Rutland, Meigs county, Ohio, July, 1841.

BROTHER STONE—Some information in regard to the progress of truth in this section of country may not be uninteresting to you. In this county there are 8 congregations, embracing about 500 members, most of which have been organized within the last two years. They are daily increasing. We have three Evangelists in the field constantly proclaiming the word of life, and its proclamation is not without effect, having obtained near three hundred additions within the last sixteen months. Hence you will learn that the proclamation of God's word is not without effect, when delivered in its native beauty and grandeur. This should inspire us with zeal for the law of our King. And believe me, my old brother, every means are resorted to by the sects to oppose the truth, for which we contend. We are called *traitors*, because we have abandoned the creeds of our ancestors; we are called *apostates*, because we have entered our protest against the corruptions of Christianity. We are called *heretics*, because we cannot embrace the dogmas of priestly zeal, and wear the fetters that bind the human will. But we will not mind these things, and will be mild, just and generous; humble before our God, and zealous for his honor and law, for a glorious prospect is extended before us. The day dawns upon us in which christians will reverence the long neglected statutes of Jesus, the Messiah. Likewise, there is in reserve, a rich inheritance for all the righteous, where we shall drink of the streams of divine goodness, and "bask in the sunshine of his Love." O, then, let us look to the recompense of reward beyond the Jordan of death! Your friend and brother,

RODNEY DOWNING.

Brother L. Hatchitt of Mo. writes about 1st inst. that about 24 were lately added in his itinerations through the north of that State. ED.

The religious intelligence of brother Ross of Iowa is mislaid, and cannot be found.

Since Sept. last the Detector reports 225. ED.

The letter of brother J. Smith of Ky., to the editor of the Harbinger. came too late for this number.

"The Ohio Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church last week held its session in Springfield, Ohio; and, amongst other business, the name of a young man was announced as a candidate for the ministry. A brother rose and said that the candidate was worthy of reception; for he was a true Methodist!

"At this, Mr. Crall, the Secretary of the conference, rose to inquire what was meant by 'a true Methodist; 'for,' said he, 'Methodism has now so many heads and horns that I despise its very name!!!'"—*Western Christian Advocate.*

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

December, 1841.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 3.

From the Christian Palladium.

PLAIN THOUGHTS.

BY ELDER T. CARR.

[*Continued from page* 22.]

Some will ask, Why all this from men professing to take the Bible as a rule of faith and practice? Why, it originated from a few short sentences of scripture, by them isolated, forming in their minds this short creed, viz: faith, repentance, and baptism, (inseparably connected) for the remission of sins. This they think is God's plan for the salvation of the world. This being the constituted plan of Heaven, neither of the items can be dispensed with; each is a *sine qua non* to remission of sins. The person neglecting either faith, repentance, or immersion, must remain unforgiven, not pardoned. Consequently immersion must be attended to or the sinner lost!

Now if this system be true every thing else must be false: consequently very many of those whom we always recognized as Christians have not been immersed, and can not be regarded by them as Christians! Our rule of action in this particular, has always been to embrace, in the arms of affection, all the lovers of the Lord, of every name, and to receive all who give evidence that the Lord has received them. Hence the Disciples must regard us, at least, as brethren walking disorderly, and ought in all conscience to withdraw themselves from us.

The above named scheme is at war with every other system in Christendom. I now ask, how this people can fellowship unpardoned sinners? The honest and undesigning among them do not fellowship any but the immersed. Others, for the sake of advantage, seemingly fellowship all. Now what is such friendship but dissimulation?

I have said the honest among them do not fellowship any but the immersed, because none but such have remission, consequently not born of God, not his children, not their brethren, not Christians; and to fellowship such would be to encircle in their communion the unregenerate, and

give 'holy things to dogs.' The Editor of the Christian Messenger, (whom I highly esteem) says, 'in his parts they commune with Methodists, Presbyterians,' &c. Such a course, to say the least of it, is doubtful. The Lord says, 'come out from among them, and be ye separate.' To embrace as brethren those whom they know are not such, shows a want of moral honesty, and a disregard of God's word.

Now, dear brethren, this people can never unite with us unless they renounce their creed; because we have always believed remission of sins is received upon the principle of faith, repentance, prayer and seeking with all the heart, though there be no *water* within miles of the place. God is not dependant upon any immersing nor sprinkling priest to enable him to pardon the sinner.

Why, brethren, they must regard us as standing in the way of the promotion of God's cause, or plan in which he saves sinners, consequently if we have any influence over sinners, that influence must in their estimation, be against the salvation of men. Therefore, the honest among them treat us as enemies to the cause of God. If I am treated otherwise, I regard it as arising either from ignorance of their scheme, or from dissimulation. Those who are the most intolerant I love the most, because I think them honest, not hypocrites.

As well might we expect a union between a believer and an infidel as a union with this people. Long have I hoped, and in some degree expected this people to abandon their little contracted creed, and embrace truth, which would expand their hearts, but have lost almost all hope. They are strengthening themselves in it, and consequently their opposition to us and all others, is on the increase, and with this view of the subject we are enabled to know from whence arises that of which the Disciples complain so much; intolerance, bitter denunciations, &c. &c. against all who oppose them, declaring themselves right and all others wrong. Now, if blame must rest any where it should be upon the doctrine, the natural tendency of which is to inspire such an unchristian spirit.

Now, from the foregoing considerations, I have thought it best for the peace and advancement of the cause of God and truth among us, that we no longer seek for union with the 'Disciples,' for in all cases, in the bounds of my knowledge, (which is not very limited,) where it has been attempted, they have claimed the complete control, and every thing had to bow to their creed, the 'Ancient Order,' as taught by A. Campbell, must be fully established or union could not be had. And if the union continued, it in all cases was at the expense of that sweet gospel liberty and spiritual enjoyment that always has been characteristic of the Christians; and cold death-like formality has followed.

Let us remember that 'evil communications corrupt good manners,' and resist every thing that will deprive us of that sweet spiritual enjoyment, without which religion is but an empty name. O, for a more free intercourse between heaven and our souls. *This* is the religion for which I preach, and for which I pray. None other is worth possessing.

Liberty, Ia. 1841.

REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

BROTHER MARSH:

I proceed to the further consideration of your correspondent, T. Carr's communication. In exculpating himself and such as think with him, he gives the *indubitable* reason, whence originated the disorder and confusion, apparent between us. "Why," says he, "it originated from a few short sentences of scripture, by them, (the Disciples) isolated, forming in their minds this short creed, viz: faith, repentance and baptism, inseparably connected, for the remission of sins. This they (the Disciples) think is God's plan for the salvation of the world." Is it possible, brother Marsh, that you endorse this sentiment, and publish it to the world?—that the cause of strife, contention and confusion, is the preaching of faith, repentance and baptism!—asserting this to be God's plan of saving the world!!—and that a few isolated texts incline that way!!! Has your correspondent forgotten the divine commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved--Go, teach all nations, baptizing them, (if they believe)--that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Was not this the plan of God to save the world? Did not Peter receive this commission? Would he have acted up to it, had he neglected to enjoin either faith, repentance or baptism? Did he not combine them all when he began to preach in Jerusalem at Pentecost? He preached the gospel--the people believed--he told them they must repent, and be baptized--they obeyed and were saved.

Did the Lord ordain any other plan in the New Testament of saving the world? Did the apostles teach any other plan? Durst they conform to the ig-

norance and prejudice of the world, and omit to teach the whole divine plan? Would they have been faithful to their Lord to add or diminish from his plan? If the teaching of this plan be the cause of strife or confusion, who is to blame for it? the teacher or the taught? Had your correspondent been present at Pentecost, and heard Peter preach, would he not have corrected the apostle for informing the people that they must be baptized for remission or salvation? Would he have said, Why Peter, do you make baptism an essential, a *sine qua non* of salvation or remission? "We can never unite with you, unless you renounce this creed; because we have always believed remission of sins is received upon the principle of faith, repentance, prayer and seeking with all the heart; though there be no water within ten miles of this place. Peter, we must be right, for our experience teaches us that we received remission of our sins before we were immersed; therefore, there is no necessity of water baptism; God is not dependant upon any immersing or sprinkling priest to enable him to pardon the sinner." Peter would have replied, My Lord commanded me to baptize, and I must obey him. Would your correspondent have replied, The Lord knows there is no necessity for baptism—God can and does save without it. As well might he have withstood Peter, as those acting and believing as Peter did. As well might he withstand the Lord of all, because he required baptism.

Now, I have proved beyond fair contradiction, that faith, repentance and baptism, is heaven's constituted plan of salvation. All the gloomy inferences of your correspondent, are not against us, but against the Institutor himself. He should be careful lest he be found fighting against God.

But why does he not believe baptism to be required in the plan of salvation? He may say, that faith is

frequently mentioned alone, by which we are saved or justified. Will he from this conclude that repentance, prayer and baptism are unnecessary? So repentance is often mentioned alone, as that by which we are forgiven and saved—Will he thence conclude that faith, prayer and baptism are unnecessary? Baptism is also mentioned alone, as that by which we are saved—Will he thence conclude that faith, repentance and prayer are unnecessary? Did not he that enjoined faith and repentance, also enjoin baptism in the plan of salvation? Have we any scriptural authority to dispense with baptism? This is the question; to approach which many seem fearful. Who will dare say, that any one item of God's plan of saving sinners, is not essential, and therefore it is a matter of indifference whether we attend to it or not?

I will now notice a few of his gloomy inferences. 1st. If baptism or immersion is necessary, and a part of God's plan of salvation, "then immersion must be attended to, or the sinner lost." Yes; if the sinner knew that God required immersion, and will not obey, he will certainly be lost, or not saved. "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." "And if ye die in your sin, where God is you cannot come." This inference of your correspondent is denied by us, as far as I know, in case of ignorance of duty. We with you believe that immersion only is baptism, and is not to be administered to helpless babes, but to believers only. Yet we believe with you that there are many from wrong teaching, who think that sprinkling or pouring a few drops of water on the subject, whether adult or infant, is a compliance with God's will. Now we think with you that there are many pious christians, who from ignorance of immersion as their duty, have neglected it, and yet are accepted of God with all their ignorance. Yet these same people have the spirit of obedience, and did they

know that immersion is required, they would obey. For twelve years I thus lived without immersion, and believe that I lived under the smiles of heaven. But when I became acquainted with my duty, I submitted to it. How should I then act? Should I teach the world that baptism was unnecessary for salvation, because I experienced salvation without it? Should I labor to comfort people in their ignorance, or teach them their duty and urge them to obey? Surely this is a consistent course. Is not the contrary course presumption?

2. He says, "Our rule of action has always been to embrace in the arms of affection, all the lovers of the Lord of every name, and to receive all that give evidence that the Lord has received them. Hence the Disciples must regard us as brethren walking disorderly, and ought in conscience to withdraw themselves from us."

I ask your correspondent, whether he ever read of an unimmersed person received into the church under the New Institution? or whether that book authorized such to be received into the church? If so, where in that book is it found? Has not the Church of Christ, from the beginning, in every land, in every party who believed in water baptism as a divine ordinance, in all their creeds, believed that a person must be baptized, before he could be received as a member of the church? May we not love a foreigner of an unblemished character, and receive him kindly to our hospitalities? But would we claim such as a fellow-citizen, and grant him all the privileges of our government, until he take the oath of allegiance? We could not agreeably to our Constitution. To do it would be a violation of our Constitution. So baptism is the *sacramentum*, or oath of allegiance, by which we become a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. John iii.

We receive all of a christian character into our

arms of affection, but we cannot receive the unbaptized into the church. To do so, would be to act without scriptural precept or example. Did Christ and his apostles ever receive an unbaptized person into his church? Where and when? Did they ever authorize it to be done? Where and when? We grant, all that work righteousness in every nation, are accepted of him, as was Cornelius; but this does not prove that they are to be received into the Church. But you may say, We are commanded, (Rom. xv. 7.) "Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God." Remember, this was addressed to the saints in Rome, who had all been baptized—yea, buried with Christ in baptism. These saints, whether Jews or Gentiles, were to receive one another—but they were not commanded to receive the unbaptized into the church. Your correspondent's *rule*, and our *rule* for receiving into the church, are very different. The Bible only is our rule of practice for receiving into the church—his rule is a man-made one, and works differently from ours. By which shall we work? judge ye.

Such is my charity, that we have received unbaptized persons of a christian character to join with us in our worshipping assemblies, to pray and sing, and even to eat and drink at the Lord's table with them. For the Lord's supper was instituted and attended to previous to baptism, and we are no where forbidden to do so. But because I and many of my brethren have done so, your correspondent has represented us as hypocrites, dishonest and designing men. It is a small thing to be judged of man's judgment. Judge not, lest ye be judged, says a greater than T. Carr.

3. His next inference is, "That this scheme is at war with every other system in christendom." That may be, and yet our scheme may be right and every other wrong. Let it be proved to be at war with the

Bible, and we yield, not before. "At war with every other system in christendom!" Were the sentiment of any weight, I could easily prove the reverse; but let it pass unnoticed. In passing, I remark that your correspondent has slandered us, in thus speaking evil of us. But a man in this day may slander a professed brother without any fear of responsibility to his party.

He proceeds; "Now brethren, this people can never unite with us, unless they renounce their creed." Then there is an end of all hope; we will never give up our creed, the Bible. But, we must receive their creed, or their plan of God's salvation, which is to renounce water baptism, or whittle it away to an unessential, or that which may be received any way, or rejected in toto, as every man pleases. We cannot receive this creed, because we deem it latitudinarian; and therefore, if urged upon us we reject it as we do every party scheme on earth. We unite not on opinions, but on the facts and spirit of the gospel. We agree that faith and repentance are indispensible parts of God's plan of saving sinners; and that praying and seeking for salvation as naturally flow from true faith and repentance, as that waters flow downwards. We differ but in one point; you think immersion not a part of God's plan—we do. Shall we, therefore, be rejected on this ground?

Your correspondent with your endorsement, has expressed the very essence of sectarianism. We may unite with them, if we will renounce our creed and adopt theirs. So say all the sects. To avoid this foundation stone of sectarianism, we took the Bible alone for our creed, near forty years ago; and all who take this and act up to it, we receive in union, without regard to diversities of opinion.

Your correspondent says, "As well might we expect a union between a believer and an infidel, as a union with this people," Then are all our attempts to promote union, vain. If this be the language and spirit of the eastern christians, I for one, do not desire it; *actum est de unitate inter nos.* His idea why a union cannot be effected between us is, that we will not give up our little, contracted ereed, and embrace his.

Upon the whole, he advises his brethren not to unite with us!! and yet would make the world believe he was not a sectarian in the proper sense of that term. He ought never to declaim against sectarianism, unless he first proclaim aloud, that the Disciples are all infidels, and have no just claims to christianity. Let him unite with all the sects in denouncing us, and prepare to give an account to his Judge at last, for acting in opposition to his will, that all that believe should be baptized, and should be one even as the Father and Son are one.

He calls us by a sectarian name, *Disciples.* In doing thus he is partly justified, because many among us have taken this name in preference to that of *Christian*, given first at Antioch by divine authority. Yet all have not taken that name. Thousands among us disown the name, (Disciple) and blush to see in our periodicals, "The church of the Disciples,"—"A meeting of the Disciples," &c. The name *Christian* appears to be studiously avoided, and the name Disciple to be purposely used, in order to fasten it upon the whole body. I soon shall leave the shores of time, and while bidding farewell to the world, I again solemnly protest against the change of the name. In doing this, I condemn not my brethren who think differently. The matter will be determined before the final judgment seat not many days hence.

Praying for a better state of things, I subscribe myself, Your old brother,

B. W. S.

THE NAME JESUS.

Matt. i. 21. "And thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins."

[*Continued from page* 16.]

In my former number I have taken a view of the dignity and glory of the Son or Word of God before he came down from heaven, and was made flesh. I also glanced at his deep humiliation in becoming flesh, and I now desire to speak of his glory when he became partaker of flesh and blood.

He had a soul and a body. "Now," said he, "is my soul troubled, even unto death." This soul was that very glorious being, whom we described in the former number, as the Son or Word of God, who was with the Father, and by whom God created all things. This same being, in the fulness of times, for our salvation, descended from heaven, and was made flesh, or took flesh and blood, such as the children had, subject to pain, sickness and death—or he was the seed of David according to the flesh—but was declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the spirit of holiness, or Holy Spirit, by the resurrection from the dead. He was the root of Jesse, yet a rod out of the stem of Jesse—the stem of Jesse was David, and the rod from this stem was Jesus: Isai. xi. He was the root and the offspring of David.—the root of Jesse and of David; because they, among other creatures, were created by him—but he is their offspring according to the flesh. What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say, the son of David. But David said, the Lord said unto my Lord, "sit thou on my right hand, till I make thy foes thy footstool. If David in Spirit called him Lord, how is he his son? They could not answer him. Neither could we unless we had been better instructed. As to the Spirit or soul he

was David's Lord, or Jehovah, but as to the flesh, he was David's son. In the Psalms it reads, "Jehovah said unto my Jehovah, &c." In the same sense, the Father speaks to the Son, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever, a sceptre of rightousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom—Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity, therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Heb. i.

The person of Jesus then consists of one soul and a body, that soul is the Son or Word of God, that existed in glory before the world was. He was divine as being the Son of God—human, as being the son of David.

He says, when in the flesh, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father, for the Father dwelleth in me, and I in him. Such texts frequently occur. When, therefore, we see him, we see the Father—when we know him we know the Father; for we see God manifested in the flesh of Jesus. But it may be asked, what of God do we see in Jesus? I answer, not the being or substance of God; for no man hath seen God at any time, or can see: but we see the perfections of God—the glory of God in the face of Jesus—the image of the invisible God—the character of his person. We see God, as I have said, in his perfections. The mighty works that Jesus performed were manifestations of God's almighty power. "It is not I that speak, by which those mighty works are done; but the Father in me, he doeth the works,"—The same says Peter, Acts ii. "Jesus, a man approved of God, by signs, wonders and miracles, which God did by him."

In Jesus we see the perfections of God, not only of power, but of wisdom, love, mercy, truth, faithfulness, all the fulness of Godhead—the very image of God, (characteer) the very character of his substance. All that benevolence, mercy and love we see in the Son,

are the benevolence, mercy and love of the Father manifested. All those words of grace which flowed from his lips are the words of the Father. "He spake by his son." In him we learn the Father. They are *one* in mind, purpose and love to the fallen world. Where else shall we know the Father but in the Son. There he is plainly revealed in all his glorious perfections. Whosoever loves the Son, loves the Father—whosoever honors the Son, honors the Father also. They are one character, and character is the object of affection.

To come to the Father by the Son, is a scriptural idea, and how few feel its force. Through or by the Son, we see the Father, and come to him as manifested in the Son. This is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent. Avaunt forever, vain speculations on this soul-reviving doctrine! Grow in the knowledge of Christ, and you will grow in the knowledge of the Father, and experience eternal life.

Look at Jesus weeping over a lost world—this is the very temper of the Father himself—see him bleeding and dying on Calvary—you see the very compassion and love of God manifested. See his tender solicitude for the salvation of sinners—it is the very heart of the Father. Think you that Jesus loved sinners, and that the Father hated them?—that Jesus was the friend of sinners, and the Father their enemy? Did he come, live and die to reconcile the Father to us, and to bear his vengeance for us in his own person? No: God is love, and love to the world moved him to give his only begotten Son, not to appease his wrath against the sinner, but to save them from their sins.

B. W. S.

(To be Continued.)

For the Christian Messenger.

Queries, No. 1.—ELDER BAILEY.

Elder B. W. STONE:

As you are engaged in publishing a religious periodical, may I be permitted to ask a few questions? I have been a student of the Bible for many years, endeavoring to learn God's method, or plan of saving sinners. I have arrived at this conclusion, that the *grand secret* in religion consists IN BELIEVING WITH THE HEART ALL THAT GOD TEACHES, AND DOING ALL HE COMMANDS. Am I mistaken?

Elder Bailey, a Baptist minister of Winchester, Ill. asserted in the Christian meeting house in this place, during a course of lectures he was delivering, "That persons may be born of God frequently *after*, and ought always to be born of God *before* baptism,"—"That God has no set way to proceed in conversion."

I assure you, I was not a little surprised to hear a man, who professed to be called and sent of God to preach the gospel, inculcate such a sentiment. If this doctrine be true, how are we to know when we are pardoned? Mr. Bailey also said, that, "Born of water and spirit," (John iii. 5) did not allude to baptism. That it should be translated, "*Born of water, even of the spirit.*" Titus iii. 5. "Washing of regeneration," says he, "I deny that baptism is taught in this passage."

Will the Baptists endorse these sentiments? To shew you what importance Mr. Bailey attaches to the institution of Baptism, I will transcribe from my notes his own words. Says he, "If a man knows it to be his duty to be *immersed*, and will not bow to the *test*, which God requires, he CANNOT ENTER into the kingdom of heaven. A man must submit his neck to the *yoke* of Jesus Christ: Nay, I go still farther, if a man learned from *tradition, even* if he were to *fancy* a thing right,

and then refuse to obey it, he would be damned. His conscience would be his guide."

Is not Mr. Bailey putting too much stress on tradition?—on a man's imagination?

These are but a few, of the many assertions, made by the Rev. gentleman, and if permitted, I will, in a future number of the Messenger, state the objections which Mr. Bailey made to "the Doctrines of the Reformation, so called," soliciting from your pen remarks upon them, trusting, that if they fall into his hands, he will see the futility of his arguments, and like a MAN, retrace his steps.

Please attend to the foregoing queries, and favor your readers with such comments as you think proper.

Truly, yours, &c.

D. P. H.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

My dear BROTHER:—Your definition of religion is, "believing all that God says, and doing all that he commands." I have no doubt, that these are the means ordained of God, through which we obtain religion. The word, religion, is derived from the Latin word *religo*, which primarily signifies, *to bind again.* Its application is, that Adam in innocency was bound to his God with the cords of love; but sin dissolved or cut these cords, and separated him from his God. *Religion* is to bind him again, or to rebind him to his God. This is the work of God through the means he has ordained, that is, "by believing all he has said, and doing all he has commanded." This is religion, or *at-one-ment*, which will be completely effected by the resurrection from the dead to immortality and eternal life.

You ask my opinions on several doctrines, advanced

by Mr. Bailey in your hearing. One is, "that persons may be born of God frequently *after* baptism, and should always be born of God *before* baptism—that God has no set way to proceed in conversion."

According to Mr. Bailey's definition of being born of God, as signifying a new creature, we all believe that many have been made new creatures *after* they have been baptized; for we are not so charitable as to think that all who are immersed are new creatures; nor so uncharitable as to think they never can be made new creatures afterwards. As to his assertion, that persons should always be born of God, or made new creatures before they are baptized, you, my brother, as firmly believe as he does; for you contend that no unchanged, unrenewed person should be baptized; and that the baptism of such avails him nothing. Where then do you and Mr. Bailey disagree?

You may say, I believe that regeneration is not a change of heart, but of state, and this change of state is effected through baptism. Yet you as firmly believe in a change of heart as he does, and he as fully believes in a change of state as you do—so fully that he will not admit an unimmersed person into the church, or to partake with him of the holy supper. He therefore must view all the unimmersed as aliens from the commonwealth of Christians, nor can this state be changed until they are baptized, should they even be changed in heart and as holy as Cornelius.

Is not the contest a logomachy, while you both believe the same thing? So, I confess, it appears to me. There appears to be an unhappy disposition among christians to find fault and condemn at the present time. Ought they not rather to examine and compare their sentiments, in order to effectuate a union? Surely this would be more like Christians.

Another sentiment of Mr. Bailey, is, "that God had no set way to proceed in conversion." By the term

conversion, I suppose, from the connection, Mr. B. understands regeneration, or being made a new creature, according to the Old School. This, he says, is sometimes effected *after* baptism, and should be always *before* it. In this respect he doubtless was led to conclude, that God had no set way of conversion. Your agreement with the sentiments advanced we have already noticed. But to take the sentence, "God has no set way of conversion," as an abstract proposition, is certainly indefensible; we should never know with certainty what to do to be saved--whether we were certainly doing the will of God or not; or whether we could be accepted in that way. Yet, according to the abstract proposition, every different sect is right in his own way, and none can be wrong, seeing God has no "set way," and' therefore, left every man to act, according to what seemed right in his own eyes. This is the rock on which the christian world has split.

I am certain that Mr. B. would reject this, because it could not be in accordance with the subject connected. But can he blame you for taking up the ideas suggested, from the sentence he used, when he and his brethren treat us in a similar way; taking from our connected doctrine, a detached sentence, and upon it building a system of absurdities, and palming them upon us as the doctrine we teach, and holding us up before the public as a set of intorerable heretics? Even on the very article of regeneration--when we give the scriptural meaning of it, as a change of state, and not of the heart—they represent us as denying a change of heart, and the influences of the Spirit, though these things we constantly teach and affirm. But of this hereafter.

You mention another doctrine Mr. B. advanced in his lecture, "that born of water and Spirit," John iii. 5, did not allude to baptism; that the text should be

read, "born of water (*kai*) *even* of the Spirit." This translation of *kai*, *even*, instead of *and*, I remember when young to have seen used in defence of Trinity, by a smatterer in Greek. It was then scouted by the intelligent and learned, and was thought to be put to eternal rest; but Mr. Bailey, it seems, has revived it to help him in a desperate case. By the help of this criticism of *kai* meaning *even*, we can learn a thousand new things in theology. For instance, we used to think there were twelve apostles; but by this criticism we have but six; as Matt. x. 2. We shall substitute *even* instead of *kai*, *and*. Peter, even Andrew his brother—James even John—Philip even Bartholomew—Thomas even Matthew--James even Lebbeus —Simon the Canaanite, even Judas Iscariot. Wonderful, sirs, would my old friend say! How ignorant must our fathers have been; what dunces, not to have known this! Wonderful discovery! By the help of it we now see that to be born of water, and to be born of the Spirit, are the same thing! Now we can read the scriptures, and find out new things on every page!

You say, Mr. B. denies that baptism is taught in Tit. iii. 5. He hath saved us,—by the washing of regeneration (*dia loutrou palliggenesias, bath of regeneration*) and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he hath shed on us, &c. This idea, no doubt, he received from his accepted criticism that *kai* means *even* and not *and*. He reads it, By the washing of regeneration *even* the renewing of the Holy Ghost—therefore the bath of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost means the same thing! If the criticism is good in this case, it must be equally good in the following verses of Tit. iii. 5, as in verse 10. "A man that is a heretic, after the first, *even* the second admonition, reject." By this criticism we are taught that the *first* means the *second*, and the *second* means the *first*. In verse 13, "Bring Zenas the law-

yer, *even* Apollos diligently on their journey." Now without the help of this criticism we should have thought that the *first* admonition did not mean the *second*, and *vice versa*, and we should have thought that Zenas and Apollos were two men, and not the same man!

Now, as Mr. B. has made "born of water—born of spirit—saved by the washing of regeneration—and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, the same thing; and as he appears to wish by his efforts to do away the scripture texts for baptism, I will assist him by the help of his own criticism, to do away a few more. "He that believeth (*kai*) *even* is baptised, shall be saved: therefore believing means baptism, and baptism means believing; i. e. If a man believes, he is also baptized, therefore this text has no allusion to water baptism. This would be a powerful argument to establish his favorite doctrine of justification or salvation by faith alone—and having gone thus far in proving that believing means baptism, he might shew that the apostles were mistaken, and practiced baptism without authority, and therefore, it is not a divine ordinance binding on any. This would overthrow us entirely, which would be highly gratifying, no doubt.

By his criticism I will help him to do away the force of another text which is in his way. Acts ii. 38, "Repent, *kai* even be baptized, therefore repentance means baptism. Again, "And many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, *kai* even were baptized," therefore hearing and believing mean baptism. Again, "Brother Saul, why tarriest thou? arise, be baptized, *kai* even wash away your sins ——," therefore baptism means washing away sins. I grant this last text will not suit him so well. But we will let it now stand. He can as easily find another criticism to do it away, and to do away the views af all the orthodox, the Baptists not excepted.

I may have been too particular on Mr. B's accepted criticism, but I know such criticisms have a greater effect upon the less informed, than those calculated to instruct correctly. You shall be attended to in my next, if life and health be continued. B. W. S.

NO HARM MEANT.

"Tell it not in Gath—publish it not in the streets of Askelon."

No: I would not do it for my right hand, had it not already been told and published, over the signature of the worthy brother himself, in the public journals of the day, which by this seem to endorse the sentiment. I would not do it, lest it might be thought that I was trying to detract from his deserved popularity, and influence in the world. I should blush to do it, because he is my worthy friend and dear brother, and by doing it I should seem disposed to expose him as an erring brother to the censure of an unfriendly world. What shall be done?

Friend, what is the matter? Why this unintelligible soliloquy I heard as I stept in? What can it mean?

It was nothing but the ebullition of a heart filled with grief, shame and confusion at the conduct of a much esteemed brother and friend; and yet I have no doubt, in his own view, he acted correctly, and from the purest motives; but those acts are calculated to mislead others, and injure society.

Do not keep me in the dark; explain the matter at once. I should be the last man to do it; but he has done it himself, and, to my sorrow, in the public journals. From this it appears he wished his acts to be known. A worthy preacher among us sometimes leaves home to preach the gospel for a few days or weeks. He makes it a point in publishing the good effects of his lectures, to publish also the sums of mo-

ney given him by each church to which he has ministered. The churches knowing his course will exert every nerve to raise a respectable sum, that they may appear wealthy and liberal in the eyes of the public; but we cannot prevent the thoughts nor words of men; they will think, despite of us, that the foundation of the scheme, is avarice in the preacher. Another preacher knowing that a large sum was received from this church by our brother for his ministerial services, may also call, and spend some time amongst them. When he leaves, the church may give him very little, perhaps nothing. The language of their conduct is very plainly this, "We esteem your services very lightly, and wish you not to return." If he has brains he will take the hint, and never go there again. He goes off discouraged, not because he received no money, which he may have greatly needed, but because of the low esteem in which he was held by the church. A pious, zealous, useful young evangelist may be thus destroyed—the doctrine of Diotrephes established, and the reprobated practice of the church of Corinth revived to our ruin. All men know the influence of such a course. Brotherly love will be ultimately merged in the love of money, and preaching become a lucrative trade. Then farewell religion.

A church that is poor can give but little; shall she be held up to the public as avaricious? She may have given as much as others, but to several different evangelists at different times.

Paul would not eat meat with offence to a weak brother. I hope our publishing brother will imitate him, and publish no more such things, to the offence of many weak brethren, and to the laugh of scoffers. An old afflicted man, on the crumbling brink of eternity, writes these things, and shields himself behind the rampart of age from the shafts of malevolence.

Some worthy brethren request an insertion of this article in those journals which have published the commuuications of said brother, on the point above named.

B. W. S.

NON-ESSENTIALS.

By D. Monfort, a Presbyterian minister.

As so much is said about the essentials and non-essentials of religion, I would ask, where is such distinction laid down or found? where is the line of demarkation between these two supposed classes of revealed truths, and the divine warrant for an individual to reject the latter! It is no where found as far as my observation has gone, in the word of God nor in the Confession of Faith, nor in the writings of the fathers of the Reformation. It seems to me to be a modern discovery. If it be of such practical importance; the distinguishing point ought to be ascertained—it ought to be a tangible thing.—But I have asked for it in vain. My brother Rice does not even attempt to give it, seeming to be sensible that he cannot do it: and he seems to be content with saying, that his antagonist is pressed with the difficulty as much as himself. Permit me to say, I do not feel the difficulty, nor any necessity from which it can arise, having never made nor allowed the distinction, I have never felt authorized either by implication, or directly to allow myself or any other to disbelieve any part of God's revealed truth. That our standards do not contain all the truths revealed in the Bible imposes or *presses* no difficulty on me for admitting, they only contain a summary of the whole, it is proof to me that this summary is to be believed and practised; and besides, that if any part is not included in this summary of doctrine, our obligation is the same regarding *it*, unless you can point out the exceping clause, or show what truths the author of our religion has allowed us not to believe and practice.—*Baptist Banner.*

MORGAN COUNTY, Dec. 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE:

We have been blessed for the last two months, with meetings of a very interesting character. At Antioch some 18 or 20 have been added to the congregation, principly under the labors of that indefatigable servant of the Lord Jesus, Brother WM. M. BROWN, and the prospects are still flattering for more accessions. Please give us your view of 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.

H. W. OSBORNE.

A FEW THOUGHTS ON 1 COR. VI. 2, 3, AT BRO. OSBORN'S REQUEST.

In this section the apostle reprobates the practice o one Christian going to law with another, before th unjust, or unrighteous. Such were the pagans amon whom they lived; for the world is divided into tw classes, the righteous and the unrighteous. In appealing to Cæsars judgment sent to decide their matters, they virtually said, "we have no men of intelligence, honesty and virtue amongst us to judge correctly between us." This would be a degradation to the church from that lofty eminence to which she is exalted by the Lord.

1. Know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? They with their Head, the Lord Jesus, shall judge the world of the ungodly at the last day. How they shall do it, we are not informed; we as others might guess, and hazard opinions; but I am not fond of speculations. They may simply say, righteous and true are thy judgments, O, Lord, and give a loud Amen.

2. Know ye not that ye shall judge angels, a class of beings above that of the world. The angels are the fallen spirits from heaven, reserved in chains of darkness against the judgment. These shall the saints also judge in the last day. Now if you are to be judges in such important matters, are ye not worthy to judge in the smallest matters? matters that pertain to this life? And will you set them to judge who are least esteemed in, or *by* the church? Such are the pagans, who fill the judgment-seats of Cæsar. I have rendered the words as Doct. McKnight does in the interrogative form, from conviction of its correctness.

B. W. S.

FEET WASHING,

BRO. STONE, Please give me your views of feet washing. Is it a church ordinance under the new Institution? Also, how often should the Lord's supper be received by a well regulated church W. G.

ANSWER.

Is washing feet a church ordinance of the new institution? I answer: No. We find it from time immemorial practised by the servants of God as well as by others. But we find no church ever practising it, or commanded by divine authority to do it. We may call it a family ordinance; as Jesus washed the feet of his little family, and said, "If I your Lord and master have washed your feet, you ought also to wash one another's feet; For I have given you an example that you should do, as I have done unto you."—John 13. Let us remember that every family was to eat the passover separately; unless it was very small; in that case another might be joined. So the family of Jesus ate the passover alone and the feet of that family alone he washed, and gave the command to them alone as a family to wash one another's feet. In Matt. x. and in many other places of scripture, Jesus gave par-

ticular commands to his family of Apostles, which do not apply to us. But we have equal authority to consider them as commands to us, as that given to them, to wash one another's feet.

Paul also tells Timothy, "Let not a widow be taken in the number (of those to be supported by the church) under three score years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children; if she have lodged strangers; if she have washed the saints' feet; if she have relieved the afflicted; if she have diligently followed every good work." As well might we say that it is an ordinance of the church to lodge strangers, because this widow did it, and it was among her good works which she performed. As the head of a family she performed this grateful, necessary and humble service of washing the saints' feet. It was a good and grateful work to the person whose feet were washed. For after walking in sandals through dust and heat, it was an act grateful to nature to bathe and wash the feet in cool water. This widow being three score years old may have practised it before Christs' public ministry, and may also have perpetuated what she had long performed. Yet who will say, that because she did it, the church is bound to do the same? Who will say, because the Apostles as a family were commanded to do it, therefore the church is also bound to do it. So because the Apostles were commanded to teach and baptize all nations, therefore, the whole church, individually are commanded to teach and baptize all nations, every man, woman, and child on this principle becomes a teacher and baptizer.

I should rejoice to see families practice feet washing, when needed. It would be setting before their children an example of humility and benevolence.

2. How often should the Lord's supper be received by a well regulated church?

ANSWER.

If no particular time be specified, then once a month or once a year, or once in ten years, or once in life may be pleaded as fulfilling the command—"Do this in remembrance of me." "And as often as ye do it, do it in remembrance of me." We think Luke has particularly specified the time in Acts xx. 7. "And upon the first day of the week, when his disciples came together to break bread." The time is here specified to be the first day of the week—the Lords day. On this day it is further specified, that the disciples came together to break bread. If this does not determine every Lords day; then the consequences above must follow. Yours,

B. W. S.

A CONVENTION

Of Delegates from Churches of all denominations of Christians in the U. States, on the subject of Christian Union—met by special appointment.

The day was fine, as if Providence smiled upon the plan. The hall of the Convention was large and commodious—the assembly of auditors was numerous, and silently seated around. The members of the convention being introduced to each other, and having exhibited satisfactory testimonials of their delegation, took their seats together. Of the large number convened, there was not one, whose head was not silvered with age, and whose face did not exhibit the entrenchments of death. Their solemn appearance inspired reverence in the silent crowd, and checked and suppressed every tendency to levity. At length a venerable Elder rose, and broke silence.

My brethren we have met together to deliberate upon the most important subject that ever engaged the

attention of man--the subject of Christian Union. This subject has pre-engaged the counsels of heaven, and determined the Son of God to come down to earth to be made flesh, to live a suffering life, to die a painful death, to be buried, to rise again, to re-ascend to heaven, and appear in the presence of God for us. Angels now are hovering round us, and the spirits of the just made perfect, all intent upon the result of our deliberations. The Christian world are awake to the evils of disunion, and to the necessity of Christian union—for the want of which they see the world are dying in myriads, and the witnesses are prophesying in sackcloth in the view of their almost powerless attempts to meliorate mankind. Infidelity bodly walks abroad, and with her destroying scythe mows down the fair prospects of Zion. Ten thousand prayers are daily ascending to God from the weeping saints to hasten the longed for event of Christian union. To devise the best method in order to accomplish this desirable end, are we sent here by our brethren. Let us humbly kneel before our heavenly Father, and implore his merciful presence and blessing.

After prayer, a Moderator and Clerk were chosen, and took the seats assigned them.

The Moderator then rose, and in a very impressive manner thus addressed the Convention:

My brethren, when I look around I see that all our heads are bleached with the frosts of many winters; we are advanced almost to the verge of time, and must soon hear the summons to leave earth, and appear before our Judge. The young are warm and impetuous and more easily swayed from the right way by sinister motives. The aged have by long experience learned the folly of such things, and are under fewer temptations to err. I see the wisdom of the churches in selecting gray hairs for this all important subject. The way is now open to commence the business which has called us together. He sat down.

P.—Rose, and thus spake. My mind and voice are for Christian union. Long have I seen and deplored the unhappy division existing amongst us. It is certainly contrary to the expressed will of God--to the ministry and prayer of Jesus—to the happiness of society, and to the salvation of the world. It is contrary to the very nature of God, and of his government—to every thing sacred and divine. To me it is a matter of astonishment that the Christian world should have slept so long, and suffered this *upas* to take root so deep and wide. Now it will require hard labor to uproot the deathly tree, and remove it from the world. From my earliest thoughts on this subject, I partially saw its evils, and wished them removed. I evidently saw that nothing could remove them but a wise constitution. The various constitutions of the Christian world I examined, and adopted that, formed by the Westminister assembly, as the best in doctrine and government, to unite christians in one. But I soon found multitudes of good christians, whose constitutions materially differed from that adopted by me, who were as conscientious in adhering to theirs and of rejecting mine, as I was in adhering to mine, and of rejecting theirs. To me it is plain that none of the parties could unite with me on my creed, nor could I conscientiously unite with them on theirs. I could not relinquish a doctrine I believed divine; nor could I reasonably expect them to do it; nay, I could not require it. Should it be required, and complied with by any, I should doubt their genuine christianity. On this principle it is vain to hope for the union of christians.

We must have a constitution; but all those in being are not adapted to the end contemplated. This constitution should be very concise, including only a few articles, the essentials of christianity, to which all christians of every sect will cheerfully subscribe. Such a constitution I have, with much care and labor

drafted, and in due time will present to the Convention, if required.

E—. Then rose, brethren, I agree with the esteemed brother who last addressed you, that there is an absolute necessity for a constitution, and that those now extant will not answer the purpose of uniting christians. This is true in fact. The Westminister stands as fair as any other; but fact proves that it cannot unite one sect of christians together. That sect, who adopted it, is divided into many, and are as far from union as any other. Even the one of my choice, I am confident, cannot answer the purpose—it cannot keep together its own sect, but we also are divided into contending parties. Convinced of these things, I have despaired of the parties uniting upon any platform now in being. Having an ardent desire to see christians united, I have like my venerable brother, drawn up a constitution, comprehending only a few articles, embracing the essentials of religion only, to which any christian can subscribe, and on which they can unite. I am willing to submit it to the convention, which can be compared with my brother P——s, and from which we may mould a plan adapted to the end.

M—. rose: brethren I have diligently attended to the two old brothers that have adddressed us, and am unanimous with them in all their views respecting the iusufficiency of any creed now extant, to unite christians, and to keep them united. If any could do it, I have thought ours stood fairest. But I have to confess, it has failed to unite us. It cannot be denied that we also are divided. With vehement desire for christian union, I have, with many prayers and much labor, also drafted a constitution, which I have brought with me to this Convention, and will produce it when required.

D—. Brethren, I most cordially agree with you all that a constitution is indispensably necessary to unite christians; but I cannot agree with you that there is

none extant that can answer the purpose. I will readily grant that no constitution formed by the wisdom of man, can effect this all important object. The history of man-made creeds from their first introduction, is proof decisive. Yet there is a constitution extant, which is completely adapted to this end made by the great Head of the Church himself, to which all are under obligations to attend. This constitution is the New Testament. To form another is virtually a reflection on our Lord's wisdom and authority, and a eulogy upon our superior wisdom in framing one better adapted to answer the end of christian union. I stand opposed to every other constitution as authoritative. The church in her best days had no other, and on no other can her scattered members ever unite, and rise to her primitive glory. From the day that human constitutions or authoritative creeds were introduced, *Ichabud* has been written on the face of the church, which remains indelible to the present time.

I could not subscribe any other constitution than that given by infinite wisdom, and undisputed authority. Brethren may draft constitutions as they please, but they must not present them to me for subscription. Were there not more than two or three articles proposed, and these articles in the very words of scripture, yet I would not receive it as a constitution; because it would only be a part of what God saw necessary to give—but a part of the whole constitution, which we are not at liberty to multiply, nor mangle, nor diminish. Had the Lord seen that a few articles had been better to effect christian union, he would certainly have given those few, and not the whole New Testament. Had he given but a few, then would have appeared the propriety of calling these only essentials; consequently every thing else in the New Testament would be unessential; and therefore to do, or not to do them would be left optionary with us, and entirely indifferent. I therefore, brethren plead for the Bible

s the only divine bond of christian union. It never et divided christians; but like Uzzah, the church when ottering, has caught hold of the sacred ark, and eneavored by human aid, and props to stay it. These ave ever done the mischief.

C—. rose, and thus spoke: Brethren, I agree with ou all on the inadequacy, and inaptitude of all huan constitutions already formed, and yet to be formd, to effect the longed for union of Christians. My ear Brother D—. has fully expressed my mind with espect to the Bible, as the only constitution of heaen; yet he has spoken a few things from which I nust dissent. He calls the Bible the only divine bond f union. Have all who profess to take the Bible lone as heaven's constitution, remained in union? Let facts speak. Something more is necessary, and his I will endeavor to make appear.

(*To be Continued.*)

STATISTICS of the Churches of Christ, In Illinois, reported to their annual meeting in Jacksonville, September, 1841.

Church at Columbus, Adams county organized 1831 present number 55, Elders J B Curl and D L H Peder. Seaton's 1835, present no. 30, Elders R Seaton and D Hobbs. Bear Creek 1838, present no. 35, Elders R Guthrie and L Cassell. Lima 1841, present no. 51, Elder P Hatchitt. Ursa 1829, present no. 110, Elders S. Ruddell and J Hatchett. Mill Creek present no. 36. Princeton Bureau county 1839, org. with 10 present no. 20 added past year 9, Elder J M Yearnshaw. Clay county 3 churches present no. 120, W Schooley Evangelist. Salt Creek De Witt county 1832, when org 18 present no. 84 added past year 17 Elders Mahlon Hall S Ely H Dodson, Evan. H and W Bowles. Gap Fulton county 1835 present no 80 Elders W A Howard E Monagon. Centreville present no 50 Elder C Rigdon. Athens Greene county 1837, present no. 50 Elder E J Butcher. Greenfield 1841 present no. 25 Elder R J Renshaw. Lurton's present no. 34 Elders J Henderson T Rawlings. Green Plains, Hancock county present no. 15 L Hatchitt evangelist. Brunt's Creek present no. 35. Church in Hancock name unknown, present no 64 Elders G and J Callison. Reekes Creek Jackson county present no 26 Elders S Hiller W G Lindsey. Little Crab Orchard present no 14 Elders R G Lindsey H Casey. Cove Creek present no 53 Elders O E Fletcher N E Robinson. Hugin's Creek Union county present no 18 Elder G M'Cumber. Dundee Kane county, org 1841 with 13, present no. 22 Elder —— Oatman. Gage Settlement Lake county org 1841 with 20. String Prairie Macoupin county present no. 24 Elder A Simms. Otter Creek present no 25 Elder J Cherry. Lake fork 30 Elder R Allen. Head of Apple Creek 24 Elders G and A Simms. Jacksonville, Morgan county present no. 165. Lynnville org 1837 with 27 present no. 53. Hart's Prairie org 1838 with 19 present no. 30 Elder G Owen. Coal Creek org 1840 with 6 present no. 16. Apple Creek present no. 40 Elder John Eads. Wood River Madison county org 1833 with 11 present no. 97 Elders R Humphrey J C Young E Gillett. Henderson's Grove Knox county, present no 60. Colter's Creek 22. Stout's Grove McLean county org 1837 with 15 present no. 35 Elders J T Gunnel J Hay. Bloomington org 1838 with 14 present no. 20. Blooming Grove 24. Crow Creek Marshall county org 1836 with 20 present no. 65 H Palmer Evangelist. Money Creek McLean county org 1840 with 21 present no. 22. Sugar Creek Logan county org 1836 with 6 present no. 130 Elders C F Ewing D G Thompson. Lake Fork org 1837 with 5 present no. 70 Elder J England. Postville org 1840 with 6 present no 40. Perry, Pike county present no 34. Highland 85 Elder J Burbridge. Milton 11. Green Pond 78 Elder W Gale. Griggsville 8. Barry 17. East Kickapoo Peoria county org 1841 present no. 31 Elders W VanVelson A Russell jr. Oxbow Prairie present no 30 Elders P G Young A Harvey. Springfield Sangamon county Elder D B Hill. Germany present no 60 Elders J W Cartmill W B King. Fork Prairie 102 Elders R Bell S Williams A Richards J Stokes. Lick Creek org 1830 with 9 present no. 37 Elder L J Sweet. Island Grove present no 14 Elder A Scott. Rushville Schuyler county org 1833 with 22 present no 75 Elder L Lusk Winchester, Scott county present no. 157. Oneco, Stephenson county org 1841 present no. 40 Elder J Howe, Evan. H Howe. Dillons' Tazewell county org 1835 present no 70 added past year 20 Elders R Lynn J Bennett. Little Mackinaw 40. Washington org 1837 present no. 14. Mt Pleasant org 1837 with 20 present no 35. Hittle's Grove 40. Sand Prairie org 1841 present no 46 Panther Creek Woodford county org 1841 with 23. Walnut Grove 1836 with 20 present no. 60. White Oak Grove 1836 with 20 present no 60. Bowling Green 1837 with 30 present no 60. Versailles 1839 with 28 present no 41. Talbot's Creek, 1839 with 44 present no 72 Elders W Murphy Jos Murphy W Hopper Evan John Murphy. Cedar Fork present no 70 Elders E Davidson sen, J G Haley J Whitman. Meridian Creek 97 Elders J and S C Murphy. Napierville, Du Page county 10. New Oregon, Ogle county 25 Elder Jacobs. Cherry Grove, Carroll county. 6, Elder G Moffit. Chambers Grove, Elder Yager. Brewster's Ferry, Wisconsin Ter. 20. Lost Creek, Iowa Ter. 150, added past year 80. Union, Desmoines county 115. Fort Madison, Lee county 6. Columbus city, Louiza county 23. Mt Pleasant, Henry county 30. Bentonsport, Van Buren county. Philadelphia 19. Fairfield, Jefferson county 15. New London, Desmoines county 15. Stephenson 40 Big Cedar, Cedar county.

THEO. SWEET, Ch'n.

J. M. YEARNSHAW, Sec'y.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Carrollton, Ill. Dec. 30, 1841.

Father STONE:—I have just time to say to you, that since our arrival in this place, the scattered members here, have re-organized. 27 came forward—one bishop and two deacons chosen and ordained. Since then about 44 have been added, making the present number 71. The work is still progressing and prospects good for more.

I purpose furnishing you notes on my tour from Ky. to the West, so soon as I have leisure. I also intend noticing the conduct of Elder Bailey with us in Jacksonville. Bro. Gilliam has been with me here, and has been useful in the good cause.

We shall be able to obtain 15 or 20 subscribers for the Messenger, and most of them *paid* in advance.

Several Methodists, Presbyterians and Baptists have united with us here. I hope to see you soon. May the good Lord bless your last efforts for the conversion of sinners. W. M. BROWN.

Bro. Wm. Clark of Arkansas, writes, Nov. 9th 1841, that they have had recently three co-operation meetings in that State—one in Johnson county, at which there were 12 additions to the church, which consists of 103 members—one in Scott county, during which 12 joined; and one in Washington county, at which 2 joined.

In Jacksonville, Ill. we have had a protracted meeting, which has lately closed. There were 75 additions. Bro. W. M. Brown was the principal agent. Bro. J. Creath of Mo. assisted for a week or 10 days.

Georgetown, Ky. Dec. 16, 1841.

Dear Bro. STONE:—I have just returned from Lexington where I labored with brethren Allen, Kendrick and Curtis J. Smith, for 10 days. We obtained 45 additions in the city, and two in the country. At the same time, brethren Tho. Smith and C. Kendrick obtained, as I learn, upwards of 50 at Lancaster. At the same time, brethren Gano and Rice obtained 26 at Riddle's Mills in Bourbon county. Praised be the name of the Lord! The cause of Union will prevail against all opposition. Most affectionately yours, J. T. JOHNSON.

Bro. R. B. Roberts of Ky. writes Dec. 19, 1841, that he had just returned from a tour through the Green River country—that he had baptized 42, besides some from the Baptists. Truly, says he, Green River is ripe for the harvest, and the laborers are few.

Brothers John Smith and A. Campbell have advertized James McVay, *not James T. McVay*, as an unworthy Evangelist, and a bad man, and as such should not be countenanced among us. The documents are too lengthy for insertion; nor was it deemed necessary, as the Harbinger, in which are the documents, has a wide circulation. ED.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

January 1842.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 3.

ON MATT. V. 15—17.

"Ye are the salt of the earth."—Our Lord having described the character of the Christian, in the first verses of this chapter, states the purposes, why they are left in the world, and not immediately taken into heaven—into the rest prepared for them. These purposes are stated in figures not to be misunderstood, as

1st—"Ye are the salt of the earth." Ye—the poor in Spirit—ye, mourners in Zion—ye, who hunger and thirst after righousness—ye, meek of the earth—ye, merciful—ye, pure in heart—ye, persecuted for righteousness' sake—ye are the salt of the earth. As salt is used to preserve meat from corruption, so ye are designed to save the world from corruption and ruin. Had there been ten such characters in Sodom, it would not have been destroyed. Such characters as these are like a glass, in which the world see their own deformed and sinful character; by which means vice is checked, and many turn to the Lord, and are saved.

Fact proves that in whatever neighborhood such characters may appear, living and walking in the Spirit, there salvation-work is effected; and in whatever neighborhood such are not, there vice reigns.—To profess to be a christian, and not possess the character, is an injury to the world, rather than a blessing; for if the salt has lost its savor, or saltness,