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-

ed the Holy Spirit of promise, according to the gospel Peter preached at Pentecost. So, when it is said, He that believeth hath everlasting life– is saved—is justified—is born of the Spirit, &c., baptism is also implied, though not always expressed. So baptism is frequently represented as that by which we are saved, where there is no mention made of faith or repentance. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit—He hath saved us by the bath of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he hath shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ. The like figure whereunto, baptism doth now save us," &c. But certainly, faith and repentance are implied in all these cases.

In my late numbers of the Messenger, this objection is fully answered, to which inquirers after truth are referred.

14. He says, "They nullify between 80 and 100 express declarations of the Bible, by teaching baptism for the remission of sins."

Dreadful havoc! And who is to blame for all this? Shall we say, the good old Baptist, John? he baptized for the remission of sins. Shall we blame old father Peter? he preached baptism for the remission of sins, and indeed was so bold as to say, the antitype, Baptism, doth now save us. Doubtless, he meant, in connection with faith and repentance, these being implied. Can the blame be laid on Ananias, immediately instructed of the Lord? Shall we blame the Lord himself, who taught the same in substance, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and except a a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God? In this case, a man is said to be born of the Spirit of God without the mention of repentance or baptism. Surely, they are implied, or the scripture is nullified indeed. But shall we blame the old fathers and martyrs of the first centuries? They taught baptism for the remission of sins —they lived in the purest state of the church. Shall we blame old father Wesley and his numerous followers? They teach the same thing in their books and creeds. And what sect of Christians does not teach the doctrine in their creeds? In this they have only done what the Reformers, Luther and his coadjutors have done before them. But they oppose the doctrine now, though advocated by such high authority, and taught in their own creeds. But why oppose it? Is it because it is running like fire in dry stubble before the wind, through the length and breadth of the land? In such company as that mentioned above, we are not ashamed to be found; but might rather deem it a high honor.

15. He next states the views of his party. "Our views are, If we secure repentance, all the rest will flow from it, (as faith, obedience, &c.) If we believe, we will repent, and obedience follows."

That is repentance is before faith, and faith is before repentance, *quod erat demonstrandum*. Wonderful logic!

16. "I don't say a man can repent without faith—he must believe before repentance, but it is a dead faith."

That is, Though I have said, repentance is before faith, I do mean so; I do not say a man can repent without faith—he must believe before repentance; yet it is a dead faith—that is, it is a dead faith, and yet it produces repentance! Wonderful sirs! To me it is all confusion, and this is effected by declining from the truth.

17. He says, "Repent and be baptized, is their mode of obeying the gospel." We grant, that we have taken this from the model old Peter gave us. But we say a little more; we include faith and all the commands of God, as stated in the gospel.

18. He proceeds to state his own views. "Repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, is the scriptural mode of obeying the gospel."

Had he only added baptism, he would have stumbled into the truth; for he says, faith precedes repentance; but we wish to do him justice, he last left an open door to escape, for he says repentance precedes faith.

19. He says, "Baptism is professing to turn from sin to God."

From this we are left to conclude, that when Peter said, Acts iii. 19, "Repent and be converted, (or turn) that your sins may be blotted out," means, Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. This is the very doctrine of Peter; it is the doctrine of A. Campbell; and he contends strenuously for it. But let not Mr. C. be alarmed, and give it up; it is Bibleism; and therefore our doctrine does not nullify between eighty and one hundred express declarations of the Bible.

20. "Their leaders don't believe that one in twenty of them will ever get to heaven."

I reply: Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and shall persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you *falsely* for my sake." How many leaders of them has Mr. C. known, and conversed with, or heard make this declaration? In what leader's writings has he seen the statement? Had he said, *Our* leaders, meaning, the leaders of the sects say so, we should not have contradicted his word. This is the way he takes to put us down! Is it slander?

21. "They don't teach that men should fear God."

I leave this to the decision of the public. They know what we teach; but those who will not hear us, do not know. This doctrine is prominent in our creed, the Bible. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom—Fear God and keep his commandments, is the whole duty of man.

22. "If they can get a congregation to laugh, it is an evidence with them of the truth of their doctrine."

This I am constrained by truth to say is not so. Am I to blame for contradicting such a glaring untruth? Let Mr, C, prove the charge from an avowal of this in our writings or speaking. Shame! shame! To what a length will opposition to the truth carry men?

23. He proceeds: "I would, if I had time, take up a number of other dogmas."

We think he has taken up enough for his own reputation as a preacher of righteousness, or as a conscientious Christian. Such things are sufficient to blast the character of a preacher in the esteem of the public. I have seen eccentric preachers of all denominations excite the laughter, or smiles of the congregation, by witticisms; but never did I hear but one preacher, and him not 100 miles from Jacksonville, attempt to justify it, and he was not of us. But I never heard before that any ever made it a test of truth, or made it an objection against us. Mr. C. has surely been dreaming—but not the dreams prophesied of by Joel the prophet.

24. "The foundation of their system is all rotten—not one of them rests on the Bible—they are all on the sand."

I advise Mr. C. to read Matt. vii. 1, "Judge not that ye be not judged." Had Mr. C. not made so many glaringly false charges against us, his opinion might have an ounce of weight; but his statements if true hereafter, will be suspected. Can the sects choose such a man to plead their cause against us? Such another, who unblushingly can make such charges, will hardly be found among those professing Christianity in America. Their cause must labor.

25. He proceeds: "The sects, say they, unite to put them down. I will tell you the reason. The different denominations of Christians believe alike in the

fundamental principles of Christianity as taught in the Bible, and they are one when infidelity and error attack the Bible. There is a great battle to be fought, and it is at hand."

Yes; the battle is begun anew—nor will it end until the truth shall prevail. Brethren, arm yourselves for the fight. Put on the whole armor of God. Not carnal weapons, such as are used against us; these work not the righteousness of God. Let us labor in the spirit to pray for our enemies, who despitefully use us and persecute us. Let us always live near the Lord, and though falsely called infidels, shew that we are Christians. The union of Christians is not far off. The good of all the parties will flow together under the standard of heaven. Let us be thankful that the sword is in the hand of the civil power. The Lord reigns, and we will rejoice. Amen. B. W. S.

P. S. If my reproofs are severe and sharp, the public I hope will see that necessity was laid upon me.

B. W. S.

A SHORT CONVERSATION.

Bro. B.—I am truly glad to meet you. I have been relieved often from difficulties of mind by your assistance; and hope to be relieved again.

B.—What is the matter now?

C.—Last Sunday week I went to hear a Christian preacher. His subject was faith. He proved that there was but "one faith"—that this faith was simply believing the gospel on the testimony of the inspired prophets and apostles, as recorded in the scriptures. The texts he adduced in proof of this proposition were such as these. "These are written that you might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name." "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Christ prayed that all that believed on him through their word, might be one"—"that many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized"—and many similar texts. He showed that the foundation of faith, was the things written—that the object of faith was, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and the end of faith was life, eternal life. That this faith was produced by the testimony of the Spirit speaking in the word, and not by any extra operation from the word. That all sinners, by attention to the evidence given in the word, could believe be convinced of sin, and repent, or turn from their wicked ways to God, to come to the Savior for life and salvation, and obey his command to be baptized; through which means the Lord would save them, and grant them eternal life. He urged on the sinner immediate compliance with many arguments.

Yesterday I went to hear another preacher, called by pre-eminence, an orthodox evangelical. He took up the same subject of faith, and proved, or tried to prove, that there were more than one faith, he enumerated many; as a dead faith, weak faith, a faith of assent, a faith of miracles, a faith of reliance, or trust, a justifying faith, an assured faith &c. His arguments were plausible, and therefore my mind is confused. Do help me if you can.

B.—I think they are both wrong in the outstart of their theories, and that they are both right in the main point. That they are both wrong, is apparent, because they take for granted, that the "one faith" in Eph. iv. means the act of faith, or believing. It means nothing more nor less than the faith of Jesus Christ, or the gospel he and his apostles taught and testified. They did not teach the various discrepant faiths now rife in the world. Their teaching was one—'one faith' &c. Your first preacher was certainly right in his remarks on faith, as the creature's act. Your second

preacher was wrong in his many kinds of faith, as the faith of assent, of trust, of reliance, of justification, of assurance—these are not faith, but the fruits of faith —faith must exist before these acts, or fruits can grow. As well might he have added, the faith of repentance, the faith of prayer, the faith of love, the faith of obedience, the faith of hope, the faith of purity &c., for these are equally the fruits of faith. Faith or the act of believing, is among those words in our language, that hardly admit of a definition to make them plainer than they are. Children as soon as they begin to talk, understand the meaning of believing, as well as a D. D. or a philologist. One child tells another something; he replies, I don't believe it, or I do believe it. He thus speaks from the plausibility or unplausibility of the testimony adduced.

A dead faith is defined by James as being unattended by works, being alone. Two men hear the same sermon, in which the testimony of the prophets and apostles is exhibited to prove, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; sent by the Father in love to save the world from sin, death and hell, to which they every moment stand exposed; and to give them eternal life. They both believe the fact, that Jesus is the Son of God, sent for these benignant purposes; they both *assent* to it. But one seriously lays the things to heart, and from the conviction of his danger, and the hope or wish of salvation from ruin adds works, he determines to repent, cease to do evil and learn to do well, and do as the Lord has directed him. It ends in life. But the other will not take up the cross—will not reform—will not obey—this is a dead faith—the other is a living faith because it led him to obedience, and eternal life—or it, led him to obey, and trust in the Savior, from whom he received salvation and the life giving spirit, by which he is sanctified and saved from sin and hell.

Unless we admit that a sinner can thus believe and act, why preach to him? Of what use is testimony? Of what avail are warnings, and motives to fly from the wrath to come, and lay hold on eternal life? As well might we preach to the rocks and trees.

C.—My mind is considerably relieved—but the evangelical orthodox preacher insisted that justification, or pardon of sin was granted by faith alone, and that this faith was different from the faith of assent, or a dead faith.

B.—Wherein is the difference? They both believed and assented to the fact that Jesus was the Son of God, and they believed this from the same testimony of the scriptures. In this their faith was the same. But one considered the importance of the subject, and obeyed the faith; the other did not consider—did not obey. The faith of one was with the heart, i. e. it influenced his heart to resolve, to determine, and purpose to repent, reform and obey the gospel in order to justification, pardon and salvation. The faith of the other was dead, not influencing the heart to those things. The end of faith with one was pardon and eternal life—the end of the other was death.

As justification is so much insisted upon as being by faith alone, let us pay particular attention to it.

1. In the Apostles day, there was a great controversy between the apostles and Judaising Christians. Whether a man was justified by the faith of Jesus Christ, or the law of Christ, without the Mosaic law or deeds, or whether they were justified by the faith of Christ, together with the law and the deeds of the law. Paul and the apostles affirmed the first—and the Jews, who believed the gospel, and yet were zealous of Moses, affirmed the second.

2. The word faith, especially with the article *the* prefixed, signifies very commonly, *the faith* or law of Christ. It is emphatically called *the faith*, Gall. iii.

25. "After that (*he pistis*) *the* faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster or the law of Moses." Hence, it is said, that many of the priests were obedient unto *the faith*." Acts vi. 7. "Contend earnestly for *the faith*, once delivered unto the saints." "But ye beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith." Jude 3. and 20., Rom. i. 5, and xvi 16, "obedience of faith among all nations"—Gall i. 23. "He now preached *the faith*, he once destroyed."—2 Tim. iv. 7. "I have kept *the faith*." Tit. i. 13. "Rebuke them—that they may be sound in *the faith*"—Rev. ii 13. "Hast not denied *my faith*"—Rev. xiv. 12. "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and *the faith* of Jesus." Eph. ii. 9. "By grace are ye saved through *the faith*." Gall. iii 24–ii. 16. I might multiply texts to prove this point, but am certain that it will not be denied by any intelligent person.

3. In this sense I understand the apostles when they say that, we are justified by faith, and not by the law —by the obedience of the faith, and not by the deeds or works of the law. This is the great point to be proved, and upon which they insist with so much earnestness against the Judaizers, who were zealous of Moses. They insisted that Christians must also keep the whole law, or they could not be saved.

4. Having stated the proposition, I will show the proof as adduced by Paul to the Romans and Gallatians.

The expression so much insisted upon, *justification by faith alone*, is but once mentioned in the scriptures James ii. 24, and this in direct opposition to the sense, contended for. "Ye see, therefore, that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only." If by the expression he meant, when used by the evangelicals, that we are justified by faith alone, without the deeds of the law (which is Paul's doctrine) I shall not object. For justification is not by the law of Moses; but by the law of Christ. Nor is it by obedience to the law of Moses, but by obedience to the law or faith of Christ. This is certainly the meaning of the inspired apostles.

We read of justification by the law, Gall. v. 4, and justification by the works of the law, Gall. ii. 16 &c. Should it be asked, how were any justified by the law? We would answer, it was by obedience to the law, or by works of the law. We also read of justification by the faith? Should any ask, how they were justified by the faith? We answer, by obedience to the faith. Both the Old and the New Testament witness that "Christ was the author of eternal salvation to all them that *obey him*. "And it shall come to pass, that every soul that will not *obey* that prophet in all things whatsoever he shall say, shall be destroyed from among the people." So spake Moses.

To say that we are justified and saved by faith alone, in the sense contended for by the evangelicals, is positively contradicted by the scriptures. For the scriptures say, 1. That we are justified and saved by grace. Rom. iii. 24. Tit. iii. 7 &c. 2. That we are justified by his blood. Rom. v. 9. 3. We are justified by his knowledge. Isai. liii. 11. 4. Justified or pardoned through repentance. 5. Justified and saved by prayer. Luke xviii. 14, Rom. x. 13. 6. Saved, and consequently pardoned, by confessing Jesus and believing in heart that God has raised him from the dead, Rom. x. 7. Justified or pardoned, and saved by baptism, Acts ii. 38. If we contend that God justifies the sinner by grace alone, without any act or work of the creature. Then it follows that the reason he saves and justifies one and not another, is his own sovereign will; and the creature cannot be justly condemned for not being saved—seeing God did not sovereignly choose to do it. Therefore, we conclude with Paul, "It is of faith, that it might be by grace," and not by the law.

Justification on God's part is by his grace, or mercy and the death of his Son. On our part it is by faith, knowledge, repentance, prayer, confession, and baptism. This is called God's righteousness, or the righteousness God requires—the righteousness or obedience of *the faith*, or the system of the Grace of God, revealed for our salvation and justification. This plan of justifying or saving the sinners is revealed in the gospel fully; yet it was witnessed by the law and the prophets, and is the way of salvation. This I promise, if spared to make plain at our next meeting.

C.—If it can be done, I think all altercation on justification must be silenced. I am anxious to hear farther.

B. W. S.

POURING AND SPRINKLING,

OF THE METHODIST DISCIPLINE A HUMAN TRADITION.

In order to prove the above proposition, it will be necessary to prove that a part of the Discipline is altered from the Liturgy of the Church of England. To do this, I will here insert entire, the address of John Wesley to Dr Coke, Asbury and the American brethren, dated,

"*Bristol, September* 10, 1784.

"To Dr. Coke Mr. Asbury, and our brethren in North America.

"By a very uncommon train of Providences, many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from the mother country, and erected into independent States. The English government has no authority over them, either civil or ecclesiastical, any more than over the States of Holland. A civil authority is over them, partly by the Congress, and partly by the Provincial Assemblies. But no one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority at all. In this peculiar situation, some thousands of the

inhabitants of the States desire my advice. In compliance with their desire, *I have drawn up a little sketch.*

"Lord King's account of the primitive church convinced me, many years ago, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our travelling preachers. But I have still refused; not only for peace sake, but because I was determined as little as possible, to violate the established order of the national church, to which I belonged. But the case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are Bishops who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none, neither any parish minister. So that for many hundred miles together, there are none to baptize or administer the Lord's supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end; and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order, and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending laborers into the harvest. I have accordingly *appointed* Dr. Coke and Francis Asbury to be joint superintendants *over* our brethren in North America; as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas V. Passey to act as elders among them, by baptizing and administering the Lord's supper. And I have prepared a liturgy, little *differing* from that of the Church of England, (I think the best constituted national church in the world) which I advise all travelling preachers to use on the Lord's day in all the congregations, reading the liturgy on Wednesdays and Fridays, and praying *extempore* on all other days. I also advise the elders to administer the Lord's supper on every Lord's day. If any one will point out a more rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding these poor sheep in the wilderness, I will gladly embrace it. At present I cannot see any better method than that I have taken. It has been proposed to desire the English

Bishops to ordain part of our preachers. But to this I object. 1. *I desired the Bishop of London to ordain one, but could not prevail.* 2. If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceeding; but the matter admits of no delay. 3. If they ordain them now, they would expect to govern them. And how grievously this would entangle us. 4. As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the State and the English Hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or the other. They are now at liberty to follow the scriptures, and the primitive church. And we judge it best, they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free.

"JOHN WESLEY."

The Discipline, chap. i. sec. 1. recognizes the above. In the liturgy of the church of England, adopted in the reign of Edward the sixth, and Queen Elizabeth, the baptism of persons of riper years, was by dipping. Mr. Wesley at first had no idea of separating from the church of England. His principal object was to restore the purity of the ancient church, and therefore insisted on baptism by dipping. Mr. Southey, in his life of Wesley, says, that in Georgia, "By insisting on intolerant discipline, on immersion in baptism, and on other severities, he hindered the good work." The following is an extract from his journal:

"*Savannah*, 1736, *Feb.* 21.

"Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church, and the rule of the church of England, by immersion.

"*May* 5.—I was asked to baptize the child of Mr. Parker, second bailiff of Savannah. But Mrs P. told me, neither Mr. P. nor I will consent to its being dipped. I answered, If you certify that your child is weak, it will suffice, (the rubrick says) to pour water upon it. She replied, Nay, the child is not weak; but

I am resolved that it shall not be dipped. This argument I could not confute. So I went home and the child was baptized by another person."

I have not a copy of the liturgy sent to the American Methodists. The Conference has the power to change or abolish the rites and ceremonies of their church every four years. (See Discipline, sec. i. art. 22. "It in not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same, or exactly alike. Every particular church may ordain, change, or abolish rites and ceremonies; so that all things may be done to edification." All the reformed church establishments, and the sects derived from them, claim this power.

J. S.

To be continued.

A PART OF PAUL'S FAREWELL SERMON AT EPHESUS.

Acts xx. 34, 35. "Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me.

"I have showed you all things, how that so laboring, ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."

This sermon was preached particularly to the elders at Ephesus, convened at the request of Paul.

He reminds them that when he had formerly preached among them, that he supplied his own necessities, and of them that were with him, by laboring with his own hands. Now, says he, I have shewed you all things; I even have shewn and given you an example in thus laboring with my own hands, that ye *so*, or in like manner, laboring, ought to support the weak, (or more properly) to assist the poor, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said,

is more blessed to give than to receive. In the same manner he acted in Thessalonica. "Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought, but wrought with labor and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you. Not because we have not power or authority, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us." 2 Thess. iii. 8, 9. Paul did this, lest by receiving a compensation for his ministerial services, the gospel of Christ might be hindered from having success among the people. 1 Cor. ix. 12. Neither he nor his associates would receive any thing, but he supported them all by working at his trade—and he advises the elders at Ephesus to do the same, that they may have something to support or help the poor. To support them is imperious.

Preaching was a poor trade at that time to make money, and held out poor inducements to any to engage in it, said my friend. I wonder what the Ephesian elders thought of Paul's advice, to labor with their own hands as he did, to have something to assist the poor. Preachers do not at this time generally labor with their own hands; and if they do, (and of this class I have known a few) they appear to have a different object in view, which is to enrich themselves, and not to give to the poor. If such advice were given to the preachers now, as Paul gave the Ephesian elders, I think, preachers would be scarce, or not receive the advice.

My dear sir, you mistake the matter; though Paul labored with his own hands, and advised other elders to do the same, yet he proclaimed it an ordinance of heaven, that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel—that he himself had this authority, but declined using it, lest some might think he preached for money, and thus the success of the gospel would be hindered. God's ordination is that they should live by the gospel; but not to live in palaces or fine houses

with sumptuous fare—not to grow rich like his wealthy neighbors—not to live in sloth—No: If this was his ordination, it has failed with respect to his apostles, and thousands of others the most worthy. A rich preacher is generally but a drone in the religious world. The cares of this life, and the deceitfulness of riches choak the word, and it brings forth no fruit to perfection. Our great exemplar Christ Jesus was rich, but for our sakes he became poor. Paul was rich, but for the sake of the gospel, became poor. We read of none who became rich by preaching, nor do we read of any that died for want.—God feeds even the sparrows.

We have too little trust in the Lord to prosper. If we go out into the world to preach, we must have our purses well filled, and saddle-bags well stuffed with apparel; and until this is done, we refrain from going. Now, do such trust in the Lord for support, or to their money? Do such receive gifts as coming from the Father of lights, and are therefore thankful to him? Or do they think their supplies come by chance, and not from the Lord, who sitteth in the heavens, regardless of these things? Lo! I will be with you, if faithfully discharging your duty, always.

Sir, you speak my mind exactly. I think the preachers should preach without money or any earthly reward. The Lord will provide for them; and if they should need any thing, let them labor with their own hands to get it, they will be rewarded hereafter.

My dear sir, the christian world have greatly erred on this subject, and have run to extremes. A part have thought that the preachers should be made rich —the other part, that they should be kept poor, and labor for their living. Both parties have ruined their preachers, and destroyed greatly their influence in the world. Those made rich are generally lazy drones,

and are afraid to offend their congregation by plain, pointed preaching as, Thou art the man. Those who are poor and unassisted by the people, have but little time from manual labor to improve their minds by reading or by going abroad to preach. Such generally are regarded by the rich as beneath notice, because they cannot dress according to the ton of the day. Large salaries given to the preachers are one of the strongest props of sectarianism. If I leave the party, I lose my salary, and must struggle with poverty, says the carnal preacher. I will adhere to my party. This is often done at the expense of a good conscience, and may be, of eternal life itself. The poor preacher has not these temptations, but he is not exempt from as severe ones. He thinks if God, and his people, approved of my labors, should I be left thus destiute, and despised. He fears he is acting in opposition to the will of God in trying to preach. How withering such a thought!

It is time for the christian world to wake and correct this great evil. It must be done, or sectarianism's prop will still support the evil. It must be done, or nothing but drones will administer to the church, and the industrious, worthy poor be banished from it.

Among us, Christians, I fear this evil is growing, and if not suppressed in time, it will ruin us, as it has all others. Large salaries are given to some, to enable them to dress and live in the style of this extravagant age! one half of which would decently and fully support them, were they to live according to the gospel in plainness and frugality; and something would remain to aid the poor, and thus receive the blessing; it is more blessed to give than to receive.—The poor preachers should be encouraged to the work, by timely administering to their wants, and treating them as the ministers of the Lord.

B. W. S.

Conversations between a Methodist and a Sinner.

NO. 2.

METHODIST.—Our meeting has just closed, and I have the pleasure to inform you, my dear friend B., one of your neighbors, who has long been seeking religion, got it to-day. He joined as a seeker last camp meeting, and to-day the Lord has blessed him. Oh, what a precious meeting we had!! I am sorry you did not attend. I hope, however, that your mind is not so much disturbed, as it was this morning.

SINNER.—It is no pleasure for me to attend meeting, under my present state of mind. I have thought much, since our interview this morning, about the love of God. Indeed, I have been reading, meditating and praying, humbly calling on that great and good Being for the pardon of all my sins, and for his Holy Spirit.

METHODIST.—I am glad to hear it. Be not faithless, but believing, and in God's own time you may look for mercy.

SINNER.—My mind is still distressed, nor can I understand how my sins are to be forgiven by faith alone.

METHODIST.—Paul says in the 1st verse of the 5th chapter of Romans, that we are justified by faith alone and not by works of law. I perceive no difficulty in this doctrine, although this morning we both had some difficulty on our minds about the one faith in the 4th chapter of Ephesians.

SINNER.—I think you are mistaken, you have not read the passage right; here it is. Paul says, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." He does not say by FAITH ALONE.

METHODIST.—Well, suppose he does not say ALONE, it is clearly inferred that he meant faith alone.

SINNER.—Suppose I were to say, that wood *alone*

would keep you from freezing on a cold day without fire, would you be willing to sit down by a piece of wood and try the experiment? I think not; and yet to my mind, there would be as much propriety in the one as in the other. Wood without fire never can produce heat, neither can I comprehend how faith alone can save me.

METHODIST.—If you would study up fewer difficulties, and pray more fervently, I think it would be better. It is positively said in the verse I have quoted, that we are justified by faith. This ought to be sufficient. But here is our Class leader, whose duty it is to study more about these things, to whom I now introduce you, hoping that he may lead your mind the right way.

SINNER.—I am pleased to acknowledge the deep interest you both take in my welfare, and hope to be profited from your conversation.

CLASS LEADER.—Cheerfully will I contribute to your instruction on the important subject of salvation, if it is in my power. Will you, therefore, please state your difficulties, and the operations of your mind.

SINNER.—To state the operations of my mind, would indeed be a difficult task. I have long been seeking for happiness. I have been trying to get religion. I have gone to meeting and listened to preaching—have prayed and prayed, and God's people have prayed for me, and still I am distressed. I am like a ship at sea in a violent storm, without pilot, rudder or compass. All is darkness, gloom and fury around me.

CLASS LEADER.—I am not at all surprised to hear you thus speak. You perceive the need of a Savior. I regard your present feelings and experience a good omen, that you are not far from the kingdom. But what particular difficulty is there on your mind, in reference to God's plan of pardon?

SINNER.—The preachers teach me that I cannot be

lieve in the Lord Jesus Christ without God sends down his Holy Spirit, and gives me this faith in answer to prayer. I have prayed for this faith—have mourned and wept day and night, and have done all I can to obtain it, and still the Lord has withheld it from me. You teach me that God forgives sins by faith alone. This I do not understand.

CLASS LEADER.—I am surprised that there is a difficulty on your mind in reference to a subject so plain, and one too, which is now the burden of nearly every sermon. It is a Bible doctrine, and *our discipline* says, it is "a wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort."

SINNER.—It may be full of comfort to others, but to me it is full of sorrow and pain.

CLASS LEADER.—If you will turn your mind to the scriptures, you can have no difficulty on this subject. You must pray in faith. While unbelief lurks in your mind, the blessing you will not obtain. This I apprehend is the cause of your present distress. You need not wait, and wait as though the Lord will not bless you *now*. Yes, even now, at this very time, if you will pray IN FAITH, the Lord will bless you and forgive you your sins.

SINNER.—How can I pray in faith, when I have got none?

CLASS LEADER.—But this you must do; for without faith it is impossible to please God.

SINNER.—This is a strange idea, indeed, to my mind. You say that when I obtain faith, my sins will be pardoned—I shall have the witness in my own soul; and yet tell me, I must pray in faith for faith. Surely this is curious doctrine.

CLASS LEADER.—It is not more curious than true, and my advice to you is, that you do not tempt God by unbelief.

SINNER.—Is there no other way to have my sins pardoned? do tell me.

CLASS LEADER.—I know of no other plan. God has but one revealed plan of saving sinners. You must obey God.

SINNER.—If I must obey God, I wish you to turn me to the chapter and verse, where he commads me to believe, and promises pardon of sins by faith alone.

CLASS LEADER.—The Bible is full of it. I wonder if you have read your Bible as much as you have stated to my brother here, and have not found chapter and verse.

SINNER.—I have read that we are justified by faith, justified by grace, justified by blood, justified by works; but in all my reading I have never seen the passage that says, we are justified by *faith alone.* You surely now can see clearly my difficulty.

CLASS LEADER.—The bell rings. I must go to meeting. We have a great doctrinal preacher, who will preach to-night against the views of the Campbellites. I am fearful your mind has been poisoned with their doctrines. Come and hear our preacher to-night and then we will, at another time, talk on these matters.

SINNER.—I will go. I have often heard of the strange doctrines of those people, and perhaps I will gain something that will be of service to me *from hearing* him.

D. P. H.

To be continued.

A BRIEF REPLY TO ELD. BAILEY'S SECOND NUMBER.

Dear Sir:—Your 2d No. of the "Voice of Truth" is just received. I hesitated to notice its contents in the Messenger, because I had explicitly written on all subjects you have touched as respects myself, in former numbers of the Messenger. I am also confident, that what I write will never be read by your readers; therefore a lengthy reply would only be a waste of labor and paper, and be of no manner of use to them; nor would it be profitable to our own [illegible]n; for they without farther shewing understand me. I have concluded to make a few remarks and explanations, and shall hereafter endeavor to write on more important subjects.

You begin your 2d number with John iii. 5, and your translation of it, "Except a man be born of water *even* of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." By this translation, to be born of water, is the same as to be born of the Spirit. Water, according to your rendering, is the Spirit. Now, literally, the water is not the Spirit, but a figure of the Spirit: the Spirit is also a figure. Then, to be born of water, is to be born of the figure of the Spirit, and strange! this figure of the Spirit, is the Spirit itself, and it a figure. Of what is the Spirit a figure? This appears to me more foreign from truth, than any exposition I have seen of the text. The figure of a figure is strange language.

You explain the text by Isai. i. 16—18. "Wash you, make you clean" &c. Well really, this looks like water baptism—"Be baptized and wash away your sins," and then they should recive the Holy Spirit, "by which they should receive a washing away of sin indeed," as you justly observed.

You, for reasons best known to yourself, represent Nicodemus as marvelling at the expression, "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit." In this, I think you have erred, for the astonishment of Nicodemus arose from the expression, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." To be born again is the work or end—water and the Spirit are the means by which the work is accomplished.—Nicodemus, as a ruler of the Jews, should have known from the scriptures that the doctrine of being born

again, was taught there, as Ps. lxxxvii. 5. Isai. lxvi. 7, 8, 9, &c. But the means, by which this object or end was to be accomplished in the day of Christ, were not revealed there, and must have been unknown till Christ revealed them to Nicodemus. What appears strange to me, is, that many rulers now in the Christian church wonder as much at the means ordained by the Lord, as Nicodemus did at the end, i. e. of being born again.

My friend appears strangely disposed to nullify every text he can, that speaks against the errors of the apostacy on baptism and its design. I have no doubt that you are inclined to this from the noble principles of charity. But charity should not palliate the errors of a brother; but in meekness we should strip them off, for it is our business to please God not man.

On page 24, you say, that you remarked in your lectures in Jacksonville, that the doctrine of remission of sins in the act of baptism, leads inevitably to the conclusion, that all not baptized shall go to hell; or else there are two methods of salvation—"Father Stone has laid hold on the latter, and contends that there are two methods of salvation, an evangelical and extra-evangelical."

Dear sir, I am sorry to say, that this savors too strongly of something, unworthy of the title of your periodical, "The Voice of Truth." It was intended no doubt for effect; but it can only be momentary.—You represent us as holding that every unbaptized person will go to hell. Where did we ever say this? You have drawn your own inference from the doctrine, and palmed it upon us, which we deem unfair, for we have again and again declared the contrary in plain language. I have said what you cannot or dare not deny, that if the Christian world were to be judged strictly by the letter of the law, Mark xvi. 16, &c. all the unbaptized would be condemned.

You represent me as contending for two methods of salvation, one evangelical the other extra-evangelical. Now, sir, you must know that I have *contended* but for one revealed plan of salvation, and for one only, in as plain language as I am capable of. You know too that I *contended* but for one revealed plan or method of salvation in opposition to you, who stated in your lectures in Jacksonville, that God had no "set way" of salvation. You contend against what we call the Lord's plan of salvation, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: for your system is, that a man must be saved, be born again, justified and made a new creature before he should be baptized.

I have admitted as my *opinion*, what you and others always admit, that thousands of the unbaptized are saved, being ignorant of the law on the subject of baptism. I also said what you dare not deny, that if saved they were not saved according to the evangelical plan in Mark xvi. 16 &c. Then it follows undeniably that they are saved, if saved at all, extra-evangelically; that is, they are not saved according to the one revealed plan of God. When I said, they were saved extra evangelically; did I by this propose what the plan was? Did I propose any plan, as revealed from heaven, or even suggested by myself? Did I *contend* for any other plan than that one revealed? You know surely that I did not. But you may have been mistaken by ignorance of my meaning of this word. I will explain.

Were I to say that a certain criminal was cleared *extra-judicially*, I should be understood to mean that he was cleared, not according to the common course of legal procedure. Do I in this declare any *plan* by which he was cleared? Certainly not. Theologians speak of a Levitical cleansing, which is according to the purification of the sanctuary in the law. This plan is very explicitly stated and enjoined. They also speak of an *extra-levitical* cleansing, by which

they mean, that which is not according to the law of purifying. But they declare no particular plan by which they were purified. They only mean to say negatively, the cleansing was effected not according to the revealed law of the sanctuary. 2. Chron. xxx. Now, sir, I hope you understand me. The word *extra-evangelical*, I acknowledge I coined, as more expressive of my idea than any other I knew. For this I have as good a right as any other man.

You represent me as denying that men *can* love God before immersion. Did you ever see this denial in any of my communications? It is your inference palmed upon me again. By quoting half sentences, and disjointing them from their connection, almost any thing may be proved. Do you not know that I have plainly and earnestly contended that God's revealed, ordained plan of salvation, is faith, repentance and baptism? That according to this plan, salvation follows baptism? But have I not repeatedly admitted that God *may* save the penitent believer, ignorant of his duty to be baptized, without baptism? This I have repeatedly expressed as my opinion.

Your system falls, if it once be admitted, that the New Institution puts salvation, cleansing and justification after baptism, or in the act. Therefore you contend that these things come before baptism, and are conditions of it.

Dear, sir, I view your plan of salvation, if you have any "set way," as an accommodation to the doctrines and prejudices of men, which doctrines have sprung up in the days of the apostacy. To the law and to the testimony, should be our motto. Do these attach more sanctity to baptism than to any other religious act? Do they teach that the poor, penitent, believing sinner is too vile and polluted to submit to it, or to obey his commands?—and that he must be saved, his sins pardoned, and be justified and born again, before

he should be baptized? Do they teach that the poor sinner is too vile and polluted to pray—to come to the Savior, and to confess him with the mouth unto salvation? Do they say, that the sinner, who has resolved in his heart to cease to do evil, and learn to do well, and honestly has determined to spend his life in obedience, yet sinking under a conviction of his guilt and sinfulness—do they say, he must first be washed from his sins, and be baptized—or do they say, "Be baptized and wash away your sins?" Do they say, he must first be saved and then baptized; or be baptized in order to salvation?

From what I have written, you may see that I have answered all your queries in substance, except one in these words, "Can Mr. B. show in one instance in those times (times of the Apostles) of one believer unbaptized?" This query I had proposed in a former number, and which you affect not to understand. I will propose it now in more intelligible terms. Can you find one instance of a saved or justified person, or one whose sins were forgiven, since the Lord's ascension, without baptism either expressed or implied?

My dear sir, be not offended when I say, that your dialogue between Stone and a candidate for baptism is a perfect carricature of my views. Of this you appear to be apprised, when you affirmed it was no carricature; and this too, before you were accused by any one, unless by your own conscience.

Yours, B. W. S.

From the Christian Messenger, Old England.

A QUESTION ANSWERED.

At the close of a proclamation of the good old gospel, I was met by the following question:—"Do you mean to say then, that only those, who have been immersed will be saved?" I replied, "Friends, my sim-

ple human opinion would be of little worth in so important a matter; but let us see what is the language of him, who spake as never man spake, even of Immanuel himself:—He that *believeth* shall be saved: No; He says *no such thing*. He that believeth and *is immersed* shall be saved, these are the conditions. The Holy Spirit says also by Paul "If we have been planted in the *likeness of his death*, we shall be also in the *likeness of his resurrection*. Again, the objector, "What then has become of all those *pious* individuals who *never were immersed*? I answered, my friends, I am not constituted their judge; moreover, secret things belong to God, but I can tell you thus far—Jehovah said that he would raise up a prophet (Jesus) and would put his words into his mouth; that he should speak all *that he should command him*; (and Christ said, that he spake not his own words, but the words of his Father that sent him,) and it shall come to pass, that *whosoever would not hearken to the words of that prophet*,, should be destroyed from among the people. Now this prophet has *solemnly declared*, that " except a man be BORN OF (not sprinkled with) WATER, and the spirit, he CANNOT enter into the kingdom of God." Friends, I read of ONE baptism, and that this is *for the remission of sins*. It is the medium of our salvation, just as the water was the medium of Noah's. It washes away sins which faith alone could not remove (as was shown in the case of Paul, who was *directly called* by Jesus. It is one of the pre-requisites to a part in the first resurrection, Rom. 6·5. It is the second birth, or, in scripture language, being born, *not* of blood, *nor* of the will of the flesh, but of God." Such then friends, is the baptism of the New Testament, and is worthy of infinite wisdom; for like all else that emanates from the same glorious source, it *has reference to eternity*; to *salvation*. Not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy

hath he saved us, by the *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Spirit."

Contrast with *Christian* baptism, the *popular* baptisms of our day; and for the blessed '*one* baptism,' instituted and left us by Christ, we have THREE, and what are they? One declared by its advocates to be a NON-ESSENTIAL! Another (*Infant sprinkling*) which is NO BAPTISM AT ALL! A third, much talked about, but of which there is no *authenticated* instance, save on the opening of the kingdom to the Jews on the day of Pentecost; and subsequently to the Gentiles, in the house of Cornelius, and immediately *after* which, they were commanded to be baptized in the name of the Lord.

Why even of your own selves judge ye not what is right?

W. PALMER.

Brother Palmer, We are condemned as those who take the law of Christ into our own hands, and who sit in judgment upon all other sects. This we deny, and are prepared to prove, that those who say sinners can be saved, or saints sanctified, in any other way than that appointed by Christ, and given to us by his apostles, are themselves guilty of the very conduct they charge upon us. All we contend for is this, that our heavenly Father has revealed *only one* way of salvation in the New Testament; all persons knowing it, at their own peril if they despise it.

J. W.

Religious News.

Bro. Walter Bowles of Illinois, writes, August 1. 1842. Brother J. Powel and myself held a protracted meeting at Cantrell's Creek Sangamon county. We had a very interesting meeting; the brethren were much refreshed and prompt to Christian duty. Six were added by baptism, and one restored.—On the 5th Lord's day of July we baptized 3 at Sugar Creek, Logan County.

Bro. W. M. Brown has been for a few weeks operating in Sangamon —at Rochester he gained 24—at Athens 17—at Indian Creek 9.

Bro. Greenup Jackman of Mo. writes, that brother Livy Hatchitt and himself had obtained 32 additions to the church at Ramsey's Cr. He adds: "Most of these were in the bloom and vigor of youth, whose parents have labored to instruct in the science of religion. They are now being blessed in witnessing the conversion of their offspring to Jesus, the Son of God. O, that Christian fathers and mothers would exert more energy to instruct their children both in word and deed! The scriptures should be read every day, and suitable questions proposed. Thus darkness would be dissipated, and the light of heaven would break upon the land; and the destruction of sin and impurity follow.

"Christian mothers, will you exert your power? for your influence in forming character is mighty indeed. This is the only thing we can carry with us to eternity. The laurel will fall from the hero's brow, the glitter of wealth will lose its lustre, the bubble of earthly honor will break at the touch of death; but our character will appear at the judgment seat, and there be weighed in the balances of truth. Lord, help us to form characters in time, that will not be found wanting in the judgment of the great day." Your Brother, G. JACKMAN.

Bro. Lancaster of Mo. writes, Sept. 3, "Within the last four weeks there have been additions at the following places in Mo.—Richland 45, Georgetown 12, Madison 38, Clinton 12, Dover 54.

Bro. T. M. Allen writes, August 15, 1842.—"A church of 20 members has been recently organized 8 miles west of Columbia. Another of 27 members at Marshall Saline county. Several additions have been made at many other places."

Bro. Livy Hatchitt of Mo. writes, August 8, 1842, That he and his brother P. Hatchitt, had just closed a meeting on Fabius 10 miles north of Palmyra. Six were added.

Notice.

The churches of Christ in the counties of Calloway, Boon, Howard, Randolph, Monroe, and Audrain, Mo. have agreed to have an annual meeting at Bear Creek meeting house, three miles north of Columbia, to commence on Friday before the 4th Lord's day of October next.

Also—An annual meeting of the brethren of Upper Missouri will be holden at Barry, Clay county, to commence on Friday before the 2nd Lord's day of October next.

Also—An annual meeting will commence on Saturday before the second Lord's day in October next. Bro. J. Creath is respectfully solicited to attend (* as you did not solicit his attendance at your State meeting) together with all the preaching *brethren in* Illinois, Missouri, &c.

G. JACKMAN.

*NOTE.—Bro. J. Creath's name was among those invited by us, but was overlooked by our printer, and not discovered by us in time to correct it. ED.

On the 4th Lord's day of August, Bro's W. Giliam and D. Henry baptized and received 18 near Illinois River on Indian Creek.

Georgetown Ky., Aug. 15, 1842.

Dear Bro. Stone:

Bro. Rice and myself have just returned from a tour of 9 weeks, having labored chiefly in that section of Green river, occupied by bro. G. W. Elley as an Evangelist during the past 12 months. We commenced operations at Russelsville in conjunction with brother Elley; and from thence proceeded to Elkton, Hopkinsville, Bellville, Red river, Keesburgh, Adamsville, Franklin, Grassdale, Bethel, Bethany, (Fountain Head, Gallatin and Hopewell in Tenn.) Dripping Springs and Salem. We labored faithfully at each of those places and succeeded beyond calculation. At most of these places, the cause is now so far elevated that it is beyond the reach of the opposition if the brethren prove true and loyal.

We labored every day for 8 weeks and continued in fine health. The additions were 238, of whom a considerable number were from the different denominations. Thanks and praise to the Lord for all his goodness.

It is due to the congregation at Grassy Springs in Woodford county, to say, that bro Rice was sustained by them while engaged in this mission. And the churches at Georgetown and Dry Run, partially sustained your humble servant. These congregations seem resolved to aid the cause to the extent of their power.

I trust the time is at hand when the wealthy congregations will be ashamed of their indifference to the general success of the cause, and when it will be esteemed a great privilege to assist in the proclamation of the gospel to the poor and destitute.

We are under greater obligations than any other party in christendom, inasmuch as we have assumed more. The union of Christians upon the Bible alone, and the conversion of the world by the gospel, in the hands of an united church, are fundamental points in

all that we say and do, and it is our imperious duty to have Evangelists laboring all over these United States.

The preachers (many of them) are now compelled to hold up the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice—and they are sowing the seeds of their own dissolution as parties.

We are all in good health. Accept our best wishes for your welfare and happiness.

In all affection your brother in the good hope.

J. T. JOHNSON,

Bro: W. M. Brown has just returned from Petersburgh, Menard Co. —He states that there was one meeting house there built by the citizens on the republican plan, as they supposed; but a little clause had been slipt in, that it was for all evangelical preachers. The Presbyterians occupied the house. They refused Bro. Brown the use of it because they said, he was not an evangelical!—He however went to a grove, where the citizens, maddened at the refusal of the house, built a stand, from which he addressed a large crowd for six days and nights, the fruits of the meeting were 11 immersed, 2 of them deists and one Presbyterian, 7 deists were convinced but have not all yet been baptised. The people had not been in the habit of hearing our preachers there.

Bro's. Wm. Gilliam and D. Henry have just returned from near the mouth of Indian Creek.—they labored there 4 days, and gained 26

Bro. Lancaster, and others have just closed the meeting at Springfield, Ill. The additions were 63 during the meeting.

Bro. Chatterton has also just returned from Lick Creek, in Sangamon Co, during 5 days meeting, 14 were immersed, and the meeting yet in progress. Many other additions to churches, the accounts of which are mislaid.

Bro. Sam'l Knox of Hancock, Ill. writes September 9. We had a protracted meeting on Bear Creek the 4th Lord's day of August, 21 additions, and 3 on the first, Lord's day in September.

Bro. R. Foster writes September 3. that he Bro's· Simms and Cherry had just returned from a tour of two weeks, and had 95 additions.

OBITUARY.

On Sept. 12. 1842, Died our dearly beloved young brother, Alfred Lindsay of congestive fever in Milton, Ill. He was an evangelist of great promise. His dying remarks were very impressive—he left the world in the full assurance of hope. His weeping Father took his corpse home, about 120 miles.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

October, 1842.

VOLUME XII. NUMBER 12

B. AND C. AGAIN MET.

C.—Very opportunely we have met again. Since we last conversed I have found in the community a very exciting controversy between the Christians, and the Baptists especially, and indeed all the sects are up against the Christians, and take side with the Baptists. Have you witnessed the excitement of which I speak?

B.—Am I only a stranger in this country, and have not known it?

C.—Do you understand what are the grounds of this controversy? If you do, please inform me.

B.—I think I do, and will willingly state them to you. The ostensible grounds I shall only mention; the real grounds may be secret, and purposely hidden from view. The Christians, you know, have rejected all human creeds as authoritative, and have adopted the Bible alone as their standard of doctrine and practice. This step was very offensive to the sects, and they labored long and hard against it; but despite of opposition, the sentiment prevails, and the controversy on that subject is fast dying in the land. A new controversy has of late sprung up. The Christians by reading the Bible, became confirmed in this as truth, that God has revealed but one plan of salvation, and forgiveness in the New Institution; and that plan is faith, repentance and baptism; as "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved—Repent and be baptized for