fluenced to return to the Lord and renew their covenant. And in all we had 124 additions, during a series of 37 lectures. Bro. Gilliam of this town was my faithful fellow laborer.

The Baptists commenced a protracted meeting in which the Baptists and Methodists united, to oppose us; but all in vain. "Truth is mighty, above all things, and will prevail?" Slander with her hundred tongues employed all the sects in Carrolton against me. Pray for me, that I may be humbled before the Lord more and more.

I will furnish you a few notes on my tour to the West, for your next No.

W. M. BROWN.

Bro. Hawkins of Eminence Ill. of Dec. 24, 1841, writes; the Church of Christ here is still in a prosperous condition the brethren are well united, about 20 additions since september last. We now number 150 members. The church at Postville in this county is also increasing very fast.

Bro. Taylor and J. W. Cox's communications received, but crowded out of this No.

A PEDO-BAPTIST CHURCH IMMERSED.

'The Swansea Cambrian a weekly newspaper, states that, on Sunday last, the 13th of June, the members of an Independent church were baptized by being immersed in Swansea river, about four miles from the town. The Rev. J. Spencer, of Lanelly. delivered a sermon from John i. 15, and the ordinance was administered by Rev Daniel Davis, in the presence of from 8 to 10,000 spectators, and the evening, those that were baptized, 120 in number, communed together at the Lord's table in their own chapel, near Mynydd-bach.'—*Religious Herald.*

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

February, 1842.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 4

THE CHRISTIAN EXPOSITOR.

Rom. i. 16, 17. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation, *eis soterian*, in order to salvation, to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written, the just shall live by faith."

There are several ideas included in these verses worthy of all acceptation, important truths expressed necessary to be understood, in order to have a right knowedge of the whole epistle.

1. How is the Gospel the power of God unto salvation to Jew and Gentile, that believe in Jesus?

2. What is the righteousness of God spoken of in the text?

3. How is the righteousness revealed from faith to faith.

1. How is the gospel the power of God unto salvation?

Solomon says, "In the word of a king there is power" Eccles: viii. 4. But there is no more physical power in the word of a king, than there is in the word of a common man. The authority of a king, and his power to execute his word, give it all the power it has. He has power to kill, and power to save. Suppose by his word the sentence of death is passed upon a number of his guilty subjects, and they cast into a dungeon, and chained there, to await their doom.

How powerful is that word of condemnation! their joys are fled their spirits sunk, and they tremble at the dread prospect of a speedy and cruel death. While thus depressed, a messenger of good enters the dungeon and exhibits to them the words of their king, that he will pardon them all, provided they will each subscribe his name to an instrument of writing, in which they promise to sin no more. They believe the messenger. What power there is in this word! their joys return, their spirits revive, and their trembling fears dissipate as darkness before the rising sun.

So by the word of God the world of the ungodly is condemned to death, eternal death. All who really believe this, fear and tremble. What shall we do to be saved? How shall we escape the damnation of hell? are their anxious inquiries. They sensibly and painfully feel the power of that word. While anxiously seeking relief, and almost despairing, the gospel of Christ is preached to the condemned sinner. It proposes pardon and salvation to him upon conditions easy and within his power to perform. This word is heard and gladly received. How powerful it is! It has removed his guilty fears, raised his desponding heart, inspired hope. He turns at the reproof of God; and comes to Jesus in his own appointed ways, and from him obtains pardon, salvation, and the Holy Spirit. It is the powerful means appointed of God for salvation to every one that believeth. The Gospel is not the Savior, but the means of salvation. It is not the spirit, but the means through which the spirit is received.

Now, if with the heart the sinner has believed and obeyed the gospel, he is forgiven, and has received the Holy Spirit of promise. He is a son; and because they are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into their hearts, crying Abba, Father. This is the Spirit of adoption which witnesses with our spirits that

we are the sons of God.—This is the spirit of God dwelling in us, and the fruits which grow from this Spirit, are love, joy, peace, &c. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, given unto us; the perfect love that casts out fear; if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? rather, *by the odedience of faith*.

The obedient believer has two evidences of his pardon, and acceptance with God, one is, the promise of pardon upon his hearty obedience, the second is, the gift of the Spirit, which is the seal of God instamped upon him, by which he is known of others, recognized by God as his own, and assured of his acceptance with his God and Savior. Whoever receives remission of sins also receives the Holy Spirit of promise. Let none deceive themselves that they are pardoned and are the sons of God, unless they have received the two evidences just stated. He hath saved us by the washing, or bath of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he hath shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Lord. Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God· Water without the spirit will not save.

Our opposers say, we rely upon baptism for salvation, and deny the influence of the Spirit. I know of no assertion more untrue; yet it may be true with respect to some. Let us make sure of salvation while it is called to-day, and while we have the means and opportunities. It will soon be seen that a spiritless religion will avail us nothing at the last day.

2. What is the righteousness of God spoken of in the text.

This the apostles explains in Roman. iii. 21; 26. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the proph-

ets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference, For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being *justified freely by his grace*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, 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.

He had just proved in this chapter, that all the world were guilty before God, and therefore, by the deeds of the law no flesh could be justified in his sight. But *now*, at this time, the righteousnes of God is manifested, brought to light, explained or fully made known. It is without the law, entirely disconnected with it, yet witnessed by the law and the prophets. Now we are prepared to say, what the righteousness of God is. It is *to be justified freely by his grace or favor through faith*, as stated above. This excludes all boasting or glorying. If justification were by the law in whole or in part, it could not be *free*, or of grace or favor: but it is of faith, that it might be by grace, and not of debt.

This free justification by grace through faith is witness by the law and the prophets. 1st, It is witnessed by the law in the case of Abraham, he was freely justified by faith, his faith was imputed to him for righteousness or justification. He was justified in uncircumcision, and 430 years before the law, therefore, his justification was not by circumcision, nor by the deeds of the law. Be it remembered, the five books of Moses were called the law.

2. The righteousness of God, or justification freely by grace through faith, is also witnessed by the prophets. "Even as David also describeth the blessings of the man

to whom God imputeth righteousness, or justification without works saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin! These different expressions, not to impute sin, to cover sin, to forgive sin; to justify freely by grace through faith, are of the same import as the righteousness of God.

3. This truth is established by the witness of Habbakuk, the prophet, ii. 4; for says Paul, therein (the Gospel) is revealed the righteousness of God from faith to faith; as it was written, The just shall live by his faith, or more properly read, as all agree, The just, or justified by faith, shall live. To be justified by law, and to be justified by faith, are two very distinct ideas. The law never promised, nor gave eternal life; but the Gospel does. The righteousnes of God is revealed from faith to faith. This is understood by the apostles quotation from the prophet; for the old testament was the faith of the Jews, as the New testament is now the faith of Christians. The original is *ek pisteoos eis pistin*, which literally rendered is, out of faith unto faith; i. e. Out of or from the faith of the Jews, or old Testament scriptures, "unto faith," i. e. unto the faith of christians; the New Testament now *come* and fully confirmed. Paul calls the N. Testament emphatically, *faith*. For after that faith is come, we have no more need of a school master, as of Moses, teaching the law. Gal. iii. 23—25. 2. Received ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith." Here, as in other texts, the law and faith are contrasted. Gall. ii: 15, 19.—A similar expression is used by the apostle in the same relation, Rom. iii. 30. Seeing it is one God which shall justify the circumcision by faith, *ek pisteoos* and the uncircumcision through faith, *dia tees pisteoos*.

The Jews were ignorant of God's righteousness, or

free justification by grace or favor through faith; and many still adhered to, and contended for their own righteousness, or justification by the deeds of the law, Ye must be circumcised and keep the whole law, or ye cannot be saved, was their doctrine. Paul contended for God's righteousness, or justification by grace, or favor through faith, without the deeds of the law, and proved his position from the law and the Prophets. The Jew contended that God could not be just in justifying the ungodly merely by grace, or favor, without the deeds of the law. Paul replied that our redemption was entirely in Christ Jesus from or by whom, as the mercy seat, God has declared his righteousness, or justification for past sins, at this time, that he can be just in justifying him that believeth in Jesus. His declaration is confirmed by all the signs, wonders and miracles performed by almighty power in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus the Son of God.

B. W. S.

CIRCULAR LETTER.

From a New Jersey Baptist Association, who are pleased to call themselves Independent Baptists.

[Continned from page 75.]

We have dwelt, thus far, upon the *infrequent* observance of the Lord's supper by the churches: There is also a deplorable *irregularity* in its observance by individuals. Although the table is spread but seldom, compared with the constancy which our Lord designed, yet many forego the advantages which are yet allowed them, by improperly, though ignorantly, refusing to communicate. And here we recognize one of the evil results which have orginated in the error above discussed; for the infrequency of the ordinance has done much towards investing it with an imagined,

superior sanctity, distinguishing it from all others, and thus debarring from it many an humble believer who has deemed himself unworthy to approach it. Had the ordinance continued to be constantly administered as often as the churches assembled for public worship, every Lord's day, would this mistaken and injurious apprehension of its character ever have arisen? Would it not have been regarded as it really is an ordinary means of grace, and not a reward of distinguished piety? Let it be well considered that the Lord's supper is an ordinance *enjoined* upon his disciples in church connection: "*Do this in remembrance of me.*" No member, then, can lawfully neglect it without divine warrant. Yet it is often treated as if it should depend on the caprice of an individual whether to observe it or not. A brother considers himself to be in a state of spiritual declension. He declines to participate in the sacred supper. Not that he no longer deems himself a disciple; for had he arrived at the deliberate conclusion that he was never a subject of divine grace, no one could approve of his acting the hypocrite, by sitting at the table of the Lord. But he feels himself unworthy, and therefore declines to communicate; while he is the very character who emphatically needs this ordinance, needs to reflect much on the dying love of Jesus, and to seek, by faith, the renewal of his grace within him. Shall he refuse to partake of this "stream" which is appointed to make "glad the city of God?" Shall he deny himself the *means* until he shall have found the *end*? As well may one neglect prayer until his wants are supplied, or the study of the scriptures until he shall have become mature in Christian knowledge. This association of superior sanctity with the ordinance, is a relic of Popery, and should have been discarded with the doctrine of transubstantiation.

This apprehension of the Apostle's remarks in 1 Cor.

xi. has determined many from approaching the Lord's table. He is there speaking of the perversion of the ordinance by the newly converted heathen which it is quite impossible for us to practice. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.

This is *our* unworthiness; but the disorderly and unworthy *manner* of eating the supper—"one is *hungry* and another is *drunken*." But what is that to *us*? Is there any danger of *our* doing so? Besides, the word "damnation" does not convey at the present time the idea of the original—which is "Judgment." The Greek word *kdima*, which is here used, is often translated as in Matt. vii. 2.; John ix. 29.; Gal. v. 10. The judicious Doddridge says, "I think it the most unhappy mistake in all our *version* of the *Bible*, that the word *kdima* is here rendered *damnation*. It has raised a dread in tender minds which has greatly obstructed the comfort and edification they might have received from this ordinance. The Apostle afterwards says. "*We are judged*, (that is, as he afterwards explains it, *we are corrected*.) *that we may not be condemned*;" which plainly shows the judgment spoken of might be fatherly chastisements. Let not this text deter any real christian, who understands the import of the ordinance, and who wishes to show his grateful love to the Saviour, from coming to the Lord's table. This holy ordinance was not designed to be a fiery *ordeal* through which none but the sinless can safely pass. It was intended, like all ordinances, for the imperfect and frail. He who is duly prepared for any religious ordinance, is prepared not only for a safe, but for a profitable attendance on this. The consecrated bread and wine are nutritious aliment for every soul that hungers and thirsts after righteousness. We shall notice one other occasion of neglecting this ordinance. It is when a supposed wrong has been received from a brother, or a fault has been committed by him. The aggrieved brother thinks himself at liberty to quit the communion of the church till the difficulty, real or imagined, be removed. This opinion is founded in entire ignorance of the nature of the ordinance; and it is dificult to account for its prevalence among us, without implicating those who have been the guides of the church in matters of faith and practice. Fellowship, it is true, is professed by the communicant; but it is fellowship with the church. It is presumed that it is a spiritual body. As a member of this body, he unites with it in prayer, in praise, in the supper. In obedience to his Lord, he performs his duty in "keeping the feast in remembranne of him." He cannot abstain, without violating the command. A brother's fault does not exempt him from obligation. "To his own master he standeth or falleth." In case of a private offence, let the rule in Matt. xviii. be pursued; but refusing to commune with the offender is directly opposed to the course there enjoined. It is making public what should be kept private. It is inflicting punishment on the uncondemned. The aggrieved becomes himself an offender and trespasses against his brother and his Lord. Instead of concealing with scrupulous care the offence, he proclaims it upon the house-tops, by directing observation to the supposed offender; and he deprives him of the opportunity to repent and to be forgiven, which the good Shepherd has provided for him.

Should a member, then, refuse to communicate, for such a reason, he ought to receive the censure of the body, which he has wronged directly, as well as indirectly; for his act was, evidently, excluding it from his fellowship.

If the offence committed is a *public* one, or if, though originally private, it has, at length, come under the cognizance of the church, the accused is entitled to

his seat at the table until suspended or excluded by the body; and to refuse to commune with him is nothing ess than assuming the prerogative of the church, and publicly pronouncing a sen tence of condemnation.

We have thus very briefly, considering the nature of the subject, borne our conscientious testimony against the unwarranted neglect of the Lord's supper by both churches and individuals. Most gladly would we dwell upon the benefits which would probably result from restoring this ordinance to its legitimate place in our esteem and attention. Not to speak of the most obvious result in the increase of affection to our dear Redeemer, whose dying love would be thus constantly exhibited, we merely observe, that this frequent separation of the church from the world would promote the *personal acquaintance* of the members; and thus, by exciting mutual interest and sympathy, draw closer the tie of fraternal love. It would greatly aid the *discipline*, the watch and the care of the flock. It would impress upon Christians the necessity of making their walk through the week consistent with their *profession every Lord's day*; and it would remind the wicked of the "*breadth*" which now exists between them and the Lord's day, and which will be fully revealed in the final separation at the great day. In a word, we may expect at least *quadruple* the advantage which any of us now derive from this invaluable institution. But is it not superfluous to enumerate the blessing of obedience? Duty is ours —results, God's. Let us resolve to "go forth in the footsteps of the flock," and we shall surely meet Him who maketh them "lie down in green pastures and leadeth them beside the still waters," and we shall also hear the approving words of an under shepherd "How I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you."

THE CHRISTIAN EXPOSITOR.

Matt. xxiv. 29—In the former part of this chapter the Disciples are presented as showing their Lord the building of the temple. Jesus answered, "Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here, one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." When they were in private, his disciples asked him, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? No doubt the Disciples thought these three events would be cotaneous; i. e. that the destruction of the temple would not happen until the Lord came, and that at his coming the end of the world would take place. This last idea he had just before taught them in the parable of the tares. Matthew xiii 39. "The harvest is the end of the world *suntelia tou aionos*, and the reapers are the angels. As therefore, the tares are gathered, and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of this world. The son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all that offend, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their father." This doubtless refers to the last day, or the *suntelia tou aionos*, the end of the world. With this very phrase *suntelia aionos*, the disciples asked our Lord as above, when shall be the end of the world?

I know that many have taken the *suntelia tou aionos*, the end of the world, to mean, the end of the Jewish state or age, which they suppose took place in the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and in the great tribulation of the Jews. They therefore suppose that the Son of God did then come to take judgment or vengence on his enemies. Hence they have concluded that the judgment is past, and that there will be

no future judgment, and that the Son of man will no more come to judge the world.

These destructive errors have grown out of the opinion that the end of the world meant the end of the Jewish state, or age, and that the whole chapter referred to that event. The fallacy of this will appear from a proper consideration of the chapter from 29th verse, and the parallel passages in Mark xiii 21, and Luke xxi, 24.

1st. Matthew xxiv, 29--"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven." Mark and Luke say, "Then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory." Recollect, it was after the tribulation of those days, these signs were to appear--after the tribulation suffered by the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple. Now as these signs did not literally take place *immediately* after this tribulation, nor ever have as yet taken place, many have given the verse a figurative interpretation. The *sun* say they, means God himself, the fountain of light hidden from the Jews by the clouds of their iniquities rising between them and their God. The *moon* signifies the book of God's revelations by Moses and the prophets. As the moon reflects the rays of the sun; so this book reflects the glory, or light of God to the world. The *stars*, they make to represent the priesthood, whose lips were to keep knowledge, and the powers of heaven, they say, mean the rulers and high dignitaries of the church. The interpretation at first view looks plausible, but it will not comport with the connection.

2. All this was to happen after the destruction of the city and temple. But the interpretation above happened before this tribulation, which took place in the

year 70. And when he was come near, he beheld the city and wept over it, saying, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace! but *now* they are *hid* from thine eyes."—Luke xvii. 42--44.

What has induced any to give this figurative interpretation, is the words *immediately* after the tribulation of those days. The word *eutheoos* rendered *immediately*, is variously translated by our translators, as *straightway, forthwith, anon, by-and-by.* It is rather indefinite, and specifies no definite period of time. Luke in the parallel passage (xxi, 24) puts this matter beyond dispute "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars, &c." It is evident that these signs in the sun, moon and stars are not immediately to take place after that tribulation; but after the Gentiles had trodden down Jerusalem, and continue to tread it down till their times be fulfilled. This will take place *by and by*, at some future period, when they shall yield their long and present possession of Jerusalem to its lawful proprietors. After these events the sun shall be darkened, &c.

These things will literally be accomplished, and shall precede the second coming of the Lord; for *then* shall appear the Son of man with great power and glory. And when these things begin to appear, then hold up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh—your complete, eternal redemption.

To talk of our Lord's coming to destroy Jerusalem, is entirely unauthorized by scripture; we yet look for his second coming. Not once is it named there; but always at some time after that destruction.

This same truth was taught by Joel the prophet, quoted by Peter on pentecost Acts ii, "And it shall

come to pass in the last days saith God I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs on earth beneath—the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come. What day can this be but the great day of God Almighty--the day in which he will judge the world in rightousness by Jesus Christ. A part of Joel's prophecy was fulfilled at Pentecost; and a part remains to be fulfilled.

The Saviour continues his discourse; "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand--his eternal kingdom and glory." Then adds, "This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." This generation (*genea*,) this race of people, meaning the Jews, shall continue a distinct people, till the Lord shall come—till all these things shall be fulfilled. What a living evidence of truth is this prediction! The Jews are yet a distinct people, while all other nations that existed of old have dissolved and passed away in the tide of time. Where are those nations now? Many cannot be found, even on the page of history.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away," and Peter says "with a great noise." This will take place at his coming. Luke xxi, 35,"for as a snare shall it (the last day) come on all them that dwell on the face of the earth." This cannot apply to the destruction of Jerusalem.

"And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet (which shall wake the dead) and they shall gather his elect from the four winds, from the one side of heaven to the other." This does not apply to the Jews, for they have never yet, since that tribulation been collected together. The *elect* here included God's children, both those raised from the dead, and those who shall be alive at his coming.

That this day refers to the last judgment, is clear from the same discourse, Matt. xxiv. "But if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken, The Lord of that servant will come in a day, when he looketh not for him--and shall appoint him his portion with the hypocrites. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

The next chapter, Matt. xxv, is the continuance of the same discourse, and that it throughout refers to the last judgment is too plain to deny. It is admitted by all. O that men would lay these things to heart, and prepare to meet their Lord in judgment.

B. W. S.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

BY D. LONG.

Br. Marsh—I have just been reading Br. Stone's remarks and your reply on Christian Union, found in Palladium, Vol. x. No. 8. I consider your reply to the point. The Disciples, as far as my acquaintance with them extends, *do* make baptism for the remission of sins a prerequisite to communion. In fact, they deny any person having the remission of sins before he has been baptized; of course, they do not consider an unbaptized person a Christian. How then can they extend the hand of Ghristian union to us who commune with unbaptized persons? Happy is he that condemeth not himself in the thing which he alloweth.

Bro. Stone says, "We had for many years before their existence been standing on the Bible alone." That is, the western Christians had taken the Bible alone for their rule of faith and practice, before the reformation got up by A. Campbell was heard of in the west. Yes more than 27 years since I first heard Br. Stone on the waters of Deer creek preach that the Bible, the *Bible*, is all sufficient for faith and practice. Bnt did he then preach faith, repentance and baptism, inseparably connected for remission of sins? Did he tell the young man that felt, "*Wo is me if I preach not the gospel*," that God did not call men to the ministry *now*? Or did he teach that it was wrong for a sinner to pray *before* he was baptized?

Perhaps this is the step he has taken; for he says, "True, we stepped forward to welcome our brethren to the foundation of the Lord." Yes, this must be the step, and when he stepped 'forward' he left us standing on the "old" ground, in perfect union with the eastern Christians; for

before this step was taken Elder Badger and others from the east, had visited the west and I thought, and do yet think, that a union was consumated between the eastern and western Christians, and a correspondence of a most friendly kind was conducted by Elders Stone and Badger published in the Christian Messenger and Gospel Luminary, and I never knew that there was a *dis*-union, till it was published in the Messenger that some of the Christians, with Br. Stone, had united with the Disciples in Kentucky.

(*To be Continued.*)

REPLY TO ELD. D. LONG.

Bro Marsh, I now proceed to redeem my pledge, to notice my old brother's communication to you in the October number of the Palladium. Brother Long has egregriously erred in the very outset of his communication. He states positively, that the Disciples do make baptism for remission of sins a prerequisite to communion. This I am compelled to contradict, and as positively pronounce a mistake of my brother. It is a new charge never made against us before, even by our most infuriated enemies. This you knew; why did you not correct the mistake among others you noticed in his letter, when you published it.

He adds, "In fact they deny any person's having the remission of sins before he has been baptized."—Once more I will state my views on this subject for the information of the candid. We believe that God has revealed the plan of salvation, and remission of sins plainly in his word, and that this plan is one; that is, he has revealed but one plan, Faith, repentance, prayer and baptism. This plan we preach, and hesitate not to say, that God will pardon and save all who heartily comply with it. But we do not limit the Almighty, and say he *cannot* pardon those who are ignorant of this as their duty; nor can we tell them upon what other plan he can pardon them, because he has not revealed it. On this subject I have been already explicit in the numbers of this volume. I

have no doubt that the less informed amongst us, have done violence to this subject, and given too much cause for others to blaspheme it.

We cherish for the unimmersed the kindest feelings, and hopes, (for charity hopeth all things and is kind) yet we tenaciously adhere to the position, that God has revealed to us in the New Institution but one plan of salvation or pardon. Had he revealed two ways, one including immersion, and the other without it, and left it optionary with us which to choose; then would immersion be forever relinquished; For who would submit to so humiliating, flesh' revolting rite, when it is unessential, and indifferent, whether we submit to it or not. Baptism may be considered a mere outward ordinance and of little or no importance. But let us remember the life and death of the whole world depended upon the eating of an apple.

My old brother has adopted the common arguments against us, i. e. the inferring of gloomy, soul chilling consequences of our doctrine; but he does not bring us, or our doctrine to the test of revelation. This argument is becoming stale, and must ultimately become harmless in the eyes of the community.

He adds; Brother S. says, we (the Christians of the West) had been standing on the Bible alone, many years before the existence of the Reformers. Yes more than 27 years ago I first heard brother Stone on Deer Creek preach, that the Bible the Bible is all sufficient for faith and practice. "Well, if my old brother were to hear me yet, he would veritably hear the same doctrine. I have not for an hour doubted the truth of it. Is it possible that brother Long can seriously think for one moment, that I have left this foundation!! I assure him, that by a trial of that book for near forty years, I am more confirmed in its all sufficiency for faith and practice. I am now about to leave time, being on its crumbling brink, I state this

fact, that I took that book to learn from it the whole will of God, and do it; and to correct all my errors by it.

But my old brother affects to think that I have left the Bible, because when he first heard me preach on Deer Creek in Ohio, "I did not then preach faith, repentance and baptism, inseparably connected, for remisson of sins." True, I did not, because I knew not then that the Bible taught it. It is also true, that a little while before that time I, and the whole posse of us did not preach that baptism was only immersion, and believers the only subjects of it. From that book we learned this truth, and relinquished our old views. Did we therefore leave the Bible? or did we leave our wrong opinions? Does my old brother think I have left the Bible, because I preach, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved? or does he think that he cleaves to the Bible, by preaching virtually, he that believeth, and is not baptized shall be saved? I took the Bible *examined* it to learn from it, and not to put it under my pillow, or carry it in my pocket, as an amulet against Demons.

Our first and old ground was infant sprinkling. Many among us were offended, when some of us submitted to immersion, and finally left us saying in their justification that we had left the old ground. We the immersed kept together, till some of us learned not only that baptism was immersion, but that it was for the remission of sins—many became offended and walked no more with us. So it will continue to be, till every error shall be abandoned in the Christian world. O, what a little thing to divide Christians! Posterity will wonder at our conduct.

But my brother has another reason why, he thinks I have left the Bible, because when he heard me preach 27 years ago on Deer Creek, I then believed that God divinely called and sent men into the ministry. This

may be so; but if I then beleived it, was it therefore certainly true? Was I then inspired and infallible? Is it really wrong and disgraceful to change from an opinion? If so; farewell all hopes of reformation, Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists, and the hundred and one sects will trudge along their old beaten circle, like the bear on his string without going one inch farther into truth. Farewell all hopes of Christian union on earth; and farewell the salvation of the world.

Though my old brother thus speaks, yet I reckon we shall hardly disagree on this subject. He does not believe that God now calls and sends men to preach with an audible voice, as he did Samuel, the twelve Apostles, and the other 70. Was he thus called by name, and sent? No. What is the call for which he pleads? It is not a vocal call; but strong impressions on the mind. A man full of the spirit feels a strong desire to benefit his fellow creatures. His love for them flows forth in tears and prayers for them, and exhortations to them. Let such do all the good they can, their profiting will soon appear to all men. Let them be encouraged by the church, and scripturally ordained to the work of Evangelists? I have no idea that a man should preach without spirit; such preachers are a curse not a blessing to the world. If this is what is meant by a call to the ministry we differ not; but should we differ in this opinion, does this justify him in saying I have left the Bible, and in withdrawing fellowship.

Another reason he gives why he thinks I have left the Bible, is, because, "I did not then, 27 years ago, preach that it was wrong for a sinner to pray till he was baptized." No, nor have I ever preached nor taught it since. Why impute this to me? Did he ever hear that I taught it in any manner? I assure him, if he did, he was wrongly informed, if he did not hear it, he has done what I could never have expected from him, he

has slandered his old brother, when we are both on the verge of the grave. We like Ananias say to the praying sinner, why tarriest thou (in praying, as if no other duty was to be performed, arise and be baptized and wash away yours sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Is this equivalent to saying a sinner must not pray before he is baptized? all will answer, no. Does brother Long teach differently? Does he tell the praying sinner to tarry in praying days, weeks, months and years, and not be baptized till his sins are washed away? Does his Bible teach him that.

Another reason why brother Long thinks I and the western Christians have left the Bible, is that we stept forward to welcome the Reformers, when they first came upon the same foundation on which we had been for years standing, viz. the Bible—our stepping forward was in his view the same thing as stepping off the foundation! Is it possible that my old brother reasons thus. Is it possible that he who glories in the Bible alone should think that to receive one another, without regard to diversities of opinion, is stepping off the Bible? Is it possible that he views that the union of Christians is a step off the Bible? By union of Christians, he probably means, all that unite with his sect. But to unite with any others is disunon; for says he, I never knew there was a disunion between the E. and W. Christians till it was published in the Messenger, that some of the Christians with brother Stone had united with the Disciples in Kentucky." Observe, he lets us know, there was *disunion* when union was effected between us and the Disciples, who were on the same foundation, and had agreed to worship together. Would the same objection be made against us, if the Methodist Church had done as the Disciples did, and we had agreed to worship together? And can it be that we who profess to make Christian union our polar star, would be the first to raise the tocsin against it!

that the holiest act of our lives should be condemned by those who glory in the name *Christian*? We are willing to suffer reproach for such conduct. I shall attend to the latter part of my brother's letter anon.

B. W. S.

ELDER BAILEY, No. 3.

Bro. Henderson.—At your request I shall proceed to examine your notes, which you took from the mouth of Mr. Bailey, while he was delivering a course of lectures in Jacksonville against the reformation so called.

On Remission of Sins.

Mr. B. says, "That baptism before remission of sins' is the error of the sect;" meaning the Reformers so called. He proceeds, "I will now prove that persons *may be* pardoned before immersion, and without it; and that forgivness of sins does not depend upon that act."

This I am constrained to say, is an evasion. He can prove what we do not deny. Who ever denied that God pardoned sin in the patriarchal age without baptism? It was never required of them. Who ever denied that God did not pardon the penitent sinners in the Mosaic age without baptism? Who does not know that the publican, the prodigal son, and the thief on the cross, with the many others he has named as pardoned without baptism, all lived under the law as did our Saviour himself through life, they all lived before the kingdom of God was set up, and before the laws of the new institution were promulgated and enforced. Let him prove, if he can, that any one was ever pardoned in the New Institution before baptism. This is the point, from which he should not depart, till he had established it. When this is done, we no longer contend, but yield.

We have said that, according to God's "set" plan of pardoning, none receive pardon before baptism. But we presume not to say that God does not pardon, and cannot pardon the unimmersed penitents, who know not his law, are ignorant of their duty, having been wrongly taught, or such as may be in peculiar cases. God had a "set way" of pardoning under the old economy; yet he was not so confined, or bound by this old institution, that he could not pardon the one that sinned ignorantly without this plan.

But let us attend to Mr. B's. proofs that God pardons without and before baptism under the New institution. He states them in nine distinct propositions.

Prop. 1. Acts xiii, 39. "All that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses." Now I ask, what does this prove? Simply that we are justified by faith, and not by the deeds of the law; that we are justified from all moral iniquity, which the law could not—the blood of the law could not take away such sins, or purge the conscience. But does Mr. B. think that because faith is only mentioned in this text, that they were justified by faith alone, without repentance, without confessing with the mouth the Lord Jesus, without baptism, &c? The apostles James thought differently chap. ii. 18—26. "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness," or justification. But was he justified by faith alone? Nay; was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar? Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. Should I say, that a man is forgiven or justified by repentance: I could prove the proposition by many texts. Does it therefore follow that it is by repentance *alone* without faith, without confessing with the mouth the Lord Jesus, without baptism? I trow not. Again, should I say with Paul, that we are freely justified by grace; does

it follow that faith, repentance and baptism are all excluded?—that God can forgive without faith, without repentance, as well as without baptism?

But says Mr. B. "some say, Baptism is included in Acts xiii, 39. I acknowledge I am one of those "some," and Mr. B. is another; for he says, "I admit that one term may include in it all the rest—grace may and does include all the rest—as being justified freely by his grace, includes faith, repentance, &c. This admission is fully satisfactory. He asks a printed question from the best text. Are all that believe baptized? I answer unhesitatingly, that all that believed under the new institution by the word of the apostles were baptized, or would be, as soon as an opportunity was presented. I speak of the times before the apostacy. Can Mr, B. show one instance in those times of one believer unbaptized? Thus goes his first proposition to prove his favorite doctrine of justification and salvation prior to baptism. I proceed to his 2nd.

Prop. 2d, Rom. v, 1. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." My answer to this is given in the preceeding paragraph. I will remark on one sentiment he uttered on this proposition. "There is," said he, "no necessary connection between an external ordinance and faith." Then there can be no connection between baptism and faith. Yet the Lord has intimately connected them! "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." If the Lord has connected them, who shall say—who dare say, the connection is not necessary? Who shall be his censor? If Mr. B. means metaphysical necessity, he may enjoy the consolation it may afford, unenvied by me. I proceed to proposition 3d.

Prop. 3. God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him, might not perish, but have everlasting life, John iii, 16 He asks, "is baptism implied? I say no." A bold

negation, truly! Is it in accordance with the commission, "he that believeth and is baptized shall he saved?"

Mr. B. says "that Christ did not give his apostles a new commission. He only enlarged the first one given." It was enlarged by preaching the gospel to every creature; whereas the first was limited to the Jewish nation. Now as the commissions were the same, surely then baptism was one part of it. If so they and their Lord preached faith and baptism for salvation. But hear Mr. B's. arguments to prove that baptism is not implied in John iii, 16. "Joseph of Arimathea was a disciple of Jesus, and was never baptized." Ah! how does Mr. B. learn that he was never baptized? It is said that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John; and yet here is one of his disciples unbaptized.

Again says he, "Nicodemus was never baptized." How does he know this? The scriptures no where say so. These positive negations may pass with the uninformed; but better proof is needed to convince the inquiring mind. But this proof he has at hand; "The Jailor and household. There is no evidence that baptism was preached to them." Then these poor Pagans were baptized without any instruction on baptism as a divine ordinance—that it was the will of God they should be baptized—that it represented the burial and resurrection of Jesus—that it was for the remission of sins, and *that*, through which they were to become members of the church. Strange! that Paul should have so far neglected his duty, to preach the gospel to every creature, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and should have omitted it in this case! I proceed to his

Prop. 4. He says, "I infer from the whole book of Romans that we are justified by faith without baptism." As this is only inference, and not a fact, I shall say but little. Inferences have already ruined the Christian

world; we should be careful not to substitute them for facts. But let us hear his inference. We will throw his argument into a syllogistic form. 1. "This epistle was written to develope and prove the doctrine of justification. 2. Baptism is kept out of view entirely, till the apostle had got through his arrangement in chap. vi. 3. Therefore justification or pardon was before baptism—they were baptized because their sins were forgiven!"

Let us try our hand at a syllogism too. 1. Paul wrote several epistles on the doctrine and practice of christianity. 2. Repentance is entirely kept out of view, and not once mentioned. 3. Therefore repentance is not a doctrine or practice of christianity!! Again: Paul wrote several epistles on the doctrine and practice of christianity. But baptism is entirely kept out of view throughout—therefore baptism is not a doctrine or practice of christianity!!! Who does not know that in many of the epistles, the practical doctrine of truth is put before faith? But Mr. B's conclusion is not contained in his premises—there is no hint of the Romans being baptized because their sins were forgiven. Baptism was casually introduced; "Know ye not that as many of you as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into his death?" Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death—into what death? Will he say the death of sin? Then must he acknowledge that sin was alive in them, and continued so, till they were baptized; how then can he assent that sin was reconciled, and yet living in them before they were baptized? I will further say that understanding death in the text to be spiritual and not natural, that Christ was once alive to sin, and died to it also. This interpretation I do not receive, though commonly accepted.

Prop. 5. "Christ forgave sins before baptism"—and he again introduced many cases of those under the old

dispensation—but not one under the new institution. As we have said, this is the point. Let him produce one and but one instance of pardon before baptism under the new institution and we yield. We believe as well as he, that pardons were granted under the old institution without baptism, as before observed.

The four remaining propositions are deferred for our next number. B. W. S.

For the Christian Messenger.

AN ADDRESS TO MY BAPTIST BRETHREN,

No. 2.

Containing my reasons for seceding from the Baptists.

1. One of the most intelligent and eloquent Baptists of England, says, "whenever it becomes impossible to continue in a religious community without concurring in practices and sactioning abuses, which the word of God *condemns*, a secession is justified by the Apocalyptic voice, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her plagues." Rev. xviii. On this principle the conduct of the Reformers in separating from the Roman Hierarchy, admits of an ample vindication, in consequence of the introduction of superstitious rites and ceremonies, it becomes impracticable to continue in her communion without partaking of her sins; and for a similar reason, the non-conformists seceded from the Church of England, where ceremonies were enforced, and an ecclesiastical polity established incompatible, as they conceived, with the purity and simplicity af the Christian Institute. In each of these cases the blame of schism did not attach to the separatists, but to that spirit of imposition which rendered such a measure requisite. In each instance it was an act of self-preservation, rendered *unavoidable by the highest necessity*, that of declining to concur in

practices, at which their consciences revolted."–Robert Neal, on Communion, page 132.

To all this, we say a loud Amen. This is sound logic. In common law, when one man pushes upon another man, and threatens to wound or kill him—if the man assailed kills his assailant, the blame of murder attaches to the assailant, and not to the man assailed. If those large, respectable and pious bodies of Christians, who seceded from the Mother of Abominations; as the Novatians, Paulicians, Henricians, Catharines, poor men of Lyons, Puritans, Wyckliffites, Hussites, Waldenses, Vadois, Hugenots, and Reformers, were justifiable, then so are we justifiable in our secession from the modern Baptists, and all other sects. Those who can find an apology for the Methodists in seceding from the Church of England, and she from the Mother church, can easily find an excuse for us—for our secession from the Baptists. Remember, *emphatically*, the blame is yours, not ours.

Yours, benevolently,

J. CREATH, Jr.

Palmyra, Mo. Jan. 1842.

QUERIES—By J. B. Ranson.

1. Please explain 1 Cor, v. 5.
2. Also compare and explain Acts ix. 25—30, with Gal. i. 17—19.
3. What are the duties of Elders, according to Acts xx. 28.
4. What are the duties of Deacons?
5. Are the wives of Deacons to act as deaconesses in certain cases? 1 Tim. iii. 11.

—

1. Please explain 1 Cor. v. 5. "To deliver such a one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

1. The fornicator was to be excommunicated from the family of God into that of Satan; for two purposes especially this was to be done—one for the destruction of the flesh—the other for the salvation of the spirit. The Lord in order to shew his hatred of such evil practices, frequently inflicted on such offenders sore bodily punishments. As in 1 Cor. xi. 29, 30 "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep (or die). This incestuous person, when excommunicated, when sorely punished in body, and pining away in disease, might by these afflictions be brought to the consideration of of his sin, and to repentance, as was really the fact in this case, and thus his spirit was saved. So in the case already alluded to, 1 Cor. xi. 30. "But when we are judged (punished) we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the (impenitent) world."

2. Compare and explain Acts ix. 24—30, with Gal. i. 17—19.

Ans. Saul was converted at or near to Damascus, and there, after his conversion he remained and preached for many days. The Jews at length took counsel to kill him. He escaped from Damascus, by being let down by the wall in a basket. Acts ix. 18—25. From this place he went, not to Jerusalem, but into Arabia, and after remaining there awhile, he returned to Damascus. Then after three years he went up to Jerusalem for the first time after his conversion. The whole difficulty arises from verse 26 of Acts ix. For there, after Paul's escape, it is immediately added by Luke the historian, "And when Saul was come to Jerusalem," &c.—as if he went straight there when he left Damascus. But it is not so said.

3. What are the duties of elders, according to Acts xx. 28. "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church of God (the Lord) which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Ans. 1. It is their duty to take heed unto themselves—to walk blamelessly in all the commandments of God, and to be ensamples to the believers in word and conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith and purity.

2. Their second duty, is, to take heed to the flock, To correct their wanderings; and to lead them in the right way, to pleasant pastures, to feed them on the sincere milk of the word, and on stronger meat, as they may be able to bear it.

Que. 4 What are the duties of deacons.

Ans. At first the Apostles acted both as Elders and deacons. But finding the two offices too onerous, they called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said: It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore look ye out from among you seven men of honest report, and full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. It appears from this that the duty of deacons was to attend to tables, or to the temporalities of the Church. This was their particular business; but doubtless, they in common with their brethren, exercised in their spiritual worship.

Que: 5. Are the wives of deacons to act as deconesses in certain cases 1. Tim iii. 11?

Ans. We are not informed in the Scriptures and can therefore say nothing.

Your old Brother.
B W, S.

A correspondent, who signs his name Alpha, cannot be attended to, until he gives us his real name. With pleasure he shall receive our attention when this is done. B. W. S.

From the Cross and Journal.

SECTARIANISM.

Sect, as regards the Church of Christ, is a fraction or body broken off from the true church. This is the primary or proper import. The term is used secondarily to denote a body of professors who separate from the established church in any country. A sectarian, then, properly speaking, is one that is favorable to the building of a sect in opposition to the regular church of Christ. It will follow, then that sectarianism is the approval of sects and efforts to promote them instead of the true Church, and as particularly applicable to all those who think it best to have so many denominations instead of one. To ascertain, then which denominations are sects, we must ascertain which are founded upon the plan of the gospel, and which are not; and, to determine whether any man is a sectarian we must determine whether he is adhering to and endeavoring to build up the true church, or adheres to and builds up a sect. A sectarian in the Apoatles' days, would have been one that promoted an organization differing from the regular apostolic church; and of course a sectarian would be the same now. Hence it will follow, that sectarianism must be a great sin. To break off from the true church, and to build up a distinct and opposing organization, strikes the mind at once as a high-handed offence. And is it so considered in the scriptures. The Apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, xvi chapter, 17th and 18th verses, says, "Mark them that cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesns Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the simple." This is a terrible charge against sectarianism. Again, the same Apostle, in warning Titus against this character, says, "A man

that is a heretic after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted and sinneth being condemned of himself." A heretic here is evidently one who teaches opinions and practices different from the true church; and consequently would build up an opposing interest. He is to be rejected if he cannot be reformed, lest he draw away the less informed and less substantial members of the church.

These passages, with others which might be quoted, show that it is a fearful business to be engaged in building up a sect or denomination in opposition to the true church of Christ. It becomes every man, and especially every minister, to seriously examine the subject, and ascertain what he is doing.

From the above we see that all the attempts to throw dust over this subject, and try to make people believe that it is best to have the church cut up into many sects or denominations, must be highly offensive in the sight of the Holy Redeemer, who has commanded us to be of one mind and one judgement. We also see that it is a most fearfully responsible business to originate a new denomination. No man certainly should dare to do it, unless he have ample evidence that the Church of Christ has lost its visibility, and that God requires him to restore it again. We further see that it can be no great privilege to trace the church to which we adhere back to some great leader as the origin—as Wesly, Knox, Calvin, or Luther. It must be much more gratifying to feel our own way back into the obscure wilderness, where the "woman fled from the face of the dragon whence she was to emerge after a thousand two hundred and three score days." *Rev.* 12 Z.

Bro. N. Field, Editor of the Israelite, suggests the expurgation of the word *Disciples*, as the appellative of our brotherhood, and the substitution of the word *Christians*. So mote it be.

DUTIES OF PARENTS.

It is at times necessary to censure and punish: but very much may be done by encouraging children when they do well. Be evermore careful to express your *approbation of good conduct than disapprobation of bad*. Nothing can more discourage a child than a spirit of incessant fault-finding, on the part of its parents. And hardly any thing can exert a more injurious influence upon the disposition both of the parent and the child. There are two great motives influencing human actions, hope and fear. But who would not prefer to have the child influenced to good conduct by the desire of pleasing, rather than by fear of offending? If a mother never expresses her gratification when her children do well, and is always censuring when she sees any thing amiss, they are discouraged and unhappy. They feel there is no time to please. Their dispositions become hardened and soured by this ceaseless fretting. At last, finding whether they do well or ill, they are equally found fault with, they relinquish all efforts to please, and become heedless of reproaches.

But let a mother approve a child's conduct, whenever she can. Let her show that his behavior makes her sincerely happy. Let her reward him for his efforts to please by smiles and affection. In this way she will cherish in her child's heart some of the noblest and most desirable feelings of our nature. She will cultivate in him an amiable disposition under a careful spirit. Your child has been, during the day very pleasant and obedient. Just before putting him to bed for the night, you take his hand and say, "My son, you have been a very good boy to-day. It makes me very happy to see you so kind and obedient. God loves little children who are dutiful to their parents, and promises to make them happy. This approbation from his mother is to him a great reward. And when with a more than ordinary tone of affection, you say "good night my dear son," he leaves the room with his heart full of feelings. And when he closes his eyes to sleep, he is happy and resolves that he will always try to do his duty to his mother.—*Sat. Cour.*

Our worthy brother, W. M. Brown, is now operating at Winchester. He has been the instrument of adding about 30 to the church, with a fair prospect of many more.

Bro. Davenport, of Plymouth, Pa. writes Jan. 26, That bro. Wm. Lane had a meeting of days in this place during the present month, and much good has been done—more than 20 have been added by immersion and otherwise, and prospects are good. A number have confessed the Lord Jesus, but have not been immersed. May the cause of christianity prosper, not only here, but elsewhere!" Amen.

Bro. Henry Thomas, of Florida, Mo. writes Feb. 2, 1842: "The religion of Jesus is prospering in this country, Since June last, at the meetings that I have attended, there have been added to the Lord and introduced into his kingdom, 324; and at the same places many more when I was absent. The churches have commenced meeting every Lord's day, and obeying the Lord's commandments.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

March, 1842.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 5.

THE CONVENTION.

SESSION SECOND—*Continued from page* 63.

After solemn prayer and praise, the full convention silently sat for a few minutes, then the venerable moderator of the former session arose, and said, By the kind providence of our common Father, we are spared to come together in time. To draw the cords of Christian union closer amongst ourselves, and to extend and promote it to the ends of the earth, are the grand objects of our assembling together. Let us choose us a moderator and a scribe, and proceed immediately to business.

It was quickly and unanimously determined; *nemine contradicente*, that the former moderator and clerk should be retained.

C—— rose and thus spoke: When we last assembled, I said that the Bible was the only divine athoritative constitution, or law, given to the world, as the means of saving them, and of uniting the saved in one body. I farther remarked, that no laws how wisely soever devised—no constitution, however good—not the Bible itself, could of themselves unite the church. I need not use labored arguments to prove this position: The Savior prayed to the Father that all that should believe on him through the word of the twelve apostles, might be one. "Even as thou Father art in