'The power of the keys,' &c. &c. If the reader will take the trouble to consult the articles, in the Christian Baptist, and Christianity Restored, above referred to, I am satisfied that he will be amply rewarded for his trouble, in the able and lucid arguments of Brother Campbell, in favor of the necessity of a return to the pure Bible speech, and a consequent abandonment of all the 'language of Ashdod,' and 'Babylonish terms and phrases'.

Now without calling in question the truth, or falshood, of any sentiment contained in the above 'phrases,' was brother Campbell right in rejecting them, because they were merely human; and in *their stead*, 'choose to speak of Bible things, in Bible words"? We think so; and if it was correct then, is it not still so? Now if the Apostle Peter thought it necessary to write to his brethren "to stir up their

pure minds by way of remembrance, that they might be mindful of the words, which were spoken before by the holy Prophets, and of the commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour;" it may be equally important for us, occasionally to refresh our memory in reference to the *words spoken* by our brethren in their contending for Bible truth, and the *fundamental* principles of christian union. This will enable us to "hold fast the form of sound words," and not leave the "principles of the doctrine" so ably contended for in the early days of this reformation.

I have frequently thought I would invite the attention of the brethren to the forgoing catalogue of "Babylonian phrases," and invite a comparison of them, with many expressions that have since fallen from our intelligent and worthy brother; but a desire for peace, has hitherto prevented.

In the December number of the Millenial Harbinger for 1840, my attention was forcibly drawn to the same subject by the following language of brother Campbell, in his letter to Mr. Broaddus, on page 559. "Your references to vital and fundamental principles, I approve." But with regard to that venerable correspondent, of whom you speak, we must not judge too soon. I view it as an oversight, rather than an intellectual omission, that he left out the *expiatory designs*, of the Messiah's death. Men, long addicted to speculative controversy on Trinitarian and Unitarian hypotheses, are sometimes seared past mount Zion, Mt. Calvary, and Mt. of Olives. Some good men shudder with horror at the idea of "placating an offended Deity," "of satisfying dishonored justice," of "reconciling an angry God," that they are afraid to use the words, expiation, sin-offering, atonement, lest they should resemble the children of *Ashdod*. For my part I am not so timid!!! I believe that that venerable correspondent will come

out with a full declaration of faith, that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures," and that "without the sheding of his blood," God could not in honor, or in truth have forgiven one sin. "For my part, I am not so timid." Strange indeed! Why may not others be equally brave, and be allowed the same liberty? Shall others be condemned as departing from the pure speech of Canaan, when they speak of Bible things, in human words; and shall we be justified, when we abandon spiritual words, and substitute our own? How much more *Babylonish* is it—how much more the language of Ashdod—or how much greater the departure from the pure speech of the Bible, for others to say, 'Trinity,' 'God the Son, Satisfying divine justice, Reconciled God, coequal, &c. than for us to say Eternal word, Father of Eternity; Coetaneous. Society in God, Reconciles man and propitiates God, placating an offended Deity, Satisfying dishonored justice, Reconciling an angry God, God could not in honor or in truth have forgiven one transgression, &c. I again repeat, it is not my purpose *now*, to enter into an investigation of the truth or error in any one of the above expressions, but my object is to call public attention to the original ground assumed by brother Campbell, and decide whether he was correct or not. If he was correct in repudiating 'Babylonish phrases' in others, it will certainly be correct in him, and in all of us to abstain from the same practice yet. If primitive teachers of christianity were required "in all things to show themselves a pattern of good works"—to be examples to the flock, should not our teachers now, practice what they teach others, and avoid in themselves what they condemn as wrong in others?

Brethren, my voice is still for peace; I should deeply deplore a renewal of any controversy about human speculation; and one effectual means, by which it has been checked, has been in giving up the language of Ashdod, for the pure speech of heaven; and shall we now, after having so zealously contended for the faith once delivered to the saints, and witnessed such glorious, and splendid achievments by the truth of God, abandon first principles —depart from the words of the Holy Spirit; and turn again to the jargon of Ashdod? Forbid it heaven!

"It is a virtue to forget the scolastic jargon, and even the dogmas which have convulsed christendom." If it is a concession due to the crisis in which we live, for the sake of peace, to adopt the vocabulary of Heaven, and to return the borrowed nomenclature of the schools to its rightful owners—to speculate no more on the opinions of St. Austin, St. Tartullian, St. Origin: then let us speak of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—the gospel—faith—repentance—baptism—election—reconciliation—atonement, in all the phrases found in the record, without partiality; and learn to love one another as much when we differ in opinions, as when we agree, and to distinguish between the testimony of God, and man's reasoning and philosophy upon it.* Let us adhere to this, and all will be well.

But if it is Babylonish to say, 'Trinity,' what is it to say 'Society in God'? If it is human to say 'eternal Son,' and 'coequal,' What is it to say 'eternal Word' and 'coetaneous?' If it be the speech of Ashdod to say 'satisfy divine justice,' 'Reconciling God,' &c. what sort of speech is it to say 'satisfying dishonored justice'—or 'Reconciling an angry God'? I again remark, that it is not my purpose to excite controversy in reference to the correctness or incorrectness of the sentiments contained in the above phrases.

It is only against their use, as unscriptural, for which I plead. If we lay down rules for our gov-

* Christianity Restored page 126.

ernment, for the accomplishment of great and glorious gospel ends, let us adhere to them, if correct; if otherwise, let it be known that we have discovered our error, and found out a 'more excellent way.' For my part, I trust, I shall ever be so timid, as to abandon the use of the Scholastic jargon, and speak of Spiritual things in spiritual words. By so doing, I am confident I shall maintain the vital and fundamental principles of revelation, in the pure speech of the Bible; although I may not come up to the requirements of human creeds;—or use the language of religious philosophers—or maintain 'the vital and fundamental principles, of scholastic divines.'

If I receive the Bible as the word of God, acknowledge it as the only rule of faith and practice, believe all it teaches, obey its commands, walk by its directions, and speak of its communications in the language of the Holy Spirit, am I to be denied fellowship with my brethren, for mere difference of opinion, which they may call vital and fundamental, when these opinions too are expressed in the language of Ashdod.

Brethren, judge ye; and beware, I beseech you, lest while you reject all human creeds from your hands, you still retain them in your hearts. May the Lord guide us into all truth, and grant that there be no division among us!

T. M. ALLEN.

[*From the Genius of Christianity.*]

CONVERSATIONS.

Enter Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Quaker, Unionist, Freewill Baptist and Christian.

Baptist. We have happily come together to-day, friends, and though our meeting be somewhat accidental, yet I hope it will not prove unprofitable. It is

true we differ in somethings very much, which for myself I could earnestly desire might be otherwise; but I still cannot but feel that God has called me to preach the doctrine which is held by my denomination and I am constrained to believe that our practice is more consistent with the word of God than that of other denominations.

Quaker. Friend B. art thou not altogether bound to the letter? Dost thou not know that the letter killeth, while the Spirit only giveth life? I can tell thee, friend B. that Friends know what it is to be called of God by the Spirit to the ministry of the true gospel, the inward word of life: and we speak not except we are moved upon by the Holy Ghost, when we utter such words as the Holy Ghost giveth us, being careful not to speak but as the Holy Spirit directs.

Methodist. I do not know but your remarks in relation to brother B's. sticking to the letter are fully justified; for I believe that God has called me, and qualified me by the Holy Ghost to preach the doctrine of the Methodist Church. Now we believe in preaching the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.—Moreover, God has put the seal of his approbation upon us, in so abundantly pouring out his Spirit upon us. We believe that it is our privilege to be fully assuredby the Holy Ghost that we are right and in the way to glory. But, friend Q. we do not believe that the Spirit will allow us to keep silent and let the wicked go down to hell. We feel called upon by the Holy Ghost to cry aloud and spare not, and lift up our voice like a trumpet. The Holy Ghost requires us to *speak* and not to hold our peace. We believe that our course is fully asserted by the abundant blessings of God.

Unionist. Brethren, it is time for me to speak out. You see that your differences bring us in contact with each other. Now I would not have you give up

your conscientious practice, but I believe that God by his grace and spirit has called me to labor, to unite you all together in Christ. I believe that I am sent of God to this work. Therefore, I beg of you to submit your differences as mere non-essentials and strive to destroy that fiend and opposer to God, sectarianism. God calls upon you by his Spirit, and by his word to be united. Now, while I do not deny that you are all christians, and that God has called and blessed you, I do still believe that God has called me to this work of union.

Pres. It is all in vain to think of honoring God, if we do not keep in view his sovereignty. I have entered the ministry of the Presbyterian church in accordance with the rules of our denomination, and have received ordination by the Presbytery, having given satisfactory evidence that God had called me to preach the gospel, and to maintain the doctrines and ordinances according to the customs of the Presbyterian church. I do not believe that God, after having called me to the ministry in the Presbyterian church, will allow me to fellowship this plan of Unionism, which fellowships those who deny the most essential doctrines of our church.

Congregationalist. You are right, brother P. in saying that God does not call you to sanction the crying out "*union*—UNION,' as though the salvation of the world from hell depended on the surrender of the essential doctrines of the gospel. I think that this profaning movement, which would blend together Unitarians, Universalists and every thing else for union sake, is a scheme to *de*form and not to *re*form the church. I believe that God has called me by his spirit to preach and maintain a different doctrine from this Unionism. I am with you, brother P. only in your church government, which I cannot feel that God *approves* or *justifies*.

Unionist. We do not mean to hold fellowship with error in the least degree. that we can prevent.

B. Q. P. C. & F. B: (All together.)

Freewill Baptist. It appears to me that your discord cannot be divine. I think that I can fully claim to be called of God by his Spirit to preach the free gospel of the grace of God. Yet I think that the Spirit of God, which has called me to preach, requires me to maintain the stand my denomination have taken, and that you know will not harmonize with any of you. I believe we have all expressed our views but Mr. C. and perhaps he has nothing to say for himself. Perhaps he will fall in with one of us.

Christian. Indeed I hardly venture to speak what I think. I have heard a confusion of tongues surely. All of you called of God, and yet all contradicting each other? If I may confide in your different statements, God is the author of all this confusion and contradiction. I beg of you to consider the difficult and insurmountable barrier, which you throw in the way of the world's believing. Jesus, my Lord, when he sent men to preach, said to them, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Now look at the case as it stands before us this day. If the pretensions of Mr. B. are valid, and he has really been called and qualified by the Holy Ghost to preach the doctrine of the Baptist church, then I must believe him or be damned. So of friend Q. If his claim be valid I must believe him or be damned. Now I cannot possibly believe both? Is not then my damnation inevitable. But here, gentlemen, you have all presented the same claim, and the same consequences must of necessity follow each. Here are seven of us. Now, if we are each to raise the same claim to be authorized and directed in our doctrine by the infallible Spirit, we shall present to the mind of whoever may hear us nothing short of *seven impossibilities* of gaining eternal life. Now I have seen the consequences of your course. Very many honest

minded people desire to embrace the gospel of Christ. If I should direct them to the scriptures of the New Testament, as the only rule of faith and practice, and plead for the primitive gospel as the only directory to eternal life, you would perhaps all unite your cry in denouncing me as maintaining a spiritless religion, and as a cold formalist. But I entreat you to consider that your bickerings and strife in building up your party systems is an ill proof of your possessing the spirit of Christ. I will now leave the subject by presenting three difficulties, which are urging me to the conclusion that your supposition of being directed by the infallible spirit is incorrect. Either, 1. God has not called you severally to preach; or 2, You do not preach what he called you to preach; or 3. God is the author of confusion, and the damnation of all that hear you is sealed by the impossibility of believing contradictions.

Dillon, Tazewell County, Ill. Feb. 8th, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE-

Please answer the following in the Christian Messenger and oblige your brother

PETER WHIP.

1. By whom according to scripture should Elders or Bishops of churches be ordained, or appointed?

2. If by the whole congregation, where do you find scripture to support the practice?

3. If by travelling preachers or evangelists, where do you find scripture to support it?

4. If by the Eldership, or Presbytery, where do you find scripture to support the practice?

5. Would it be scriptural or reasonable for an elder to exercise the duties of the office in a congregation, if he be ordained to the office by mere permission, the congregation having no faith or confidence in the necessity of such ordination?

QUERIES PROPOSED BY BROTHER PETER WHIP.

Query. 1st. By whom, according to scripture, should Elders or Bishops of churches, be ordained or appointed?

Answer. You take for granted what needs proof, that *ordained* and *appointed* mean the same thing. That elders were chosen and appointed by the church needs no proof; but the church has no authority to ordain an elder. The scriptures no where name such authority, nor have we an instance on record that they claimed, or exercised such authority. Therefore, if a church exercise it, the ordination would appear null and void. If this authority was given to to church, why did not the Apostles teach them their duty, and not officiate themselves in doing it? Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in every church, Acts xiv. 23, had it been the duty of the church, why take it out of their hands, and do it themselves? And why was Titus left in Crete to ordain elders in every city; if the churches were authorized to do it themselves? Titus 1.

Queries 2, 3, 4, and 5, are all answered in the answer to the first.

B. W. STONE.

Monticello Lewis Co. Jan. 20th, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE.

My poor afflicted wife lies in her bed beside me not able to set up, nor do anything for me and her children. She declines fast. It is consumption. I go out preaching a few days sometimes, and I fear when I return I shall find her a corpse.

PROGRESS OF THE GOSPEL.—On the ninth and tenth instant we held a two day's meeting in this county, [Lewis] thirty miles North-west of Monticello, on

the North Fabius river, and organized a Christian Church consisting of seventeen members. It is named Antioch. Brother Stonard is the Evangelist there and in the vicinity.

Last Lord's day at Houston, in Marion County, two young gentlemen confessed the Lord.

J. CREATH. Jr.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

A protracted meeting was held at Winchester, Ill. in the present month—23 were baptized. The labrorers were T. Sweet, W. Strong, D. P. Henderson, S. Hatchitt and B. W. Stone. There was at the same time a meeting at Mt. Sterling, not yet closed. We heard a few days ago that about 10, or 12 had been immersed by brother John Taylor, jun.

Bro. T. M. Allen from Columbia, Mo. Jan. 12, 1841; 12 were baptized recently in Columbia, and Bear creek.

In Fulton, were 7 additions, 3 by letter, and 4 were immersed. In a P. S. brother Allen adds, that 3 united with the Church that day ni Columbia. The laborers are himself and brother T. Smith.

Brother J. Creath's valuable communication was partly set up in type, but for want of room, is lard over for the next number.

Brother Crihfield, in his Detector of the present month, gives us a table of additions to the Christian Church since his last number, which are 2480.

Would to God, that piety increased among us in the same ratio with our increase of numbers. Would to God we could receive intelligence of the churches that they "mind not earthly things," and are abounding in the work of the Lord, and flowing together into one body, and all drinking into the one Spirit! Hasten it Lord, in every land! EDITOR.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

MARCH, 1841.

VOLUME XI. NUMBER VII.

(For the Messenger.)

A HINT TO CHRISTIAN PARENTS.

If Christian fathers would read the scriptures twice a day in their families, i. e. morning and evening, and interrogate their children on the contents of each chapter, and sing and pray with them, there would be less for the proclaimers to do. How many readers of the Christian Messenger follow this old fashioned practice? If we had a greater number of christian mothers and grand mothers, who would act the pious part that Lois and Eunice acted, we should have more Timothies in the Lord's harvest. O Lord, be pleased to revive the knowledge and practice of the Holy Scriptures in every family, in every town, village, hamlet, county, state and nation, until, the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the seas! How many parents are raising their children for the Lord, as Hannah did little Samuel from two years old? How many are preparing their children for war by their training? How many for the law? how many for medicine? how many for the world? for riches? for fame? for politics? Many have painted flags in politics, but have never raised a flag of peace and salva-