last Monday night. The additions were 6, with fine prospects. On Monday next I, with bro. Rice, expect to start on a tour to Green river. May the blessing of heaven be yours, my worthy old brother.

In this county, Morgan, Ill., we have considerable religious excitement—it yet continues. At Princeton about 35 were added—at Franklin, about 80 in a few days, rather nights, and still progressing, chiefly by the labors of bro. D. P. Henderson. At Apple creek and Sandy, about 60. At Lick creek in Sangamon, 9.

Bro. J. A. Gano of Bourbon, Ky. June 3, 1842. "We have had 47 additions at the meetings I have attended in May, principally in this county; 16 of them at Antioch.

Bro Carroll Kendrick of Ky. to bro. Cribfield, June 26, 1842—"that since I last wrote, we have had 281 additions."

Bro. Js Kinkennon writes from Ia., June 10, 1842. That 60 had been immersed in his bounds in about 12 months.

Bro. R B Roberts of Henderson Ky., writes June 14, 1842, We have gained 5 more at Green river, Ohio county. On the first Lord's day in June, at Republican, Henderson county, we gained 10 from the world; and from Republican in Hopkins county we gained 8 more.

Bro. G Jackman of Clarkesville Mo. writes May 18. 1842, that he and bro. L. Hatchitt had just closed a meeting at Ramsey's creek with 13 additions, which with 19 just before make 32.

At Virginia, Ill. there has been about 27 additions—at Rushville 72, at which places Bro. Brown attended.

Bro R. Humphrey of Alton writes, June 26. Our church on Wood river numbers 120. In Alton we constituted a church a few months ago with 17, and 3 have been since added. I have visited Green county and baptized 9 in April, 3 in June—and at a three days' meeting with other brethren, we baptized 7.

A brother, Asa W. Lane of Dubuque, is very urgent that some of our preaching brethren visit them. He says the prospect is good. I should be glad his request could be granted,

Bro. Walter Bowles of Dewit county Ill. told me the 17th day of July, that he had within the seven past weeks added to the church 227. At the time he told me this we were at a three days' meeting at Antioch, near Jacksonville. At this meeting about 36 were united to the church, and in my neighborhood 5. Bro. Bowles has but a very limited education, and labors with his hands to support his family. He is the son of Hugh Bowles, formerly of Caneridge, Ky.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

AugusSt, 1842.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 10

REMARKS ON A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BY MR CARTER

Continued.

5. Another charge he makes, "When did you ever hear them teach the repentance of the Bible, turning from sin to God? Never."

I suppose Mr. C. knew that the greater majority of his hearers had never heard us at all, and therefore had never heard us preach this doctrine. He also knew that the pulpit protected him from a flat contradiction, and of the true state of the case. I appeal to the candid public, who have heard us, if they have never heard us preach, that they must turn from sin to God; and whether this be not among the prominent items of our preaching. I tell Mr. C. that such groundless and positive assertions will not subserve his cause, nor injure ours long. The people who hear us will judge for themselves. Depend upon it, there will be a reaction. The people see hundreds of sinners turning from sin to God through our instrumentality. They will naturally conclude that we taught them this doctrine somehow. But Mr. C. doubtless teaches his congregations this doctrine—how many has he persuaded to do it?

6. He states again, "Their faith nullifies three score declarations of God, save one, (as Mark ii. 5. The thief on the cross, &c. &c.")

Out of the 59 declarations of God, all adduced by

him were under the old dispensation, before the New institution was introduced—before the kingdom of heaven was set up—before the last commission was given to the apostles, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Had the apostles have preached and acted under their first commission, would they have done right? Would they have been accepted? We think not, and have, therefore, determined to follow in their foot steps.

He had found 59 declarations of God nullifying our faith in baptism for remission of sins. Had he examined the Old Testament, he could have found many, very many more, who were pardoned without baptism, and for this reason they were pardoned without it, because God had not then required it. God has his plan of pardoning in every dispensation. That under the patriarchs, and under the law, will not do now under the New institution. The law is not of faith. We must render obedience to Christ, not to Moses.

7, Another charge Mr. C. prefers against us is, that we hold, "No baptism, no pardon. The channel thro' which pardon flows, is, coming in contact with the water."

That faith, repentance, and baptism connected, is the ordained and revealed plan of heaven for pardon, we most assuredly believe, and wonder that any can unblushingly deny it. We read of no one sinner under the new institution, pardoned without baptism, in all the history and acts of the apostles, and in their epistles. It is plain that all in the church at Rome were baptized—were immersed. For Paul wrote to all that be in Rome, called to be saints. These were all buried with Christ in baptism. Yet in this same epistle he very often says, that they were justified by faith—without any mention of repentance, prayer or

baptism in connection. Can we believe they were, therefore, omitted, when it is so expressly declared, that they were all baptized? and baptized into Christ, and became new creatures, not before; and, therefore, not saved from their sins before baptism? All the church at Corinth were baptized, and baptized too into Christ, and thus became new creatures, and put him on; of course were pardoned, and not before.

All the churches in Galatia were baptized *into* Christ. Chap. iii.

All the church at Ephesus had one baptism—a water baptism, into the name of the Lord Jesus. For the first twelve received this baptism; and if there is but one, then were all the church baptized in the same way. Acts xix.

All the church in Collosse were buried in baptism, and put off the body of the sins of the flesh through this baptism. I need not be more particular to prove this point. When any one shall find one instance where one sinner was saved or pardoned without baptism under the New Institution, then I will acknowledge my error. Bare assertions are as light as air to me.

I repeat it, Had not the apostles baptized all believers, they would have been unfaithful servants to the commission they received, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. If unfaithful in this matter, who can have unshaken confidence in their word?

I say, this is God's revealed plan; now let Mr. C. or others more competent, prove another revealed plan under the New Institution. We are represented as teaching no baptism, no pardon. We confess we can see no other plan given of the Lord: yet we do not say that God *cannot* and will not pardon a penitent believer without baptism, in the case of ignorance, and other uncontrolable circumstances. If he has two revealed plans, one with baptism, and another

without it, then will the plan without baptism or immersion prevail, and the ordinance be nullified, or made non-essential to salvation. This is now being done by many. It is a very easy matter for Mr. C. to declaim before a prejudiced audience, when he is behind the ramparts of a pulpit, where he cannot be contradicted.

8. Mr. C. then takes notice of Acts ii. 38; "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of your sins," &c. Now, says he, according to their mode of reasoning, you may repent, but unless you are baptized you cannot receive the remission of your sins."

Had Mr. C. but added what we uniformly say, *according to the Lord's revealed plan*, we should say, our mode of reasoning was logical, and entirely conclusive. Suppose Mr. C. had been present with his sectarian opinions, when Peter preached, Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins—he would have replied, Peter, repentance alone is necessary for remission of sins, why preach baptism too, when there is no necessity for it? Peter doubtless, would have answered, It is better to obey the Lord than men: my Lord commanded me thus to preach and act; if I did not obey, I should be an unfaithful servant. And he that knoweth his Master's will, and does it not, shall be beaten with many stripes.

Let us notice Mr. C's. mode of reasoning: You may repent, but except you believe, you cannot be saved. You may believe, but except you repent, you cannot be saved nor justified. Therefore faith without repentance, and repentance without faith, will not save or remit sin. But he says, Faith is implied to exist where repentance is; and repentance where faith is, though it be not mentioned. And why may we not reason in the same manner of baptism, though in many cases not mentioned, yet is certainly implied in connection with faith and repentance?

He gives an illustration of what he deems the absurdity of Peter's doctrine; baptism for the remission of sins, by a drunkard; "you must quit drinking, and sign the pledge, and you will become a sober, happy man; but unless you sign the pledge you will not become a sober man.—The veriest youth attending College would ridicule such reasoning." The pledge in Mr. C.—s view is useless, seeing a man becomes sober without it. How completely has he set aside baptism; a divine command and a saving ordinance! Let us attend to his illustration a little father. You must quit your sins, and be baptized, and you shall be saved.—You may quit your sins, but unless you are baptized you will not be saved. Or you must quit your sins, and if you be not baptized you shall be saved—saved from what? He shall save his people from their sins.—But Mr. C has got this done, without the use of the ordained means, i. e. baptism—and done too by himself, the sinner's own mighty powers! and after it is affected, then he argues there is no use of baptism. Now we are simple enough to take God at his word. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." We do not then expect the end, salvation, without, using the ordained means, baptism; through which simple means God has promised salvation pardon and the Holy Spirit— as simple is the means, as that which cured Naman's leprosy; as that which restored sight to the blind man by washing in the pool of Siloam. Sobriety is never promised to a man upon condition of his signing the pledge. But salvation is promised to a believer if he be baptized. There is no similarity between the figure, and the case just considered. The College boys may now turn their ridicule upon the author of this illustration. They could invent scores of sophisms more plausible against the truth, were they disposed to weaken its power.

9. He next introduces Acts x. 44. "Cornelius received the gift of the Holy Ghost before Baptism, and consequently was in a pardoned, justified state."

And yet Peter was to tell him words whereby he and his house were to be saved! among which words, he commanded them to be baptized.—This objection I have fully answered in my strictures on Elder Bailey, and have proved it is believed, that receiving the Holy Ghost, in its miraculous powers, is no evidence of pardon, or justification. To that No. of the Messenger, I refer the inquirer.

10. He proceeds. It is a duty, however, to be baptized (not rantized.) The believers are bound to do it. Yes, but are unconscious babes bound, *however*? Though baptism is as useless to salvation or pardon, as the temperance pledge is to make a sober man, yet it is a duty! and believers are bound to do it. Suppose this believer had been baptized, or rantized in infancy, and grows up to the age of intelligence, and then becomes a believer—should he be baptized? What but unauthorized tradition hinders.

11. He next introduces Acts xxii. 16. Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling on the name of the Lord Jesus. He says, "If this passage means pardon, then Paul forgave himself,"—seeing he himself was commanded to wash away his sins. Well if to wash away his sins means to purify or cleanse away his sins, then he himself cleansed himself from his sins! What is the great difference. But this exposition will not suit Mr.C.—he therefore supposed that Paul washed his hands, as did Pilate, when he said I am innocent of the blood of this just man (Christ.) Baptism is thus frittered away to a pagan rite in order to escape from the truth. Mr. C.—is entitled to a patent for this idea, for I think it is his own. See the good of driving men to extremes. They must either yield or invent something new under the sun.

But Mr. C's. idea vanishes when we cast our eyes on the Greek text. "Be baptized and wash away," are translated from the Greek verbs *baptisai* and *apolousai*. Both verbs are in the Middle voice, the first Aorist tense, and the Imperative mood, second person singular. If one of the verbs be translated passively, so must the other. The correct translation then should be, Having risen up, be baptized, and be washed from your sins. But if one of the verbs be taken actively, then must both be taken actively. It would then read, Having risen up, baptize yourself, and wash away your sins. This would be a precedent for autobaptism, or for one to baptize himself, which Mr. C. will not approve, because it would do away infant baptism, they being unable to baptize themselves; and because it is stated that Saul was baptized in the Passive voice, *ebaptisthe*. Therefore, he did not baptize himself, and consequently, did not wash his hands like Pilate in a basin of water. Let Mr C. turn it as he will, still Saul's sins were washed away somehow in connection with baptism, therefore his sins were cleaving to him till he was baptized and washed, and consequently, Saul was not saved before he was baptized. As the orthodox claim the right of changing the rites of the church, and of instituting more convenient ones, wonder whether they will institute Mr. C's, rather Pilate's rite of washing the hands in order to the washing of sins after baptism. But immersion is so indecent. Yes, truly; and so was the bloody rite of circumcision. But indecent and painful as it was, the old church was not allowed to change this divine ordinance. Such feeble attempts to do away baptism for remission will confirm every thinking person in the truth.

(To be continued.)

TO ELDER A. CAMPBELL.

Dear Brother:

I had written you a lengthy letter on some remarks you made to Mr. Broadus in your last reply to the postscript of his communication to you; but on reflection, I have suppressed its publication for the present. I wish to express my sincere thanks to you for your very kind and able defence of my religious character from the imputations of Mr. Broadus. To bro. Henshall I have already tendered my thanks for the same favor.

You have said one thing, in your letter to Mr. Broadus, which I wish as a brother to notice. You say to Mr. B. "You and I both agree that in Corinth, Paul regarded him that said, I am for Christ, (a christian) as great a sectary, as he that said I am for Paul."

From a moments reflection you must both see your error. It is not said, I am *for* Christ, and I *for* Paul, and I *for* Apollos, and I *for* Cephas. The words used by Paul convey a different idea. They are *ego eimi Christou*, which literally and grammatically rendered, are, I am *of* Christ, and I *of* Paul, as it is in our translation, and in your New version. Our translators, and you also in the new version, have rendered the same words *yours*, or belonging to; as whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas—*panta humoon estin*, all are yours, and *humeis de Christou*, you are Christ's; *Christos de theou*, and Christ is God's. See also Gall. iii. 29 and v. 24. John viii. 54.

When Paul said, *humeis este Christou*, did he mean you are sectaries? as your exposition is; or did he mean, you belong to Christ? Our translators render the same words belonging to, Mark ix. 14. *Hoti Christou este*, because ye belong to Christ, and Heb. v. 14.

You also give the meaning of *I am for Christ*, to be a Christian; and say he is as much a sectary, who calls himself a christian, as to say I am *for* Paul, or a Paulite. This may be, because none said I am *for* Christ, but certain I am, that all the saints are said to be of Christ, or belonging to him. They are not their own, *ouk este seautoon*, but Christ's, bought them with a price &c. They cannot then be sectaries, who say, I am of Christ, or I belong to him; but for any to say I belong to Paul, or Apollos, or as very common in our day, I belong to the Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Baptists, this is sectarian indeed; but when any say, I am of Christ, or belong to him—he is not a sectarian—he speaks correctly; for he was baptized into Christ, and have put him on. Had any been baptized into the name of Paul, he would be properly a Paulite and not a Christian.

The reading of this verse is disputed you know. In Greenfield's Greek Testament, in the margin, it reads: I am of *Chrispou*, instead of *Christou*. Then the whole would read, "For while one says I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Chrispus, are ye not Carnal." Certainly. Now Chrispus was a noted person in Corinth. He had been a ruler of a synagogue, and after his conversion to christianity, no doubt he was an active and popular agent in the cause. While some were saying I am of Paul, others said I am of Crispus—they were equally sectarian. But to say, I am of Christ is not sectarian.

B. W. S.

TO ELDER ALVIN BAILEY.

Sir:—The first number of your periodical, titled the "*Voice of Truth*," edited in Winchester, Ill., lies before me. You are certainly deserving of credit for the honest and candid disclosure of your object and design; for you say, "The object (of your periodical)

is one, namely to withstand the array of error, which comes upon us like a flood, under the name of reformation. The doctrines of Mr. A. Campbell, in their worst form, are zealously, and successfully propagated in this region, and to withstand their influence, this periodical is designed." No doubt Saul of Tarsus was equally honest in withstanding the flood of supposed errors, propagated by the apostles of Christ, and of rescuing millions from their influence. And we doubt not, that many opposers of reformation in every age since, have been equally honest in their opposition, and had a very good conscience toward God, believing they were doing him service. These were regulated by conscience, not by truth.

You inform us that you have the assurance of aid from devoted men, whose hearts are enlisted in this cause; and you solicit aid from all the evangelical christian denominations. "A cannon is not charged to shoot a fly." We may, therefore, view you as the organ of the sects, the self-styled evangelicals.

I plainly see that you have adopted the ancient mode of warfare against us, which is, 'divide and conquer.' You wish to divide our ranks, by spreading discord among us, or by inducing us to squabble about certain doctrines of no avail to the interests of christianity. We shall be on the alert to defend ourselves, and especially the truth as it is in Jesus.

In your letter to me, you labor to rescue your criticism on *kai*, as meaning *even* in John iii. 5 and Tit. iii. 5, from the bonds of my strictures in the Dec. No. of Messenger; in doing which you have made a few mistakes; First, you represent me as holding that *kai* never meant, or was rendered *even*. This I have never done. Secondly, you represent me as saying, that your criticism is, that *kai* always means *even* and not *and*. This I have not done. I was simply shewing the absurdity of this rendering by its application to other

texts, besides those in John iii. 5 and Tit. iii. 5. Your meaning of *kai* in the texts last cited, you must acknowledge is merely arbitrary. For of all the many thousand times the word *kai* occurs in the New Testament, our translators whom you justly call "that learned host of divines, who gave us our excellent version of the scriptures," have not translated *kai* by the word *even* in but a very few—say half dozen texts, according to Cruden's complete concordance. Is it not then arbitrary truly to render it *even* in John iii 5? Especially when John in all his writings has never once used it in this sense, though it occurs hundreds of times? Even in this 3d chapter, the word occurs 30 times, and is not once translated *even*.

Again, Is it not arbitrary to render *kai even* in Tit. iii. 5, when Paul in all his writings had used *kai* thousands of times, and in but three texts is it translated *even*, by "our learned host of divines," according to Cruden. There may be a few more. And I will add that in these three texts it would read equally well, by translating it *and* as commonly done. See the 3 texts, Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor, xv. 24. 2 Cor. i. 3. I will farther add, that our translators themselves have frequently translated the very word *and* instead of *even*, in the very same connection, as is found in two of the texts just quoted; as 1 Cor. xv. 24. 2 Cor. i. 3. Let any, who may doubt turn up the Greek Testament and read and compare the following texts, 1 Cor i 3, Rom. i. 7, Gall i. 3, Eph i. 3, Phil i. 2, Coll i. 3, 1 Thes i. 1, 2 Thes i. 1, 2, 1 Tim i. 1, 2, 2 Tim i. 2, Tit i. 4, Phill 3. James i. 1. 1 Pet i. 3, 2 Pet i. 2 John i. 3, Jude i. 1, Rev i. 4, 5 &c. Rom xv, 6 compare Phil iv. 2. Should *kai* be rendered *even* in these and similar texts, then we should read grace, mercy and peace from God, the Father, *kai* even the Lord Jesus Christ. This reading would confound the persons of trinity, and be a death blow at the doctrine. For this reason, I said

that when I was a youth this criticism of *kai* received by you, was scouted by the intelligent. I said, that the man who introduced this criticism to prove the Godhead of the Son, must be but a smatterer in Greek, because in doing this he upset the doctrine of Trinity.

Your argument, that by translating *kai* in the texts above, by *even*, it will prove that there is one God—but by translating it by *and*, it will prove two God's, is as light as air. With us, says Paul there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him. and one Lord Jesus Christ, of whom are all things and we by him, Now you would read it, there is one God the, Father—*even* one Lord Jesus Christ. But we read it as it stands in our Bible, One God, the Father *and* one Lord Jesus Christ. You reject this reading, for you say "it will teach the doctrine of two God's." Then you reflect a little squinting wit, in these words. "Perhaps you think, with Solomon, that "two are better than one." And so, I suppose your 'learned host of divines' thought, who gave us the common translation of *kai* in this text! If two be better than one; by the same mode of reasoning, three, are better than two, and so you will have the advantage any how.

As you have made a supposition of what I may think, I will candidly tell my own thoughts. I think that the Rantizers make a greater shew of truth in translating *baptidzo* than you have in your criticism.

You have adduced two texts, which you think decisive to shew that *kai* should be rendered *even*, Matt. xxi 5, and Cor. ix 5. The first is, "Behold thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, *and* a colt, the foal of an ass." You think, that *kai* should in this text be rendered *even* or it would follow from the reading that Christ rode on two asses. That learned host of divines thought differently, for they give us the common translation of the word. How perfectly intelligible is it to say, "sitting upon an ass, and that a colt, the foal of an ass.

The other text is 1 Cor. ix 5. "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" So our translators render it. Let us apply your criticism to the text. and read it; "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as the apostles, *even* the brethren of the Lord, *even* Cephas." This we think obscures the text, and therefore we prefer the common rendering. Grant us the privilege which you have taken, (and who claiming it for himself can deny it to another?) and we could nullify and stultify many precious truths. But with the common translation of *kai*, not one truth would be obscured; or weakened.

"Behold what a great matter a little fire kindleth."

Yours respectfully,

B. W. S.

THE SIGNS OF THE LAST DAYS.

2. Tim iii. 1–5.–This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their ownselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.

In the last days—This phrase the last days, generally in the New Testament, signifies the time from the first coming of Christ to his second; or the gospel age; particularly, the last days or last time of this age. As much depends on this definition, I will be particular in considering all the texts where the expression occurs.

There appears to be a difference between the last

days, and the last day. The last days signify all the time between the first and second coming of the Mesiah—the *last day* signifies the last or final day of that period or gospel age.—Paul, Heb. i. 2. In these *last days* God hath spoken to us by his son.—This surely means the beginning of the last days, or of the gospel age. Again Acts. ii. 17. And it shall come to pass in the *last days*, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before that great and notable day of the Lord come."—From this it is plain that *the last days* were the beginning of the gospel age, which was to continue till the great, notable and last day of the Lord should come. Immediately before which day the sun and moon were to lose their splendor. These signs have never taken place since Peter spoke this prophecy.

In the last day, the dead shall be raised. John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54. Jesus had just said I came not down from heaven to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all he hath given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him may have eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. Here are two items of the will of God. The first is that Jesus should raise the whole world, that not one of them should be lost or missing in the last day. "In Christ shall all be made alive," raised from the dead. The second item is that all believers shall have eternal life as well as be raised again at the last day—the closing day of the gospel age, see as 44, 54, John xi. 24. Martha saith unto him, I know he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.

The last days of the gospel age or, emphatically the last day—is the judgment, the great and notable day

of the Lord. John xii. 48. It (my word) shall judge him in the last day. 1. Pet. i. 5. "God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world &c. The last days or day, then generally mean the gospel age, and especially the closing period of that age. At this period shall many signs appear in the heavens and in the earth; among which signs on earth shall appear the characters stated above (2 Tim. iii 5,) which we shall now notice, and ask, Is not this sign evidently seen at this time?

1. Men shall be lovers of their own selves, or *philautists*) Self love is not a sin, unless it be confined to self. For no (sane) man ever hated his own flesh. The command is, Love your neighbor as yourself. If to love self were a sin, then to love our neighbor as ourself would be also a sin. The self love in the text means, doubtless, love confined to self exclusively. He looks to, and seeks his own interest, not regarding that of another. This character can be better explained by contrasting it with its opposite, which pre-eminently shone in Jesus, the great pattern of perfection. He, though high in honor, rich in glory, and perfectly blessed, yet in love to sinners, humbled himself, became poor, and suffered and died in order to save a miserable, sinking world, even his enemies. He was a philanthropist, or lover of man—not a philautist or lover of self. Had he been such, he would have looked to his own things exclusively, and not to these of others, the consequence of which would have been, that not one of the human family had been saved. He, through love to the human, miserable world, sacrificed his honor, his godlike form, his riches of glory—his blessedness in heaven—and came into our wretched world, lived in pain, hated, persecuted, put to death, and buried—all for our good—for our salvation. Here is our pattern. "Let this mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus." Phil. ii. 1—10.

The mind in Jesus was, love to all mankind without exception of any.

This mind we must also have, to weep over their miserable condition--to pray and labor for their good--and make a sacrifice of all for their salvation. This did our Lord Jesus. Time is a drop, eternity is a boundless ocean; upon this inch of time depends the eternal happiness or misery of the human family. This brought Jesus from heaven to earth, brought him to poverty; this led him to the cross; to the grave.

Have we the mind of Jesus? Do we weep over the world as he did? Do we pray and labor for their good! O yes, says one, I pray daily for the world. But do you labor for the world? O, I cannot preach. But do you labor with your hands, that you may have to give to him that can preach in the spirit? What sacrifices do you make for the salvation of the world? Of your honors, how much? of your wealth, how much? of your glory, how much? of your ease, how much? I have a family to support--Yes and a house floor to be covered with superb carpeting, a table to spread with rich viands, a spacious house to furnish with costly furniture, a home and a living to provide for each of my children; and—enough. Tell me no more that you are a christian; and have not sacrificed yourself, and your all to God—to his glory—you have no love to mankind—you are a philautist, a lover of your ownself. You have not the mind of Christ, and will be convinced of this hereafter, when it may be too late. The world are dying on account of the self love of professors.—O it is surely the last time.

2. A second character which is a sign of the last days, is the covetous. This character is nearly allied to self love, if not inseparable from it.—The covetous are those, not contented with food and raiment, and with such things as they have, but desire more in order to feed self love. This desire leads them to seek

for more—and this leads to striving and grasping still for more. A covetous man is hardly an honest man. He will take advantage of his fellow creature, and strip him of his money and goods for his own sordid gratification, and self love. A covetous man has nothing to spare. The poor may die in want for him—The world may perish forever before he can find in his heart to give something to aid evangelist, to bear the gospel to them. The desire of the covetous man increases with his wealth. Were he in the possession of all the wealth of this world, he would desire that of another, and so on to infinite. Nothing less than the throne of God, and the wealth of the univers would satisfy him-satisfy him? Impossible, satisfaction and he are at antipodes, and must forever be. Poor wretch. Yet this covetous man has the form of godliness.

Boasters.—Some boast that they have made a good bargain, having got their neighbor's property for much less than its value—or that they have sold property for more than its worth.—they glory in their own shame, others boast of their wealth. This may be tolerable—but some may boast of their high attainments in knowledge-in religion. In their foiling an adversary in an argument, or religious debate. Some may boast of their great success in making converts; I preached, and baptized so many. Some boast of their lucid exhibitions in preaching. O!! Is it possible. Yet these boasters have a form of godliness; but lack the power of it. That power leads to different results.

Proud.—Pride is an inordinate self esteem—a wish to appear eminent, above others. It appears in a thousand forms. But the lowest and most despicable form in which it is seen, is in adorning the body with costly apparel, with gold and jewelry, and pompous pageantry. They cannot condescend to men of low estate. Some are proud of their wealth—some of their honors—some of their great learning--some

of their oratory—of their great influence over others—in their large gifts for benevolent purposes—and even of their religious zeal; and yet have a form of godliness!

BLASPHEMERS.—The meaning of the word is to injure a character, whether of God or man. To blaspheme the name of God by swearing or speaking irreverently of him, cannot be what Paul designed here: for such blasphemers could hardly have a form of Godliness; but he means those who blaspheme or injure the character of others by unjustly detracting from their merits—or imputing slanderously unknown faults to them—by telling lies of them, or wilfully misrepresenting them—magnifying small improprieties—by speaking evil of them behind their backs. How full of blasphemy is the Christian world at this time! Even those, who should be examples to the flock, appear in the front ranks of blasphemy, one against the other. They do evil that good may come, whose damnation is just. They pretend a great zeal for God to promote his cause by putting down heretics; but their zeal appears to be in reality to promote and increase their party, and to glory in their flesh. What a long, black list of names of this character will be found in the last day! Alas! the earth groans under their weight now, and is writhing in pain to vomit out such trash from her disordered stomach. Yet these same persons have a form of godliness!

To be continued.

For the Christian Messenger.

INFANTS NOT SAVED WITHOUT BAPTISM!!!

Etd. B. W. Stone:

Dear Sir—Will you permit me to direct the attention of your readers to the following quotations from the Methodist Discipline, and from a work published by order of the General Conference of 1812, entitled

"DOCTRINAL TRACTS," including John Wesley's short Treatise on Baptism.

My object in doing this, is to show our Methodist friends, that their author and founder, John Wesley, teaches the doctrine of Infant Salvation by water.

I now quote from *Doctrinal Tracts*, page 251. Mr. Wesley remarks:

"2. As to the grounds of it, (infant baptism.) If in-"fants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper "subjects of Baptism. Seeing, in the ordinary way, "they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by "Baptism. It has already been proved, that this orig-"inal stain cleaves to every child of man; and that "hereby they are children of wrath, and liable to "eternal damnation.* It is true, the second Adam "has found a remedy for the disease, which came up-"on all by the offence of the first. But the benefit of "this is to be received through the means which he "hath appointed; through Baptism in particular, which "is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that pur-"pose; and to which God hath tied us, though he may "not have tied himself. Indeed, where it cannot be "had, the case is different: but extraordinary cases do "not make void a standing rule. This therefore is our "first ground. Infants need to be washed from origi-"nal sin; therefore they are proper subjects of Bap-"tism."

I shall now quote from the Methodist Discipline on the same subject. On page 141, of the fourteenth edition we have the following.

"THE MINISTRATION OF BAPTISM OF INFANTS:"

"*The minister coming to the font, which is to be fill-*"*ed with pure water, shall use the following, or some* "*other exhortation suitable to the sacred office.*

*Infants liable to eternal damnation!! and saved from it only by baptism!—ED.

"*Dearly beloved*, forasmuch as all men are conceiv-"ed and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, "'None can enter into the kingdom of God, except "he be regenerate and born anew of water, and of "'the Holy Spirit: I beseech you to call upon God the "Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, That of his "bounteous mercy he will grant to *this child* that thing "which by nature *he* cannot have; that *he* may be bap-"tized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received "into Christ's holy church, and be made a *lively mem-*"*ber* of the same."

I leave the candid reader, to ponder in his mind the doctrine taught by Mr. Wesley and the Methodist Discipline on the subject of Infant Salvation, and ask every pious Methodist mother, whether Jesus and the apostles ever taught any such doctrine. If so, it follows that every child that has died without Baptism still has original sin cleaving to it. Therefore the child is lost. Again, Mr. Wesley says, on page 247, quoting from Eph v. 25 and 26, "He gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word;" "namely in Baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification." *Baptism the ordinary instrument of our Justification*!!!!

Will the reader please turn to the Discipline and read. "Wherefore that we are *justified* by *faith* only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." And yet baptism is the ordinary instrument of our justification! Consistency thou art a jewel!!!

I think from these quotations our Methodist friends will be convinced of their error, and, under the firm conviction that the Bible, and the *Bible alone*, is sufficient to govern Christians, they will leave such contradictory doctrines, and flock to the standard of truth:

"Come out of her my people, and be not partakers of her sins" is the language of Heaven.

As ever yours,

D. P. H.

CONVERSATIONS ON THE WAY OF SALVATION.

BETWEEN A METHODIST AND A SINNER.

Methodist—I am happy on this bright morning that calls to my remembrance the resurrection of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, to find you fellow sinner, still in the land of the living, and within the reach of God's mercy. My prayers are still for you, that you may be brought to a proper knowledge of your undone and ruined state, and that without a Savior, you are in bondage to sin—under the fear of death, and exposed to eternal woe.

Sinner.—It is true I am still alive; and although the Sun now pours a flood of light over the world, and has chased darkness away, and every thing looks cheerful, yet alas, poor me! I wander up and down in this world without comfort, without hope, and truly as you say, I am in bondage; a heavy load of guilt oppresses my soul. Will you, my friend, point me the way I should go?

Methodist.—Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. Only trust in the merits of Christ's death, and your soul shall be freed from sin.

Sinner.—But how shall I believe? Long have I prayed and agonized for faith. Months have passed away since I first resolved to serve the Lord. At first my heart was tender, I could weep. But now months, (which seem like years) have gone by, I am still left miserable. The fountain of tears is dried up. Oh that I could believe! I would give a world of pure gold and gems, were I possessed of it, could I only believe.

Methodist.—The scriptures say, without faith it is impossible to please God." You must believe—you must pray for faith. God will send down his Holy Spirit into your heart, and give you faith in answer to your prayers.

Sinner.—You suggest a difficulty to my mind in the

text you have quoted, which I never thought of before; It is this, "without faith it is impossible to please God, for he that comes to him must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek him." I once thought that my prayers, groans and tears, were pleasing to God, while I was in unbelief—I now see the difficulty. I must believe before I can please him.

Methodist.—You take a wrong view of the passage. The kind of faith spoken of in the text, is not justifying faith; nor can you believe, unless the Spirit works faith in you. This must be done in answer to prayer.

Sinner.—You bring strange things to my mind. I have been reading my Bible all the time, and praying for light. Perhaps within the last three months I have read the New Testament through a dozen times. I find in the 4th chapter of Ephesians, that there is *one Lord*, *one faith* and *one Baptism*. How am I to understand, when he says there is one faith? I cannot think that prayer, *not* offered in faith, is acceptable to God; without faith it is impossible to please God.

Methodist—I perceive your difficulty, and indeed it has been a difficulty to my mind; nor can I say that I am fully satisfied on this point. Perhaps we do not understand the Apostle's *one faith*. I am well satisfied, however, that justifying faith is the kind you want, and this you must get in answer to prayer. This is the kind, probably which the apostle speaks of in the passage you have quoted from Ephesians.*

Sinner.—My dear friend I am suffering too much to rest on probabilities. My soul is distressed. What shall I do to be saved? Is there no mercy for me?

Methodist—All that I can tell you, is, to put confidence in God. Trust in him.

Sinner.—But how can I without faith? You say

*The one faith, doubtless means the faith of Jesus Christ—the gospel, or the foundation of faith.—Ed.

without faith I cannot please him. How then can I put confidence in him.

Methodist.—The Savior is gracious. He died to save all. "Ask and ye shall receive, Knock and it shall be opened." "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved." If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Surely here is sufficient encouragement.

Sinner.—If I had not read the Bible, then I might draw comfort from these passages. But they are not addressed to me, a poor unbeliever, without God and without hope.

Methodist—You surprise me. What! these promises not made to sinners? If so then I am laboring under a great mistake, and so are our preachers. I propose that we take time to consider on these passages. I will talk to my class leader, and if he will consent after meeting, we will see each other, and probably he can help us.

Sinner.—Oh wretched man that I am, who shall guide me aright in this important matter!!!

D. P. H.

[To be continued.]

Bro. Stone,

To the great joy and satisfaction of the sectarian community, the first No. of the "Voice of Truth," edited by Alvin Bailey, aided and abetted, by the whole sectarian phalanx, has made its appearance. The editor after taking a course of ten years in reviewing the writings of A. Campbell, has discovered two cases, in which Mr. C. has not clearly expressed his views upon the subject of justification, or the remission of sins. This is an amazing discovery; for which he should certainly be entitled to a leather medal. But does Mr. B. wish to be understood, that Mr. C. has changed his views upon the subject of justification,

and refer to said piece as a proof. This he cannot do, either from them, or any thing else Mr. C has written on the subject. Why then produce these. I suppose for the purpose of shewing that Mr. C. does not always express himself with equal clearness.

It is not my object to enter upon a defence of A. Campbell. This he is amply able to do himself. But I wish to contrast the views of the valiant editor with some of his own brethren in the Baptist Church, as well as those of the Pedobaptist ranks, who are aiding and encouraging Mr. B. to set aside the one Immersion of the New Testament, and make it a mere nulity, or a non-essential. His position is not singular. Enemies have made friends before, in order to effect a certain purpose; and when effected they were found in hostile array as before. In order to make up the issue fairly, I shall proceed to state briefly the views of what is commonly and invidiously called Campbellism by our courteous opponents, but repudiated by us. Upon the subject of remission of sins.

Our blessed Savior says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." A fair commentary upon said commission, is Peter's answer to the question, what shall we do? to the enquiring multitude on the day of Penticost, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Our conclusion then is, that baptism to a penitent believer in Jesus Christ is for the remission of sins. Mr. B. upon the contrary maintains that justification by faith alone is a wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort, in the language of the popular creeds of the day. Now do all Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians agree upon this subject. We shall see.

Let me introduce you to the sentiments, published by a very popular Baptist preacher, and editor of a religious, periodical, Mr. Meredith, in reply to Dr. Ryland of the same denomination. I hope Mr. B. will not complain of a want of perspecuity or clearness.

"The proper question to be asked here, it appears to us, is this—What is the scriptural import of the phrase, *eis aphesin amartion*—in the text rendered 'for remission of sins'? To answer this question in short, we turn first to Matt. xxvi. 28, and read as follows—'For this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many, *eis aphesin amartion*, for the remission of sins.' This passage is, in our opinion, decisive. That the blood of Christ was shed 'into the remission of sins,' or 'into the confession or doctrine of forgiveness,' we are sure no one will contend. On the contrary, that it was shed *for the remission of sins*, as an end, is equally beyond the possibility of a doubt. The same phrase occurs Mark i. 4: 'John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance, *eis aphesin amartion*, for the remission of sins.' This passage when interpreted by the former, as it ought to be, is not less certain and decisive in its import. To say that John preached the baptism of repentance *into* the remission of sins, would be to employ language singularly obscure, if not altogether unintelligible. See again Luke iii. 3.—'And he came into all the country about Jordan preaching the baptism of repentance, *eis aphesin amartion*, for the remission of sins.' The same remark applies to this case which was made in relation to the preceding. These, including the passage in question, are the only instances in which the phrase *eis aphesin amartion*, occurs in the New Testament. That the first case is decidedly in favor of the present rendering, *for the remission of sins*, and that the others are but little less so, it seems to us cannot admit of a doubt. To say the least, there is certainly no evidence in favor of the rendering proposed by the author.

"That *eis*, when employed in the same construction as above, very commonly has the meaning of the preposition *for*, any one can satisfy himself by referring to such cases as the following:—'And offer the gift that Moses commanded *eis marturion autois*, for a testimony unto them.'" Matt. viii. 4. See also Matt. x. 18—Mark i. 44—vi. 11—xiii. 9—Luke iv. 15—xxi. 14; ix. 15—xxi. 13—Heb. iii. 5—James iii. 5—all relating to the single phrase *eis marturion*, and all correctly rendered, '*for* a testimony.'

"In the next place we object to the *rendering* of the passage as proposed above. True, the author has not given a literal version of the text agreeably to his criticism; but the passage must be translated, and if his reasoning be correct, the rendering must be this; 'Repent and be baptized every one of you *into* the remission of sins.' That this rendering is not very intelligible we think the author was aware, from the fact that he gave a paraphrase rather than a literal version. A rendering which requires a paraphrase to make the sense intelligible may always be suspected.

"In the third place, we object to the *sense* as given in the paraphrase—because we believe that it destroys the point and meaning of the apostle's reply. The convicted multitude had just required to be told what they must do—what they must do to be saved—to obtain deliverance from the guilt and penalty of sin, as we must suppose of course. In

answer to this question, the apostle uttered the language of the text: "Repent and be baptized every one of you" &c. Now, when we suppose the apostle to have informed the Jews, in the sense of the common version, what they must do for the remission of sins, we suppose him to have given a direct answer to the question proposed; but when we suppose him to have told them what they must do for *confession* or the *doctrine* of forgiveness, we suppose him to have answered altogether another question; and to have given them information which, at that particular juncture, to say the least, could have afforded but little satisfaction.

"In the fourth place, we object to the *theology*—the sentiment inculcated in the above construction. It will not be doubted, we presume, that the phrase *eis aphesin amartion*, is proposed in the text as an end not of baptism only, but of repentance also. 'Repent and be baptized,' &c. Now when a man is required to be *baptized* into the confession of remission, the doctrine, though not a little doubtful, may perhaps be received; but when he is commanded to *repent* in the confession of remission, a doctrine is inculcated which is as difficult of belief as it is of intelligible comprehension.

"We object in the last place, to the necessary *tendency* of the argument before us. This argument, if we understand it correctly, goes to show that baptism has no sort of connection with remission: and that, although a positive institution of the New Testament, and the only authorized medium of admission to the christian church, it is nevertheless a matter in which the sinner's salvation is no way concerned. Now, when we hear two evangelists speak of the 'baptism of repentance for remission of sins'—when we hear the king himself, in his last commission affirm that 'he that believes and is baptized shall be saved'—when we hear an apostle, acting under that commission, require the people to 'repent and be baptized for the remission of sins'—when we hear Ananias say to Saul—'And now why tarriest thou, arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins'—we believe all this must mean something. And when we call to mind that three thousand were baptized on the same day of their conversion—that the household of Cornelius had no sooner given evidence of repentance, than Peter demanded their baptism—that the Ethiopian eunuch was baptized in the midst of his journey—and that the Phillippian jailer and his house were baptized at midnight-we cannot but believe that baptism has a much more important connection with remission and salvation than is now generally supposed. At any rate, we cannot but suspect the expediency of any attempt to explain away the force of passages which, if we be not much mistaken, are well sustained by the analogy of faith and the *usus loquendi*."

But before I close, let me introduce you to a declaration of Timothy Dwight, D. D. late President of Yale College, and a Presbyterian Rabbi, and standard writer of the sect.

"Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of

God." To be born of water, as here intended, is in my view, to be baptized; and is as absolutely necessary to our lawful admission into the kingdom of God, as to be born of the Spirit is to our admission into the invisible kingdom. It is, however, to be observed here, that he, who understands the nature, and authority of this Institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter either the visible or invisible kingdom." Let some of our good Pedobaptists who understand this matter, pay some little respect to this learned divine; and not teach, that it is a non-essential; lest peradventure they may be found false witnesses for God.

Mr. Wesley in his Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament, second American edition, 1806, page 350, says:—

"'*Be baptized, and wash away thy sins*'—Baptism administered to real penitents, is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God, ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this on any, unless through this means."

Methodist doctrinal Tracts, published by order of the general conference of 1812, page 249.

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spitit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. John iii. 5 By water then as a means, the water of Baptism, we are regenerated, or born again; whence it is also called by the Apostle; the washing of regeneration. Our church therefore ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done."

Now listen to the Western Christian Advocate, a Methodist paper published at Cincinnati.

"In all deference we suggest to our brother, the editor of the Baptist Banner, that among the many things that rend and tear the body of Christ, and yet have nothing to do with the salvation, and enjoyment of Christians, Baptism is chief and foremost. It is the mammoth apple of discord among us. It has a serpent's hiss, a serpent's bite, a serpent's venom, and ten serpents' lives; will our brother help us to kill this royal reptile? Will he help to expel him from God's Eden, and blot out his memorial forever?"

Our accommodating editor of "the Voice" would respond, and say, oh yes; I will agree to almost any thing, if you will help us drive another royal reptile into some hole, or corner of the earth, where the mercury never rises above zero. Affectionately yours,

J. T. JONES.

TO YOUNG PREACHERS.

My sons; Hear the advice of an old Father, just about to leave you--just about to be discharged from his service in the ministry for nearly half of a century. I have been among the early pioneers of the west, in laboring through difficulties unknown to you, to preach the gospel.

1. It is a common saying among the preachers of this day, "Old men for counsel young men for war.', This is often advanced in justification of the public debates, with opposers, or the clashing doctrines and opinions, which now distract and divide the world. "Old men for counsel."—Do they counsel you to engage in such debates? Do they laud you for victories won? I will fearlessly answer, that no old man of piety, and intelligence, will give such advice, unless in an extraordinary case. For they know by long experience that such debates tend to strife, deaden piety--destroy the spirit of prayer--puff up the vain mind, annihilate the taste for the marrow, and fatness of the living word, and destroy the comforts of true, heavenly religion.

Seldom do we see in the same person, a warrior and an humble devoted christian. *Rara avis in terra.* Such acquire a controversial habit, and temper. They may proselyte many to their opinions, and greatly increase their numbers; but the children are like the parents, lean and pigmy things. I have known, in the course of my days, great and good religious excitements in certain places, quashed by such debates from the pulpit. I have really thought

that the most effectual, and shortest way to put a stop to such excitements, is for two debaters to propose a public debating match, or an ecclesiastical duel on a certain day, and at a certain place. Generally at the close of the debate, ends the good excitement.

I know it is said in justification of such debates that Paul disputed in the synagogue at Athens, and in the School of Tyrannus, with the Jews and others.

Read the verse correctly, and the force of the objection is removed--He reasoned or dialogued with them. This should be the constant practice of every faithful minister of Christ. Would to God, it were the practice of all our young preachers, to reason out of the scriptures on the important things of the gospel!

But "young men for war." What war? not against flesh and blood, for nothing but carnal weapons can affect them; but against the powers of sin and hell, with spiritual weapons afforded us from above—not against men, but against their sins, as did our Lord and his holy apostles, in order to save them from ruin.

But are we not to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints? Certainly. But cannot this be done without set debates, challenges, judges, rules &c? Did our great head--Did his apostles, ever act thus? And who will say, they did not earnestly contend for the faith? There must be something wrong in this matter, because these zealous duelists do not like to be called the challengers. Now if this be the proper way to contend for the faith, why not fearlessly challenge every opposer, and thus shew your holy zeal?

In these public debates, but few persons attend them, who have not their minds prepossessed in favor of one or the other of the parties. Arguments as weighty as lead, are to such minds as light as chaff.

A few unsophisticated persons may be proselyted, to your opinions; but one renewed soul is of more value than a score of such proselytes; and such renewed souls are made by the truth uttered in the spirit, and heartily received and obeyed.

2. I advise you, my sons, to preach the word, the gospel of the son of God with all boldness and humility. If any error or stumbling block lie across the path of truth, and might neutralize its effect on your audience, labor with cogent arguments to roll it out of the way, without pity for its age, though sanctified by many centuries, and supported by the great and the learned for many ages. But be careful, and certain that it is an error before you touch it with your little finger. Truth like a plow-shear, will tear up the noxious weeds and plants, sown and planted by erring man. Be careful not to name any person, or people, by whom these noxious seeds were sown. The moment you name a Presbyterian—a Methodist—a Baptist, as having done it, that moment he buckles on his coat of mail, and shields himself against your arguments however powerful. You cannot profit him by all you say afterwards. "Be wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."

3. I not only advise you to preach the word, but also preach it in the spirit. In vain we attempt to preach in the spirit, unless we have the Spirit, and experience the force of that truth we deliver to others. A man may preach the truth in the letter without the Spirit. Such preaching is vain—useless to saint and sinner. Apathetic, and moral lectures on religion have almost ruined the world, and swelled the number of skeptics. For they thus argue; Did these people believe what they preach or read, would they be so cold and unfeeling in their addresses? would they not cry aloud, and spare not? Did you ever know one such preacher convert a sinner from the error of his ways?—A person may also preach with a great

vociferous zeal and manner; this may be, and often is nothing more than mere animal nature, without the Spirit. Live and walk in the Spirit, and preach in the Spirit; then will the attention of your hearers be arrested, and good effects will follow.

When we see our neighbor's house in flames and the unconscious family within exposed to instant death, we do not take time to study and write an eloquent speech in order to read it to them, that they may fly from impending ruin—nor do we write a speech to read to persons, whom we see ready to rush down a deathly precipice, unconscious of their danger—no. Were we to do so, those people would be apt to disregard our admonitions, and perish.

4. Be as holy out of the pulpit, as in it. Be always sober, (not morose;) indulge at no time in jesting, mirth, nor light conversation; these grow by indulgence. I advise you to beware of what is termed gallantry. It will ultimately sink your influence in the public mind.—Be plain, but neat in your dress. Wear not costly apparel, nor tinselled ornaments of any kind. It savors of vanity, and will detract from your usefulness. Be often on your knees, always endeavor to keep God before your mind, and labor to please him, rather than man; for if you seek to please men, you will certainly displease God. The friendship of the world is enmity to God. Some are tempted to please man by an ostentatious show of learning and talents. This is to preach self, not the Lord Jesus—it is to advance self, and not the cause of Christ—It is to gain the applause of the world, not to save souls from ruin—It is to be popular, not useful. Vain presumptious mortal! How despicable in the view of heaven!

5. In your public addresses, like the householder, bring forth out of your treasure things new and old. The word of God is your treasure, not the wisdom of men—with this you must store your mind so as to

be able to exhibit to your audience, things new as well as old. Do not forever harp on one string—on one doctrine however true. The mind needs variety, and that variety is afforded to the bible student in the scriptures. "Warn the unruly, comfort the feeble minded, support the weak." You should not preach that to another, of which you do not experience the truth yourself. It will be a dry morsel, unseasoned with grace, both to yourself, and those that hear. Avoid every thing, every expression, every smart word, that may excite levity or laughter, in your hearers. Your object is to save souls; an object truly serious and important, and should be managed always in the spirit of seriousness and solemnity. What! to excite levity in those on the brink of everlasting woe! God forbid!

6. Beware of an avaricious or covetous spirit. Read Paul to Timothy 1 Epistle vi. 6-11. Having food and raiment, let us therewith be content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou! O man of God, flee these things, and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life. Avoid every thing like boasting of your self, or of your success in the gospel.

7. My dear sons; If this advice be good, receive it and conform to it. I have known it to be good for half of a century. Be diligent, and faithful, and soon you shall receive your reward. O that we may hear the plaudit of our Lord, Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of your Lord. Amen, and Amen. B. W. S.

THE
CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.
September, 1842.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 11

REPLY TO MR. CARTER.—CONCLUDED.

13. Mr. C. proceeds: "Their baptism makes more havoc of the scriptures than their faith. Jesus says, he that believes has eternal life, is born of God; they say, No; not without baptism."

Pray, Mr. C. have they eternal life, and born of God without repentance?—without prayer? for except they repent, they must perish. Will faith alone, without repentance—without obedience, give eternal life? O, no; he will say, repentance and obedience are implied; and why not baptism be implied too, I ask?

Paul found twelve disciples at Ephesus, and he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since you believed? This, without doubt, Paul knew that every believer received, and received through baptism. For he asked them immediately, on their saying, We have not so much as heard, whether there be any Holy Ghost. Is it possible? Unto what were ye baptized? You are believers, and if believers, you of course have been baptized; and if baptized, you must have been baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. What can be plainer. Here Paul understood that they were believers; and though no mention was made of their baptism, yet he certainly inferred it; because all were baptized according to the commission, and none else under the New Institution. He inferred too that these believers were not only baptized, but had also receiv-