from Mt Vernon, Indiana, was with us. He preached three times on Lord's day, and once again last night. He starts homeward this morning. We anticipate a glorious triumph of truth here." Under date of June 26, he says, "I have written you an account of our meeting the Lord's day before the last. At our last meeting we also had four additions—two by letter and two by immersion. Praised be the name of the Lord! May his glorious truth triumph here—at Jacksonville, and every where! May God speed your editorial efforts to aid his cause."

W. H. HOPSON.

Rochester, June 22, '43.

Brethren STONE & HENDERSON—I have been constantly travelling for the last four months, in which time I have immersed between two hundred and fifty and three hundred persons. My labors have been very much scattered, and mostly at new points, where I have never labored before; but I feel very grateful that the 'gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes.' I met the brethren a few weeks ago in the town of Bloomington, McLean county, where we set together in a heavenly place in Christ Jesus. We had 29 additions during our meeting. Your Brother, W. P. BOWLES.

Bro. D. P. HENDERSON—Perhaps it will be gratifying to you and the readers of the Messenger, to learn how the work of the Lord is prospering in this section. I have been laboring the most of the time for three months past, in conjunction with brother Henry C. Voiles of Ia. There have been added near 30. We have labored mostly in Madison and Green counties—prospects are generally good.

July 20, '43. R. HUMPHRY.

Pittsfield, July 21, '43.

Bro. HENDERSON—On Monday last I went to Milton and spoke a number of times; during the meeting there were three confessions. The congregations in this place and Milton seem to be doing very well. Generally the brethren are walking in peace, love and union—attending regularly to the institutions of the Lord's house. They devote every Lord's day, from one and a half to two hours, in mutually instructing each other, by assembling in the form of a Bible class, and investigating certain portions of the word; a practice which, no doubt, would be profitable in our congregations, if well attended to. S. S. CHURCH.

Bethel, Morgan county, June 13, '43.

Brethren STONE & HENDERSON—The meeting that you referred to in the first number of the Messenger at this place, continued to progress until there were 45 additions by immersion, and two united that had been immersed before. Prospects are still very flattering here. This congregation now numbers eighty-two. Your brother, N. G. AVERITT.

Springfield, Ill. June 23, '43.

Dear Brethren STONE & HENDERSON—I have just retured from Peterburg where I was assisted by bro. A. J. Kane. Our meeting continued some 3 days. We had quite an interesting meeting. There were eight additions to the little church, six by immersion and two by letter. Much good I think could now be done at that place. Bro. Kane held a meeting some days on Wolf creek, and added 13 to the number of the faithful in that neighborhood. His meeting closed on the 22d inst.

Your brother in the good hope. J. P. LANCASTER.

The Christian Messenger.

VOL. XIII. August, 1843. NO. 4.

A PROTESTANT OPIATE.

The present aspects of the protestant world are any thing rather than pleasant. The protestants have swallowed an opiate administered by the wicked one, which has effectually lulled their senses to a sleepy repose, and caused them to dream pleasant dreams, and to see pleasant visions of transporting glory. These dreams and visions they tell, which become a source of comfort to their lethargic disciples, and the basis of calculating times and seasons. A few of these dreams I will notice, as a warning to a stupid world.

They have dreamed that the papal power is crippled, consuming and dying, and this monster—the man of sin, and dread of christendom, will soon expire to live no more. Their fears are lulled to rest, and they are carelessly borne down the rapid stream of time into the very vortex of destruction—the very jaws of the enemy, gaping wide to receive them—the very enemy, whose fall they are joyfully celebrating. They see not, that destructive wiley power, marching on with a steady step, and with increasing zeal, influence, and numbers. They are pouring their thousands of men and money into every land, especially into America, in order to accomplish one great end—the subjugation of the world under her domination and power. With Jesuitical craft they are establishing their public schools and colleges, and gaining the patronage of protestants, and men of no religious faith. Pompous advertisements of the merit of these institutions frequently appear in our journals, calculated to win the confidence of the unsuspecting community and to enlist their sympathies in favor of the *poor, wrongly*

persecuted papists. This is the *desideratum* of that power.

By the influence, the secret influence of this power, it is believed that the counsels of the English hierarchy are at present so divided—a part are led by the celebrated Pusey of Oxford (who may be a Jesuit in disguise) led to retrograde to the bosom of the old mother of harlots, and to unite under her blood stained banners against the protestant world. The contest is begun, and the result is dubious, probably, in favor of the old mother. Many of the Wesleyan Methodists in England, headed, probably, by a Jesuit in disguise, have become discontented with their ordination, as not coming in direct succession from the holy hands of Bishops down from the apostles. They have, therefore, declared in favor of a return into the bosom of the established church of England. It would not have been good policy to have persuaded the more enlightened, and spiritual Methodists to go at once like the Puseyites, into the bosom of the old mother, but first to unite with one of the elder daughters, and then to march hand in hand into Rome.

This invisible power may have caused the great agitations, and divisions, now being in the Kirk of Scotland. A mighty revolution is effected there. O'Connell of Ireland, as the restless humming-bird, is flitting from place to place instilling his spirit of opposition to the British government, into the listening multitudes of the Irish. That government stands in the way of the growth of popery. O'Connell is no fool; he well knows that Ireland alone cannot cope with the mighty power of Great Britain; and therefore we conclude that his boldness and threats are based upon the assurance of the co-operation of the papal powers in Europe.

The protestant world seems to be strangely infatuated, and under an illusion not easily accounted for. They seem to apprehend no danger, and therefore fear none, and will likely remain in this state till roused by the thrilling sound of danger, when too late to escape. The papal powers, conjoined with the Mormons, and all the disaffected to christianity, and civil liberty may

wave their banners over our land, and find the protesants in hostile bands fighting one against another. "Divided we fall." O wretched state! Are we prepared for the contest? for the faggot? for the horrid inquisition? The hypocrites, and insincere of every party, unable and unwilling to bear the fiery trial, will fly from their profession, and rally under the banners of Babylon. This may be the means of uniting the scattered family of Christ, and of purging the Sanctuary.

When the infuriated enemies of the real church of God shall be marshalled, and ready to strike the fatal blow, then shall appear the Son of Man in the clouds with power and great glory for the rescue of his people, and for the destruction of his enemies. Then shall the righteous dead be raised to life and immortality, and the living saints changed in a moment—in the twinkling of an eye. Then shall commence the millenium, and Christ shall reign with his saints on earth a thousand years. B. W. S.

For the Messenger.

ESSAY ON THE CLAIMS OF EVANGELISTS—NO. 2.

In my last number, I promised to shew, that the support of Evangelists is a matter of *justice; it is not almsgiving, nor charity.* We pay those who serve us in any way, or from whom we receive any consideration. We give alms to the needy, to beggars, from whom we have received nothing, nor do we expect to receive any thing from them. Evangelists are not beggars—they are not objects of charity. They are laborers, who reap our fields for us. They are our drudges—servants—who do the work of teaching our children, our families, our neighbors, the first principles of Christianity, which ought to have been done at home by Parents and heads of families—by mothers and grand mothers—as Lois and Eunice did Timothy. Is there any profession of men in society who render the same amount of good, and who get as little for it as do Evangelists? Human laws are no more than cob-webs without the sanctions of Christianity, which are pro-

claimed and enforced by Evangelists. But are not Evangelists themselves to blame, in part, for the brethren's remissness in this part of their duty? Have they not neglected to teach this part of the will of our master for fear that the brethren would say, they were preaching *for money*? How many discourses have been delivered lately on the ninth chapter of first Corrinthians? Paul said he had not *shunned* to declare all the counsel (Oracle) of God. Any man who would preach *for money* ought not to preach at all. How many are able to preach *without it*? If we had no preachers, but those who are both able and willing to do it for nothing—how many would we have? What would become of the world? They ought not to preach *for money*, nor ought they to do it *without money*. As we are bookmen, let us look at this long neglected chapter in the Book. Let us see whether Paul placed it on the footing of *justice* or *alms giving*. I gave so much, says one—rather say, I paid so much,—we give alms to beggars, not to laborers. Our Lord says, 'the laborer' (in the harvest field) 'is worthy of his hire.' Have we not a right (*exousia*) authority to demand a living, the necessaries and comforts of life from those for whom we labor? 1 Cor. ix. 4. Secondly; does not the common sense of all mankind say, that labors of all sorts, or classes, and soldiers, should be *paid* for their services? Who goes a warfare at any time at his own expense? Does a soldier provide his own (*opsonian*) victuals? Does he find himself clothes, victuals and money for his services, and risk his life and health to defend the life, liberty, families and property of other men, who are making money. and are in peace and security, *at his own charges?* No; he does not. Would such a course be unjust and wicked? Yes, it would. It is equally unjust and wicked to treat Evangelists so. Thirdly; who cultivates a vineyard, or a farm all the year, and does not think himself entitled to eat of the produce of the farm? No none. It is equally unreasonable to require a man to evangelize all the year in the community, and not sustain him and his family, while doing so. Fourthly; when a man

follows a flock all the year, and defends them from wolves and dogs, heals the sick and dying, and saves them, is it justice or alms giving for himself and family, to live and have a part of the flesh and its increase? It is justice and not charity, that he should be paid for sustaining the dews and scorching suns, and all the inclemencies of the seasons. In the same manner ought those who evangelize to be sustained. Do I say these things according to the reason and practice of men only? or does not the laws of Moses say the same things also? Yes the law of Moses says the same things. Thou shalt not muzzle the ox treading out the corn. In the eastern country they did not thrash out their wheat as we do—they tread it out with oxen. This is said to teach us what is due to our laborious Evangelists. This is his fifth argument, 'would it be unjust and *cruel* to muzzle the mouths of oxen all day long so that they could not eat any thing while treading out the wheat; it is equally *cruel* and wicked to treat our Evangelists so.' Paul, therefore, places the support of Evangelists,—first upon the Gospel of Christ. Secondly, upon the law of Moses. Thirdly, upon the common sense, the common justice, and the common practice of all nations, ancient and modern. He who *plows* and he who *threshes*, does it in hope that he and his family will receive food and wages—a house to live in, and clothes to wear. He who sowes spiritual things, ought to get such carnal things as these for the great good he does? Are not the mouths of some our Evangelists muzzled at this time? Will not our kind and liberal brethren go, as soon as they read this, pay and take the muzzle off and let them eat? Does God shew kindness and humanity to oxen, and will not Christians show the same to their Evangelists. Go my beloved brethren and do likewise. The Levites who waited at the altar, received the tenth part. Brethren, study, teach and practice the 9th of first Corinthians, and all the book. If those who teach sectarianism live by it, how much more should those who teach the New Testament. Mechanics of all sorts, farmers and professional men, all live by their la-

bor and talents; why should not Evangelists do the same? I speak to wise men, to good men, to Christians, surely brethren you will not need more than these two essays on this subject.

Paul says, 'he who labors in word and teaching, is to receive a double support,'—and some do not get one instead of two. Hark! 'The hire of the laborer who have reaped your fields, which is fradulently kept back by you, cries, and the cries of the reapers have entered into the ears of the Lord of Hosts; James v. 4; Levit. xix. 13; Duet. xxiv. 15. Will some brother preach from these passages. The Jews were forbid to keep the wages of the laborer by them all night.

Your bro. in the tribulation and patience of Christ.

J. CREATH, Jr.

CONVERSATIONS—No. 7.

CHRISTIAN. Another month is gone, never to return. It is now numbered with those beyond the flood. Time flies, Oh how swiftly! "we take no note of time but from its loss: to give it then a tongue is wise in man." Shall we my dear friend forget the past, improve the present and prepare for the future? With the loss of time, have we not lost much? What so precious as time, in our probation? I am glad to see you, very glad indeed.

CLASS LEADER. Many of our friends now sleep with the month that has gone. They have left us.—Oh! shall we ever see them? Shall we meet them around the burning throne of Heaven's eternal King to join them again in praising through eternity, God and the Lamb?

C. Yes, my dear friend, if we "*Obey from the heart*" the Gospel of Jesus Christ, walk in the light, as he is in the light, we shall reach the golden beach of immortality, and strike hands with all who have died in Jesus. Transporting thought! What a pity it is that we are so divided—so disunited—so discordant—in our views about Jesus and his holy religion! I often think of what old Father Wesley says in his preface

to the notes on the new translation he made of the New Testament. Says he, "would to God that all the party names, and unscriptural phrases and forms, which have divided the Christian world, were forgot: and that we might all agree to sit down together, as humble, loving disciples, at the feet of our common Master, to hear his word, to imbibe his spirit, and to transcribe his life in our own!" I will add, would to God that the hearts of all who profess to follow Wesley, were as deeply imbued with the spirit of union as he has expressed!

C. L. Wesley was pious and labored to benefit the world of mankind. His desire for Christian union was strong and I can say Amen, to the sentiment you have quoted from his writings. I think every lover of the bible feels the same in his heart. Allow me to return you the "DOCTRINAL TRACTS," which you kindly loaned me, with my thanks for the use of them.

C. Shall we now examine the treatise on baptism written by Mr. Wesley? I wish for us to close our examination on the subject of baptism, so that we can spend some time investigating other important topics connected with christianity.

C. L. I am now prepared to examine Mr. Wesley's views of baptism as exhibited in the Doctrinal tracts, and although my mind is not fully made up on the subject, yet I think I understand more about the design of the institution than I ever did before.

C. Mr. Wesley asks first "what are the benfits we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered." "And the first of these is, the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death." page 246. Are these your sentiments?

C. L. The subject of Original sin, I do not understand as presented by Mr. Wesley. He may or may not be right; but I have never fully believed that children would be lost because Adam transgressed. Mr. Wesley teaches, I know, that Original sin cleaves to every child of man, and that Infants are guilty of Original sin, and says, in the ordinary way they cannot

be saved without baptism. This Doctrine I cannot receive, because I think it wants the sanction of scripture.

C. We will waive the examination of Original sin at this time, and proceed to Mr. Wesley's second point.

C. L. Paul in reasoning with the saints at Rome shows conclusively to my mind, that death was caused by Adam's disobedience, and that all must die, but he *nowhere* affirms, that Infants must believe or repent or do any thing else to entitle them to heaven. JOHN says, "*sin is the transgression of law*" and I would ask what law did an Infant ever transgress?

C. Your Discipline teaches the same idea that Mr. Wesley has advanced, when it is treating of Infant baptism, and it is the doctrine of the Methodist church that Infants must be baptised to bring them into covenant relation with God.

C. L. This is contending more strongly for baptism than you have done, although it is often asserted, that you make baptism every thing almost in a man's salvation.

C. I know very well, that almost all the sects, contend more strongly for baptism than the word of God authorizes, and yet we are stigmatised because we contend for what Jesus says—the institution is ridiculed and Heaven's authority set at naught by some of the "*called and sent*" doctors of sectarianism.—Consistency what a jewel though art!!

C. L. I am sorry that preachers pursue such a harsh and unkind course in their declamations against those who may differ from them. It is ruining the world. The moral and religious sentiments of mankind in some places, are becoming more corrupt, and the Lord only knows what the end of such things will be. For my part I fear the result will be awful to many dreaming enthusiasts and heated bigots, who stir the flame of party spirit.

C. But just, as your reflections are, and well timed too, still I fear, our conversation will leave Mr. Wesley, the Doctrinal Tracts, and the subject of baptism,

unless we return and take up some more of his points. The second point brought up in reference to the benefit we receive by baptism is, says he, "By baptism we enter into covenant with God," &c. By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members, of Christ, its head." "By baptism we who were by nature children of wrath, are made the children of God." page 248. "This is grounded on the plain word of our Lord." "Except a man be born again of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. John iii. 5. By water then as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again." page 249. Again says he, "In consequence of our being made children of God, we are heirs of the Kingdom of heaven." "Baptism doth now save us, if we live answerable thereto; if we repent, believe, and obey the gospel: supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, so into glory hereafter" page 249. But I have read enough. What say you now to Father Wesley's views of baptism? If he were here preaching such sentiments he would be called any thing else by many, but a christian. He would certainly be called a Campbelite.

C. L. I understand most of the points you have read, and most of them I think true. Indeed, all of them may be true; but I still cannot comprehend how baptism makes a man a child of God. The Discipline of our church, says, that it is a wholesome doctrine and full of comfort that we are justified by faith only. Now, if justification is by faith alone, then baptism has nothing to do with it. If a man is justified he is certainly a *child* of God, and that too without baptism.

C. But you must remember that John Wesley is higher and better authority than the discipline. The discipline is only an effect, while Wesley is the cause, and as the cause is always superior to the effect, so in this case, The DOCTRINAL TRACTS, must take the preeminence. And not only so, but the Discipline flatly contradicts the word of the Apostle James, who says chap. ii. 24. "Ye see then how that by works a man

is justified and not by faith only." Your difficulty then must vanish at once, if you are willing to believe the highest evidence Methodism can give, and the word of inspiration.

C. L. I cannot see what connexion there is between an outward ordinance and the inward change, which every child of God experiences, when they become an heir to eternal life. Whenever a person is changed, then they become children.

C. Of this, there can be no doubt, if the change is according to the will of God. But what constitutes the change? Is it a class of feelings which a person experiences, that constitutes the change? Most surely not. The feelings are only an effect, while that which produces the change, is the cause. The Savior says, as quoted by Mr. Wesley, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom.' John iii. 5. What must be done now to bring about this change? He *cannot*, says Jesus enter into the Kingdom without a birth of water and spirit. If he is not in the kingdom, he is not a child. He is not an heir to the inheritance of the Saints.

C. L. Still, I am left in the dark, in regard to the change effected by Baptism. I can see no connection between water and my heart--between the water of baptism and the pardon of sins.

C. There may be a thousand things that you can see no connection between, and yet all of them important. Let me present this subject before your mind as plain as I can, and I think you and old Father Wesley still can get along together, at least in the main. First, the sinner is commanded to believe with all his heart that God exists and is a rewarder of all those who diligently seek him. That Jesus Christ is God's own Son, who suffered, died, was buried and rose again according to the scriptures, and now lives at the right hand of the majesty on high, to grant repentance and remission of sins. He is, in the second place, commanded to repent of all his sins, to cease to do evil and learn to do well. To break off his sins by righteousness and come to Jesus for life. To take the yoke of

Christ upon him, and learn of him who was meek and lowly, &c. This has produced a most wonderful change in the man. Things he once loved he now hates. Those he once hated he now loves. He is changed. Ah, how changed! Still he is not born into the kingdom; the entire change which makes him a child has not taken place. He has now the power to become a son. What is he now to do? Says Jesus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom." The sinner is now baptized. He has the word of Christ for it, that his sins are all pardoned--that he is now a child of God. "Because you are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father." Gal. iv. What, you ask, is the connection between baptism and the pardon of sin? I now answer, the WORD of Jesus. This is the connecting link that will yet shake heaven and earth, and will hurl all the disobedient into everlasting chains of darkness.

C. L. Enough, enough--I ask no more--the word of Jesus is sufficient. D. P. H.

THE NAMES AND TITLES GIVIEN IN THE SCRIPTURES TO THE SON OF GOD.

Continued from page 43.—

APOSTLE.

"Consider the Apostle—of our profession." Heb. 3. 1.

The word *apostle* signifies one sent by another. Christ is the apostle, sent by the Father. "We have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." 1 John 3: 14.

2. Divine love moved the Father to send him. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," &c.—"In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and

sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John 4: 9, 10.

3. The world was the object of God's love, and to the world was the Son sent from heaven as a Savior. "I am come a light into the world that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." John 12: 46. "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." John 6: 38.

4. The love and favor of God the Father was the origin and spring of the whole scheme of redemption to the world. This caused him to will good concerning us, and to send his Son to execute his good will towards us. John 16: 28.

5. For what purpose was the Son sent into the world? This is an important question, and demands our serious attention. He himself declares the purpose. John 3: 16, 17. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world, to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." This appears to have been the theme of apostolick preaching. "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son, to be the Savior of the world."—These two ideas, salvation and life, seem to embrace all the purposes of his being sent into the world, though these purposes are expressed in different words; as to redeem, to reconcile, to bless, to preach the gospel—to bear witness to the truth, raise the dead, &c.—To save from sin, the love, power, practice, and effects of sin, and to give eternal life, was the purpose of the Father in sending him into the world.

But there is a condition, which must be performed by us before we become partakers of salvation and life. This condition is obedience to the law of faith. Of this we have spoken already in the Messenger.

B. W. S.

CHRIST.

This is a very common title of the Son of God. It is a Greek word and signifies *anointed*. In the Hebrew

he is called Messiah, which signifies the same thing. Under the law; kings, prophets and priests were anointed with oil by divine command, by which ordinance they received authority to act in those several offices. Though they were called the Lord's Messiah or anointed; though his people were so called, yet they were only typical of the Lord Jesus and his people, who were to come in the last days. Jesus was anointed with the oil of gladness—the Holy Spirit, which was the antitype of the oil under the law; by this was conferred on him, the offices of prophet, priest and king. By this same oil of gladness, or the Holy Spirit, the children of God are anointed. "But ye have an unction from the Holy one, and ye know all things. But the anointing which ye have received of him, abideth in you.—1 John 2: 20, 27. How applicable is the name *Christians*, given them by divine authority! *anointed ones*. If the Lord's people were of old, in the very infancy of religion, called *Christ* or anointed, as Heb. 11: 26, how much more properly now may they be thus called? 1 Cor. 12: 12, especially when God himself has sanctioned the name by divine authority. Acts 20: 26.

By the anointing Jesus received, he was not only authorized to act in the offices to which he was appointed, but was perfectly qualified to fulfil all to perfection.

B. W. S.

THE BREAD OF GOD.

John 6. 51, 53. "I am the living Bread that came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world—Jesus saith unto them, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood ye have no life in you.—My flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed, &c."

This language was very offensive to the carnal Jews. How can this man give us his flesh to eat? said they; and from that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.—He did not mean they were literally to eat his flesh, and literally to drink his

blood. For, said he, the flesh profiteth nothing; i. e. If you were to eat all my flesh literally, it would be of no spiritual benefit. It is the spirit that quickeneth. Were you to drink all my blood, it would profit you nothing—it would not wash away one sin. "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." The poor Papists think the eucharistic bread and wine are converted into the real body and blood of Christ. What if they were, would this profit them? Jeremiah (chap. 15: 16) said, "Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart." Do we suppose that the prophet literally ate the words written with ink and pen, and the parchment upon which they were written? And would this have given him joy and rejoicing of heart? No. It was the truth revealed by the words that produced this joyful effect in his heart. It was intellectual food. So the literal flesh and blood of Jesus, if literally eaten and drunk would produce no spiritual effect. It is the divine truth revealed by his flesh and blood that cheers the heart. This is intellectual food. How then are his flesh and blood meat and drink?

1. The flesh of Jesus, his lungs, his tongue and lips were the organs, by which he spoke the words of eternal life to men. The mysteries of God were revealed the way of salvation was made known, the love of God to man was manifested, the fountain of grace burst forth to the world from his lips, the world of glory—the heaven of eternal life and immortality was discovered, and the resurrection from the dead plainly revealed. O what delicious food! What joy and rejoicing of heart does it produce! What life to the believing soul! Evermore give us this bread—this spiritual bread—this soul quickening food! "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and life."

2. The flesh of Jesus is food, is meat and drink, because when we see him we see the Father in him—not the being or substance of the Father; that is invisible by mortal eyes; but we see the glory of God in the face of Jesus—we see the image of the invisible God

shining in his Son—we see the very character of God in him. All that was necessary to be known of God by man, is manifested in Jesus—in the flesh. His almighty power is seen in the miracles and wonders performed by Jesus, for it is not I that speak, but the Father in me, he doeth the works.—The love, mercy, grace, truth and benevolence, which flowed from his heart and lips—what are they? God speaking by his Son! Does Jesus weep over a dying world? It is the compassion, and pity of God weeping in flesh. If you would know the Father, look at the Son—there you see his express image. He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and if ye had known me ye should have known my Father also. Here, indeed, is soul reviving food—the food of angels—food for eternity! and this too in the flesh of Jesus.

3. The flesh of Jesus dying on the cross is meat indeed, and his blood shed there is drink indeed. It was seen necessary in the infinite wisdom of God that his son should die for the salvation of the world from sin, death, and the power of the devil; and in order that he might die, he must be made flesh—take flesh and blood such as the children had, subject to the same infirmities, to sufferings and death. "He was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death," i. e. in order that he might suffer death; for without such a body as the children had, he could not have suffered nor could the immortal angels. But "through his death he destroyed (brought to nought) him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and delivered them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage." By his death the resurrection was procured, and secured. If Christ be not risen from the dead, then they that are fallen asleep have perished, shall never more arise from the dead—shall never live again. The resurrection from the dead was one great end of his death. Jesus said, "I lay down my life that I might take it again. i. e. I die for this purpose, that I may rise from the dead, and thus secure the resurrection of men. "He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification"—our justification

from the condemnation of the one offence of Adam, which brought death upon all. When he had said, I lay down my life that I might take it again, he added, 'This commandment have I received from my Father.' When, therefore, he died and rose again, it was a part of that obedience to the Father, by which *the many* are raised from the dead, who were by the disobedience of the first Adam doomed to die. He was obedient unto death.

Had not Christ have risen from the dead, his death, would have been of no avail to the world. "If Christ be not risen from the dead your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins—our preaching is vain, yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ." Some place the whole of our salvation from sin in the blood or death of Christ, as by it, were satisfied all the demands of law and justice against us. These are not once named in the scriptures. But the death of Christ is of no avail to us, disconnected with the resurrection. "For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life," i. e. by his resurrection, "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea *rather* that is risen from the dead." On the resurrection is laid the emphasis of our justification.

Much plausible, but vain philosophy has been introduced to the annoyance of religion on two questions. Why did the disobedience of the first Adam to a positive, not a moral, precept being death upon all mankind? and, why by the obedience of the second Adam to a positive, not a moral precept, that he should die and rise again, was brought the resurrection to life to all mankind? As the reason for his conduct in these things God has not revealed to us, we should not invent reasons, but say with the Savior in another case, "Even so Father for so it seemed good in thy sight." It is revealed as his will, and that should satisfy us. That it was the will of God that Jesus should die and rise again is constantly declared. The Father with infinite ease could have rescued him from death; but

his will was that he should die and rise again. "He spared not his own Son, but freely delivered him up for us all." He will knew, *foreknew* that wicked hands would take and crucify his Son, yet according to his inscrutible *counsel* he delivered him up into wicked hands to put him to death; determining 'to make the wrath of man praise him'—to make the death of his Son the destruction of death itself to all that obey him—to overturn the kingdom of the devil, and destroy the reign of sin—to bring life and immortality to the world.

In the flesh of Jesus on the cross we see sin condemned. No where else can we see it exhibited in darker colors. It wreaked its fury upon the most holy, lovely, innocent person, on whom the sun ever shone. It would not permit him to live, who came in love to give life to the world—it was callous to pity, unmoved by his groans which even penetrated to the heart of creation; nothing less than his blood--his life, could allay its vengeance, or unnerve the arms of wicked hands, guided by the monster sin. If sin in the wicked thus hated and persecuted the very image of God, would it not dethrone and annihilate the majesty of the universe, had it only power?

In the flesh of Jesus, on the cross especially, we see the love and grace of God pre-eminently displayed. "God has commended his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us," and "He by the grace of God tasted death for every man." Not that he died to procure the love and grace of God to us; for it was the love and grace of God that led him to the cross--not that he died to make a way for the love and grace of God to come to the salvation of the world, for the love and grace of God gave him up to die.

O the sweet wonders of his love!
The Lord of glory dies for man!

In his flesh and blood on the cross, we see a foundation laid for full salvation, redemption, pardon, justification, sanctification and glorification, to a fallen world. Here then is soul satisfying food, as boundless as our wants, and as lasting as eternity.

4. In the flesh of Jesus, buried and risen from the dead, we have already seen what divine good is afforded to believers to quell their fears of death and the grave, to raise their hopes above the tomb, and with joy to grasp immortality and eternal life. "O death, where is thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?" Thanks be to God that giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

5. In the flesh of Jesus ascended, immortal, to die no more, is divine food to all eternity. "As I live so shall you also live." As I live in immortality, so shall you—I live forevermore; so shall you—I live in glory and honor; so shall you—as I live in eternal bliss; so shall you. Enough! Enough!! What shall we render to the Lord for all these gracious benefits? Eternity, eternity will be too short for us to pay that debt of love and praise so justly due.

Here Lord, we give ourselves away,
'Tis all that we can do.

B. W. S.

AM I A CHILD OF GOD?

Nothing is more common among professors of the present day, than to hear them expressing their doubts and fears, in relation to their acceptance with God. With every class, there seems to be successively, 'seasons of refreshing,' and periods of langor and stupor. How often do we hear the following sentiment,

"'Tis a point I long to know
Oft it causes anxious thought,
Do I love the Lord or no,
Am I his or am I not?"

Do I sincerely love the Lord? Am I really his? Am I of God? are questions around which doubt, and uncertainty seem to cluster. In a very ancient, and valuable document, which I have in my possession, written near eighteen centuries since, there is an infallible rule given, by which the above queries can be easily and definitely answered.

Before I proceed to give the above rule, I shall acquaint my readers with an answer, which I heard given, not long since, by a Preacher of considerable

notoriety. 'We know' said he, 'that we have been pardoned by *the Spirit of God within us.*' No man can know that his pardon is sealed, no not an angel in Heaven, until God reveals it unto him. 'The pardoned man reasons thus,' continued he,' 'whereas before I felt condemned, I did not rejoice, I did not love God; and now I *feel* acquitted, and rejoice in the love of God shed abroad in my heart; I know that a change must have taken place, and I know I must be pardoned."

I shall not stop here, to show how this preacher *contradicted* himself, in first making the knowledge of our adoption depend upon a *direct revelation from God*, and in the *next breath* upon our *feelings*; but I will leave it to the reader, to determine its scripturality, by contrasting this sentiment, with the rule which I shall now give. 1 John iv. 6. 'We (the apostles) are of God, he who knows God hearkens to us; he who is not of God, hearkens not to us.' By this we know the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error. There is no longer room for doubts in reference to this subject. Do you hearken to the Apostles of the Lamb? then you are of God. Do you refuse to hearken? you are *not* of God. And in thus refusing to hear the Apostles, you refuse to hear both the Father, and the Son, for, says the Savior, Luke x. 16. 'He that despiseth you despiseth me, and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.' If you reject the Apostles, and their teaching, you reject the Son, and in rejecting the Son, you reject the Father, and therefore cannot claim to be, indeed are not, the sons of God; for it was *only* to those who *received him*, the Savior gave power to become *sons*. John i. 12.

Let us again refer to this infallible rule, and determine whether we have passed from death unto life, and been adopted sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. 1 John iii. 14 and v. 3. 'We *know* that we have passed from death unto life *because* we *love* the brethren.' It is not a matter of supposition, or conjecture, but of knowledge. But the question is, do *I love* the *brethren*? How may I know when I possess that disinterested love and affection for them required in the New Testament? 'By this we *know* that we

love the children of God, (the brethren) when we love God.' But yet another question arises, and when that is answered, the matter will be settled. How shall I know when I love God? If I could answer that, then I should certainly know whether I have passed from death unto life. 'For this *is the love of God,* that ye *keep his commandments.*' 'He that hath my commandments and *keepeth* them, *he* it is that *loveth* me.' 'If a man *love* me, *he will keep* my commandments.' 'Ye are my friends, if you *do* whatsoever I command you.' Thus the question is answered. We know we *love* God when we *obey* him.

I will throw this rule into a syllogistic form, that it may be more forcibly impressed on the mind of the reader.

'We *know* we have *passed* from death unto life *because we love the brethren.*

We *know* that we *love* the brethren, *because we love God.*

We *know* that we love God, *because we keep his commandments.*

Therefore we know that we have *passed from death unto life, because* we *keep* the commandments of God.

CLEMENT.

TYRANNY.

A fair specimen of tyranny, will be seen in the following, sent us not long since for publication. With many of the names signed to the letter below, we have been long familiar. They are of the very first standing in society, and we regard the course pursued towards them, too tyranical to pass in silence. We do not pretend to justify or condemn, save in this, that without the means of self defence it appears they were thrust out of the church, contrary to the word of God.

EDITOR.

TO THE BAPTIST PUBLIC.

The fact that 21 female members of the First Baptist Church of Lexington have been excluded from that Church, makes it necessary that they should, in self-defence, publish a true statement of the transaction. The facts of the case, then, are these. The Church was declining; the members were not harmonious; and our number gradually but steadily diminishing. We believed that this state of things was in part at least, attributable to the Pastor, and that but for him peace might be restored, and prosperity return to us. We therefore caused the following letter to be written, which was handed to Mr. Broaddus on the afternoon of the 10th inst.

DEAR BROTHER:—We the undersigned members of the First Baptist Church in Lexington, deeply mourn for the desolation of Zion. Ichabod is written upon the walls. The cause of God is standing still. Sinners are going to judgment without an advocate; and saints that should be the salt of the earth, are spending the Lord's time that should be most sacredly used to promote his kingdom, in biting and devouring one another, without a peace-maker. Although so great a blessing is attached to that character, no one is emulous to obtain either its honor or its blessing. No! the whole church appears emulous to obtain the curse: to have the honor of saying the most bitter things.—'Cursed is he that sows discord among the brethren.' And where is the communion of saints, that sweet, soul-ravishing, highest of all enjoyments, next to God himself? Is it to be found nowhere but at the Lord's table? Our spiritual interests, too, are so prostrated, that we cannot raise our affections to the enjoyment of communion with God; and we are compelled to take up the lamentation of the church of old: "Woe is me, for I am as the grape-gleaning of the vintage, though we desired (and expected) the first ripe fruits."

"But for Zion's sake we will not hold our peace with God until he shall make Jerusalem a praise in the earth." And for Zion's sake we will not hold our peace (with you) to shew you that the Gospel by your ministration is powerless to all your hearers. Sinners are not convinced, saints are not edified; for although it has been a fine sermon, all devotion is left at the church door. The Lord is not blessing your labors.—There is an Achan somewhere; for after a three years' experiment, the church is in a much worse state than you found it, and much worse than it ever was.

In consideration of this awful state of things, we have thought proper to request you will resign your

Pastoral Charge. It is not yourself or any other individual that is the subject of our agonized feelings; it is Zion, poor bleeding Zion; the reproaches of those that say, "Ah, ah, so would we have it;" "where is now thy god?" The cause of Christ is blasphemed through us among the Gentiles, and Christ is wounded in the house of his friends. And will you be indifferent to this great evil? Are your own views and feelings so sacred, that you cannot deny yourself and relinquish your prospects and prepossessions, even though you should be righteous in this case, (which is very problematical?) Can you not suffer loss for the cause of Christ? Did not your suffering Savior deny himself, when agonizing in the garden? "Not my will, but thine, be done." As you are a disciple of his, surely you will not hesitate to imitate so perfect a copy, so benevolent and so condescending as to take upon himself the form of a servant for you? And if so for Christ's sake, so for the disciples' sake, for they are all one. We beseech you, we entreat you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the peace, for the fellowship of his cause and the honor of Zion, that you will have a sympathetic respect, not only for the feelings, but for the spiritual interest, of perhaps some 30 of the Church, who cannot profit under your ministry; and as Brother SEDWICK has nobly and generously done, when he discovered dissatisfaction among his people.

May the Lord deliver you and us from all unholy selfishness and prepossessions, and regenerate our corrupt hearts, that we may be willing to be any thing or nothing, so that we may push forward the Redeemer's Kingdom, the conversion of sinners, and the peace, comfort and establishment of Zion; is our prayer for Christ's sake. AMEN.

Nancy Kirkpatrick,	Mary A. Elliott
Lucretia Hoagland,	Mary L. Drake,
Cornelia Hoagland,	Martha Ann Miller,
Sarah A. Kirkpatrick	Rebecca Rucker,
Mary K. Kirkpatrick,	Sarah Noble,
Hannah Drake,	Agnes Wiseman,
Julia Thompson,	Polly McMain

Sally Downing,	Jemima Gordon,
Matilda Scott,	Susannah W. Richardson,
Ann B. Drake	Susan A. Richardson,

Elizabeth Love.

At 8 o'clock the same evening, our church meeting convened. After the regular business had been gone through, Mr. Broaddus produced the letter we had written, and after having read it publicly, made an inflammatory address against us to the church, refused our request, and concluded by urging us to withdraw our names from the paper, and threatening, in case we failed to do so, that we should sorely repent it. Mr. Mixer then offered two resolutions: one of which declared that our procedure in presenting this request to the Pastor tended to schism; and the other that we should be excluded. These resolutions, we have been informed, were drafted by Mr. Broaddus, and copied by Mr. Mixer before coming to the meeting. A motion was then made that the business be laid over to the next meeting; but the majority voted it down. Mr. Brent moved and urged the appointment of a committee to wait on us and if possible to reclaim us.—The moderator, Mr. Broadus, declared the motion out of order, and refused to entertain it. Some of us stated that we were willing to assign our reason for our procedure to a committee; but we were not permitted to defend ourselves, except publicly, and before the whole audience, which of course we could not do. Mr. Broaddus then took the vote on the resolutions, and they were carried; and thus in a few hours after our letter was handed to him, we were cast off from the church.

We hereby solemnly enter our protest against the course of the majority, for the following reasons; 1st, Because it is a violation of our Church rules, which require that due notice and opportunity of defence be allowed the accused. 2nd, Because some of us were absent from the meeting, and were excluded without even our knowledge. 3d, Because the gospel steps were not taken to reclaim us if we were in error; and, 4th, Because we solemnly declare before God,

that our object in signing and delivering that paper, was not schism, but the pacification of the church.

And has it come to this? Have Baptists become such slaves to their PASTORS, that they dare not express a desire for the removal of a preacher, (even although they believe such removal essential to the interests of the Savior's kingdom,) without incurring the penalty of excommunication? Is not this lording it over God's heritage? This is not, cannot be, 'bound in heaven.' God is offended with his people when they act thus; and we cherish the belief that good men will disapprove it.

We are Baptists—Baptists in our faith, in our practice, and in our affections. We have never been contentious in the church. Some of us have for many, many long years, filled our places in the house of God, and have stood by the Baptist cause in Lexington in its deepest adversity. And shall we now be deprived of that name? Shall we now, without just cause, be cut off from the fellowship we love? Is the heaviest punishment the church can inflict, to be visited on us for the faithful performance of what we believed to be a sacred duty? Read again our letter to Mr. Broaddus, for which he would exclude us. There is nothing harsh, nothing unchristian in its temper or language; and pronounce upon us the verdict 'GUILTLESS.' Do more—right this wrong, redress this grievance. You have the power. Only publicly express your disapprobation of all such oppressive measures; only discountenance them, from whatever source they may proceed, and you must prevail. We appeal to you, to ministers, to people, to the denomination at large. And may God keep from you the bitter cup of which we have been constrained to drink.

CREEDS.—No. I.

We think it important, that the subject of human laws or creeds, made to govern the Church of Christ, should undergo an examination, and the impiety of the same duly exposed. Without the sects will

abandon their Creeds and formularies, there never can be union. No never. The Baptists never will subscribe to the Presbyterian Confession. The New School, never will subscribe to the dogmas of the Old, and vice versa. All admit that Jesus Christ prayed for union. That the Apostles have taught it and enforced it. All admit that if we ever land in heaven, we shall be *one* there, and surely we should be *one*, while in this world. As we are charged by our friends with having a creed in our heads, we extract the following arguments from "a plea for the Bible alone to govern the Christian Church," by Jacob Creath Jun. to which we invite the attention of all our readers.

D. P. H.

"We shall use the word creed, in its usual and popular acceptation. Judge Blackstone, says it is the usual or common signification of a word that determines its meaning. Words are the stipulated signs of ideas. Ideas are clothed with words, as our bodies are with garments. Webster defines the word creed to be a brief summary of the articles of Christian faith. The popish Manual, contains a brief summary of the Catholic faith: The Episcopal Prayer Book, contains a brief summary of the faith of the Church of England: The Westminster Confession of Faith, contains a brief summary of the Presbyterian faith—it is styled 'the Constitution of the Presbyterian church in the United States.' The London and Philadelphia Confessions of Faith contain a brief summary of the Baptist's faith: And the Discipline contains a brief summary of the faith of the Methodist Episcopal church—according to the above great names of Blackstone and Webster. A creed, according to them, and the above illustrations, is a *visible—tangible—written and printed book*—set forth to the world by each of the above named and highly respectable and numerous denominations, as a brief summary of their respective faiths.

The English word *Creed*, is derived from the Latin verb *Credo*, I believe—and from the Saxon word *Creda*, I believe. According to the above popular use of the word *Creed*, a man's writings are not his creed—his sermon is not his creed—his views are not a creed.

Calvin's institutes are not the Creed of the Presbyterian church--but the longer and shorter catechisms. Wesley's sermons and writings, are not the Creed of the Methodists'--but a book called the Discipline. Gill's and Fuller's writings are not the Creed of the Baptists --but the London and Philadelphia Confessions of Faith. We do not call the sermons, nor the discourses, nor the writings of one man, the creed of a denomination--but a brief summary put forth by the whole fraternity. According to Webster, these denominations have not their creeds in their heads, nor in their pockets--but in a printed book. This is a fair and common sense meaning of the word *Creed.* There was no Hume's History of England, nor Gibbon's History of the fall of Rome, before they were written, printed, and circulated. They were not called *Histories,* while they were in their author's *heads*--but when they became *visible* and *tangible.* A man cannot carry Hume's History in his head. The word Creed, is a definite and clearly defined word, as much so as the word history, chair, table, or house. A person cannot carry a Creed, nor any of the above named things, in his head. A creed must be written, printed, visible and tangible; so that it may be examined and appealed to by the denomination who set it forth, and by the public. So much, therefore, for the popular meaning of the word creed. And, according to this broad and popular meaning of the word creed, the denomination to which the author of this Essay belongs, has no creed—if it has, he has not seen it, nor heard of it. And if our denomination had a written and printed creed, that would not prove that it was right to have creeds--two wrongs cannot make one right--two blacks cannot make one white.

"The next question is--are the above creeds authorized by the word of God--the Bible—or are they made by human authority? We say they were made by poor, fallible man. Let him that says they are authorized by the sacred writings, point us to thus saith the Lord--you shall have a brief summary of faith. This the advocates of creeds are bound to do. Protestants, in their discussions with Catholics, about the utility of the

Mass, the Cross, and the Pope's supremacy, say 'give us apostolic precept or example for these things, and we will have them too.' James, the Apostle, says there is one lawgiver, who is able to save the obedient, and to destroy the disobedient. Reader, how many do you say there are--one or four--one or fifty? Is the Pope the one lawgiver? or is it Luther. or Calvin, or Wesley? We say it is Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

REFLECTIONS OF OLD AGE.

1st. The present generation should profit from the experience and observations of the generation last preceding.

2nd. I never yet have seen the man, elected to Congress, or to a State Legislature, that returned home a better man, more religiously disposed and religiously engaged. On the contrary, if they had been religious before, they returned less so, barren and dead to God, and divine things.

3rd. I never saw a man seek for, and obtain an office of state whether in the civil or military departments who became more piously disposed, and religiously inclined and engaged. On the contrary his religious affections were cooled, and his religious activity paralyzed.

4. I have never seen a man much engaged in politics and religion at the same time. As he advanced in the spirit of the former, he declined in the spirit of the latter, and vice versa.

5. Must we conclude from these facts, that our Congress and State legislatures, are schools of corruption and demoralization?—that the departments of state are nurseries of vice and irreligion?—and that the politics of the day are in opposition to the politics of heaven? —Dreadful conclusion! yet how can we evade it, with such facts in view?

6. Are we not tempted to think that the whole foundation of all human, civil and military governments, is built upon the sand, and that they must ultimately fall?

7. Was not the first organized government a pure theocracy?—God by Moses was the only lawgiver—the judge, and executive. Every different department was filled by men of the Jewish religion according to God's appointment. The nation were not permitted to change their government—to add to, or diminish from the laws given by God—to appoint judges from any other nation than the Jews. They, it is true, changed their executive,—they would have a king; but from that day they never were the same united, devoted people.

8. Their laws and government were changed at last by God himself; he having appointed his Son, Jesus Christ, Lord of all: him we are now to hear and him to obey. He is Lord not only of the Jews but also of the Gentiles, of all nations. To him is given authority over all flesh—he is the one—the only lawgiver of all—of the whole world. All, Jews and Gentiles are under his government, and bound to obedience to his laws. They are not to add to, nor diminish from, his laws—they must not change his government, but submit to it cheerfully, fully, and cordially. Were all to do this, peace, love and harmony would unite, and keep united the now jarring, wretched world. All would become christians indeed—the earth would be full of the glory of the Lord; as the waters cover the sea—the will of God would be done on earth, as it is done in heaven. It would be heaven on earth.

9. Our government is a pure monarchy; Jesus being appointed Lord of all, the only law-giver of the world. While he reigned and ruled alone in the first centuries of the world, religion in her loveliest forms dwelt on earth; but in the fourth century, the christians became dissatisfied with their government, and desired a change, and a change they must have—not the common people, for they still heard him gladly; but the leaders seduced the people, and yoked them in bondage and led them from the good and the right way.

The leaders thought there was no king in Zion, he was in heaven; they must have one near them to go before them. His government of course must be

changed—a vicegerent must dwell amongst them. They—the clergy, changed the laws and government of the king of Zion at the council of Nice, A. D. 325, and the many took the government from the shoulders of Zion's, king and laid it on their own. Zion must have a visible God or king to go before them. This was the beginning of Israel's fall, when Moses was so long concealed in mount Sinai, and they "wot not what had become of him," they made a molten-calf as a god to go before them, and to be among them. So, in the days of Samuel, they said, "Make us a king that may judge us like all the nations." They by this rejected God from being king. So did the clergy, reject Jesus Christ from being king, when they changed his government, and assumed it to themselves, and finally put it on the shoulders of one man, the Pope—the man of sin who is seated in the temple of God, claiming to be the vicegerent of the king of Zion.

The protestants have rejected the Pope from being their king; they will not submit to his government and laws, but they have substituted themselves in his stead—they claim the right to change the government of the Lord, and to add to his laws, and form governments for the people, and to rule them. The difference between Papists and Protestants, is, that the Papists are ruled by one infallible Pope, and the Protestants by many. They are based on the same principles. The lawful king, Christ Jesus, will shortly put them all down, and reign with his Saints on earth a thousand years, without a rival. Then shall peace be restored to Zion, not before—then the unity of Christians shall take the place of discord and strife. Then shall all man made laws and governments be burnt up forever. These are the seat of the beast.

Men by the light of truth are beginning to see that Christians have no right to make laws and governments for themselves, and that all should submit to the government and laws of our king. This is a great reformation; but more must be done, we must cease to support any other government on earth by our counsels, co-operation, and choice. We believe that all are bound to submit to the government and laws of Jesus,

the Lord of all. If they will not, we should not aid them in rebellion against their rightful sovereign. Let Christians shew by their peaceful, holy lives, that his laws are sufficient to govern the whole world in peace and love. If these earthly governments and laws are according to the divine will, why do they destroy the fervor of devotion, and the comforts of religion in those who are occupied in them? If they were divine, would these effects follow? These thoughts are boldly, but modestly submitted to my brethren. If wrong, do shew the wrong—if right let us labor to promote the great and needed reformation. If we do not, it will be done by others—the millenium approaches. B. W. S.

DEBATE IN LEXINGTON KY.

We understand, that preliminaries for a public discussion in Lexington, Ky., between A. Campbell of Bethany, Va., and N. L. Rice of Ky. a Presbyterian Clergyman has been settled, and that on the 15th day of November next, the discussion is to take place. The questions for debate are,

1. Immersion in water into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is the only Christian Baptism.
Affirmative—A. Campbell.

2. The Infant of a believing parent is a scriptural subject of Baptism. Affirmative—N. L. Rice.

3. Christian Immersion is for the remission of sins.
Affirmative—A. Campbell.

4. Baptism is to be administered by a Bishop or ordained Presbyter. Affirmative—N. L. Rice.

5. In conversion and sanctification, the spirit of God operates on persons *only* through the word of truth.
Affirmative—A. Campbell.

6. Human creeds and bonds of union and communion are necessarily heretical and schismatical.
Affirmative—A. Campbell.

The moderaters chosen, are Judge Robinson and John Speed Smith.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"Do urge and *spur* up our preaching brethren to send in, for the Messenger, the success of their labors. It is sought after with great avidity by its readers."

The above, is an extract from a letter rec'd from Bro. T. M. Allen of Mo. If we knew how to persuade the teachers of Christianity, to communicate to us the religious news, in the different portions of the west, gladly would we do it. I am well aware, how solicitous the brethren are, to hear of the success of Christianity, and we are all anxious upon the receipt of a Periodical to turn over and see what has been done the last month.

In Missouri and Illinois alone, we have perhaps, near twenty thousand members, and the number daily augmenting. If the Preachers, would report to us the fruits of their labors, as well as the "wants of the churches," we should be better enabled to prepare such articles as would be most conducive to their interest in divine things. Three to four pages of our paper shall always be devoted to that department, and we fondly hope that the Brethren will not longer withhold from our readers, the desired information. D. P. H.

Religious News.

Boone Co. Mo., Aug. 15, '43.

Brethren STONE & HENDERSON—I wrote you from Shelbyville, while there on the second Lord's day in July, when we had 7 confessions and baptisms. The 3d Lord's day I was in Columbia, but no additions. On Saturday before the 4th Lord's day I commenced in Palmyra, with bros. Creath and L. Hatchett, and continued until the Tuesday night following; 2 confessed the Lord and were baptized. I then went to Hannibal and gave three discourses, and had three accessions. The following Saturday we commenced a meeting at Berea, Monro county. I remained until Monday evening, up to which time, 17 had confessed the Lord. I then left Bros. Thomas, Alexander, Sidenor and Shute to continue the meeting, and understand that ten or twelve others were obtained. The first Lord's day of this month I was in Columbia, when one confessed the Savior. On last Saturday I met Bro. Jacob Coons at Union in the north of Calloway Co. and continued until yesterday evening—we had 12 additions; 5 from the Presbyterians and one from the Baptists. This church was gathered and planted by Bro. L. Hatchett last winter, and in the midst of violent opposition, and is prospering greatly; it now numbers 50 members. The bitter spirit of the sects are driving the pious to union on the Bible, and the violent effort of the *pedoes*, are inducing many of their most worthy members to be buried with Jesus by baptism. If our brethren will only be faithful, and in a good spirit contend for the

faith once delivered to the saints, the truth will prevail, and the violent efforts of the parties will greatly conduce to its prosperity.

Just before I was in Monroe, Bros. Alexander and Sidenor had gained 36 at Antioch, and bro. Thomas several at Paris. Bro. Creath has done much to build up and spread the cause on the Mississippi; and the church that has been recently planted in Hannibal is prospering and doing well. It is greatly blessed in having such an elder as bro. (doctor) Morton. Last week bro. L. Hatchitt and myself gained 6 a few miles north of me. I received a letter from bro. T. Thompson a few days ago, dated Grundy Co. Mo. July 27, '43, in which he says, "Bro. Jno. Allen and myself commenced our evangelizing operations up here about the 1st of June; up to this time there have been 60 baptized, and 40 added by letter: of the above number there were 5 from the Baptists and 10 from the Methodists. The good cause is going ahead in our State.

Your Bro. T. M. ALLEN.

Annual Meeting in Missouri.

Our annual meeting for the cos. of Calloway, Boon, Howard, Randolph, Monroe & Audrain, will commence in Paris, Monroe co, on Friday before the 3d Lord's day in October. It is expected that each church will be heard from, stating the number of members and additions since our annual meeting in October last. Preaching brethren from other parts of this State, and other States are invited to attend. T. M. ALLEN.

Springfield, Aug. 1, '43.

Dear Brethren STONE & HENDERSON—Since I last addressed you, I have visited Decatur. The congregation there is now doing well. Peace and harmony prevail in her borders. Within the last few weeks 12 have been added to her number. Bro. Bowles, myself and others, at Mechanicsburg a few days since, added three. At Musketo, constituted a congregation of 16 on the Bible alone, most of whom were from the world. Bro. Bowles a few days previous, had a meeting on South Fork, 35 were added. I was with him only one day. Bro. Kane about the same time had ten additions at Rushville. He also had within the last few weeks some 18 additions at Wolf Creek in this county. Bro. Kane commenced a meeting last Friday at Chatham, 11 were added. The meeting has been continued by brethren Kane, Powell, myself and others. A little removed from Chatham 23 additions up to last evening. Bro. Bowles is now holding a meeting at Richland—2 additions up to Lord's day, since which time I have not heard from him.

Yours in the good hope, J. P. LANCASTER.

Flat Rock, Ky. 22 July, 1843.

Beloved Brother HENDERSON—I have the pleasure of informing you, that our beloved Father Stone reached old Cane Ridge, and commenced a protracted meeting on the 14th of June, in conjunction with his son and Bro. Jno. A. Gano, and continued four days. The meeting was numerously attended and there were six young soldiers added to the army of the faithful. I have never witnessed such intense interest awakened in any congregation in the same length of time, (so short a time) nor never have I known a meeting discontinued when prospects were so flattering; but father Stone's engagements, and the extreme and continued indisposition of Bro. Gano's wife compelled them to leave.

W. P. PAYNE.

The Christian Messenger.

VOL. XIII. September, 1843. NO. 5.

A RAMBLE.

The senior editor, B. W. Stone has just returned to his post, after an absence of several months in Indiana, Ohio and Kentucky. His health is greatly improved. He designs to continue in the faithful discharge of his editorial labors in future. He was greatly pleased to meet with many of his old christian brethren; some, like himself, pressed down with the weight of years, and attendant infirmities, and standing on the eve of time, soon to hear the summons, "Come up hither." He is happy to state that bigotry and party-spirit are fast receding, and dyihg in the hearts of christians of all denominations. In their brotherly embraces I was cordially received as a brother, and as cordially did we unite in worship without one hard speech, act, or thought. O that this temper and conduct might universally prevail amongst christians! It would be a blessing indeed to themselves and to mankind—it would recommend religion to the acceptance of the world, and hurl the soul-destroying monster, sin, from his long usurped throne in the human heart. God and his truth would be glorified, heaven would descend on earth, and shame infidelity and skepticism, and smile them from existence. What but bigotry, and party spirits prevent these glorious events?

Religion, where I have been, is onward in its march, but not so triumphant as I fondly anticipated to find it from the vast numbers, who had recently professed the faith of Christ in those countries. Several things of a serious nature conspired to check its progress in my opinion. These I will expose in brotherly love, hoping that the exposure may be profitable to all.