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

the remission of sins--Be baptized and wash away your sins—The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us," &c. For this plan they feel bound to contend, and to preach it to the world; but in doing this they act in opposition to the evangelicals' system; which is, that a sinner must be born again, made a new creature, saved and forgiven before he should be baptized—(except infants) that these things, of course, are the qualifications and conditions of baptism. This is the ground of the controversy.

C.—I saw a little book lately, titled Campbellism exposed by W. Philips, (the orthodox text book.) He plainly said, and very plausibly too, that baptism for remission of sins, was a Popish doctrine. Can it therefore be right?

B.—That the Papists held the doctrine, is readily admitted; and it must also be admitted that the Papists held many doctrines which all Protestants hold—as that Christ died, was buried, and rose again the third day—ascended to heaven—and will come again to judge the world in righteousness—they also hold the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, life everlasting &c. Are these doctrines therefore wrong, because Papists hold them? If all the doctrines Papists hold were taken from the Protestants, they would be as naked as the jackdaw stripped of his borrowed plumes. Papists also hold and practice rantism instead of baptism. I am willing to concede this to be a purely papal doctrine; but why do many protestants practice it?

C.--But they tell me, they hold these doctrines true, not because Papists hold them; but because they are taught in the scriptures.

B.—This is the very reason given by the Christians, why they hold, and teach baptism, in conection with faith and repentance for remission.

C.—But the Baptists and others deny that the scriptures teach baptism for salvation or remission of sins.

Mr. Philips, in his exposition of Acts ii. 38, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins," says, and boldly asserts, that the expression is elliptical, and should be read, 'be baptized *to represent* the remission of sins.'

B.--By this unauthorized criticism we must then read the very same words, 'This is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many, to *represent* the remission of sins.' Will this be received by the advocates of such criticism? We think not. But we must repent to represent the remission of sins too! Is this so? But it is contended that ellipses is not forbidden by the genius of our language. This is a very convenient way of evading and getting over hard texts. In this way, Mr. P reads Acts xxii 16. 'Arise and be baptized *to represent* the washing away of your sins.' Let this of supplying ellipses be admitted, the scriptures would soon be made to suit every man's system, and become as unintelligible as the Pythian oracles, or as the books of the Sibyls. Ellipses is sometimes necessary to understand a few texts; but its admission is always natural, and not strained: 'As I am the vine, ye are the branches, viz. I am *as* the vine, ye are *as* the branches.

C.—Your reasoning appears to be conclusive. Then it appears to me that the Baptists and Christians agree that immersion is only baptism and that intelligent believers are only proper subjects. But the Baptists contend that the believers to be baptized must first become new creatures, and saved from their sins. The Christians contend that the promise of salvation and pardon is in obedience to God in baptism. Is this the ground of the controversy?

B.—So I think. At first view it would appear as a very small matter for controversy. But the Christians contend that salvation and pardon are not the conditions and qualifications of baptism; for if they were,

the poor penitent sinner would wait and seek these qualifications before he would submit to baptism, thro' obedience, to which command, connected with faith and repentance, salvation and pardon are granted according to the Lord's plan. I conversed a few days ago with a person under deep conviction of his guilt and sinfulness, and anxiously enquiring, 'what shall I do to be saved?' I asked him if he believed in the Lord Jesus, as the Savior of sinners? Yes, said he, I do believe this with all my heart; but I am afraid he will not save me, I have sinned so long and so grieviously. Do you repent, said I? He said, I fear not—I do feel sorry that I have sinned, and am so evilly inclined, and I am determined to sin no more, and to spend my life in trying to do well, but alas! alas! I feel worse and not better by all my attempts. O that I could repent! I am always afraid my repentance flows not from pure, but from selfish motives. I asked him. Do you love God and the Savior of sinners? O this is what I desire above all things in the world; but I never can say that I love God indeed. For if I loved him I should be born of God, and fear would be cast out indeed. I should have the spirit of a son, and the witness in my heart that I was a child. This I cannot hope to be my lot, a poor sinner. Do you hate sin, said I? I am afraid not from right motives. How long have you been in this situation? One year, said he.—Often I am ready to give up all hope, and cease from striving. I have been laboring for these qualifications in order to be baptized and join the church; but I fear I shall never get them. I then told him that God had promised pardon and salvation through baptism as one of the means, and endeavored to teach him the way. He heard and believed and was baptized immediately, and like the Eunuch went off rejoicing.

C.—This looks like the ancient apostolical way.—And for doing this are the Christians so abused by others?

B.—Yes, this is the reason they assign for their opposition principally. They all acknowledge that baptism is a non-essential to salvation; but a mere rite to be performed after the sinner is saved and regenerated, or as some affirm, in infancy.

C.—Baptism a non-essential, and yet an express command of God! This is carrying matters too far; man becomes a judge and not a doer of the law.—This is an assumption unbecoming man, poor fallen man. Indeed, brother, it appears to be presumption. But do they produce any authority from the word for this opinion.

B.—I have heard of none worth notice. But they base the opinion upon this, that thousands are saved without baptism, and that all ought to be saved before baptism in order to, and as a condition of baptism.

C.—How do they prove from the word that thousands are saved without baptism?

B.—Not by the *word* directly, but indirectly, by experience and by detached texts.

C.—What do you mean by not *directly* saved?

B.—They attempt to prove from the word that they are saved and justified by faith alone, and this is without baptism.

C.—By faith alone! What! without repentance! without prayer!

B.—No: they say these are implied, and accompany faith.

C.—And why not baptism too implied? I see no reason for the admission of one, and not the other.—Baptism is more frequently mentioned as accompanying faith, than either repentance or prayer.

B.—So I have thought. It appears to me they oppose the doctrine because it opposes their opinions, and their practice; and because it condemns thousands, whom they judge as saints, of living in disobedience.

C.—But do the Christians say that all the unbaptized are unregenerated, unsaved, and will go to hell?

B.—No: they indulge as great hope for them, as their opposers do. But they feel bound to declare the Lord's plan of saving sinners, and no other not revealed.—Their business, they say, is to preach the gospel—to preach the word, and not the inventions of man. They urge obedience to their Lord's commands with earnestness, irrespective of the opinions of men. While these inventions are neglected in the daily ministrations, offence is taken at it. But who is to blame?

C.—And are these the reasons of the great excitement and opposition against the Christians?

B.—These, as I told you, are the ostensible reasons. But if I were permitted to speak my sentiments freely, I would say, that the great success attending the Christians in gaining proselytes, and many from the sects too, and the general conviction in favor of their doctrine, is the real cause. My reasons for thinking so, are, that the Christians have long believed and preached what they now believe and preach. They were not so systematically and violently opposed till the leaven of truth began to work among the mass of the people, and such multitudes bowed obedience to it. Then the danger began to appear. If they be let alone, we shall be undone. It was judged better that they should die, than that the large numbers of them should perish. I have no doubt that many of them, are as sincere in their opposition, as was Saul of Tarsus in persecuting the Christians of old. They like him, have a good conscience, and verily think they are doing God's service.

C.—The sects had better let them alone, and attend to their own concerns. If this work be of man it will come to nought; but if it be of God, they cannot overthrow it: they should fear, lest they should be found fighting against God. I thank you, brother, for the information you have given me. I really am disposed to think that the Christians are right in theory; and if they live according to it, they must and will prevail; and that the opposition against them will tend to fill their ranks. I judge from past history. Farewell.

B. W. S.

For the Messenger.

THE FEAR OF GOD.

I am induced to believe this is an important subject, from the stress put upon it in the lamp of truth, the store-house of the unsearchable, incorruptible, and never fading treasures of eternity. Therefore, I conclude it will not be amiss to call the attention of the readers of your instructive and highly interesting "Christian Messenger," to a serious consideration of the fear of "The glorious and fearful name THE LORD OUR GOD. I will advert first to these remarkable words of Job: "Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom. xxviii. 28. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Ps. cxi. 10. "The fear of the Lord is the instruction of wisdom." Prov. xiii. 33. These writers inform us that it "is wisdom," "the instruction of wisdom;" yea, "the beginning of wisdom." Before we can take one step in this delightful path, we must be influenced by the fear of "The Lord of Hosts;" or rather, it is the first step in this heavenly path. My reason for making this remark is, that some urge objections to preaching up the fear of God, and place great emphasis upon the passage of scripture, "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." This we believe with all our heart, and we also believe what Paul says in the same connection, "But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness; indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first and also of the Greek." The wrath of God is revealed in "The glo-

rious gospel of the blessed God" against all ungodliness." Thanks be to his name for his loving kindness, in making it known that we may fear him, and keep his commandments.

I wish it to be observed, that this is the order in which Solomon placed it, when he brought the whole matter to a conclusion, "Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. This is exemplified in the Pentecostians; Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken; do you hear them when pierced to the heart, cry out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" Will you go with Peter to the house of Cornelius, and hear him say, "In every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

I fear I have already wearied your patience, but I hope you will hear the conclusion. David says, the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. Solomon says, fear God and keep his commandments. Peter says, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. I am induced to believe from these passages that Fear and Love is the order observed in revelation.

I hope I shall appear in your columns again upon this subject. J. S. P.

For the Messenger.

THOUGHTS.

While sitting in my room and contemplating the benevolence , power and wisdom of our heavenly Father, manifested in the visible creation, in forming and adapting every thing around us to man's happiness, and enjoyment; and revolving in my mind the origin, and progress of matters and things in general, in the political world, I was peculiarly struck with the wide contrast presented to the imagination, between the present and past ages, in a religious point of view; and was led to inquire of myself, if so great have been the revolutions, and so perceptible the alterations and changes in the religious world, within a century past, what will be the changes, and what the advancement in a century to come?

Scarcely one hundred years have passed away since our forefathers were almost entirely unaided by the light of divine truth, groping their way through this wilderness of woe, in darkness and uncertainty. Partial ignorance of God's word, and the remedial system presented to the world by Jesus of Nazareth, seemed almost universally to prevail; except here and there, interspersed through the moral heavens, might be seen a star surpassing its fellows in brightness, which, for a time, would 'brightly burn,' and shed a lustre over a small space around, but whose glory would soon fade, and retiring it would soon lose itself in the dark abyss. But then so dark and cloudy was the firmament in which these lights appeared, that like the pale flickering lamp in the criminals dungeon, they seemed rather calculated to dazzle and perplex, than afford a light, which would guide the world into the way of truth. But how changed!

View now the point in the moral universe to which we have arrived! Although the consciences of our fore-parents were tied down to the contracted conceptions of fallible man, although their faith was bounded by the narrow limits of a human creed, by force of civil law; yet we, truly a favored and blessed people in this land of liberty and of Bibles, are permitted to worship the God of the universe, under our own vine and fig tree, according to the dictates of his holy word.

Long enough have the souls and consciences of the community been in the hands and at the disposal of a set of men, assuming to themselves prerogatives be-

longing only to the God of heaven. Long enough has the world been kept in darkness, in reference to heaven's truth and holy institutions, and no longer will it be permitted. The light of truth has again flashed upon the world; the tempests of infidelity, clouds of error, and mists of superstition, begin to disperse; and sectarianism, hydra-headed as it is, is beginning to recede and hide its mutilated countenance under the rubbish of the dark ages, and ere long its cold consumptive remains will be consigned into the deep dark sea of black oblivion.

"Man cannot keep the world in night,
For God has said, let there be light."

The cause of truth and the Bible is rolling onward, and gloriously triumphing. Between thirty and forty years ago, the Reformation which is now o'erspreading the fair valley of the Mississippi, and moving forward with such velocity and irresistible force, was set in motion by a few noble souls, who, disengaging themselves from the shackles of witchcraft, kingcraft, and priestcraft, came out from the city of Confusion, confessed in the face of the universe that God's word should govern them, and that they were willing to unite upon the Bible, and the Bible alone; as the foundation which is laid in Zion, and as the only religion of Christians. They hoisted and again unfurled the blood-stained banner of the Prince of Peace, and sword in hand, have valiantly fought in "front of battle," until now, with the watchword continually passing from rank to rank, "onward and upward." The truth has been daily and hourly gaining votaries and defenders, and by the aid of the God of Bethel, and the valor of its champions here, it will ere long overcome all opposition; human thrones, dominions, principalities and powers give way before it, and, as the waters cover the great deep, so will it cover the whole earth.

Springfield, Sept. 1842. S. C.

SIGNS OF THE LAST DAYS—Continued.

The signs of which the apostle speaks, appear in the characters of men. I have already taken notice of several, as mentioned in order by the apostle, 2 Tim. iii. 1. The last noticed was the *Blasphemers.* The next in order now is

The Disobedient to Parents.—To all observers, no day has appeared more distinctly marked with this evil, than the present. The children have an overweening conceit that their acquirements and abilities are superior to those of their parents; they become disobedient to their commands, however just and reasonable they may be. They weigh them in the scale against their own judgment of the matter, and find them too light to demand their attention. When children in infancy are permitted by indulgent parents to have their own will uncontrolled, no wonder that they acquire a habit in after life to disobey their parents in every thing opposed to their will. The law of God is, that parents rule their children; but in the present age, children generally have assumed the reigns of government, and rule their parents. And yet these children are professors of Christianity, and have a form of godliness!

Unthankful.—A generous heart feels bound by the ties of gratitude for favors bestowed, either by his God or by his fellow creature. He feels a joy to express in language the dictations of his full heart. But the poor unthankful professor is like the brute which eats the fruit that falls from the trees, without looking up, or caring from whence it comes. Every good gift and every perfect gift comes down from the Father of lights." They receive them, their meat, drink and raiment; but they lay it not to heart whence they came, nor feel their heart warmed with gratitude to their benefactor. For richer favors, as the gift of his Son, and his fulness of blessings, they are unthankful

—such favors are too high for their carnal minds to reach; too great for such hearts to feel and comprehend. Yet they have a form of godliness!

UNHOLY.—Holiness is a conformity to the universal law of love to God and man, both in the spirit and letter of it. In heart, the saints love God and man; in life, they keep the commandments. To be unholy, is not to love God nor man in sincerity, and not to observe his commands with purity and diligence. O, what multitudes of professors drag out a wretched existence without holiness in life—not considering, Without holiness no man shall see the Lord! A day approaches, which will break their slumbers forever. How little real holiness and piety is now apparent among real professors! How much bitterness among them, one to another! How little fellowship and union! The plain reason is, because they have not fellowship with the Father, nor with his Son, Jesus Christ. When the Son of man comes, shall he find faith upon the earth?

WITHOUT NATURAL AFFECTION.—In this, man sinks below the brutal creation. They love their own offspring, and would die in their defence. Human nature must be deeply sunk, when natural affection ceases. This is the first and the last affection of the human heart. When this is gone, he completely bears the image of Satan. Can such yet have a form of godliness? So says the apostle.

TRUCE BREAKERS.—This more intelligibly may be rendered, *covenant* breakers. The obligation to observe covenants, made in good faith, has ever been considered very sacred by our divine legislator, and which our worldly legislatures have sanctioned by penalties. But it is here declared, that in the last days, even professors of godliness shall be covenant breakers! How many now endeavor to evade the articles of a covenant, by wresting them from the proper, and *bona fide* intention, so as to defraud him with whom the covenant or contract was made! This vice is almost hidden under the specious name of smartness; and practiced by so many of the higher circles, that its deformed aspect almost disappears. Does it not now begin to appear among the professors of godliness?

FALSE ACCUSERS.—Would to God that this sign of the last days, did not appear amongst us! especially among professors of Christianity! It is too apparent to be denied. How many from the pulpit and press accuse others of sayings, doctrines, and behavior, of which they are as innocent as the accusers themselves! and this done with the base design of sinking their influence in society, and of exalting themselves on their ruin. Deep must be the depravity of that man's heart, who can act thus under the sanctimonious garb of religion! This is a vice which more nearly assimilates men to demons, than any other. It is the enemy of peace, the antipode of love, the converse of the law of God, and an insuperable bar to the entrance of heaven.

INCONTINENT OR INTEMPERATE.—He is one who is not the master of himself—one whose reason is dethroned by passion, appetite, or lust. The drunkard, the debauchee, the miser, the spendthrift, the worlding, fills up the character.

FIERCE.—This is the opposite of gentleness and meekness. When such a man is insulted, or concieves himself insulted, the inward fire of wrath kindles and bursts forth in flames from his eyes, his face and tongue against him from whom the insult came. He renders railing for railing, and reviling for reviling. His temper is not mellowed to the gentleness of Christ, by the prevalence of divine grace. Yet they may have a form of godliness!

DESPISERS OF THOSE THAT ARE GOOD.—The good

are the beloved of the Lord. If such are despised by men, it is manifest that these men have not the spirit of the Lord, and are therefore none of his. How many good men are despised, because they may have a different religious creed, or name from others! How many of the good are despised, because they are more attached to the institutions and commands of heaven, than to those of men! Surely, no prior age ever was more disgraced by such characters, than the present. We are authorized to despise errors, but not the man who holds them. We must ever love our enemies. Do the Christians of this generation thus act? Every observer can easily answer the question, and every real good man answers with a sigh, No.

Traitors or betrayers.—Who is a traitor? One who under the guise of friendship to another, betrays his person, or the secrets of confidence, to his injury.

Heady or headstrong, rash,—One who will not receive the advice of others—headstrong in his course, and precipitate in his conclusions. It may be called unreasonable obstinacy. Such men may have a form of godliness, but surely, they deny its power. Such lack prudence, caution, and humility.

High minded.—To be high minded indeed, is to have our minds raised above earth, and fixed on heaven and things above. This is not the high mindedness of which Paul speaks; but to be insolent and puffed up. One puffed up against another, is the man who is self conceited, and has an overweening opinion of himself, his knowledge and acquirements as superior to others. His mind is high above them, and thinks even his superiors babes in comparison with his own greatness. O, how unbecoming the gentleman, much less the humble professor of religion! Such men disgrace Christianity, and cause it to be blasphemed. A public stigma is fixed upon it, yet it cannot keep it down.

Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God.—The pleasure of acquiring and possessing wealth—the pleasure of having worldly honor, the pleasure of indulging in the lusts of the flesh, the lust of the eye and the pride of life—or the pleasure to love and serve the creature more than the Creator. This man's treasure is on earth, and consequently his pleasures supreme are on earth. "For where the treasure is, there will the heart be also. These treasures and pleasures they love, more than they love the God of glory. Yet all these characters have a form of godliness; and of such men of such characters the world is full at the present time. Can they expect to meet the Lord with joy at his coming? Alas! alas! for them! B. W. S.

QUERIES BY J. M.

Has any church or member of a church a right to object to the reception of a sinner, however great a sinner he may have been, who presents himself to them, as willing and determined *now* to forsake the world, and turn to the Lord, to confess Jesus and obey his institutions?

Ans. I know of no such right granted to the church or individuals by the Lord of the church.

Query 2. Have they a right to postpone his admission to a future period?

Ans. I know of no law to this effect. Yet there may be circumstances, which may justify such a procedure. Yet they must be such as must convince all that he is insincere in his professions. As he may have boasted in the hearing of a brother or sister, that at such a meeting he was determined to deceive the church by presenting himself for their reception. Such cases may occur. In such case, the brother, knowing this, should object, and have the matter postponed, till satisfaction be had. B. W. S.

P. S. Your nos. have been regularly mailed to you.

B. W. STONE TO ELD. A. BAILEY.

DR. SIR—Your 3d No. of the Voice of Truth is before me. I have read your 3d letter to me again and again with attention, but cannot well understand it.—This may be owing to my dullness of apprehension, rather than to your obscurity. If I understand you, you are endeavoring to explain John iii 5. "Born of water and of the Spirit," by Ezek. xxxvi. 25, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean." This you call a "birth of water," or born of water, EVEN of the Spirit. This I think could not have entered the mind of Nicodemus; for who could have conceived a likeness between sprinkling and a birth of water? But you say! "Who pretends that this is a prophecy of literal water." My dear sir, have you not known this and similar texts quoted by rantizers in support of sprinkling for baptism? It is a common argument, and urged by some with great confidence; and it really appears to me as plausible, as any other they use, and far more plausible than your "birth of water" by sprinkling.

You introduce Zech. xiii. 1, to prove the same thing. "that day there shall be a fountain opened in the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and uncleanness." You say, "This is surely a a birth of water, and also a birth of the Spirit." My dear sir, this text does not determine this to be a fountain of water, of blood or of any other liquid, or being, material, or spiritual—or whether it is to be sprinkled, poured or drunk, or washed in. Yet you have guessed it is water applied by washing; so that washing as well as sprinkling is a birth of water! No doubt you have devoutly sung,

> There is a fountain filled with blood,
> Drawn from Emanuel's veins.

But this fountain was opened in the house of David—

How will you apply this? Again; it was opened for the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Were these also the Gentile nations? I cannot see how you can apply all this to a birth of water, EVEN, a birth of the Spirit.

For fear, lest I unintentionally misrepresent your meaning, I shall close my brief remarks; for if this be not your meaning, I know not what it can be. Surely, you cannot think that it is denied by us, that water sometimes represents the Spirit, or his influences. I am willing that every one of your readers may have, unmolested all the profit your third letter to me may afford them. Yours sincerely, B. W. S.

P. S. Your 4th letter to me, page 41, in vindicating your rendering of John iii. 5, "born of water, *even* of the Spirit;" your readers may also enjoy unmolested by me. The criticism is too little in my view, to demand more than I have written already. To that I refer those who wish to be satisfied. B. W. S.

TO ELD. W. CARTER.

DEAR SIR—Your letter to me, published in the 'Voice of Truth,' lies before me. I have been absent from home in Missouri, and have time only to make a few desultory remarks.

You tell us that I declined publishing your discourse against us. My reasons I stated to you in a letter, and afterwards in conversation with you in person. I told you that the Messenger was too small to admit such a work with my replies to it. I also stated to you that it was uncertain whether I should continue the Messenger beyond the next and last number, because of the pressure of the times in money matters. Yet I wrote you and told you in person, that I would print for you in the Messenger, any correction you might make on my reporter's notes, if he misrepresented you in any particular. These are the reasons

I gave you, and the offer I made, with which I did believe you were satisfied, and I was expecting your corrections of my reporter, till I saw your discourse in the 'Voice of Truth.' I had other reasons for not publishing your discourse in the Messenger, which I thought unnecessary to name to you; as, that my readers would not be profited, and your brethren would never see nor read my remarks. Again if I published for you, others would expect the same privilege, and thus the Messenger would be filled up with the effusions of heated opponents against us, and the ill natured slang and slander of the day, instead of Christianity, to no profit to saint or sinner, but a disgrace to religion.

You wish to call my attention to some of the *misrepresentations* in my replies. Misrepresentation is become so hackneyed a word at the present time, that it seems to have lost its true meaning. You have been told that my reporter gave me the notes of your discourse—if inaccurately presented, you had the liberty to correct them. Why impute misrepresentation to me? You knew I would shield myself behind my reporter. This was a very natural thought. He may explain if he choose.

You first state "the most flagrant" misrepresentation I have made. "He states again, their faith nullifies three score declarations of God, save one, as Mark ii. v., the thief on the cross, &c." pa. 289. This you represent me, or my reporter, as stating. Now, were I disposed to notice trifles, I would say, you have misrepresented us in your quotation. We did not say Mark ii. v. as you have it, but Mark ii. 5. It should have been Mark i. 15. In this you are misrepresented by a typographical error. If this is 'the most flagrant' misrepresentation, as you say it is, the rest must be very dim.

You proceed to point out another misrepresentation of mine, and say, "You then follow on this misrepresentation by an assertion of your own equally remote from the truth. 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—pa. 289, 290." My dear sir, you appear to be very forgetful: of all the 59 texts, my reporter named but two or three, with the &c. &c. These were Mark i. 15, Repent and believe the gospel—the thief on the cross, &c. Surely you will not deny that these cases were before the last commission to the apostles. Are you then misrepresented either by myself or reporter? Is my assertion of this fact remote—equally remote—'flagrantly' remote from the truth? Do sir, save your *pious* abuse for a more proper subject.

You proceed; "I regard them, (my misrepresentations) a full acknowledgment on your part, that the argument cannot be fairly met." Dear sir, be not too hasty in your conclusions. We regard your argument as fairly met, and refuted long ago, again and again by us. But "convince a man against his will, he'll hold the same opinion still."

On pa. 44, you say; "I am reported as making another charge: When did you ever hear them teach the repentance of the Bible, turning from sin to God? Never." You say, "by referring to the discourse you will see I am not accurately reported." This is possible. But a person in preaching a discourse can easily alter the objectionable parts of it when written. But, sir, I am glad you do not now impute this sentiment to us all, but to myself only. I only am responsible for it. Because I have said that the repentance required before baptism as a condition of it, is not a spiritual change of heart, or regeneration, or new creation, therefore, you conclude I do not preach the re-

pentance of the Bible. It is easier to assert than prove. You should prove that the repentance of the Bible is a spiritual change of heart or regeneration, and must precede baptism—and that it is not ceasing to *do* evil, and learning to *do* well, as I have stated, and it is believed, have proved in former numbers. My opinions are not considered by me as disproved by the opinions of any uninspired man. To the Bible alone I appeal.

With the public I am willing to leave the rest of your remarks. They will judge whether or not I have misrepresented you.

A few passing remarks I wish to make respecting your criticism on the Greek verbs, *baptisai* and *apolousai*, Be baptized and wash away your sins. Acts xxii. 16. I observed that they stood in the same mood, tense and voice—and they are in the same relation, as being coupled together with a copulative conjunction, and referring to the same person. If *baptisai* be used passively, so must *apolousai;* Be baptized, and be washed from your sins. You would admit this, if the objective or accusative case, *amartias*, sins, did not follow the verb *apolousai*. But what was the object washed? Was it Saul, or his sins? Certainly Saul was the object on which the action of washing passed.

My dear sir, must "old age," "merely a tyro in Greek," correct a giant in literature? Do you not know that the objective case in Greek frequently follows passive verbs, and such as signify passively? Do sir, read Doct. Parkhurst's grammer on the government of the accusative case. "The accusative," says he, "joined with verbs passive, or signifying passively, is governed by *kata* understood." He gives a number of examples from Euripides, and from the New Testament; as Matt. xvi. 26, What is a man profited if he gain the whole world, and *lose his own soul?*—literally, and *be lost as to his soul.* Here the accusative, *psuchen*, follows the passive verb *zeemioothee*, and is

governed by *kata* understood. Again, 1 Cor. ix. 17. A dispensation, *oikonomian* is committed to me. Here the accusative, *oikonomian*, follows the passive verb, *pepisteumai*. It reads literally, 'I am intrusted with a dispensation. If you doubt, I advise you again to ask the College faculty; they can tell. Had you taken the old man's advice, given on a former occasion, you would not have exposed your scholarship now. Please to excuse my plainness; your unfriendly remarks seem to call for it.

The compound verb, *apolouo*, occurs but twice in the New Testament, Acts xxii. 16, and 1 Cor. vi. 11, and is there used only in the Middle voice, and translated passively in the latter text, as, "but ye are washed." One thing is reduced to a certainty by linguists, that there are three verbs in Greek, that signify to wash; as *louein*, to wash the whole body—*plunein*, to wash garments, and *niptein*, to wash the hands or the feet. See Park. on the words; Doct. G. Campbell, &c. If this be so, and no scholar will venture to deny it, then was Saul's whole body washed.

I am heartily sorry that you are so warmly irritated against us. The Bible teaches us that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God. Moderation becomes us, poor short-sighted mortals. Tho' I have addressed you in plain language, it may be considered too tart; it may be so; yet I assure you I am your well wisher. B. W. S.

Father Stone—Permit me to make a few remarks, in reply to that portion of a letter, which you have not noticed, addressed to you through the Voice of Truth, pa. 44, by Wm. Carter, and in which I am made a party, and charged with misrepresentation.

Mr. C. makes a *witty* rejoinder to your criticism on his distinction between forgiveness and remission, and says, the reporter is entitled to both the blunder and

the benefit of the criticism; nor could he conceive how I could make out six points, unless I was five fingered, or double thumbed. His notions of a reporter are somewhat new to me. I have never known one that was able to count off, *a la mode*, on the ends of his fingers, and commit the subject matter to writing at the same time. Mr C. seems to think it impossible for him to make a blunder; for he says, "I could not have made the blunder imputed to me." That he did make the blunder I am quite as certain and positive, as he is that he did not. Others who were present and heard the discourse say the same.

In reply to his positive denial of one expression, and misrepresentation of others, I would only state, that I have compared my notes with those of persons of respectability, who took notes, and find them to agree.

During Mr. C's. discourse he made several attempts at eloquence, and manifested at times, much warmth and zeal for the cause he was advocating—and he, no doubt, let slip many expressions which were not to be found in his written remarks, and which, after becoming cool and dispassionate, he regretted making, if by him remembered.

REPORTER.

A FEW ADDITIONAL REMARKS

On Mr. Carter's discourse preached in Jacksonville on Human traditions; or his effort against the Christians: since published in the Voice of Truth. Page 35.

The ground work of their system, he says, are, 1st, faith, 2 repentance, 3 baptism, 4 forgiveness, 5 gift of the Holy Spirit. Tradition is either human or divine. Surely no man who has any respectability at stake, would call these five points enumerated by Mr. Carter, human traditions! They all flow from the Bible, as directly as light from the sun. Does it alter their nature, should a man count them on his fingers, thus addressing the eye as well as the ear of the congregation? The remark appears too trifling to be made by a man of letters in a public lecture.

He says, "Faith they place before repentance." Dreadful heresy! Soul destructive doctrine! Thus they make the word of God of no effect by this human tradition! Do Mr. Carter, tell us the origin of this tradition: from whence it flowed—and how many years has it been rolling down the stream of time to us, who have received it. This might be more instructive than to speak of undefined tradition.

But he adds, "the intellectual belief, or conviction of truth, which precedes repentance, and is necessary to it, such as every impenitent man has, who does not reject the Bible, and such as the devil has, is with them the faith which the Bible requires for justification."

The faith or belief they have, is intellectual. Yes; we are willing to acknowledge this. An unintellectual or blind faith, if such can exist, such as Catholics have, we discard. Our faith depends on divine evidence, and therefore is intellectual. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name." This is purely an intellectual faith—yet life is the fruit. All the prophecies respecting Christ —all the miracles he performed—the wonders of his death and resurrection, were all written for the same purpose, and, therefore, the faith produced by them is intellectual. The Bereans searched daily the scriptures whether these things were so, and therefore many believed—this was certainly intellectual. Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized. For faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe in me through their word, that they may be one, &c.

But it is said that wicked men have this faith; we grant it; for the *ungodly* believe unto justification, salvation and eternal life. They can be nothing else but *ungodly*, until they believe and obey; then, not before they are saved, justified and made new creatures.

But it is said the devils have such faith—granted; they believe and tremble; but they have no lot or interest in Christ. He died not for them. But if Christ had died for them—and salvation was by faith alone, hell would soon be unpeopled.

Is it possible that Mr. C. seriously believes that faith is an unintellectual thing? I must think he means the same as we do, though he thus speaks. For this intellectual faith which the wicked and devils have, he says, precedes repentance, or the new birth or change of heart, and is necessary to it, as he acknowledges. So say we. His definition of faith is trust or confidence. He may call this faith if he choose; but we call it the fruit of faith. Yet we hold the same truth. Let controversy cease then on this point forever. Shall we wrangle on such trifling distinctions, while infidels laugh at us?—while sinners are dying all around? No! I say. Let us not widen the unhappy breach, but labor to have it repaired. By long observation I have seen the undue lengths, to which a heated mind may carry us. If such a mind be not checked it will carry us beyond the limits of every Christian virtue—while we think we are zealously contending for truth, we shall lose it in the fogs of uncharitable zeal and useless controversy. Many in their fervor to establish their doctrine of the influences of the Spirit, have lost those influences in themselves entirely. Many I fear, are zealously defending the truth, and beating down error, who love not, nor practice the former, nor are heartily opposed to the latter. They may at last hear—"Depart from me, for I never approved of you."

He asks, "where does the Bible teach, 1st faith, 2d repentance?" No where. Invariably it places repentance first, and then faith." Stop Mr. C. Be not too hasty. Jonah preached, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown. So the people of Nineveh believed God, and repented. For they repented at the preaching of Jonas." Jonah iii. Matt. xii. 41.

Many of the Jews and Greeks at Ephesus, believed and repented. Acts xix. 18—19. And a great many believed and turned unto the Lord. Acts xvii. 12 &c. Where did Mr. C. learn that intellectual faith preceded repentance? Doubtless he will answer, in the Bible So we say; having learned it in the same book. In that book we have also learned, that without faith it is impossible to please God. If we put repentance before faith, how can it be pleasing or acceptable to God? But Mr. C. says, the Bible invariably places repentance before faith, and quotes *two* texts to prove it. "Repent and believe the gospel" Mark i. 15. Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ" Acts xx. 21, that repentance towards God should be preached to the Jews, was no new doctrine. The prophets had long before preached it, and now the Lord of glory enforces it. They already believed in God, but now they are required to believe also in Jesus, or the good news of his having come into the world to save sinners. To the Greeks as well as to the Jews, repentance and faith were testified by the apostle, as indispensable to their salvation. I have noticed in a former communication, that the divine writers were not always punctilious respecting the order of their language. This we must acknowledge, or set them in opposition to each other.

Mr. C's. faith, or that for which he contends, follows repentance, or a spiritual change of heart, or regeneration; therefore, according to his system, a sinner is born again, born of God, made alive, pardoned or jus-

tified before he can believe. Now the scriptures have taught us, that God justifies the ungodly, Rom. iv. 5. They also teach us that God justifies him that believes on Jesus. Hence we conclude that the ungodly can and do believe, and that the ungodly thus believing are justified, saved and made alive. The ungodly believe unto obedience, righteousness, salvation and eternal life. Will Mr. C. attribute all this to a dead faith?

A few of us in Jacksonville expressed our opinion that the repentance required of the sinner, previous to baptism, was not a spiritual change, or the new birth. We then stated that this was not the general doctrine of our brethren—that they were generally orthodox on this point. But Mr. C. has imputed the doctrine unjustly to the whole body. If he knew no better he is now informed. We gave our reasons why we so believed, but these reasons have never been met but with a puny hand.

As to what Mr. C. has said, and which has been said with greater strength by Mr. Philips in his "Campbellism exposed," on the 59 texts of scripture being nullified by our doctrine, and on baptism, I have already written in my former remarks, and shall add nothing more. I refer the reader to them. It is an easy matter to sail on the current of popular opinion. A strong and spirited assertion is a good argument. But truth will ultimately prevail. Mr. C. may assail, as he does our religious character; but the world will judge us by our fruits; and they will determine how much better he is in his boasted orthodoxy, than we are in our abominable heresy. There is a day in advance when we all shall be judged with righteous judgment according to our works. The points of difference between us will not be once named there. Mr. Baxter has said, "While we wrangle here in the dark, we are dying and passing to the world, that will decide all our controversies; and the safest passage thither is by peaceable ho-

liness." So he thinks yet, and so does your servant.

B. W. STONE.

CONVERSATIONS—CONTINUED.

CLASS LEADER.—I am glad to meet you again my dear friend. Often have I thought of you since our last interview, and prayed that God would grant you his grace and Holy Spirit to enable you to believe. I trust, that you are now willing and prepared to cast yourself upon the mercy of God, and exercise faith in the Lord Jesus.

SINNER.—I am constrained to acknowledge, your unmerited kindness towards me, and the deep interest you evince in my welfare; but I am as much perplexed now to comprehend your views on the subject of justification by *faith alone*, as when I last saw you.

C. L.—This, is most astonishing to me, when I see you in such deep and solemn penitence before God for all your former sins committed against his holy laws, and your desire to be a Christian. Did not the able and eloquent sermon of our preacher, on last Sunday night, remove your difficulties?

S.—No. Its effect on my mind, was quite the reverse. I took my BIBLE along with me to church, and as he quoted his proofs that ABRAHAM was justified by FAITH ALONE without offering his son ISAAC, I turned the leaves down, so that I could examine them again.

C. L.—Well; that was right, and I think if you will examine and compare them, your mind will be—must be satisfied.

S—I examined the texts adduced from Paul to the Romans, and was forced to the conclusion, that the works of the law, and the law of Christ, was the subject matter before his mind. That no one could be justified by the law of Moses, but they could by the law of Christ. I particularly examined from the 3d chapter to the

conclusion of the 5th, and noticed this declaration of Paul in the 5th. "Therefore being justified by faith" &c. and in the 9th verse of same chapter, he again says, "much more being justified *now* by his BLOOD," &c. The conclusion then was irresitable, that Paul was contrasting the Jewish and Christian dispensation, and not teaching as the preacher said, justification by *faith*, abstractly considered.

C. L.—But Abraham was justified many years before he offered his son Isaac upon the altar, consequently we are justified by faith alone.

S.—I think, in this you are somewhat mistaken. Abraham believed God, and his faith was counted for righteousness. But was he justified? That is the question.

C. L.—Let us turn to the case and examine it.

S.—Here it is in Gen. 22 chapter and 18 verse. The Lord says "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed, because thou hast *obeyed* my voice." Obedience to his faith, therefore justified him.

C. L.—This is a new thought to my mind. I had not examined the passage carefully.

S.—My Polyglott Bible now refers to James ii. 24, which carries out the same idea. James says, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only." Yes, NOT BY FAITH ONLY!!!

C. L.—Well, to be candid, I am now not so much surprised that you are troubled about this doctrine.

S.—Another thought I will add, which occurred to me in reading the 2d chapter of James and 22d verse. "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?" This is the thought; can an imperfect faith justify a sinner?

C. L.—Certainly not, and Abraham's faith was not perfect till he added works, "by works was faith made perfect." I am astonished that I have so long overlooked that expression.

S.—This sets aside all the reasoning of the Preacher, for I cannot disbelieve what an apostle says, and my faith must rest on infallible testimony.

C. L.—My own mind is too much perplexed to continue the conversation farther at present, on this point.

S—I have just been advised that there is a stranger from another State who is to preach on the same subject next Sunday at 11 o'olock, whom they call a Campbellite. I have some curiosity to go and hear him; but I must confess, my mind is prejudiced against those people from what I have heard of them.

C. L.—And so is mine, but I am willing to accompany you; so if you are willing we will dismiss our conversation until we hear what he has to say.

D. P. H.

[To be continued.]

TO MY PATRONS.

This number closes the 12 volume of the Christian Messenger. I have been encouraged in the work, by the increasing demand for it; for my list of subscribers has been constantly augmenting. At the close of the volume, I am left considerably in debt, several hundred dollars for printing the Messenger, which I am entirely unable to pay. If my delinquent subscribers were to pay their dues, I should be able to satisfy the demands against me, and should still have as much left as would buy paper &c, to commence another volume, and for other purposes. Being disabled by paralysis from preaching and from manual labor, I was advised to purchase a press in company with a brother D. P. Henderson, and spend my time in editing the Messenger, and other works, which might be useful to the churches. I have done so, and that too contrary to my own faith, "to owe no man." My present embarrass-

ed situation detracts much from that composure of mind, I wish to enjoy in my last days.

Now brethren will you each one aid me immediately by paying, and remitting to me, through your post masters who are legally authorized to frank all such money? I know money is scarce, and hard to get; yet so small a sum for each to pay, cannot be oppressive, compared with the heavy debts I owe, chiefly on your account. Let each one determine, and determine *now*, and it will be done.

I cannot venture on another volume till I pay off past scores by your remittances, and receive from you a request to continue you as subscribers. This request must come franked by post masters, or postage paid. No letters to me will hereafter be received unless franked, or post paid. I may not be able to commence the 13th volume for 6 or 8 weeks. Perhaps sooner. I hope my agents, brethren and friends will exert themselves to obtain money for the past, and subscribers for the future. The work will be conducted as formerly, and the price the same—less if my patronage will justify it. Do help your afflicted old servant.

B. W. STONE.

P. S. Let all who send me letters, not paid, write their name on the sealed side of the letter.

B. W. S.

I acknowledged to Eld Bailey that I stood corrected in misquoting a certain text, Gal. iii. 26. I also justly blamed my printers for it. It was quoted correctly in the copy given to the printer. This acknowledgment was given in for the last No. but was crowded out with several other articles. B. W. S.

Those with whom we exchange will please discontinue until the receipt of our next number.

Our patrons will excuse us for the kind of covers accompanying this No., for we could not obtain covering paper.

Religious News.

Georgetown, Ky. Sept. 22, 1842

Beloved Bro. STONE—I have just returned home from Providence, not far from Lexington, where, in conjunction with our esteemed brethren, L. L. Pinkerton and Wm. Morton, we held a meeting of six days, which resulted in 33 accessions to the good cause. We had a most delightful meeting with the brethren. All hearts seemed to beat in unison for the good of the cause, and I trust the subject of evangelising will not be forgotten by them.

At our annual meeting a week before that, 9 additions were made at old Bethel, much to the joy of the saints. A few days before that, 4 were added in Georgetown by the labors of bro. Jno. A. Gano. The cause is prevailing every where, through the labors of our evangelists, and we need many more in the field. May the Lord bless you and yours.

Most affectionately, J. T. JOHNSON.

Henderson, Ky. Oct. 10, 1842.

Dear Father STONE—Brother Craig and myself commenced a meeting in Newburg, Ia. on Friday evening, 30th Sept. and continued until Wednesday night following. The result was forty-two accessions. Bro. Craig left for the town of Henderson, where he met with bro. E Goodwin, and where they labored until Lord's day night, and succeeded in removing a great deal of prejudice. I remained in Newburg until Lord's day, spoke twice a day, and gained 23 more, making in all 65. Of the above number, nine were from the Baptists, seven from the Methodists, three from the Presbyterians, and the balance from the world. The prospect good for many more. Yours in hope of eternal life.

R. B. ROBERTS.

Bro. Abner Davis of Washing, Ia. writes Oct. 4, 1842.—The truth is gaining every where. Within the last 5 weeks, about 120 valuable souls have been added to the Christian church here. Between 90 and 100 of that number were immersed, and the balance from the Baptists, restored, &c. Oh! it is a glorious time. Whole families have come in, old and young, rich and poor. Try to influence travelling preachers this way. We greatly need help. On the 14th inst. a protracted meeting will commence here. Eld. E. Goodwin and others will attend.

At a meeting of 3 days at Palmya, Mo. 2d Lord's day of October, bro. T. M. Allen, the principal speaker, 9 were added.

At a meeting of one day and two nights, at Waverly, in this county, Morgan, Ill. held a few days ago by bro. D. P. Henderson and others, 15 were added.

Bro. D. W. Elledge of Iowa, Louisa county, writes Oct. 6—I have lately immersed 8, and bro. H. Smith 2; and many prodigals are restored. We now number 50, and the prospect is good.

INDEX TO VOLUME XII.

	PAGE
Introduction	3
Gen. i. 26, 27	6
Genealogy of Christ	10
The name Jesus	11, 42
Plain thoughts and reply	17, 33
On worship	22
The Christian character	23
Queries and replies	45, 46, 81, 123, 149, 367
No harm meant	51
Non-essentials	53
1 Cor. vi. 3, 4	54
Feet washing	55
A convention	57, 193, 266
Statistics	62
Matt. v. 15. 17	65
A colloquy	67,309,326,339,353,379
Circular letters	70, 102, 189
The way of Salvation	75
Matt. v. 17, 19	87
W. P. Payne	92
Christian Expositor	97, 107, 170, 243, 261, 272
Christian Union	111
Reply to Eld Long	112, 208
Eld Bailey	117, 142, 161, 297, 332 368
Eld J. Creath	91, 122, 240, 263
Sectarianism	126
Duties of parents	128
Opposition of sects	134
Matt. x. 34, 37	130
Matt. xii. 43	141
Dedication of meeting houses	146
Sanctuary in winter	147
Owe no man	148
Causes of disunion	152
Different view	154
An extract	154
Co-operation	156
Eld Walter's journal	157
Minutes of Christian Conference	158
Eld T. M. Allen's letter & reply	165
Second coming of the Lord	166, 218
M. Winans letter	171
Reply to bro. Rawlings	173
Lost tribe of Israel	175
An extract	176, 231
Eld J. Rogers and reply	177
Letter to Editor	187
Obituaries	192
Suretyship	197
Christians holding civil offices	201
D. Purviance letter and reply	211
" "	225
Defamation	235
Spiritual influence	237
Letter to C. Hendrick	249
Faith and order	251
An ancient fragment	257
Reply to Mr Carter	274, 289, 321
" "	369
Trifles	279
Secrets against Christians	283
To Eld A. Campbell	296
Signs of the latter days	301, 363
To the readers of the Voice of Truth	311
To young Preachers	316
Pouring and sprinkling	332
Paul's sermon at Ephesus	335
The fear of God	359
Thoughts	360
Religious News at the end of each number	
To my patrons	381

LITERATURE
OF THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER by Barton W. Stone consists of 14 volumes, clothback binding, gold stamped, indexed and a total of 4,653 pages. It is a reprint of the famous restoration publications of this illustrious Kentucky reformer during the years of 1826-1844. #1844 (Complete Set) $125.00.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER by Alexander Campbell. 41 volumes—from 1830 to 1870. Index in each volume. Over 600 pages in 2 color hard-cover binding stamped in gold. #1529 — $350.00

T. M. ALLEN (Pioneer Preacher of Kentucky & Missouri) by Alvin Jennings. A biography of this great man of the Restoration Period. A good reference book or just an interesting story for your enjoyment. 224 pages. #1740 — $6.95.

THE SEARCH FOR THE ANCIENT ORDER. A two-volume work on the search for the landmarks of primitive Christianity covering 1849-1865 and 1866-1906, 358 and 468 pages respectively. By Earl Irvin West. Cloth $11.50 each.

16-Page Tracts
$5 per 100 — $45 per 1,000

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL — WHO WAS HE? by James Willcutt. The man and his cause. #269.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY by Alexander Campell. The biblical and reasonable justification of honorable public religious debate. #268.

ADD-RAN COLLEGE by Don H. Morris. The late long-time president of Abilene Christian University reviews incidents that led to division in the movement. #152

THE RESTORATION PRINCIPLE by Bill Humble. Unity and strict adherence to the Bible as the pattern for life and religion. #131

Star Bible & Tract Corp.
Fort Worth, Texas 76118