

THE
CHRISTIAN BAPTIST,

PUBLISHED MONTHLY;

EDITED BY
ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

Style no man on earth your Father: for he alone is your Father who is in heaven; and all ye are brethren. Assume not the title of Rabbi; for ye have only One Teacher: neither assume the title of Leader; for ye have only One Leader—the Messiah.

Matth. xxiii. 8-10.

Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.

Paul the Apostle.

What a glorious freedom of thought do the Apostles recommend! and how contemptible in their account is a blind and implicit faith! May all christians use this liberty of judging for themselves in matters of religion, and allow it to one another, and to all mankind.

Benson.

VOLUME I

BUFFALOE, BROOKE COUNTY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL, AT THE
BUFFALOE PRINTING-OFFICE.

1827.

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

1955

TO all those, without distinction, who acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be a Revelation from God; and the New Testament as containing the Religion of JESUS CHRIST:—

Who, willing to have all religious tenets and practices tried by the Divine Word; and who feeling themselves in duty bound to search the Scriptures for themselves, in all matters of Religion; are disposed to reject all doctrines and commandments of men, and to obey the truth; holding fast the faith once delivered to the Saints—this work is most respectfully and affectionately dedicated, by

THE EDITOR.

PROSPECTUS
OF THE
CHRISTIAN BAPTIST,

A MONTHLY PAPER,

To Be published on Buffalo Creek, Brooke County, Va.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

THE "CHRISTIAN BAPTIST" shall espouse the cause of no religious sect, excepting that ancient sect called "CHRISTIANS FIRST AT ANTIOCH." Its sole object shall be the eviction of truth, and the exposure of error in doctrine and practice. The editor acknowledging no standard of religious faith or works, other than the Old and New Testaments, and the latter as the only standard of the religion of Jesus Christ, will, intentionally at least, oppose nothing which it contains, and recommend nothing which it does not enjoin. Having no worldly interest at stake from the adoption or reprobation of any article of faith or religious practice—having no gift nor religious office of any worldly emolument to blind his eyes or to pervert his judgment, he hopes to manifest that he is an impartial advocate of truth.

THIS WORK SHALL EMBRACE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN THE PROSECUTION OF ITS OBJECT:

- I. *Animadversions on the Morals of Professors of the Christian Religion.*
- II. *Strictures on the Religious Systems of the Present Day, and the Leading Measures of the Religious Sects of our Country.*
- III. *Essays on Man's Primitive State, on the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations.*
- IV. *Religious News, or a Record of the Passing Events of our Time, accompanied with such Remarks as they may naturally excite.*
- V. *Historical Sketches, or Retrospective Views of the Origin and Progress of the most reputable Opinions and Practices of Modern Times.*
- VI. *Biographical Notices, and Religious Anecdotes.*
- VII. *General Views of the Religious and Political State of Nations not professing the Christian Religion.*

Such are the contemplated outlines of the *Christian Baptist*: for the accomplishment of which, he must appeal to the professing community. Having obtained a few christian friends, of general information, to co-operate with him, who are devoted to the pure and undefiled religion of the gospel of Christ, the editor flatters himself that this publication will be highly interesting and useful to those into whose hands it may fall.

PREFACE.

NO man can reasonably claim the attention of the public, unless he is fully persuaded that he has something of sufficient importance to offer. When so many writers are daily addressing the religious community, it may perhaps be demanded why another should solicit a reading? When so many religious papers are daily issuing from the press, why add another to the number? To these and similar queries it may be answered—that, of all the periodical religious papers of this day, with which we have any acquaintance, but a very few are of an independent character. They are generally devoted to the interest of some one or other of the religious sects which diversify the devout community; so much so, at least, that, being under the control of the leading members of the respective sects, under whose auspices they exist and to whose advancement they are destined, they are commonly enlisted in the support of such views and measures as are approved by the leaders of each sect. And such must every sectarian paper be. It is a rarity, seldom to be witnessed, to see a person boldly opposing either the doctrinal errors or the unscriptural measures of a people with whom he has identified himself, and to whom he looks for approbation and support. If such a person appears in any party, he soon falls under the frowns of those who either think themselves wiser than the reprove, or would wish so to appear. Hence it usually happens that such a character must lay his hand upon his mouth, or embrace the privilege of walking out of doors. Although this has usually been the case, we would hope that it would not always continue so to be. If this, however, had not usually happened, we should have had no Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c. If the party from which these sects sprang had received the admonitions and attended to the remonstrances of those bold and zealous men who first began to reprove and testify against it for alleged errors and evils existing in it, no separation would have taken place. Had the well-meant remonstrances of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley been acknowledged and received by the sect to which they belonged, the mother would have been reformed, and the children would have lived under the same roof with her. But she would not. They were driven out of doors, and were compelled either to build a house for themselves or to lodge in the open air. As it has happened to those called teachers of religion, so it has often happened to religious papers. Hence it is generally presumed that a paper will soon fall into disrepute if it dare to oppose the views or practices of the leaders of the people addressed. Editors generally, too sensible of this, are very cautious what they publish. Some of them are very conscientiously attentive to avoid

giving offence; insomuch, that when an article is presented for insertion, the first objection to it sometimes is, "*The people will not like this, and you know a man must please his customers.*" All this may do very well when a writer proposes to *please* his readers, or when he pledges himself to *support* the tenets or practices of any people. But when the exhibition of truth and righteousness is proposed, neither the passions nor prejudices of men—neither the reputation nor pecuniary interest of the writer should be consulted.

To this course we have heard it objected, that, "should a writer on religious subjects assert the truth, oppose error, and reprove unrighteousness, with christian fidelity, regardless of pleasing or displeasing men, he might expect to starve to death if he seek his living thereby, or to be imprisoned and perhaps beheaded as John the Baptist was, should circumstances permit." We shall not, in the mean time, oppose nor assert the truth of this objection. We shall submit the principle to the test of experience, and practically prove its truth or falsehood.

We now commence a periodical paper pledged to no religious sect in christendom, the express and avowed object of which is the eviction of truth and the exposure of error, as stated in the *Prospectus*. We expect to prove whether a paper perfectly independent, free from any controlling jurisdiction except the Bible, will be read; or whether it will be blasted by the poisonous breath of sectarian zeal and of an aspiring priesthood. As far as respects ourselves, we have long since afforded such evidence as would be admitted in most cases, of the disinterested nature of our efforts to propagate truth, in having always declined every pecuniary inducement that was offered, or that could have been expected, in adopting a course of public instruction suited to the times, the taste and prejudices of men. Of this an apostle once boasted, that he had deprived his enemies of an occasion to say that he had made a gain of them. Yea, he affirms that, "as the truth of Christ is in me, no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia." But, adds he, "what I do, I will do that I may cut off occasion from them that desire occasion." So say we.

The price of this paper is such as must convince all who reflect, that it cannot be a lucrative scheme. We know, however, that there is no course of conduct which can be adopted, against which carping envy and prating malevolence may not devise ill-natured objections. A striking instance of this we have in the life of John the Baptist, and in that of the Messiah. It reads thus: "John the Baptist is come, abstaining from bread and wine, and ye say, "He hath a demon." The Son of Man is come, using both, and ye say, "He is a lover of banquets and wine, an associate of publicans and sinners."

We have often heard the leaders of devotion in popular assemblies confessing their great ignorance, praying for more light, and anxiously looking for a more desirable time, when knowl-

edge, truth, and holiness should abound. This circumstance clearly argues that every thing is not right amongst them, themselves being judges. Yet we have often heard those same leaders of devotion vindicate themselves from error, and attempt to justify themselves and all their measures as soon as any reprover presented himself. This, though a common occurrence, is a singular proof that many deceive themselves, as well as their simple hearers, "by good words and fair speeches."

We are very certain that to such as are praying for illumination and instruction in righteousness, and not availing themselves of the means afforded in the Divine Word to obtain an answer to their prayers, our remarks on many topics will appear unjust, illiberal, and even heretical; and as there are so many praying for light, and inattentive to what God has manifested in his word, there must be a multitude to oppose the way of truth and righteousness. This was the case when God's Messiah, the mighty Redeemer of Israel, appeared. Ten thousand prayers were daily offered for his appearance, ten thousand wishes expressed for his advent, ten thousand orations pronounced respecting the glory of his character and reign; and, strange to tell! when he appeared the *same* ten thousand tongues were employed in his defamation! Yea, they were praying for his coming when he stood in the midst of them, as many now are praying for *light* when it is in their hands, and yet they will not look at it.

There is much less diversity in the views, passions, prejudices, and circumstances of mankind, as respects the true religion in the different ages of the world, than at first thought we would willingly admit. Who is there that has attentively considered the history of Cain and Abel, of Noah and his contemporaries, of the twelve patriarchs, of Moses and the Egyptian magicians, of the Lord's prophets and the prophets of Baal, of Israel's true and false prophets, of the Lord of Life and his disciples, with that of the religious sects of that day, of the present advocates of primitive christianity in Europe and America, and of the supporters of the popular systems of this age—I say, who is there that having considered such histories, will not be astonished at their remarkable coincidences, their striking similarities, and their concurrent contexture of events.

This paper shall embrace a range of subjects and pursue a course not precisely similar to those of any other periodical work which we have seen. Of this, however, the work itself will give the plainest and most intelligible exhibition. In introducing facts and documents in support of assertion or demonstration, there is a possibility of adducing such as are not true or genuine, owing to a variety of causes. Of this, indeed, we shall be always on our guard. If, however, on any occasion any thing should be exhibited as fact which is not fact, we pledge ourselves to give publicity to any statement, decently written, tending to disprove any such alleged facts. The truth of God and the religion of the Bible never yet gained any advantage, but, on all occasions,

sustained injury, from falsehood and lies employed in their defence.

From the subscription we have already received to this work, having subscribers from almost all sects, we would at once despair were it our intention of pleasing them all—if the support of their peculiarities, or of the party to which they belong, were expected. We are happy to say that this circumstance so accords with our design of maintaining the apostles' doctrine only, in opposition to every system, how specious soever, that it will serve as a new impulse to keep us in the course intended. We must also keep in mind the fable of the man and his ass, who strove to please every body, but finally pleased neither himself nor any one else, and lost his ass into the bargain. Besides, when there are so many accommodating themselves to the bias of the people, and endeavoring to conciliate their good opinion, we might suppose that they would be able to endure one that might be disposed not to smile at their mistakes and countenance them in error. Amongst so many panegyrists, one monitor might be endured. These things, however, we say when viewing the subject through the medium of public opinion. We are assured that there are many who will approve of what is truth, and the course adopted; and that many will know that we are not *alone* in the views to be exhibited; but that there are many who heartily accord with them.

We know from acquaintance that there are a goodly number of sensible and intelligent persons, at this day, entirely disgusted with many things *called* religious; and that, upon the whole, it is an age of inquiry. We are therefore somewhat sanguine that a fair opportunity presents itself for a work of this nature. We have learned that to make *truth* the *sole* object of our inquiries, and to be disposed to obey it, when known, serves more to guide us into it than all commentators. We have been taught that we are liable to err; we have found ourselves in many errors; we candidly acknowledge that we have changed our views on many subjects, and that our views have changed our practice. If it be a crime to change our views and our practice in religious concerns, we must certainly plead guilty. If it be a humiliating thing to say we have been wrong in our belief and practice, we must abase ourselves thus far. We were once trained and disciplined in the popular religion, and were then *steady* and uniform in one course for a time. But the foundation of our assent to, and accordance with, the popular religion was destroyed, and down came the edifice about our ears. We are thankful that we were not buried in the ruins. We have learned one lesson of great importance in the pursuit of truth—one that acts as a pioneer to prepare the way of knowledge—one that cannot be adopted and acted upon, but the result must be salutary. It is this: *Never to hold any sentiment or proposition as more certain than the evidence on which it rests; or, in other words, that our assent to any proposition should be precisely proportioned to the*

evidence on which it rests. All beyond this we esteem enthusiasm—all short of it, incredulity. In this place I must cite the words of the justly celebrated Dr. George Campbell, author of the best translation of the four gospels which ever yet appeared in our language. They are from the conclusion of his preface to the "*Preliminary Dissertations*," volume 1, page 59. They accord with our own experience, and breathe our sentiments. He says, "The language of our Lord to his hearers was, *If any man WILL come under my guidance.* Nothing is obtruded or forced upon the unwilling. Now, as the great source of the infidelity of the Jews was a notion of the temporal kingdom of the Messiah, we may justly say that the great source of the corruptions of christians, and of their general defection foretold by the inspired writers, has been an attempt to render it in effect a temporal kingdom, and to support and extend it by earthly means. This is that spirit of Antichrist which was so early at work as to be discoverable even in the days of the apostles." In the same page he says, "If to make proselytes by the sword is tyranny in rulers; to resign our understanding to any man, and receive implicitly what we ought to be rationally convinced of, would be, on our part, the lowest servility.—Every thing, therefore, here is subjected to the test of scripture and sound criticism. I am not very confident of my own reasonings. I am sensible that, on many points, I have changed my opinion, and found reason to correct what I had judged formerly to be right. The consciousness of former mistakes proves a guard to preserve me from such a presumptuous confidence in my present judgment as would preclude my giving a patient hearing to whatever may be urged, from reason or scripture, in opposition to it. Truth has been in all my inquiries, and still is my great aim. To her I am ready to sacrifice every personal consideration; but am determined not, knowingly, to sacrifice her to any thing." These are the sentiments and determination of my heart, as though they had been indited there.

We have only to add in this place, that we shall thankfully receive such essays as are accordant with the Bible and suitable to the peculiar design of this paper; and if any essays, short and well composed, written in opposition to our views, should be forwarded, they shall be inserted, accompanied with appropriate remarks. The author's name must accompany all communications.

It is very far from our design to give any just ground of offence to any, the weakest of the disciples of Christ, nor to those who make no pretensions to the christian name; yet we are assured that no man ever yet became an advocate of that faith which cost the life of its founder and the lives of so many of the friends and advocates of it, that did not give offence to some. We are also assured that in speaking plainly and accordant to fact, of many things of high esteem at present, we will give offence. In all such cases we esteem the reasoning of Peter unanswerable. It is better to hearken unto God, in his word, than

to men, and to please him than all the world beside. There is another difficulty of which we are aware, that, as some objects are manifestly good, and the means attempted for their accomplishment manifestly evil, speaking against the means employed we may be sometimes understood as opposing the object abstractly, especially by those who do not wish to understand, but rather to misrepresent. For instance—that the conversion of the heathen to the christian religion is an object manifestly good all christians will acknowledge; yet every one acquainted with the history of the means employed, and of the success attendant on the means, must know that these means have not been blessed; and every intelligent christian must know that many of the means employed have been manifestly evil. Besides, to convert the heathen to the popular christianity of these times would be an object of no great consequence, as the popular christians themselves, for the most part, require to be converted to the christianity of the New Testament. We have only one request to make of our readers—and that is, an impartial and patient hearing; for which we shall make them one promise, viz. that we shall neither approve nor censure any thing without the clearest and most satisfactory evidence from reason and revelation.

Buffaloe, July 4, 1823.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

CHRISTIANITY is the perfection of that divine philanthropy which was gradually developing itself for four thousand years. It is the bright effulgence of every divine attribute, mingling and harmonizing, as the different colors in the rainbow, in the bright shining after rain, into one complete system of perfections—the perfection of GLORY to God in the highest heaven, the perfection of PEACE on earth, and the perfection of GOOD WILL among men.

The eyes of patriarchs and prophets, of saints and martyrs, from Adam to John the Baptist, with longing expectations, were looking forward to some glorious age, indistinctly apprehended, but ardently desired. Each messenger sent from heaven, fraught with the communications of the Divine Spirit, to illuminate, to reprove, and to correct the patriarchs and the house of Israel, was brightening the prospects and chastening the views of the people concerning the glory of the COMING AGE. The “FOUNDER OF THE FUTURE AGE,” as one of Israel’s prophets styles the Messiah, was exhibited, in the emblems of the prophetic style, as rising, expanding, and brightening to view; from the glistening “*Star of Jacob*,” to the radiating “*Sun of Righteousness*,” with salutiferous and vivifying rays.

The person, character, and reign of Messiah the Prince, exhausted all the beauties of language, all the grandeur and resplendencies of creation, to give some faint resemblances of them. In adumbrating Emanuel and his realm, “*Nature mingles colors not her own*.” She mingles the brighter splendors of things celestial with things terrestrial, and kindly suits the picture to our impaired faculties. She brings the rose of Sharon and the lily of the vales—the mild lustre of the richest gems, and the brightest radiance of the choicest metals. She makes the stars of heaven sparkle in his hand, and the brightness of the sun shine in his face. She causes the mountains to flow down at his presence; his advent to gladden the solitary place; before him “*the deserts to rejoice and blossom as the rose*.” To the desert, at his approach, she gives the glory of Lebanon, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon.

Under his peaceful banner and gracious sceptre, the wolf dwells with the lamb; the leopard lies down with the kid; the calf, the young lion and the fattling, in harmony follow the mandates of a child; the cow and bear feed together; their young ones lie down in concord; and the lion eats straw like the ox. The sucking child plays on the hole of the asp; and the weaned child puts its hand on the cockatrice’s den. Under his munificent government the wilderness becomes a fruitful field; and the field once esteemed fruitful is counted for a forest. He makes the eyes of the blind to see; the ears of the deaf to hear, and the tongue of the dumb to speak. The stammerer becomes eloquent, and the wise men of other times become as babes. He brings the captive from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of

the prison house. His people march forth with joy; they are led forth with peace. The mountains and the hills break forth into singing, and all the trees of the field clap their hands.

He shall judge the poor of the people; he shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressor. They shall fear him as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth. In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace as long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him, and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the Isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him. For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth, the poor also, and him that hath no helper. He shall spare the poor and the needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. He shall redeem their souls from deceit and violence; and precious shall their blood be in his sight. There shall be, in his day, a handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon: and they of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth. His name shall endure for ever; his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed." Psalm lxxii. 4-17. Such were the glorious things spoken of Zion and her King by holy kings and ancient seers, fired with prophetic impulse. These are but a taste of the sweetness which flows in the stream of prophecy, which revived, cheered, and animated the drooping, disconsolate, and afflicted hearts of the righteous ancients. Such things they uttered who saw his glory and spake of him. These prospective views of Messiah and his institution prepare us to expect the brightest exhibition of glory in himself, and the highest degree of moral excellence and felicity in the subjects of his reign.

The fulness of time is come. Messiah appears. But lo! he has no form nor comeliness. He comes forth as a languishing shoot from a dry and sterile soil. He comes to his own, and his own receive him not. He comes to the people who had the visions of the Almighty, and who heard the prophecies of the Spirit concerning him; yet they reject him as an impostor. They recognize no charms in his person—no glory in his purposed reign. Their hearts are infatuated with worldly notions, and they view him with a prejudiced eye. They see no diadem upon his head—no sceptre in his hand. They see no gorgeous apparel upon his person—no nobles nor princes in his train. They hear no sound of the trumpet—no confused sound of mighty warriors preparing for battle. They see no garments rolled in blood, nor captives led in chains. They are offended at the meanness of his parentage; at the humble birth and character of his attendants; and at his own insignificant appearance. His glories, and their views of

glory, correspond in no one instance. His glory was that of unparalleled condescension, incomparable humility, meekness, and love. The most resplendant gems in his crown were his abject poverty, his patient endurance of the grossest indignities, and the unreserved devotion of his whole soul, as the righteous servant of Jehovah. His victories were not those of a mighty chieftain at the head of many thousands, marching through opposing ranks, demolishing citadels, devastating countries, causing iron gates to open at his approach, and leading bound to his triumphal chariot his captive enemies. No! his victories were the conquest of all temptations, of death, and of him that had the power of death. He triumphed over all principalities and powers of darkness, error, and death. In his death and resurrection he gained the greatest conquest ever won: he vanquished death and the grave; he obtained eternal redemption; he opened the gates of Paradise, and procured an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading, for all them that look for deliverance. Such were the personal achievements of the *Captain of our Salvation*.

The precepts of his institution correspond with his appearance and deportment among men. He inculcates a morality pure as himself, and such as must render his disciples superior to all the world besides. He gives no scope to any malignant passions, and checks every principle that would lead to war, oppression, or cruelty. His precepts respect not merely the overt act, but the principles from which all overt acts of wickedness proceed. Ambition, pride, avarice, lust, malevolence, are denounced, as really criminal, as the actions to which they give rise. His precepts are no dry lifeless system of morality, to be forced upon his disciples, or to be worn as an outside garment; but they are inculcated by arguments and considerations which when apprehended, engrave them upon the heart, and render them of easy practice. The reason, the nature, and the import of his death, afford, to those who understand it, an argument that gives life and vigor to all his precepts, and that makes his yoke easy and his burthen light.

When we turn our attention to the character and exploits of his first disciples, his *ambassadors* to the world, what an illustrious exhibition of the excellency of his doctrine, and of the purity of his morals do they afford! In them how conspicuous faith, hope, and love! What zeal, what patience, what self-denial, what deadness to the world! How gladly they spend and are spent in the good work of faith, labor of love, and patience of hope! They glory in reproaches, in privations, in stripes, in imprisonments, in all manner of sufferings; yea, in death itself, for the Son of Man's sake. How freely, how cheerfully, how laboriously they performed the ministry which they had received! They look for no applause, for not stipend, no fixed salary, no lucrative office, no honorable title among men. They have continually in their eye the example of their Chief, "looking off from the ancients to JESUS the Captain and Finisher of the Faith, who, for the joy set before

him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and sat down on the right hand of God." Amidst their enemies and false friends, how calm, how meek, how prudent, how resolute, how persevering! They exhibit virtues, in comparison of which, the virtues of all other religionists appear either as splendid sins, or as meagre empty names. Such was the character of the ambassadors and subordinate ministers of the New Institution.

The societies called churches, constituted and set in order by those ministers of the New Testament, were of such as received and acknowledged Jesus as Lord Messiah, the Saviour of the World, and had put themselves under his guidance. The ONLY BOND OF UNION among them was faith in him and submission to his will. No subscription to abstract propositions framed by synods; no decrees of councils sanctioned by kings; no rules of practice commanded by ecclesiastical courts were imposed on them as terms of admission into, or of continuance in, this *holy brotherhood*. In the "apostles' doctrine" and in the "apostles' commandments" they stedfastly continued. Their fraternity was a fraternity of love, peace, gratitude, cheerfulness, joy, charity, and universal benevolence. Their religion did not manifest itself in public fasts nor carnivals. They had no festivals—no great and solemn meetings. Their meeting on the first day of the week was at all times *alike* solemn, joyful, and interesting. Their religion was not of that elastic and porous kind, which at one time is compressed into some cold formalities, and at another expanded into prodigious zeal and warmth. No—their piety did not at one time rise to paroxysms, and their zeal to effervescence, and, by and by, languish into frigid ceremony and lifeless form. It was the pure, clear, and swelling current of love to God, of love to man, expressed in all the variety of doing good.

The *order* of their assemblies was uniformly the same. It did not vary with *moons* and *seasons*. It did not change as dress, nor fluctuate as the manners of the times. Their devotion did not diversify itself into the endless forms of modern times. They had no monthly concerts for prayer; no solemn convocations; no great fasts, nor preparation, nor thanksgiving days. Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, education societies; nor did they dream of organizing such in the world. The head of a believing household was not in those days a president or manager of a board of foreign missions; his wife, the president of some female education society; his eldest son, the recording secretary of some domestic Bible society; his eldest daughter, the corresponding secretary of a mite society; his servant maid, the vice-president of a rag society; and his little daughter, a tutoress of a Sunday School. They knew nothing of the *hobbies* of modern times. *In their church capacity alone they moved*. They neither transformed themselves into any other kind of association, nor did they fracture and sever themselves into divers societies. They view the church of Jesus Christ as the scheme of Heaven to ameliorate

the world; as members of it, they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dare not transfer to a missionary society, or Bible society, or education society, *a cent or a prayer*, lest in so doing they should rob the church of its glory, and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. *In their church capacity alone they moved.* The church they considered "the pillar and ground of the truth;" they view it as the temple of the Holy Spirit—as the house of the living God. They considered if they did all they could in this capacity, they had nothing left for any other object of a religious nature. In this capacity, wide as its sphere extended, they exhibited the truth in *word and deed*. Their good works, which accompanied salvation, were the labors of love, in ministering to the necessities of saints, to the poor of the brotherhood. They did good to *all* men, but especially to the household of faith. They practised that pure and undefiled religion, which, in overt acts, consists in "taking care of orphans and widows in their affliction, and in keeping one's self unspotted by (the vices of) the world."

In their church capacity they attended upon every thing that was of a social character, that did not belong to the closet or fire-side. In the church, in all their meetings, they offered up their joint petitions for all things lawful, commanded or promised. They left nothing for a missionary prayer meeting, for seasons of unusual solemnity or interest. They did not at one time abate their zeal, their devotion, their gratitude or their liberality, that they might have an opportunity of shewing forth to advantage or of doing something of great consequence at another. Such things they condemned in Jews and Pagans. No, gentle reader, in the primitive church they had no Easter Sunday, Thanksgiving Monday, Shrove Tuesday, Ash Wednesday, Holy Thursday, Good Friday, nor Preparation Saturday. All days were alike good—alike preparation—alike thanksgiving. As soon as some Pharisees that believed began to observe days, and months, and times, and years; so soon did the apostle begin to stand in doubt of them.

Having taken a cursory view of some of the leading features of the christian religion, exhibited in *prospective*, and in actual existence at its first institution, we shall in the last place advert to its present appearance. But alas! "how is the fine gold become dim!" Instead of the apostles' doctrine, simply and plainly exhibited in the New Testament, we have got the sublime science of Theology, subdivided into scholastic, polemic, dogmatic, and practical Divinity. Instead of the *form* of sound words given by the Spirit to be held fast, we have countless creeds, composed of terms and phrases, dogmas and speculations, invented by whimsical metaphysicians, christian philosophers, rabbinical doctors, and enthusiastic preachers. Instead of the divinely established order of bishops and deacons, or as they are sometimes called, elders and deacons, which remained when the age of "spiritual gifts" and "spiritual men" passed away; we have popes, cardinals,

archbishops, metropolitan bishops, diocesan bishops, rectors, prebendaries, deans, priests, arch deacons, presiding elders, ruling elders, circuit preachers, local preachers, licentiates, class leaders, abbots, monks, friars, &c. &c.

Our devotion exhibits itself in prayers, in the set phrase of pompous oratory; in singing choirs; in long sermons, modelled after Grecian and Roman orations, logical themes and metaphysical essays; in revivals, camp-meetings, praying societies, theological schools, education societies, missionary societies, Sunday schools, and in raising large sums of money by every way that ingenuity can devise, for propagating the gospel.

Our zeal burns brightest in contending for orthodox tenets, and a sort of technical language rendered sacred and of imposing influence by long prescription. Such as *the covenant of works, the covenant of grace; the active and passive obedience of Christ; legal repentance, the terms and conditions of the gospel, the gospel offer; the holy sacraments; ministerial, sacramental, and catholic communion; the mediatorial kingdom of Christ; the millennium; historic faith, temporary faith, the faith of miracles, justifying faith, the faith of devils, the faith of assurance, and the assurance of faith; the direct act of faith, the reflex act of faith; baptismal vows; kirk sessions; fencing the tables; metallic tokens, &c. &c.* Thus to speak in clerical dignity, anagogically, more than half the language of Ashdod is mingled with less than half the language of Canaan; and the people are generally zealous about such confounding, misleading, and arrogant distinctions, which all result in divesting christianity of its glorious simplicity, which adapts it to boys and girls as well as to philosophers, and which distort it into a mystery, fit to employ linguists, philosophers, doctors of divinity, all their leisure hours, at a handsome per annum, in studying, and then in giving publicity to their own discoveries, or in retailing those of others.

But into how diverse and opposite extremes and absurdities have many run in their wild, superstitious, and chimerical views of the christian religion. Inquisitive reader, turn your eyes to yonder monastery, built in that solitary desert, filled with a religious order of monks, and an abbot at their head. Why have they shut themselves out from the world in that solitary recluse? It is for the purpose of becoming more abstemious, more devout, more devoted to the study of mystic theology. Hear them contending whether the Solitaires, the Coenabites, or the Sarabaites have chosen the course most congenial to the gospel. See these poor, gloomy, lazy set of mortals, habited in their awful black, their innocent white, or their spiritual grey, according to their order, forsaking all the business and enjoyments of society, spending their days in penury and affliction for the sake of sublimer contemplations of God and of the heavenly world; and say have they ever seen a Bible! Again, see this sacred gloom, this holy melancholy, this pious indolence, becoming so popular as to affect all the seminaries of christiandom for a time! See it

command the respect of the highest dignitaries of the church; and hear them call those haunts of gloom and superstition, as some of the reformed orders of modern times call our colleges, "*fountains and streams that make glad the city of God*" by qualifying pious divines! Yes, these monasteries became so famous for piety and solemnity, that the church looked to them for her most useful ministers. And, indeed, much of the gloomy aspect, dejected appearance, and holy sighing of modern times, and especially of the leaders of devotion, sprang from those monasteries.

Next, consider for a moment, yon sobbing anachorite, with his amulet round his neck, his beads solemnly moving through his fingers, bent upon his naked knees in yon miserable cell, muttering his "*Ave Maria*," and invoking St. Andrew to intercede in his behalf; and say has he a Bible? O yes! It lies moulding and moth-eaten on his shelves!

From this scene of infatuation turn your eyes to yonder dismal edifice, with iron gates and massy bars. Within its merciless apartments view the "*minister of religion*," the "*ambassador of Christ*," attired in his sacred robes, with holy aspect and flaming zeal for the "divine honor" and that of his church, exhorting the vile heretic on pain of the most excruciating torments here, and eternal damnation hereafter, to abjure his heresy. As an argument to enforce his pious exhortations, observe the red hot pincers in hand, pointing to the boiling lead, the piles of fagots, the torturing wheels and all the various engines of horrid vengeance. Do you ask who is he. I answer, It is the *Reverend* Inquisitor. On the most solemn AUTO DA FE, see this incorrigible heretic brought forward arrayed in his *santo benito* or sleeveless yellow coat, flowered to the border with the resemblances of flames, of red serge, decorated with his own picture, surrounded with devils, as doomed to destruction for the good of his soul. Then declare of what use is reason or revelation to many called christians!

But leaving the dungeon and that quarter of the globe, visit the group of reformed christians, and see another order of "teachers of the christian faith," "ministers of religion," having prepared themselves by the study of Grecian and Roman languages, laws, history, fables, gods, goddesses, debaucheries, wars and suicides; having studied triangles, squares, circles, and ellipses, algebra and fluxions, the mechanical powers, chymistry, natural philosophy, &c. &c. for the purpose of becoming teachers of the christian religion; and then going forth with their saddlebags full of scholastic divinity in quest of a call to some eligible living; then ask again, Where is the Bible?

And, stranger still, see that christian general, with his ten thousand soldiers, and his chaplain at his elbow, preaching, as he says, the gospel of good will among men; and hear him exhort his general and his christian warriors to go forth with the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other, to fight the battles

of God and their country; praying that the Lord would cause them to fight valliantly, and render their efforts successful in making as many widows and orphans as will afford sufficient opportunity for others to manifest the purity of their religion by taking care of them!!! If any thing is wanting to finish a picture of the most glaring inconsistencies, add to this those christians who are daily extolling the blessing of civil and religious liberty, and at the same time, by a system of the most cruel oppression, separating the wife from the embraces of her husband, and the mother from her tender offspring; violating every principle, and rending every tie that endears life and reconciles man to his lot; and that, forsooth, because "*might gives right*," and a man is held guilty because his skin is a shade darker than the standard color of the times. Adverting to these signs of the times, and many others to which these reflections necessarily lead, will you not say that this prophecy is now fulfilled—2 Tim. iv. 3, 4—"There will be a time when they will not endure wholesome teaching; but having itching ears, they will according to their own lusts, heap up to themselves teachers. And from the truth, indeed, they will turn away their ears and be turned aside to fables." Chap. iii: 1—5. "This also know, that in *latter* days perilous times *will* come. For men will be *self-lovers*, *money-lovers*, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, without *natural affection*, covenant-breakers, slanders—*having a form of godliness, but denying the power of it*. NOW FROM THESE TURN AWAY." Christian reader, remember this command—and "*from such turn away*."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

* * *

FOR many ages it has been a custom to treat the Bible as Paul the Apostle treated a Grecian poet, when he took a text from him, and from it preached to the Athenians, Acts xvii. Since the days of Origen, or at least since the *nominal* conversion of multitudes of the Platonic and other philosophers, and Pagan priests, it has been the reigning custom to make the Bible a *text-book*. When the text is once or twice read, the preacher proceeds to his introduction, which resembles the exordium of a pagan oration; then comes his method or distribution, in which he cuts to pieces the text; and after having considered its metaphorical, literal, anagogical, spiritual, and practical import, and having cautioned his hearers on the great danger of resting in the literal meaning of the text, and of the great necessity of looking through the letter, (which is sometimes called *dead*,) to the spirit of the text, which gives life, he proceeds to the improvement of his subject; and having deduced the necessary inferences, he concludes with a fervid and pathetic exhortation. In the mean time his hearers are either asleep, or in extatic admiration of the splendid talents, wondrous wisdom, and fine learning of their orator, saying as they go home, "How great a blessing is

a gospel minister! Without this servant of God, poor creatures that we are! of what use would be the Bible to us?"

The following sermon has been published in several papers to the eastward, and was lately forwarded to us by a friend. It is a pretty good specimen of modern preaching, with this difference, that the preacher does not take the most fashionable view of the text; but upon the whole, he supports the doctrine of his text with pretty good evidence. It contains a useful admonition to the money beggars, and to many of the liberal givers of this day.

A SERMON UPON GOATS,

BY THE REV. MR. M'———D, D. D. F. R. S.

“And thou shalt have goat's milk enough for thy food, for the food of thy household, and for the maintenance of thy maidens”

Prov. xxvii. 27.

FROM the days of Origen, the second century, to the present, it has been fashionable to spiritualize the scriptures, and to teach men that they have a meaning besides what is expressed. Many to this day think the scriptures have a double sense—what is said and what is meant. A man who could find a spiritual meaning to Sampson's bee-hive, jaw-bone, and the tails of his three hundred foxes, connected with firebrands, could doubtless find a spiritual meaning to our text. What could it be? We will suppose it to be this:—

1st. The person addressed must mean a minister of modern times, to whom it is said, “*And thou shalt have goat's milk enough,*” &c.

2d. His household and maidens must signify, in the spiritual sense, his family and domestics.

3d. The goats must mean the non-elect, who are in the end to be eternally miserable, after feeding the minister and his family for life; according to Matth. xxv. &c.

4th. The goats' milk, in the spiritual sense of the text, which is represented as abundant, must mean the generous and constant support which these ministers, their children, and servants have received from the non-elect, or such as are declared to be of that number, who do so well for their owners here, and who are to be treated so cruelly hereafter.

We will allow that the three first propositions are so plain that they need no illustration, and proceed to prove the truth of the fourth particular—“*Thou shalt have goats' milk enough.*” It is a fact, beyond all dispute, that those who are considered the unconverted, or non-elect, are generally depended on for the support of such as have for years been considered ministers of the gospel. The meeting houses are chiefly built with the money which belonged to such as are denominated goats; and were it not for this part of the people, what a poor condition the sheep would be in!

It is a curiosity, the manner in which the goat's milk is obtained.

Money is wanted to make the parson life-member of the Bible Society. The goats must be milked—and soon the ladies produce the money. A pious young man presents himself as one called to the ministry, but is not able to obtain an honorable education at *Princeton*, *Providence*, or *Cambridge*. Milk the goats is the next step. Men, women, and children are called, and the help is *stripped* from them, and the pious young men have “goats' milk enough.”

Missionaries are needed among the heathen in *Vermont*, *Maine*, and *Rhode Island*. The goats are milked again, and the missionaries spread their fame in all directions. A brother clergyman is dismissed “because no man has hired him;” the goats are milked, and he is on a mission at twenty or fifty dollars per month.

A mission is agreed on to Asia, and the goats are resorted to, who support the friends for twenty-four years. At last this fails, and what next? Mr. *Ward* appears, and tells the owners of the goats that nothing can be done unless a college is built in Asia, and some of the natives made ministers. The goats are called up, and ten thousand dollars are collected. The goats are left to feed on the high hills until another milking time returns, when their empty pails are again presented, to be replenished from the same source.

These milking vessels are placed wherever the goats are likely to resort—as in the *bureau*, on the merchant's *counter*, in the *museum*—for the purpose of milking out the abundance of these milch kine. They have drawn from the goats, money, hats, shoes, stockings, shirts, and gowns; sweetmeats and other luxuries; with *missionary fields*, corn, potatoes, cabbages, pumpkins, &c.

All these things have been done, in addition to *stripping* for watch seals and the estates of old bachelors and maids when death shall put an end to their wants.

According to the modern pulpit doctrine, these poor goats are to be rewarded for all their milk, (so good for the elect,) with a portion with the devils and damned souls in eternal misery, where they shall see the “*very elect*,” who are fed upon their milk, and by it nourished and prepared for glory everlasting.

* * *

THE ORIGIN

Of the “Christian Clergy,” Splendid Meeting House, and Fixed Salaries, Exhibited from Ecclesiastical History.

NOTA BENE.—IN our remarks upon the “*Christian Clergy*,” we never include the Elders or Deacons of a Christian Assembly, or those in the New Testament called the Overseers and Servants of the Christian Church. These we consider as very different characters and shall distinguish them in some future number.

Mosheim, vol. i. p. 73, Charleston Edition.—“Another circumstance that irritated the Romans against the christians, was the simplicity of their worship, which resembled in nothing the sacred rites of any other people. The christians had neither sacrifices, nor temples, nor images, nor oracles, nor *sacerdotal robes*; and this was sufficient to bring upon them the reproaches of an ignorant multitude, who imagined that there could be no religion without these. Thus they were looked upon as a sort of Atheists; and by the Roman laws those who were chargeable with Atheism were declared the pest of human society. But this was not all. The sordid interests of a multitude of lazy and selfish priests were immediately connected with the ruin and oppression of the christian cause. The public worship of such an immense number of deities was a source of subsistence, and even of riches, to the whole rabble of priests and augurs, and also to a multitude of merchants and artists. And the progress of the gospel threatened the ruin of this religious traffic and the profits it produced. This raised up new enemies to the christians, and armed the rage of mercenary superstition against their lives and their cause.”—

“The places in which the first christians assembled to celebrate divine worship, were, no doubt, the houses of private persons.” p. 124.—

“In these assemblies the holy scriptures were publicly read, and for that purpose were divided into certain portions or lessons. This part of divine service was followed by a brief exhortation to the people, in which eloquence and art gave place to the natural and fervent expressions of zeal and charity.” p. 124, 125.

Haweis' Church History, vol. i. p. 150—“Nothing could be more unadorned than the primitive worship. A plain man, chosen from among his fellows, in his common garb, stood up to speak, or sat down to read the scriptures, to as many as chose to assemble in the house appointed. A back room, and that probably often a mean one, or a garret, to be out of the way of observation, was their temple.”—

“As pride and worldly mindedness must go hand in hand, assumed pomp and dignity require a sort of maintenance very different from the state when the pastor wrought with his own hands to minister to his necessities, and labored by day that he might serve the church by night. The idea of priesthood had yet scarcely entered into the christian sanctuary, as there remained no more sacrifice for sin, and but one high-priest of our profession, Jesus Christ. But on the dissolution of the whole Jewish economy under Adrian, when the power of the associated clergy began to put forth its bud, the ambitious and designing suggested, what many of the rest received in their simplicity, that the succession to these honors now devolved upon *them*, and that the bishop stood in the place of the high-priest; the presbyters were priests; and the deacons, Levites; and so a train of consequences followed. Thus a new tribe arose, completely sep-

arated from their brethren, of clergy distinct from laity—men sacred by office, exclusive of a divine call and real worth. The altar indeed was not yet erected, nor the unbloody sacrifice of the eucharist perfected; but it approached by hasty strides to add greater sanctity to the priesthood, and the not unpleasant adjunct of the divine right of tithes, attached to the divine right of episcopacy.” p. 181, 182.—

“The simplicity of the primitive worship, contrasted with the pomp of paganism, was striking. It was concluded by the heathen that they who had neither altar, victim, priest, or sacrifice, must be Atheists, and without God in the world. Those who were now rising into self-created eminence, had therefore little difficulty to persuade that it would be for the interest and honor of christianity to remove these objections of the Gentiles by very harmless but useful alterations. Though magnificent temples had not yet risen, the names of things began to change. There were already *priests*; and *oblations* were easily rendered *sacrifices*. The separation of the clergy, as a body, became more discriminated by their habits. *High-priests* must have more splendid robes than the simple tunic of linen. A variety of new ceremonies were invented to add dignity to the mysteries of christianity and obviate the objections to its meanness and simplicity. And as the populace were particularly attached to their idolatry by the festivals in honor of their heroes and their gods, and delighted with the games and pastimes on these occasions, the great Gregory Thaumaturgus shortly afterward contrived to bilk the devil by granting the people the indulgence of all the same pleasures of feasting, sporting, and dancing at the tombs, and on the anniversary of the martyrs, as they had been accustomed to in the temples of their gods; very wisely and christianly supposing that thus, *sua sponte ad honestiorem et accuratiorem vite rationem transirent*—of their own accord they would quit their idolatry, and return to a more virtuous and regular course of life. I must be exceedingly hard drove for a christian before I can put such men as Gregory Thaumaturgus into the number.” p. 182, 183.—

“Constantine having become the conqueror of Maxentius, and as it seems chiefly by the support of christians, his favor to them increased in great munificence to build them churches, and in abounding liberality to their poor. Their bishops were honored by him and caressed, and their synods held and supported by his authority.” p. 246, 247.—

“Having now no longer a competitor, Constantine resolved to take the most decided part with the christians. He prohibited the heathen sacrifices and shut up the temples, or converted them to the purposes of christian worship. He universally established christianity, and tolerated no other religion openly throughout the bounds of the empire; the justice of which I doubt, and even the policy. I see no right to compel even an idolater, contrary to his conscience.” p. 247.—

“The bounties he bestowed, the zeal he displayed, his liberal patronage of episcopal men, the pomp he introduced into worship, and the power invested with general councils, made the church appear great and splendid; but I discern not a trace in Constantine of the religion of the Son of God.” p. 248.—

“I am persuaded that his establishment of christianity, and of those bishops whom particularly at last he most espoused and favored, contributed beyond any thing to the awful debasement and declension of true religion; and from him and his son Constantius evangelical truth suffered in the spirit of christian professors, as much as their persons had undergone from Dioclesian or Galerius.” p. 249.—

“The church now in esteem of some, was exalted to the highest pinnacle of prosperity, invested with vast authority; and the episcopal order collected in synods and councils, with almost sovereign dominion. The churches vied in magnificence with palaces; and the robes and pomp of service, imitating imperial splendor, eclipsed paganism itself, with mitres, tiaras, tapers, crosiers, and processions. If outward appearances could form a *glorious* church, here she would present herself; but these meretricious ornaments concealed beneath them all the spirit of the world—pride, luxury, covetousness, contention, malignity, and every evil word and work. Heresy and schism abounded, and wickedness of every kind, like a flood, deluged the christian world; whilst the heads of the church more engaged in controversy, and a thousand times more jealous about securing and increasing their own wealth and pre-eminence, than presenting examples of humility, patience, deadness to the world, and heavenly mindedness, were, like gladiators, armed in all their councils, and affected imperial power and pomp in the greater dioceses.” p. 261.

The statements made by these two historians we are able to confirm from a great variety of documents. If there be a fact, more clear than any other established upon the page of ecclesiastical history, it is the following, viz. that *the confounding of the Jews' religion with the christian religion, or the viewing of the latter as an improvement of the former, has been the fountain of error which has, since the apostolic age, corrupted the doctrine, changed the order, and adulterated the worship of the christian church.* This, together with the influence of pagan priests and pagan philosophers, proselyted to the christian religion, has been the *Pandora's* box to the professing christian community. We happened upon the truth, when we published as our opinion, about seven years ago, that “*the present popular exhibition of the christian religion is a compound of judaism, heathen philosophy, and christianity.*” From this unhallowed commixture sprang all political ecclesiastical establishments, a distinct order of men called clergy or priests, magnificent edifices as places of worship, tithes or fixed salaries, religious festivals, holy places and times, the christian circumcision, the christian passover, the

christian Sabbaths, &c. &c. &c. These things we hope to exhibit at full length in due time.

From the extracts already adduced from these eminent historians, it appears clear as the morning that the distinction betwixt *clergy* and laity originated by degrees, and widened into all the extreme points of dissimilarity in the lapse of a few generations. But behold the mighty difference! and in it see the arrogance of the clergy and the abject servility of the laity—when the high-priest, the head of the clergy, mounts his horse, the king (as layman) holds his stirrup, and in obeisance kisses his toe. A respectable portion of this high-priest's *spirit* has fallen upon all the clergy, and a becoming share of *servility* even yet exists amongst those who admire them most. Happy they who know the truth! for it makes them *free*! How blissful the words of the Saviour of the world! and how true! “if the son shall make you *free*, you shall be *free indeed*!”

EDITOR.

* * *

From the National Intelligencer of February, 1822.

CHRISTIAN ALMANAC.

THERE is a little missionary publication under this title, circulated by the New England Tract Society, which presents to the reader a singular jumble of astronomical calculations, and instructions to farmers, chronological events, and missionary admonitions, precepts of domestic economy, and religious anecdotes. According to the editor's address, forty thousand copies of this tract were sold during the last year, and undoubtedly has indirectly an extensive influence over the class of society who read almanacs for information. As a specimen of the kind of instruction to be found in this little book, we quote from the observations on the month of MAY, at the head of the page:—

“This, too, is a time to work in the gardens. Beans, squashes, and cucumbers should be planted—also, Indian corn. Remember that in this agricultural country, many can give produce when they cannot money, to *missionary* objects. Sheep should now be washed,” &c. &c.

Many sentences of the same kind are scattered about in the work.

There is nothing to complain of in all this; and we only notice it as denoting the systematic efforts of the missionary societies to collect money for the purpose of diffusing their peculiar doctrines among the heathen.

In the 26th page we are presented with eight arithmetical questions leading to similar results. We present a few:—

“If there are 600,000,000 of heathen in the world, how many missionaries must be sent to supply one to every 20,000? *Answer*, 30,000.

“In the year 1821 the American Board for Foreign Missions had 24 missionaries in their employ, and expended 46,000 dol-

lars. In the same proportion, what sum per annum would be requisite if the number of missionaries were 4500?"

The answer to the question, though not given in the almanac, is 8,625,000 dollars, or two-thirds as much as the revenue of the general government of the United States. We will now add a few calculations chiefly founded upon the facts contained in the almanac.

How many dollars per annum would be required to pay 30,000 missionaries, the number demanded for the heathen, (allowing one for every 20,000) according to the rate paid by the American Board of Foreign Missions? Ans. *Fifty-seven millions five hundred thousand dollars per annum.*

We observe that the number of missionaries in different parts of the world is four hundred and sixty-five, and that the number in Asia alone is one hundred and fifty-six. The Baptist Missionary Society was instituted in 1792; the London Missionary Society in 1795, and the Wesleyan Missionary Society in 1786. A period of from 28 to 37 years has elapsed since their incorporation, and no authentic account that we have heard of, has been given, even in the missionary publications, of the conversion to christianity of any Hindoos belonging to a respectable *caste* in society. Some outcasts or parias, indeed, it is said, have nominally joined the christian cause. We are willing to allow, however, that the united exertions of the missionaries have induced one hundred respectable Hindoos to become christians.

If it require forty-six thousand dollars per annum to supply the wants of twenty-four missionaries; how much has it cost to maintain one hundred and fifty-six missionaries, (the number in Asia alone,) during twenty years? Ans. *Nearly six millions of dollars.*

It having taken six millions of dollars to convert one hundred Hindoos, how much *time* and *money* will it require, at the same rate, to convert six hundred millions of heathen?

The answer to this is, that it would require one hundred and twenty millions of years, and six millions of millions of dollars.

According to the Christian Almanac, the kingdom of our Saviour, at first small and obscure, is to be enlarged by a system of means. But the argument, however sound in the abstract, does not enforce the necessity of continuing the system of means already adopted. If there be any accuracy in the preceeding calculations, nothing can be more absurd than to found our hopes of diffusing the light of christianity upon so slight a progress as hath been made for twenty years in India.

"And now, people of New England, and all who fear God! with these facts we appeal to your consciences whether it is not your duty to give. We appeal to your hearts whether you are not willing to give to *save* your country from ruin, and to save millions of your countrymen *from hell*. Are you a friend of your country? Behold her nakedness, and spread over it the cover of charity. Are you friends to civil liberty? *Give*, that it may be

rescued from a violent death, and a speedy one, by the hands of ignorance and irreligion. Are you patriots? Bless your country by uniting in the holy enterprize of converting a moral wilderness into a fruitful field. Are you fathers? *Give, that you may provide for your children at home and abroad an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading, in heaven.* LAYMAN BEECHER.”

* * *

From the Ohio Republican.

DR. BEATTIE'S OPINION OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

“THE Christian Religion, according to my creed, is a very simple thing, intelligent to the meanest capacity; and what, if we are at pains to join practice to knowledge, we may make ourselves acquainted with without turning over many books. It is the distinguished excellence of this religion that it is entirely popular and fitted, both in its doctrines and its evidences, to all conditions and capacities of reasonable creatures—a character which does not belong to any other religious or philosophical system that ever appeared in the world. I wonder to see so many men eminent both for their piety and for their capacity, laboring to make a *mystery* of this divine institution. If God vouchsafe to reveal himself to mankind, can we suppose that he chooses to do it in such a manner that none but the learned and contemplative can understand him? The generality of mankind can never, in any possible circumstances, have leisure or capacity for learning or profound contemplation. If therefore we make christianity a mystery, we exclude the greater part of mankind from the knowledge of it; which is directly contrary to the intention of its author, as is plain from his explicit and reiterated declarations. In a word, I am perfectly convinced that an intimate acquaintance with the SCRIPTURE, particularly the Gospels, is all that is necessary to our accomplishment in true christian knowledge. I have looked into some systems of theology, but I never read one of them to an end, because I found I could never reap any instruction from them. To darken what is clear, by wrapping it up in a veil of system and science, was all the purpose that the best of them seems to me to answer.”

* * *

A TEXT ILLUSTRATED BY FACTS

“*And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandize of you.*”—2 Peter, ii. 2.

SUCH is one of the characteristics of false teachers mentioned by Peter the Apostle. The above text is well explained in one respect by the following doctrinal observations.

Head First—SALE OF PEWS

Sixty-nine pews were sold at auction, June 2d, in St. Andrew's Church, erected by the Episcopalians in this city, for twenty-two thousand and fifty-two dollars. The highest pew sold for seven hundred and fifteen dollars. Fifteen additional pews have been

since disposed of, which brought three thousand one hundred and ninety-one dollars.

Fifty of the pews in St. Stephen's Church, lately erected by the Episcopalians in this city, have been disposed of by auction for a sum exceeding 16,000 dollars. Other pews, disposed of by private sale, increase the aggregate to more than 19,000 dollars. The whole cost of the church is computed at 35,000 dollars.

A sale of pews took place in the New Presbyterian Church, in Arch-street, June 11th, when twenty-two pews were disposed of, which brought twelve thousand dollars. The highest price given for a pew was seven hundred and fifty-five dollars. There was to be another public sale of pews in the church on the 16th of June, the amount of which we have not learned. It is stated in one of our city papers, that "the estimate of the cost of the lot and building, including the steeple, an ornamental iron railing in front, and the walls round the property, together with a fine organ, and all the interior decorations, falls short of forty-three thousand dollars. The estimate of the pews, at a low valuation, is forty-five thousand dollars; that of the ground, twenty thousand.

The Reformer, published in Philadelphia.

The following statement of the sale of pews in a Methodist meeting house, was made by a citizen of Halifax:—

The pews were sold by Mr. Perkins, a public auctioneer, in the meeting-house, on Monday, the 18th of October, 1815, when the Rev. William Black made a suitable prayer for the occasion. Some went as high as fifty pounds (200 dollars,) and some as low as twenty pounds, for what is termed *good will*. They are not transferable, nor can they be sold out of the family, but must revert to the church on the decease of the purchaser.

The purchaser has to pay an annual rent of from five pounds to three pounds ten shillings, exclusive of the above purchase money. The same rule is applicable to the Church of England, but the sale is carried to a greater extent. Some of the pews in St. Paul's sell for 120 pounds each, for the *good will* only. *Ibid.*

From the London Morning Chronicle.

Head Second—THE SUPPORT OF THE CLERGY.

We have just received a copy of a pamphlet which cannot fail to produce a great sensation throughout the country. It is entitled, "Remarks on the Consumption of the Public Wealth by the Clergy of every Christian Nation, and particularly the Established Church in England and Wales, and Ireland; with a Plan for altering its Revenues, subject to existing interest, whereby the Episcopal Body would be provided for on a scale to make them the richest Episcopal Body in the World; the Working Clergy of the Establishment would be much better provided for than at present; the Working Clergy of all other denominations would be equally provided for with those of the Establishment, and both on a scale to make them the richest Working Clergy in the

World, and upwards of one hundred millions obtained to extinguish so much of the National Debt, and relieve the Nation from four millions of annual Taxes. London: printed for Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange." This production displays prodigious knowledge and research. It contains, in the shape of tables, the state of the church in every christian country, and the authorities from which the information is taken are regularly given.

The author considers the church the servants of the public, and the property held by them to be public property; and on this principle he deems all, beyond what the public service demands, (saving existing interests) available to the exigencies of the state.

He attempts to show that the clergy of one-third of the population of this country receive "more money than all the clergymen of all the rest of the whole christian world put together." In the following table the contrast is exhibited:—

Expenditures on the Clergy of all the Christian World, except the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

<i>Names of the Nation.</i>	<i>No. of Hearers.</i>	<i>Expenditure on the Clergy, per million of hearers.</i>	<i>Total amount of the expenditure on each nation.</i>
		£.	£.
France,	30,000,000	35,000	1,050,000
United States,	9,600,000	90,000	576,000
Spain,	11,000,000	100,000	1,100,000
Portugal,	3,000,000	100,000	300,000
Hungary Catholics,	4,000,000	80,000	320,000
—Calvinists,	1,050,000	60,000	630,000
—Lutherans,	650,000	40,000	26,000
Italy,	19,391,000	40,000	776,000
Austria,	18,918,000	50,000	950,000
Switzerland,	1,720,000	50,000	87,000
Prussia,	10,536,000	50,000	527,000
German small states, ..	12,763,000	60,000	765,000
Holland,	2,000,000	80,000	160,000
Netherlands,	3,000,000	35,000	105,000
Denmark,	1,700,000	70,000	119,000
Sweden,	3,400,000	70,000	233,000
Prussia, Greek,	34,000,000	15,000	510,000
Church Catholics & Lutherans, ..	8,000,000	50,000	400,000
Christians in Turkey,	6,000,000	30,000	180,000
South America,	15,000,000	30,000	450,000
Christians dispersed elsewhere, ..	5,000,000	50,000	150,000
The clergy of 193,728,000		receive	8,852,000

Expenditure on the Clergy of the Established Church of
ENGLAND & IRELAND.

Names of the Nation.	No. of Hearers.	Expenditure on the clergy per million of hearers.	Total amount of the expenditure on each nation.
		£.	£.
England and Wales,	6,000,000	1,266,000	7,596,000
Ireland,	400,000	3,250,000	1,300,000
The Clergy of 6,400,000		receive	8,896,000

Note by the Editor.—Converting English pounds sterling into dollars, \$4.44 each, it appears from the above table that the clergy of the christian world, excepting the clergy of Great Britain and Ireland, receive \$39,302,880; the Episcopal clergy of England, Wales and Ireland receive \$39,511,560. The episcopal clergy of England, Wales and Ireland receive \$208,680 per annum more than all the clergy of the christian world. Truly they are fitly styled Reformed Protestants!

If to these we should add the hundreds of thousands of dollars taken from the people, under the pretext of giving them to God, for the purpose of building splendid edifices for public worship, educating young men for priests, founding theological seminaries, endowing Bible societies, missionary societies, &c. &c. &c. in the various ways devised by the itinerant beggars of this age, what an immense sum would appear to be drained from the people, and what a luminous and striking illustration of the above text would they afford!

WE have to request our patrons to preserve their numbers to the end of each year from being sullied or worn, as no doubt many of them will wish to have them bound, and as every twelve numbers will make a handsome volume. Besides, this work is not intended to be filled with long accounts of revivals, ordinations, baptisms, reports of Bible and missionary societies, the constitutions and proceedings of cent societies, the election of presidents, vice-presidents and managers, secretaries and treasurers of mite societies, and all such splendid and glorious things as fill the pages of most of the religious publications of the day. We wish to publish such things as will bear to be read a year of two hence as far as the subject matter is concerned.

* * *

tion of those engaged in teaching the christian religion. It is the first of an intended series of essays on one of the most desirable subjects, viz. to point out a divinely authorized plan of teaching the christian religion. We earnestly entreat our readers to give these essays a fair, full, and strict examination. . . . EDITOR.

ON TEACHING CHRISTIANITY.—No. I.

OUR exertions for increasing the number of copies of the scriptures are now multiform and great; societies for effectuating this object are to be found almost every where. Towns, cities, villages, and even the wilderness, are forward in endeavors to make the number of Bibles in the world as great as possible; and though it cannot be said that the Bible is even now a scarce book, yet the day is anticipated when the number of copies shall be greatly multiplied, and when the blessed volume shall be found in the possession of every family, perhaps of every individual. The object of the present paper, however, is not to enlarge either on the benevolence or the extent of the present or probable success of those societies formed for multiplying copies of the Bible; but only to lend assistance to those societies or churches formed for understanding it, to present christians with an authorized plan of studying the scriptures, and to furnish the christian teacher with a certain method by which he ought to proceed in making known the great salvation to his hearers.

Were a vision vouchsafed us for the single purpose of revealing one uniform and universal plan of teaching the religion, would not every christian admire the goodness of God in determining a matter on which scarce two, calling themselves christian teachers, now agree? Would not every teacher feel himself bound in duty to abandon his own plan, and to adopt the plan of God—to study it, to teach by it and, in short, to maintain its superiority and authority against all other schemes, how plausible soever in their configuration, how apparently suitable soever in their application? The writer has not been favored with any vision on this matter; moreover, as he deems it unnecessary, he of course does not expect any. And surely if his plan be authorized by the example of God himself—by the Lord Jesus Christ—by the Holy Spirit, in his method of presenting the truth to all men in the scriptures; if the apostles taught the truth on this plan, and if missionaries in teaching idolaters feel themselves forced to the adoption of it; then there is no need of angel or vision. The path of duty is before us, and we ought to pursue it. What shall we say of the present Babel-like confusion among those calling themselves teachers of christianity? The champions of each sect forming schemes for themselves of teaching as chance, or whim, or interest directs, and all employing themselves in confirming certain factional dogmas—in making merchandize of the people, or in propagating damnable heresies. Timothy had known the holy scriptures from a child, and the apostle assured him that they alone were able to make him wise

unto salvation; that they were profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and instruction in righteousness; conjuring him at the same time, as he hoped to account for his conduct before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, to be instant in season and out of season, in teaching the word of God; asserting for it as a reason that the time was approaching when the professors of the religion, having itching ears, would, after their own lusts, (the love of novelty and of eloquence,) become disgusted with the scriptures, and make for themselves teachers, who would turn away people's ears from the truth and entertain them with fables.

Passing by, for the present, the various stupid schemes, all different and all wrong, pursued by Roman Catholics, Socinians, Arians, Covenanters, Seceders, Presbyterians, High-Churchmen, Baptists, Independents, and so forth, let us attend to the plan of teaching the truth pursued by God—by the Lord Jesus Christ—by the Holy Spirit, in presenting it to all men in the scriptures, and by the apostles and all who first preached it—a plan founded in the very nature of the saving truth itself, and into which ignorant missionaries feel themselves driven when every human scheme has failed. But what is the truth? Times out of number we are told in scripture that the grand saving truth is, that “*Jesus is the Christ.*” This is the bond of union among christians—the essence—the spirit of all revelation. All the scriptures testify and confirm this simple truth, that “*he that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God.*” John v. 2. For he who believeth it, sets to his seal that God is true. Such a one, John says, loveth God and Christ and the brethren, keepeth his commands, and is purified from all his sins, and overcometh the world, and shall be saved. Christ declared when departing into heaven, that he that believeth not shall be damned. The grand truth, then, being that “*Jesus is the Christ,*” let us attend to those scriptures which are written for the express purpose of establishing this proposition; these are the writings of the four evangelists, which at once show us in what manner God would have us to learn this truth; in what manner the Lord Jesus taught it; how the Holy Spirit has been pleased to present it to mankind; how the apostles wrote of it, and of course taught it to the world. This is the beginning of the plan authorized of heaven; and every teacher of the christian religion should commence by unfolding to his hearers the matter of the four evangelists. These things, says John, are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ; and that believing, ye might have life through his name. Now what definition soever the holy scripture has given of one evangelist, that is the definition of them all; for all of them contain a history of that marvellous evidence by which Jesus proved that he was the Christ; by which his pretensions to the Messiahship were so amply confirmed among the Jews.

The perfection of christian intelligence is a knowledge of the holy scriptures, and no christian is intelligent but as he knows the

scriptures. The desideratum, then, is a plan for teaching them to the people. By commencing with the four evangelists and abiding by them until they are relished and understood, we learn, chief of all things, that Jesus is the Christ; and while the number, magnitude, variety, sublimity and benignity of his miracles delight, astonish and instruct us, they, at the same time, carry irresistible conviction to the heart, purge it, elevate it, and fix our faith in the mighty power of God. By and by, as we become familiarized to the miraculous evidence, we become reconciled, and even strongly attached to it; losing all suspicion of its reality, and of course of the reality of our holy religion; because we come to perceive that these things were not done in a corner, but in public, and under the inspection of men who were both able and forward to decide upon their truth and certainty; men who, in point of intellect, reason, and character, might have vied with the choicest of our modern sceptics; men, in short, whose abilities to detect were equalled only by their readiness to pervert. In the writings of the evangelists we behold that power which created man and all things, exerting itself with all possible unaffected pomp and majesty, tempering, uniting, and clothing itself with all goodness and philanthropy; and so entirely at the will of the *Holy One*, that it accompanies those who accompany him. It sparkles, it flashes, it shines, it heals, it renovates, it creates, it controls, it rests, it leaps, it flies, it kindly raises up the bowed down, or pushes into silence the swelling and reluctant storm; it flies forth with the breath of his mouth, it operates at the tuft of his mantle, at the tip of his finger, or at the distance of a hundred leagues; now it is in the air with a voice like thunder; it shakes open the nodding tombs, or it rends the crashing mountains around Jerusalem; always marvellous, it is always harmless, and mostly benevolent. True, there is nothing conciliating or winning in power abstractly considered; apart from goodness, we always choose to inspect it at a distance; but if joined with malevolence, we fly from it with horror and affright. Power is formidable and even terrifying in the tiger, because in him it is a mere instrument of cruelty; but the same power becomes amiable in the horse, because all the thunder of his neck, all the glory of his nostrils, the strength of his limbs, and the fierceness of his attitude, are continually held in check by that beautiful docility which so eminently characterizes this noble animal, and by which his very will is identified with that of his rider. In the evangelists we behold the everlasting, the unexpended power itself, revealed in the form of a servant, and with more than a servant's humility, the strength of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and harmlessness of the Lamb, dwelling together in the same one.

In short, we see that the Lord our Saviour is unweariedly and everlastingly employed in supplying; comforting, and saving the unfortunate creatures whom he had originally made upright.

PHILIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

Sir—FROM the nature and design of this work, as stated in your proposals to the public, and from the character of those who may be supposed desirous to patronize it, as a work not devoted to the interests of any party, but merely and exclusively to the evolution and exhibition of christianity in its primitive simplicity and native excellence; it is presumed that an essay on the proper and primary intention of the gospel, with its proper and immediate effects in those that received it, would be a suitable introduction to such a work, as it would not only furnish an interesting and radical criterion, whereby to judge between the present and primitive state of christianity; but also would serve to show the grievous and incalculable privation of blissful and efficacious privileges, occasioned by a long and almost universal departure from the original apostolic exhibition of it; and thus tend to excite a general and just concern in the public mind to repair the incalculable loss, by strictly adverting to the pure original gospel as exhibited by the apostles, and thus to contend earnestly for the faith as it was once delivered to the saints. If you, sir, think with the writer, that such a subject would be a suitable commencement; and that the following will, in some good measure, answer that purpose, you will please accept it as a token of sincere desire for the utility and success of your undertaking, and as a pledge on the part of the writer, of his hearty determination to contribute any assistance in his power, to the accomplishment of so worthy an object.

Yours respectfully,

T. W.

Essay on the proper and primary intention of the Gospel, and its proper and immediate effects.

THAT the reconciliation of a guilty world, in order to complete and ultimate salvation, was the proper and primary intention of the gospel, is evident from the uniform tenor of the gospel testimony, as recorded in the New Testament. The gospel itself is called the word of reconciliation, 2 Cor. v. 19. The work of preaching it, as at first enjoined upon the apostles, and afterwards executed by them, is styled the ministry of reconciliation, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. Their manner of proceeding in it was to this effect; "As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye (sinners) reconciled to God," 2 Cor. v. 20, 21. The instruction under which they proceeded to the execution of their office, was, "that repentance and remission of sin should be preached, in the name of Christ, to all nations," Luke xxiv. 47. Their commencement at Jerusalem, in addressing the multitude that appeared convinced of the truth of their testimony concerning Jesus, was, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," Acts ii. 38. The immediate effect of their preaching, in all that were suitable affected by it, was reconciliation, Rom. v. 10. when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; and Col. i. 19-21, "For it pleased the

Father by him to reconcile all things unto himself; and you that were some time alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled," in the body of his flesh through death, 2 Cor. v. 18. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new;" and "all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ," v. 17, 18. From these, and a multitude of passages that might be adduced, it is evident that the proper and immediate intention of God in the publication of the gospel to the nations, whether Jews or Gentiles, was reconciliation to himself by Jesus Christ; and also, that the proper and immediate effect of this publication on all on whom it had its proper effect, that is, on all that understood and believed it, was reconciliation to God; and *that* in order to their complete and final salvation, according to Rom. v. 10. For it, 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.

Moreover, from the above cited scriptures, and many others, it is equally evident that the immediate and reconciling effect of the gospel, in all that were reconciled by it, was the belief of a full and free pardon of all their sins, through Christ, and for his sake, on the account of the propitiary sacrifice which he voluntarily made of himself upon the cross; which is therefore called the atonement or reconciliation. Indeed, when we contemplate the state of the world in the light of divine revelation, we find that all, both Jews and Gentiles, had sinned and come short of the glory of God; that the whole world was become guilty before him; there was none righteous—no, not one; none that practised good and sinned not. And that, except a very few spiritual characters among the Jews, whose minds were supported by the hopes of the promised Messiah, all mankind were alienated from the life of God, through the blindness of ignorance; and were become enemies in their minds by wicked works. Such, then, being the actual state of mankind, considered as the object of divine benevolence, we see the indispensable necessity of the means which infinite wisdom and goodness devised to effect a change for the better among such guilty creatures; namely, the proclamation of a general and everlasting amnesty, a full and free pardon of all offences, to all, without respect of persons; and *this* upon such terms as brought it equally near to, equally within the reach of, *all*, which was effectually done by the preaching of the gospel; see Acts xiii. 16-19. and x. 34-43, and ii. 14-35, with many other scriptures. In the passages above referred to, we have a sufficient and satisfactory specimen of the truly primitive and apostolic gospel, as preached both to Jews and Gentiles, by the two great apostles, Peter and Paul; in each of which we have, most explicitly, the same gracious proclamation of pardon to every one that received their testimony concerning Jesus. Re-

pent, said Peter to the convinced and convicted Jews, (Acts ii. 38.) and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the *remission of sins*. And again, Acts x. 43, to him give all the prophets witness that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive *remission of sins*. To the same effect Paul, in his sermon at Antioch, in the audience both of Jews and Gentiles, Acts xiii. 38, 39. Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the *forgiveness of sins*, and by him, all that believe are justified from *all things*. God, by the gospel, thus avowing his love to mankind, in giving his only begotten Son for the life of the world; and through him, and for his sake, a full and free remission of all sins; and all this in a perfect consistency with his infinite abhorrence of sin, in the greatest possible demonstration of his displeasure against it, in the death of his Son, (which he has laid as the only and adequate foundation for the exercise of sin-pardoning mercy;) has at once secured the glory of his character, and afforded effectual relief and consolation to the perishing guilty, by a full and free pardon of *all sin*. "And you, being dead in your sins, and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses," Col. ii. 13. Such being the gospel testimony concerning the love of God, the atonement of Christ, and the import of baptism for the remission of sins; all, therefore, that believed it, and were baptized for the remission of their sins, were as fully persuaded of their pardon and acceptance with God, through the atonement of Christ, and for his sake, as they were of any other article of the gospel testimony. It was this, indeed, that gave virtue and value to every other item of that testimony, in the estimation of the convinced sinner; as it was this *alone* that could free his guilty burthened conscience from the guilt of sin, and afford him any just ground of confidence towards God. Without *this justification*, which he received by faith in the divine testimony, could he have had peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ, or have rejoiced in hope of his glory, as the apostle testifies concerning the justified by faith? Rom. v. 1, 2. Surely no; or how could he have been reconciled to God by the death of his Son, had he not believed, according to the testimony, that he had redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of the divine grace, thus most graciously manifested? Or why could he have received baptism, the import of which to the believer was the remission of his sins, had he not believed the divine attestation to him in that ordinance, concerning the pardoning of his sins upon his believing and being baptized? Every one, then, from the very commencement of christianity, who felt convinced of the truth of the gospel testimony, and was baptized, was as fully persuaded of the remission of his sins, as he was of the truth of the testimony itself. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, seeing the testimony held forth this as the primary and immedi-

ate privilege of every one that believed it? "For to him gave all the prophets witness, that, through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins." Likewise Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, after he was convinced of the truth concerning Jesus of Nazareth, saying, Why tarriest thou; arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, &c. &c. But the fulness of evidence with which the scriptures attest this blissful truth, will abundantly appear to all that search them for obtaining a full discovery of it. In the mean time, from what has been produced we may see with what great propriety the pure and primitive preaching of the gospel was called the ministry of reconciliation, and how admirably adapted it was to that gracious purpose. Indeed, how could it possibly fail of producing that blissful and happy effect in every one that believed it? Was it not a divinely attested declaration of the love of God to a guilty perishing world, to such a degree as to give his only begotten Son to become a sacrifice and ransom for the sins of men; and that through him, whosoever believeth in him, has remission of sins; is justified from all things; shall not come unto condemnation, but shall have everlasting life; and all this immediately upon his believing, figuratively, that is typically, declared and confirmed to him by his baptism; a solemn rite of divine appointment for this very purpose, as the apostles have explained it. See Rom. 6th chapter, &c. &c. Hence, also, we may see a just and adequate reason of the great joy, consolation, and happiness that universally accompanied the primitive preaching and belief of the gospel amongst all sorts of people; as also, of the very singular and eminent fruits of universal benevolence, of zeal, of brotherly kindness, of liberality, of fortitude, of patience, of resignation, of mutual forbearance and forgiveness; in a word, of universal self-denying obedience in conformity to Christ; contentedly, nay, even joyfully, suffering the loss of all things for his sake: so that the Apostle John could boldly and confidently challenge the world, saying, "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?"

Such was the virtue of the primitive faith; and such faith the just and genuine effect of the apostolic gospel; for it could produce no other correspondent faith, if it produced any at all. In fine, from the premises before us, that is, from the whole apostolic exhibition of the gospel, and its recorded effects upon all who professed to believe it, many of whom, it is certain, did not truly understand the gospel, and therefore could not truly believe it: nevertheless, from the whole of the premises, it is evident that the professing world is far gone, yea, very far indeed, from original ground; for such was the import of the gospel testimony, as we have seen, that all who professed to believe it, whether they were intelligent persons or not, understood *at least so much* by it that it gave assurance of pardon and acceptance with God to every one that received it; that is, to every baptized believer: consequently every one that was baptized, making the

same profession, he both thought himself, and was esteemed by his professing brethren, a justified and accepted person. Hence we do not find a single instance, on the sacred record, of a doubting or disconsolate christian; nor a single hint dropped for the direction or encouragement of such; but, on the contrary, much said to detect and level presumptuous confidence. How different this from the present state of the professing world, the discreet and judicious reader need not be informed. Now, surely, if similar causes uniformly produce similar effects; the same preaching would as uniformly produce the same faith that it did in the beginning in all them that believed it; and even in all them that *thought* they believed it; namely, of the person's justification and acceptance with God; and, of course, the same faith would produce the same peace and joy in the believer, and in him that thought himself to be such, as it did in the days, and under the preaching, of the apostles and of their faithful coadjutors.

T. W.

* * *

REMARKS ON MISSIONARIES.

FOR two centuries the "christian nations," emperors, kings, princes, priests, and laity, were uniting their efforts to rescue the "Holy Land," in which the Saviour lived and died, from the hands of the infidels. A superstitious veneration for the city of Bethlehem, the place of the nativity; for the villages of Judea, the theatre of the miracles; and for Jerusalem, the place of the crucifixion and the sepulchre of the Messiah, was the cause of innumerable pilgrimages to Palestine. These pilgrimages were, for many years, performed with safety. But in the year 1065 this land fell into the hands of the Turks, and pilgrimages to it became extremely dangerous. The merit and indispensable necessity of these pilgrimages increased, in popular estimation, with the dangers attendant on them. The hard usage of the pilgrims, from the tyranny of the Turks, filled all Europe with complaints. In a council of 4000 ecclesiastics and 30,000 seculars, it was determined to be meritorious in the sight of God, to be a great and pious design, and to be "the will of God," that all christians should engage in one grand system of hostilities against the Turks; that great and powerful expeditions should be fitted out against the infidels who possessed the "Holy Land;" that the soldiers should all wear a cross on their right shoulders, and, with swords in their hands, open the way into the holy city. These expeditions were called *croisades*, from the circumstance of the soldiers wearing a cross. All Europe was engaged in this project. Buck tells us in his compend of history, that "all ranks of men, now deeming the croisades the only road to heaven, were impatient to open the way, with their swords, to the Holy City. Nobles, artisans, peasants, even priests enrolled their names; and to decline this service, was branded with the reproach of impiety and cowardice. The nobles were moved by the romantic

spirit of the age to hope for opulent establishments in the East, the chief seat of arts and commerce at that time. In pursuit of these chimerical projects, they sold, at low prices, their ancient castles and inheritances, which had now lost all value in their eyes. The infirm and aged contributed to the expedition by presents and money, and many of them attended it in person, being determined, if possible, to breathe their last in sight of that city where their Saviour died for them. Even women, concealing their sex under the disguise of armor, attended the camp." The first croisade consisted of 300,000 undisciplined, and about 700,000 disciplined men. No less than eight croisades were undertaken in something less than 200 years. Upwards of two millions were destroyed in these croisades—and yet the Holy Land is still retained by the infidels. "If," says the same Charles Buck, "the absurdity and wickedness of this conduct can be exceeded by any thing, it must be by what follows. In 1204 the frenzy of croisading seized the children, who are every ready to imitate what they see their parents engaged in: their childish folly was encouraged by the monks and schoolmasters, and thousands of those innocents were conducted from the houses of their parents on the superstitious interpretation of these words, *Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou perfected praise.*" Their base conductors sold a part of them to the Turks, and the rest perished miserably."

We are all prepared to call those croisades chimerical and wicked projects, and to compliment ourselves as elevated above such wild enthusiasm and debasing superstition, yet, perhaps some of the great and popular undertakings of our era may be pronounced by posterity as absurd and superstitious, as enthusiastic and unscriptural as those we so cheerfully censure. The collecting of money by the hands of a constable, to pay a "Divine" for teaching us righteousness, mercy, and the love of God; the incorporating of a christian society by the act of a legislative body, often composed of men of no religion, of sceptics in the christian revelation, and of men of different religious sects; the asking and receiving of money from those who have not received the gospel as the gospel of their salvation, to send the word to the heathen which they themselves have not obeyed; the selling of pews for hundreds of dollars to defray the expences of building a house of worship, decorated like a theatre, to gratify the pride of life; the taxing of those pews to collect a revenue to support the *reverend* incumbent, who weekly from the rostrum sells his prayers and his sermons; the consecrating of grave-yards; the laying the foundation stones of cathedrals and meeting houses with masonic and clerical honors; the making of holy water, or the consecrating a few drops from a common to a special use; and many other pranks of protestant priests, will, no doubt, be viewed by those that come after us as superstitious, as enthusiastic, as anti-christian as the croisades; though, perhaps, inferior in magnitude and not so palpably wicked.

For 300 years great exertions have been made to convert the whole world to the christian religion. Much zeal has been exhibited, many privations have been endured, and great dangers have been braved by missionaries to heathen lands. In this laudable object the most ignorant and most superstitious sect in christendom has been the most active, and, if we can credit its reports, by far the most successful. The Portuguese and Spaniards of the holy see of Rome, in the 16th century, spread (what they call) *the gospel*, through large districts in Asia, Africa, and America. Different orders of monks, particularly, the Dominicans, Franciscans, and, above all, the Jesuits, displayed astonishing zeal, and spent immense sums in reclaiming African, Asian, and American Pagans. The great missionary *Xavier* spread the Romish gospel through the Portuguese settlements in the East Indies, through most of the India continent, and of Ceylon. In 1549 he sailed to Japan and founded a church there, which soon amounted to 600,000 Roman christians. Others penetrated into China, and founded churches that continued 170 years. In 1580 other Catholic missionaries penetrated into Chili and Peru, and converted the natives. Others labored with ardent zeal and unwearied industry among the Greeks, Nestorians, Abyssinians and Egyptian Copts. In 1622 the Pope established a congregation of cardinals, *de propagando fide*, and endowed it with ample revenues for propagating the faith. In 1627, Urban, the pope, added a college, in which the languages of pagans were taught. France copied the example of Rome, and formed establishments for the same purposes. Amongst all the religious orders there was "*a holy ambition*" which should do most. "The Jesuits claimed the first rank as due to their zeal, learning, and devotedness to the holy see. The Dominicans, Franciscans, and others, disputed the palm with them. The new world and the Asiatic regions were the chief field of their labors. They penetrated into the uncultivated recesses of America. They visited the untried regions of Siam, Tonkin, and Cochin China. They entered the vast empire of China itself, and numbered millions among their converts. They dared to affront the dangers of the tyrannical government of Japan. In India they assumed the garb and austerities of the Brahmins, and boasted, on the coast of Malabar, of a thousand converts baptized in one year by a single missionary. Their sufferings were, however, very great; and in China and Japan they were exposed to the most dreadful persecutions, and many thousands were cut off, with, at last, a final expulsion from the empires."—*Buck's Theological Dictionary*, vol. 1, p. 147.

We all, who call ourselves protestants, hesitate not to say, that those missionaries, notwithstanding their zeal, their privations, and their sufferings in the missionary cause, left the heathen no better than they found them; nay, in some instances, they left them much worse; and, that there is as much need for their conversion from the religion of those missionaries, as there

was from the religion of idols. It may be worthy of the serious consideration of many of the zealous advocates of the various sectarian missions in our day, whether, in a few years, the same things may not be said of their favorite projects which they themselves affirm of the Catholic missions and missionaries. They should also remember that it was once as unpopular and as *impious* to speak against the missionary undertakings of the "mother church," as it can possibly be now to even call in question the schemes of any of her daughters. It might not be amiss also to consider, that a Dominican or a Jesuit *did* appeal to the privations and sufferings of their missionaries as a proof of their sincerity and piety, and to their great success, as a proof that the Lord of Hosts was with them. These reflections suggest the necessity of great caution in forming opinions on the measures of the religionists of our time. We pass over the Moravian, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, and the Baptist missionaries of the age, and proceed to suggest, in the most respectful manner, to the religious community, a few thoughts on what appears to us the CAPITAL MISTAKE of all the missionary schemes of our time.

The Capital Mistake of Modern Missionary Schemes.

IN order that this may appear as plain as possible, we shall take a brief view of the two grand missions instituted of God. The first was that of Moses and Joshua. Moses was the great apostle from God to the Israelites in Egypt. Before he became God's missionary, from his own benevolence, to his brethren the Jews, and from a sense of the tyranny of the Egyptians, he became a revenger of the wrongs of his people, and delivered one of them from the hands of an Egyptian. In this period of his history he very much resembled one of our best missionaries: he was a benevolent, zealous, and bold man; felt himself called to a good work; but not being commissioned of God, his efforts were unavailing, and he was obliged to fly his country for his ill-timed zeal. After forty years, the Lord appeared to him and commissioned him as his missionary to Egypt. Moses, from his own experience on a former occasion, discovered that something more was necessary to his success than good professions and good speeches; he, therefore, answered and said, "But, behold, they will not believe me, nor hearken unto my voice; for they will say, The Lord hath not appeared unto thee." The Lord immediately authorized and empowered him to work miracles. He now goes forth, in conjunction with his brother Aaron, clothed with proper authority, confirming his testimony with signs and wonders, and effects the deliverance of the Israelites from ignorance and bondage. See an account of this mission, Exodus, 3d and 4th chapters. The success of his mission Stephen compendiously relates in these words, Acts vii. 35, 36. This Moses whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God *send* to be a ruler and a deliverer

by the hand of the angel that appeared unto him in the bush. He brought them out, after that he had shewn *wonders* and *signs* in the land of Egypt, and in the Red Sea, and in the wilderness forty years.

Joshua becomes, after the death of Moses, the second missionary in this mission, and is thus authorized, Joshua i. 5. "There shall not any man be able to stand before thee all the days of thy life: as I was with Moses, so I will be with thee; I will not fail thee nor forsake thee." 9. "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed; for the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." Signs and wonders accompanied the ministry of Joshua until he placed the tribes of Israel in their own land and divided it to them by lot. In this manner the first grand mission commenced, progressed, and terminated. Without pausing on the mission of John the Baptist, to introduce the christian era, which was also authenticated by signs and wonders attendant on his conception and birth, and which were noised abroad throughout all Judea, whereby his testimony was confirmed unto the people; we proceed to the second in order of time, but in fact the first grand mission to which all others were subservient—we mean the Father's sending his own Son into the world as his great apostle or missionary, and the Son's sending his missionaries to perfect this grand mission. We need scarcely stop here to shew that signs and wonders accompanied his preaching, as every christian, on the evidence of those signs and wonders, receives him as God's Messiah, the Saviour of the World. But how did he send forth his missionaries? He tells them, "As the Father sent me, so also I send you." Matthew informs us, chap. x. that "Jesus called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and disease." These he *commanded* to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to preach the approaching reign of heaven, and to confirm it by miracles—"Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out demons: freely you have received, freely give."

The seventy disciples, who were sent out by the Messiah to go before his face, and to announce the approaching reign, were sent, in the same manner, empowered to confirm their testimony by signs and wonders. See Luke x. The apostles, in the last commission, were sent to all the world; but were prohibited, in the accompanying instructions, from commencing their operations, until they should be endued with a *power* from on high. Thus all the missionaries, sent from heaven, were authorized and empowered to confirm their doctrine with signs and wonders sufficient to awe opposition, to subdue the deepest rooted prejudices, and to satisfy the most inquisitive of the origin of their doctrine.

After Pentecost their powers were enlarged and new signs added. So sensible are they of the vast importance of those

miracles, that their prayers ran in the following style, Acts iv. 29. "Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants, that, with all boldness, they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thy hand to *heal*, and that *signs* and *wonders* may be done by the name of thy holy son Jesus." Those spiritual gifts continued until the gospel was preached to all the world, Jews and Gentiles, and until churches were planted in all nations. Then they ceased. Why? Doubtless, because, in the eyes of Omniscience, they were no longer necessary. The missionary work was done. The gospel had been preached unto all nations before the end of the apostolic age. The Bible, then, gives us no idea of a missionary without the power of working miracles. Miracles and missionaries are inseparably connected in the New Testament. Nor can it be considered an objection to this fact, should it appear that some persons in the train of the true missionaries wrought no miracles, seeing those that led the van performed every thing of this kind that was necessary. Just as if a missionary were sent to India, with powers equal to those of Paul, with a score of attendants and fellow-laborers, his spiritual gifts or miraculous powers accredit the mission as of divine origin, and are as convincing to the witnesses as though they all wrought miracles. From these plain and obvious facts and considerations, it is evident that it is a *capital mistake* to suppose that missionaries in heathen lands, without the power of working miracles can succeed in establishing the christian religion. If it was necessary for the first missionaries to possess them, it is as necessary for those of our time who go to pagan lands, to possess them. Every argument that can be adduced to show that those signs and wonders, exhibited in Judea, were necessary to the success of that mission, can be turned to shew that such signs and wonders are necessary at this day in China, Japan, or Burmah, to the success of a missionary.

The success of all modern missionaries is in accordance with these facts. They have, in some instances, succeeded to persuading some individuals to put on a sectarian profession of christianity. As the different philosophers, in ancient nations, succeeded in obtaining a few disciples to their respective systems, each new one making some inroads upon his predecessors; so have the modern missionaries succeeded in making a few proselytes to their systems, from amongst the disciples of the different pagan systems of theology. But that any thing can be produced, of a credible character, resembling the success of the divine missionaries, narrated in the New Testament, is impossible; or, that a church, resembling that at Jerusalem, Samaria, Cesaria, Antioch, or Rome, has been founded in any pagan land, by the efforts of our missionaries, we believe incapable of proof. Is, then, the attempt to convert the heathen by means of modern missionaries, an unauthorized and a hopeless one? It seems to be unauthorized, and, if so, then it is a hopeless one.

How, then, is the gospel to spread through the World?

THE New Testament is the only source of information on this topic. It teaches us that the association, called the church of Jesus Christ is, in *propria forma*, the only institution of God left on earth to illuminate and reform the world, That is, to speak in the most definitive and intelligible manner, a society of men and women, having in their hands the oracles of God; believing in their hearts the gospel of Jesus Christ; confessing the truth of Christ with their lips; exhibiting in their lives the morality of the gospel, and walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blamelessly, in the sight of all men. When spiritual men, *i.e.*, men having spiritual gifts, or, as now termed, miraculous gifts, were withdrawn, this institution was left on earth, as the grand scheme of Heaven, to enlighten and reform the world. An organized society of this kind, modelled after the plan taught in the New Testament, is the consummation of the manifold wisdom of God to exhibit to the world the civilizing, the moralizing, the saving light, which renovates the human heart, which elevates human character, and which prostrates in the dust all the boaster expedients of ancient and the *pillar* and *ground* of the truth; or, as Macknight more correctly renders it, the *pillar* and *support* of the truth.

The christian religion is a social religion, and cannot be exhibited to the full conviction of the world, only when it appears in this social character. An individual or two, in a pagan land, may talk about the christian religion, and may exhibit its morality as far as respects mankind in general; but it is impossible to give a clear, a satisfactory, a convincing exhibition of it, in any other way than by exhibiting a church, not on paper, but in actual existence and operation, as divinely appointed. The ambassadors of Christ, or his missionaries to the world, were commissioned to go unto all nations in quest of materials to build this pillar of truth, this house of the living God; and then to place and cement these materials in such a way as to bear the inscription of the blessed gospel, and to exhibit it in such conspicuous and legible characters, as to be known and read of all men. This work the apostles accomplished in having made of twain one new man, *i.e.* of Jew and Gentile one new institution, or associated body, the church; and having placed this in all nations, in the most conspicuous and elevated situations; in the most populous countries, the most commercial states, and in the most renowned cities, they were taken to heaven, and left the church, by its doctrine and example, to christianize the world. All that has been necessary ever since was to hold fast the apostles' doctrine and commandments. If this had been faithfully done, there would have been no need, at this moment, to talk of converting the heathen. But it has happened, by the woeful departure of ambitious and ignorant men, from the ancient simplicity of the new religion, that the same awful crime is justly preferred against the people called Christians, that was, by an

apostle, charged upon the Jews, viz. "The christian name has been, through your crimes, blasphemed among the heathen." Yes, indeed, so blasphemed, so disgraced, so vilified, that amongst those pagans that have heard of it, the term *Christian* denotes every thing that is hateful and impious. If the channel of the vast Atlantic were filled with tears of the deepest contrition, they would not suffice to wash the "christian nations" from the odium and turpitude of crime with which they have debased themselves, so as to appear worthy of the approbation of the pagans that know them best. Nothing can be done worthy of admiration by the christians of this age, with any reference to the conversion of the pagan nations, until the christians separate themselves from all the worldly combinations in which they are swallowed up, until they come out from amongst them that have a form of godliness, but deny the power of it; until they cast out all the selfish, money-lovers, boasters, proud, blasphemers, drunkards, covenant breakers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, without natural affection, slanderers, incontinent, fierce, betrayers, headstrong, puffed up, and lovers of pleasures, more than lovers of God; until they form themselves into societies independent of hireling priests and ecclesiastical courts, modelled after the forum, the parliament, or national conventions; until they cast to the moles and to the bats the Platonic speculations, the Pythagorean dreams and Jewish fables they have written in their creeds; until they return to the ancient model delineated in the New Testament; and until they keep the ordinances as delivered unto them by the apostles. Then suppose a christian church were to be placed on the confines of a heathen land, as some of them must inevitably be, the darkness of paganism will serve, as a shade in a picture, to exhibit the lustre of christianity. Then the heathen around them will see their humility; their heavenly mindedness, their hatred of garments spotted with the flesh, their purity, their chasity, their temperance, their sobriety, their brotherly love; they will observe the order of their worship, and will fall down in their assemblies, as Paul affirms, and declare that God is in them of a truth. Then will be verified anew the words of the Saviour—"If ye love one another, *all men* will know that you are the disciples of the Saviour of the world." They will say to one another, and proclaim to their countrymen on every occasion, "These christians are peaceful, benevolent, humane, forgetful and forgiving of injuries; they hate war, oppression, theft, falsehood, detraction; they are always talking of the hope of a glorious resurrection from the dead, and are looking for the coming of him whom they call their Lord. In their assemblies there is order, peace, love, and harmony. Their chief guide is not distinguished by his dress, as our priests, nor does he, like them, live upon the sweat and sacrifices of the people. He works with his own hands as those who meet with him in their assembly. They repay the curses of wicked pagans with blessings, and their

benevolence is not confined to themselves. They are as benevolent to all our people as to themselves—come, see if their religion is not better than ours—better than all other.” When the christian church assumes such a character there will be no need of missionaries. She will shine forth in the doctrine and in the practice of her members, as the sun in the firmament, and the brightness of her radiance will cheer the region and shadow of death.

If, in the present day, and amongst all those who talk so much of a missionary spirit, there could be found such a society, though it were composed of but twenty, willing to emigrate to some heathen land, where they would support themselves like the natives, wear the same garb, adopt the country as their own, and profess nothing like a missionary project; should such a society sit down and hold forth in word and deed the saving truth, not deriding the gods nor the religion of the natives, but allowing their own works and example to speak for their religion, and practising as above hinted; we are persuaded that, in process of time, a more solid foundation for the conversion of the natives would be laid, and more actual success resulting, than from all the missionaries employed for 25 years. Such a course would have some warrant from scripture; but the present has proved itself to be all human.

We do not intend to dwell much on this topic. We have thought the above remarks were due to the great interest manifested by many in those kind of exertions. We know many of the well disposed are engaged in these projects; nay, it is not long since we ourselves were enthusiastic in the missionary spirit. Let the reader remember our motto—let him “*prove all things, and hold fast that which is good.*”

EDITOR.

* * *

From the Latter Day Luminary, July, 1823

MISSIONARIES TO BURMAH

ON Wednesday, the 11th of June, at Utica, New York, the Rev. *Jonathan Wade* and his consort were set apart as missionaries to the Burman empire, by a committee of the Board of Managers of the Baptist General Convention. An interesting sermon was delivered on the occasion by the Rev. *Nathaniel Kendrick*, from 2 Tim. ii. 10. “*Therefore I endure all things for the elect’s sake, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.*” Rev. *Alfred Bennett* led in offering up the consecrating prayer. Rev. *Daniel Hascall* gave Mr. Wade an appropriate charge, and the Rev. *Joel W. Clark* gave him the right hand of fellowship, “*that he should go to the heathen;*” Rev. *John Peck* addressed Mrs. Wade, and Rev. *Elon Galusha* gave her the right hand in fellowship. Rev. *Elijah F. Willey* offered the concluding prayer. The services were performed in Rev. Mr. *Atkin’s* meeting house. The day was fine, and the assemblage was very large, and proved, by their fixed

and silent attention to the services, how much they felt for the world that lieth in wickedness; and by a collection of \$86 23 taken on the spot, they showed a willingness to share in the pleasure and expense of spreading the gospel in all the earth.

Mr. Wade is a young man, and a native of the state of New York. He received his classical and theological education in the Theological Seminary at Hamilton. He appeared before the committee a man of good sense, of ardent piety, and understandingly led by the Spirit of God to the work in which he has now engaged. Mrs. Wade is from a respectable family in Hamilton, Madison county, daughter of deacon Lapham. Her early piety and active zeal in the cause of her Redeemer, has encouraged the hope that she will be eminently useful in the cause of missions, with her husband.

Note by the Editor.—How accordant is the language and spirit of the above to the following passage from the 13th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles:—‘On Wednesday, the 11th of June, A. D. 44, the Rev. *Saulus Paulus* and the Rev. *Joses Barnabas* were set apart as missionaries to the Gentiles dispersed throughout the world, by a committee of the Board of Managers of the Baptist General Conventions, met in the city of Antioch. An interesting sermon was delivered on the occasion by the Rev. *Simon Niger*, from Isaiah xlii. 4. “*The isles shall wait for his law.*” Rev. *Lucius* of Cyrene led in offering up the consecrating prayer. Rev. *Manaen* gave Mr. Paulus and his companion (Mr. Barnabas) an appropriate charge, and the Rev. *John Mark* gave them the right hand in fellowship, “*that they should go the heathen.*” The Rev. *Lucius* of Cyrene offered up the concluding prayer. The services were performed in the Rev. Mr. *Simon Niger’s* meeting house. The day was fine, and the assemblage was very large, and proved, by their fixed and silent attention to the services, how much they felt for the world that lieth in wickedness; and by a collection \$86 25 cents, they shewed a willingness to aid the Rev. Mr. Paul and the Rev. Mr. Barnabas in carrying the gospel to the heathen.

Mr. Paulus is a young man, and a native of the city of Tarsus; he received his classical and theological education in the theological seminary in Jerusalem. He appeared before the committee a man of good sense, of ardent piety, and understandingly led by the Spirit of God to the work in which he has now engaged.’

It is then plain that the above notification is just in the spirit and style of this passage from the 13th chapter of the Acts. But in the common translation the original loses much of its aptitude and beauty; for, lo! it reads thus: “Now there was in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as, Barnabas, and Simon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work where-

unto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid *their* hands on them, they sent *them* away."

It is much to be desired that the Baptist in the western country will not imitate these precedents of pompous vanity, so consecrated in the east; and that they will rather cherish the spirit and copy the style of that much despised little volume called the New Testament. Then we know they will remember that it is spoken by our Lord, "*Be not called Rabbi,*" or Reverend. Then they will confess that many things of high reputation in this age are an abomination in the sight of God.

* * *

THE BOSTON RECORDER.

THE editor of the Boston Recorder, in a late address to his subscribers and to the public in general, has made a very generous proposal to the American Education Society, that if, by any means, he can get a thousand names added to his subscription list, (which at present amounts to 3500,) who will *pay* as well as subscribe, he will give a thousand dollars to the Education Society; and so in proportion for a greater or smaller number above the present 3500, in each succeeding year. As in inducement to their liberality, he gives a nearly correct list of the *annual income* of all the principal missionary and charitable societies of the day, which is as follows, viz.—

English Education Society for propagating the Gospel, annual income, 253,080 dollars.

Society of the United Brethren, 32,000 dollars.

Wesleyan Missionary Society, 119,360 dollars.

English Baptist Missionary Society, 58,666 dollars.

London Missionary Society, 130,708 dollars.

Edinburgh Missionary Society, 14,715 dollars.

Church Missionary Society, 146,000 dollars.

London Jews' Society, 50,000 dollars.

American Board of Foreign Missions, 59,397 dollars.

American Baptist Board for Foreign Missions, 18,000 dollars.

United Foreign Mission Society, 11,948 dollars.

British and Foreign Bible Society, 460,884 dollars.

American Bible Society, 38,682 dollars.

London Religious Tract Society, 41,000 dollars.

New England Tract Society, 3,691 dollars.

Besides these there are Domestic Missionary and Education Societies in nearly all the United States.

Thus 1,438,181 dollars, or about one million and a half per annum, is spent in the various schemes of the day. He represents the great need of more learned divines, and of more readers of religious newspapers, such as the *Recorder*, from various considerations. Among others we find the lamentable condition of the New England states and the state of New York adduced, amounting to about 400,000 families, "and of these 100,000 may be supposed to be *christian families,*" and but few of these, for

want of religious intelligence (for want of his paper and others like it) "take any deep interest in these mighty movements which are now making for the *conversion of the world.*" Yet, with all the "mighty movements," he supposes that three hundred thousand families in the above states are not christianized, *i.e.* three-fourths of his own people! Religious newspapers, learned Divines, and missionaries are much wanted in New England on this writer's hypothesis!

He then suggests to his present readers the necessity of regarding as a "*sacred duty*" which they owe God and their country, to persuade their neighbors and friends to take his paper; to "ministers of the gospel," the necessity of recommending it from the pulpit; to "enterprising females," the excellence of persuading others; to "students of colleges," especially the *beneficiaries*, to spend a part of their vacations; to "teachers of schools," to extend their usefulness; to parents, and "persons travelling," "*having a commission from the publisher,*" to do good by circulating religious newspapers in their respective spheres.

The Boston Recorder casts his mite into the treasury of the American Education Society. To make *learned* teachers of christianity is *his* grand object, next to enlarging his subscription list. "The reasons," he says, "why the Education Society was formed, may be found in the following facts: "One hundred and forty-six towns in Maine; forty-five towns in two counties of New Hampshire; One hundred and thirty-nine towns in Vermont; fifty-three congregations in Massachusetts; three hundred and eighty nine congregations in the Presbyterian church in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio; forty-six counties containing three hundred and four thousand inhabitants in Virginia; three hundred and thirty-two churches of different denominations in South Carolina, all Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and Michigan, except so far as a few ministers can supply a population of *three hundred thousand* scattered over a territory almost three times at large as New England; one thousand churches in the Baptist, and four hundred and fifty-one churches in the Presbyterian connexion, are destitute of educated ministers. Add to these appalling facts, the unparalleled increase of our population and the disproportionate increase of our religious institutions, and to these the deep darkness that covers vast portions of our globe, and truly "*the harvest is great and the laborers are few.*" Hence, then, the necessity of the American Education Society."

How very different the course recommended by the Recorder to enlighten the world, and that recommended by the Saviour and his apostles! The scheme of a learned priesthood chiefly composed of beneficiaries, has long since proved itself to be a grand device to keep men in ignorance and bondage; a scheme, by means of which the people have been shrewdly taught to put out their own eyes, to fetter their own feet, and to bind

the yoke upon their own necks. From this iniquitous scheme, a knowledge of the New Testament is the only means that can set the people FREE.

* * *

No. 3

MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1823.

VOL. 1.

THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION
THE CLERGY—No. I.

NO class or order of men that ever appeared on earth have obtained so much influence, or acquired so complete an ascendancy over the human mind, as the clergy. The christian clergy have exercised, for about fifteen hundred years, a sovereign dominion over the Bible, the consciences, and the religious sentiments of all nations professing christianity. Even kings and emperors bowed with deference to their authority, acknowledging their supremacy, and not daring to wield the sceptre until consecrated and crowned by a minister of religion. —Though vials of wrath have been poured from heaven upon the kingdom of the clergy; though many of them have gnawed their tongues and bit their lips with pain, at the loss of their former manificent and mighty sway—yet, still their dominion, though much impaired, exists to an alarming extent; and their eagerness to have an unrivalled control over the public sentiment, in all religious affairs, remains unabated. Behold the arrogance of their claims! and the peerless haughtiness of their pretensions! They have said, and of them many still say, they have an exclusive right, an *official* right, to affix the proper interpretation to the scriptures; to expound them in public assemblies; insomuch, that it would be presumptuous in a layman to attempt to exercise any of those functions which they have assumed. They must “*christen*” the new born infant; they must catechise and confirm the tender stripling; they must celebrate the rites of matrimony; they must dispense all ordinances in religion; they must attend the corpse to its grave, preach a funeral sermon, and consecrate the very ground on which it is laid. This dominion they at first obtained by slow degrees, but from its great antiquity and general prevalence it is almost universally acquiesced in, approved, yea, even admired by the devout community. From this dominion over the feelings and consciences of mankind, it was not difficult to slide the hand into the purse of the superstitious. The most artful, and, indeed, the most effectual way, to get a hold of the purse, is to get a hold of the conscience. The deeper the impression is made on the one, the deeper the draft on the other. Thus it came to pass that the clergy obtained worldly establishments, enriched themselves, and became an order as powerful in the state as in the church. The history of France before the Revolution, and of Spain until the establishment of the Constitution and the Cortes, is a convincing proof of the truth of these positions. Niles, in his “*Weekly Register*,” informs us, that in Spain before the

Revolution, "the number of secular clergy, monks and friars, &c. was 148,242. Nuns and religious women, 32,000—total, 180,242. These persons occupied 3000 convents." "The property," adds the same writer, "belonging to the clergy, in lands and buildings, amounted to the enormous sum of *eight hundred and twenty-nine millions of dollars!* exclusive of tithes and various other taxes and dues."

In the kingdom of the clergy there are many ranks and degrees, as respects influence, authority, wealth, and dignity. From the haughty pontiff that sits upon the throne of an imaginary St. Peter, down to the poor curate that sells his fifty-two sermons per annum, for a starving advance of twenty per cent, on the first cost; what a diversity of rank, of authority, of wealth, and dignity!! Perhaps it may be said, that the kingdom of the clergy was designed to bear a resemblance to the kingdom of nature, which exhibits an endless variety, that it may please, delight, and instruct us. Thus, from the mighty elephant, down to the oyster that clings to its native rock, what a variety! And from the gorgeous majesty and wide dominion of his holiness, down to the humble class-leader, marching at the head of twelve "candidates for immortality," what a diversity! But with all this diversity, what a unity of spirit, of aim, and of pursuit! The class-leader would become a local preacher; the local preacher a circuit-rider; the circuit-rider a presiding elder; and the presiding elder a bishop. Then the highest round of the ladder is possessed. No further exaltation; no higher preferment in one province of the kingdom of the clergy. But in another province of the same kingdom, there is a greater diversity of gifts, honors, and emoluments; but still the spirit, and temper, and aim, are one and the same. The bishop is an inferior dignitary in another province of this realm; he views with envious eyes the superior dignity of the lord archbishop, and when promoted to this honor, his ambition is circumscribed by his circumstances. Every member, then, of this kingdom of priests is aiming for one and the same object; and though in other provinces, the ranks may be fewer, and the honors less, the desires, and aims, and pursuits of the priesthood are specifically the same. To say that every individual of this nation of clergy is actuated by such motives, and such only, is very far from our intention. There have been good and pious kings, and there are good and pious clergy. Yet we confess it is much easier to be a good and pious king, than a good and pious clergyman. There are, in the christian religion, constitutional principles that must be trampled upon, before a man becomes a priest; but none that impede his advancement to the throne as a president or as a king. The exceptions to the general spirit and aim of the clergy, are, however, so few, that we may safely subscribe to them, as an order of men, the above views, aims, and pursuits.

But to descend from general to particular remarks on the kingdom of the clergy, let us inquire how they came to invest

themselves with such authority and dominion? If we mistake not, they acquired their authority and dominion by the use of two grand means; the first is that of an alleged special call of God to what is commonly called the work of the ministry; the other, the necessity of a consociation of these *called ones*, for the better administration of their governments, and the securing what were called the interests of the church. Many sermons have been delivered on the necessity and importance of a *special call* to the ministry; on the necessity and importance of the confederation of the ministry, in the form of general councils, synods, assemblies, associations, and conferences; in order to their securing the interests of religion, which seem so completely identified with the interests of the clergy, that many have been tempted to think that the phrase, "*the interests of religion*," means, the interests of the clergy.

Now, although I feel myself as able to demonstrate and prove that both the one and the other of these positions are false, as I am to prove that there is a God, the creator of heaven and earth; yet, I cheerfully admit that there are now, and there were formerly, many good men who have advocated the necessity, and expatiated on the importance, of a *special call of the Holy Spirit* to the work of teaching the christian religion, and also, who have earnestly contended for that confederation of the ministers of religion as above stated. Nay, that many good and eminent men have really thought such things indispensable to the promotion of christianity. But shall we be deterred from examining any principle because good and great men have espoused it? Nay, verily! Should we adopt this course, all examination of principles is at an end. We shall then venture to ask one of these *called ones* to furnish us with the evidences of his having been specially called by the Holy Spirit, to the preaching and teaching of the christian religion. The purposes to be answered by such a call, it is replied, render it necessary. What then are the purposes to be answered by such a call? It is answered, that they are two; first, the qualifications of the preacher himself; and secondly, the regard to be paid to the instructions which he communicates. Doubtless, then, it is necessary that the call be evidenced to those to whom he is sent. For if the instructions are the more to be regarded, because of the preacher's call by the Holy Spirit, it is absolutely necessary that his call be well authenticated, that his instructions may be well received. It must either be criminal or not criminal to disregard the instructions of a teacher of the christian religion. On the supposition of its being criminal, the criminality must arise from the neglect or despite of his authority to instruct; but his authority to instruct must be rendered apparent and manifest before it is criminal to neglect or despise it; therefore, it is necessary that he demonstrate his authority, to render it criminal to neglect or despise his instructions. How then does he demonstrate his authority? By

producing a license, or a certificate, from Papists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, or Baptists, that they considered him competent and authorized to preach and teach christianity. Does this prove that he is called of God? No, assuredly; for then God calls men to preach different gospels, and to teach different kinds of christianity!! This will not satisfy the conscientious. Will his saying or his swearing that he is moved by the Holy Spirit to preach and teach christianity, prove that he is so moved? No; for many have thought that they were so moved, who afterwards declared and exhibited that they were mistaken. And many have said that they were so moved by the Holy Spirit, who were conscious at the moment that they were not so moved, but sought the office for filthy lucre's sake. Nothing of this kind will be admitted as evidence that any man is specially moved by the Holy Spirit to preach or teach the christian religion. Neither a license from any established sect, nor his own saying or swearing that he is specially moved by the Holy Spirit to the preaching or teaching of the christian religion, is a proof sufficient to render it criminal in any to neglect or despise his instructions. Nothing short of divine attestations or miracles can evince that any man is especially called of the Spirit of God to instruct us in the christian religion. Can those who say they are moved by the Holy Spirit to teach the christian religion, produce this sort of evidence? No, no. It is, then, in vain to say they are so moved. Who is called to believe any thing without evidence? Does God command any man to believe without evidence? No, most assuredly. When, then, I hear a modern preacher, either with or without his diploma in his pocket, saying that he is an ambassador of Christ, sent of God to preach the gospel, moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him the work of the ministry; I ask him to work a miracle, or afford some divine attestation of his being such a character. If he cannot do this, I mark him down as a knave or an enthusiast; consequently, an impostor, either intentionally or unintentionally.

But again—It was said that a special call of the Divine Spirit is necessary to qualify a preacher of the gospel. Let it be asked, In what respect to qualify him? Doubtless to give him the knowledge of the christian religion, and the faculty of communicating it. But do those who say they are moved by the Holy Spirit to assume the work of the ministry, possess this gift of knowledge, and this gift of utterance? If they do, let them show it. Have they not, for the most part, after they profess to be thus called, to go to study the religion, and to study languages in order to communicate their ideas intelligibly? Then, indeed, their call does not qualify them! The meaning of this call, then, is, "Go and learn the religion, and learn the use and meaning of words, that ye may communicate your knowledge of it; and then I *will send you* to preach, and lay you under a woful necessity of declaring the religion." This is the

special call of the Holy Spirit contended for. What an abuse of language! nay, rather, what an abuse of principle!!! This man is especially called to do a work, or to go a warfare at his own expense! But did this called clergyman hear a voice? He answers, Yes, or No. If he heard a voice, how does he know whose voice it was? If the voice of God, how is it proved to be such? If he says he heard no voice, why then does he say that he is called? Suppose this same man who contends for a call, without a voice, had a son ploughing in his field, and his son leaves the plough and goes to visit his friends. After some time he sends a message for his son. His son appears; and when asked why he forsook the plough, and went about riding and feasting with his friends, he answers, Father, you called me from the plough, and commanded me to visit your and my friends. Nay, son, replies the father, did you hear my *voice calling* or *commanding* you to such a course of conduct? No, father, replies the son, I did not hear your voice specially calling or commanding me, but I had a deep impression on my mind that it was your wish and my duty to leave the plough and go a-visiting. Go, sir, answers the irritated father, to your plough, and remember it is time enough to consider yourself called when you hear my voice. I say, suppose one of those who contend for a call, without a voice, were thus addressed, would they not be constrained to condemn themselves? But to test this mode of reasoning, let us see how it applies to those who said, in holy writ, that they were called to the work of the ministry.

The Lord, we are told, called twelve men of the Jews during his life time, to be eye and ear witnesses of all that he said and did. These he afterwards called to be apostles, or ambassadors, or ministers of the New Testament, as they are equally distinguished by any of these names or titles of office. These he *called*, by his *own voice*, and *qualified* them to preach and teach *infallibly* the whole scope of their commission. Their instructions always extended to their commission. In other words, their instructions or qualifications, and their commission were co-extensive. In their first call and commission they were sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and were commanded to announce the approaching reign, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And to despise or neglect their instruction was criminal in the highest degree. He that despised them, despised him that sent them. But this could not have been the case, had they had no means of convincing their hearers that they were so called and sent. For this purpose they healed the sick, they cast out demons, they cleansed the lepers, they raised the dead; and as they received these powers without money or price, they freely, without money or price, imparted their benefits. In their second commission, and in the special commission of Peter to open the door of faith to the Gentiles, as "*the keys*" had been committed to him; and in the *call* of Saul of Tarsus to become an apostle to, and a preacher and a teacher of the truth

among the Gentiles, the same circumstances accompanied their call. A voice was heard, the gift of wisdom, the gift of knowledge, the gift of utterance, and the gift of working miracles, were communicated and exhibited. It is evident that all that were called to the work of the ministry by God or by his Spirit, possessed every thing that has been contemplated as necessary in the antecedent remarks. When other persons called in question Paul's call to the work of the ministry, or to become an ambassador of Christ, how did he contend for it? By referring to the wonders he had wrought, as well as to the labors he had endured. See 2 Cor. xii. 12. "Truly," says he, "the signs of an apostle were fully wrought among you with all patience; by signs, and wonders, and powers." Again he tells them, chap. xiii. 6. "But I trust when I make you a visit, that ye shall know that we are not *without proof*"—"of Christ's speaking by me."

From these premises we may conclude, that every one moved by the Holy Spirit, or specially called to the preaching or teaching of christianity, is possessed of these three requisites—

1st. He has heard the voice of God calling him.

2d. He is qualified to speak infallibly.

3d. He is capable of confirming his testimony by divine attestations, or by the working of miracles.

Every ambassador of Christ, mentioned in the New Testament, possessed these three requisites. It is absurd, vain, and presumptuous for any now to call themselves ambassadors of Christ, or to say that they are specially called to the ministry of the New Testament who possess not these three essential attributes of the *called ministers of the New Testament*.

But some, unable to resist the evidence of the preceding facts and reasons, will exclaim, What! have we no men among us *called and sent of God*? Stop, my friend. What use have we for such men? Do we need any new message from the skies? No. Divine messages require divine messengers. If there be no need of a new message from God, or a new revelation of the Spirit, then there is no need of new ambassadors, of new revealers, or new prophets. If the message of the twelve apostles, or if the revelation of the New Testament is incomplete, is imperfect, is inadequate, then we have need of a new message and new messengers from the skies. But, until some bold genius undertakes to prove that there is need for a new revelation or a new message from God, we shall fearlessly declare, that, while we have the writings of the four Evangelists, the writings of Paul, of Peter, of James, of Jude, and John, we want no new message from the skies—no ambassadors from Christ. In short, there is no *need* to have men among us professing to be "*called and sent of God*." In the natural world we might as reasonably look for, and expect a new sun, a new moon, and new stars; as, in the kingdom of Christ, to expect new ambassadors, new messages from God, new revelations of the Spirit. On this subject we have much to say; but in the mean time, we shall simply

add, to prevent misapprehensions, that, as we have a revelation developing all the mysteries of the love and benevolence of God towards sinners through Christ, a revelation clear, simple, full, and complete; it is the duty of every one who acknowledges it to be such, to devote his mind to it and study it for himself.

Amongst those who believe and understand the christian religion, there are individuals called, in the subordinate sense of the phrase, to sundry good works, of much profit to men. Those that are rich in this world, professing the faith, are called by the *word of God, written and read of all men*, to communicate of their substance to the wants of the poor, to be ready to distribute, to be willing to communicate to the wants of the brotherhood, and to the wants of others. When a brother in distress appears in the presence of a brother rich in this world, the brother of high degree is called by the word of God and the providence of God, or the circumstances of the case call upon him to put his hand into his pocket and to communicate to his distress. Just, in the same sense, a brother who is well instructed into the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven, who has attained to the full assurance of understanding what Paul and Peter, and James, and John, and the other writers of the New Testament have taught concerning the way of life and salvation; when he finds persons ignorant or unbelieving, either in public or private, is called *by the word of God*, and the circumstances of the case, to teach and preach Christ, or to show the things that the ambassadors have taught and authenticated; these things he may urge on *their authority who confirmed their testimony with signs and wonders*. And as it would be absurd and vain for the rich man to say that he was *specially called and sent* of God, or moved by the Spirit of God to give alms; so it would be absurd and vain for the person possessed of the knowledge of the New Testament, to say that he was *moved* by the Holy Spirit, or *specially called* by its operations and *sent* of God to preach.

Besides this, there is another fact to which we would advert, viz. that when there is a voluntary association of any number of disciples of Christ, met in any one place to attend to the duties and privileges of a church, should they call any one of their *own* number, who possesses the qualifications belonging to the bishop or overseer, laid down by the Holy Spirit in the written word; and should they appoint him to office, as the Holy Spirit has taught them in the same written word—then it may be said to such a person, “Take heed to yourself and to the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseer.” But this bishop, of whom we have now spoken, is neither priest, ambassador, minister of religion, clergyman, nor a reverend divine; but simply one that has the oversight of one voluntary society, who, when he leaves that society, has no office in any other in consequence of his being an officer in that. His discharge of the work of a bishop is limited by, and confined to, the particular congregation which

appointed him to office. If he should travel abroad and visit another congregation, even of the same views with that of which he was or is bishop, he is then no bishop; he is then in the capacity of an unofficial disciple. To suppose the contrary is to constitute different orders of men, or to divide the church into the common classes of clergy and laity, than which nothing is more essentially opposite to the genius and spirit of christianity. We have seen some bishops, ignorant of the nature of the office, acting very much out of character, placing themselves in the bishop's office, in a church which they might occasionally visit, and assuming to act officially in an assembly over which they had no bishopric. They acted as absurdly and as unconstitutionally as the president of the United States would do, if, when on a visit to London, he should enter the English parliament and place himself on the throne, either *solus*, or in conjunction with his majesty George IV, and that, forsooth, because he is, or was president of the United States. But of this more afterwards. In the mean time we conclude that one of those means used to exalt the clergy to dominion over the faith, over the consciences, and over the persons of men, by teaching the people to consider them as specially called and moved by the Holy Spirit, and sent to assume the office of ambassadors of Christ, or ministers of the christian religion, is a scheme unwarranted of God, founded on pride, ignorance, ambition, and impiety, and, as such, ought to be opposed and exposed by all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

EDITOR.

* * *

WHILE on the arrogance and impiety of modern clergymen, I conceive it will be advantageous to our readers to present them an extract from a letter, received some months since, from the hand of an erudite layman, who has long read the Bible for himself. The letter was not designed for publication; it is one of a series of a friendly correspondence on subjects of the greatest importance. Had it been intended for the public eye, it might, perhaps, have been dressed, in some instances, in another garb; but its present garb will recommend it to those who prefer simplicity, plainness, and candor, to the pomposity, disguise, and artifice of those who flatter men and have their persons in admiration because of advantage.—*Ed.*

—“BUT before discussing the episcopal qualifications and office, may we not take a glance backward at those who, before the existence of the christian bishop, were charged with the instruction of mankind. Previous to the announcement of the new religion, nothing could be effected in sacred matters without money. Whether we look to the holy institution of the Jews, or the false mummery of the Gentiles, religion was equally expensive to the worshippers. As the Jewish priesthood lived by the altar, the repetition of the sacrificial rite was, with them, a matter of the very last importance. Its divine authority and

antiquity afforded them a fine handle. In the praises of its propitiatory attribute they were both long and loud. Indeed the doctrine of a *real* propitiation by beasts seems actually to have been taught by them. If it was not, it may be very properly asked why Paul wrote against this sentiment; for he says, in writing to the Jews, that it was *impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin*. This was certainly intended as a refutation of the doctrine maintained and taught by the *priesthood*. Now this was a most effectual method for securing the frequency of sacrifice, and this rite accordingly proved a source of eternal eating and drinking to the lazy priests. The people either believed what was told them of the propitiatory efficacy of the offering, or were afraid to deny it. In David's day the absurdity seems to have been carried to such an unwarrantable length, that the Lord himself, by David, reproves them for it in these remarkable words, Psalm 1. "*If I were hungry I would not tell thee, for the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats?*" &c. &c. This looks as if Israel had gone so far out of the way as to suppose that God actually depended for his subsistence on their offerings. Superstition sets no bounds to its liberality towards those whom it deems the messengers of another world; and we may be sure that if once the above notion obtained footing, either in Israel or among the heathen, the folds of the wealthy and the cellars of the great would become equally accessible to the insatiable priesthood. Every christian must admire Isaiah's prophecy on the demolition of the sacerdotal reign and order. The prophet had just been celebrating (chapter liii.) the death and resurrection of the Redeemer, and the glorious things consequent on it, when the subversion of the Aaronic economy came full in his view, chap. lvi. "*All ye beasts of the field, come to devour; yea, all ye beasts in the forest. His watchmen are blind; they are all ignorant; they are all dumb dogs; they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, they are greedy dogs, which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand; they all look to their own way; every one for his gain from his quarter,*" &c. and all this was to take place immediately on the promulgation of the new institution spoken of in the 55th chapter, when money would not be asked of the worshippers for what they wanted, it being only required of them to incline their ear to hear, and their souls should live.

If we turn to the heathen we shall see that their priests were equally ignorant and vile; and that the pomp and pageantry of the religious shews and mediation were equally extravagant and expensive. Superstition opened all her stores, ostentation heaped the altar, adorned the temple, and enriched the priest. Now God has vouchsafed us a tremendous experince with respect to man mediation—of its inefficacy, and of the nullity of priests in making us wise unto salvation. From the Flood to the Redeemer, and again from his time to the present, the nations have laid

rotting under the hands of heathen and Roman priests successively.—Shall we never learn that it is the same thing to have no Bible, and to have it and not read it. One of our gospel *ministers* here announced the other day from his *wooden box*, that if a man would not pay for the gospel he should not hear it. This was a very profitable turn to give the scripture; for you remember that it reads, that he that does not work should not eat; but this would have been tearing his own flesh. But the popular clergy will tell us that they have not so erred; they are neither heathen, Jewish, nor Roman priests. True, but may they not be a commixture of the whole three? They will ask, Where are the tripods, the censers, and the gold? Where is the pomp, the pageantry, the paraphernalia of heathen or Roman parade? Where are the altar, the victim, and the priest? Where are all the gods and the lords? who hath torn from their brows their many crowns? who hath driven them from their lofty abodes? who hath laid their temples in smoking ruins along the ground? True, these symbols of idolatry have disappeared, or are broken. The Lord Jesus has rent the veil of ignorance in twain; in a thousand instances he hath cut the eyeballs of the blind, and poured in upon them celestial light; he hath flung wide open to the view and access of mortals the gates of righteousness; he hath inspired hearts with hope that never hoped before; he hath washed many from their sins in his own blood, and will ultimately present them spotless before the presence of his glory. But look at the nations as they exist under the instruction of men, impudently calling themselves the *ministers of Christ*. Listen to the blasphemy of the Most High every where around—see the drunkenness—mark the superstition and excessive ignorance of the popular assemblies; and then say if any thing but heathen darkness prevails—say if the nations under clergy are in a better condition, with respect to morals, than when they were under priests. But according to the scripture, the nations in this dispensation were not to be under either priests or clergymen, but under Christ. “*There shall be one shepherd.*” A christian bishop has no authority over the brethren but what arises out of his own superior humility. But this much by the way. After all, why should it be supposed that clergymen are better able to teach us (laics) the Bible, than we to teach one another. They are, in nineteen instances out of twenty, very ignorant of the Bible, and impudent in their approaches toward good men. Who has not observed their pomposity and their ill breeding? But they are generally from the meanest families in society, and their education is mostly obtained by charity.

Jupiter, Saturn, Mercury, and Venus, the Egyptian Apis, the Crocodiles, the Garlic, are imperishable memorials of priestly stupidity—and while we have crosses, relics, beads, baubles, with all the trumpery of monachism and the pulpit, and the sprinkle basin, and the consecrated water, we are in the possession of indestructible monuments of clerical excellency.

When the knowledge of the one God was lost among the heathen, did the priests restore it? and when it pleased God to reveal himself by Moses, who was no priest, who perverted his holy institutions, and sullied and obscured his peerless and benevolent character? The priests. But when the Son, who alone reveals the Father, made a further display of the divine character, who belied that character? Who, with matchless effrontery, stole the Bible from the people, and substituted pranks, abstinence, and gloom, for virtue and the love of God? The ministers of the gospel, as they call themselves. But it may be truly said, that, from Aaron, who cheated the Israelites of their ear-rings, and caused the people to commit idolatry, down to that hierarchical conclave which imbrued its hands in the blood of the Lord of Life, and from that time again down to the present, all ignorance, mystery, trick, and religious gloom, have originated with the clergy. But the thief steals not in the day, but in the dark. If the lamp of divine revelation would expose their cupidity and avarice, they do wisely to put it out or abuse it. If miners would have a horse to descend the shaft and become useful below in the dark, they first put out his eyes. The Philistines did this with Sampson before they dared to sport with him. So it is the policy of clergymen to shut, and obscure, and pervert the divine word, in order to carry on their gainful speculations. But I must stop. I thank you for your kind letter. Will you please to mind me when you come before the King.—I am yours, &c.”

* * *

PHILIP, No. II. on teaching the christian religion, not having come to hand, we will insert an article written by him on the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This article furnishes us with an argument in proof of the fact, which we have never seen noticed by any writer on this most important of all the facts recorded by the four Evangelists. The whole *machina evangelica* turns on this pivot, or the whole christian religion rests upon this fact. If Christ be not risen from the dead, the preaching of Christ and the faith of christians are in vain. No historic fact was ever so well proven as this, and no fact was ever pregnant with such marvellous and exhilarating consequences. It is not only the highest proof of the truth of all Messiah's pretensions; it is not only a pledge to us of the divine acceptance of the atonement of the Redeemer; but, it is to us the surest earnest, and most convincing demonstration of *the hope* of christians, viz. a glorious resurrection unto eternal life. The objects of the christian's hope are the grandest and most exalted in the whole range of human conception. A new heaven and a new earth; a new body, spiritual, incorruptible, and immortal; a society transcendentally pure, entertaining, and exalted; transporting joys, unmingled with sorrow, and increasing bliss, unalloyed with doubt, or fear, or pain, constitute the glorious hopes of every true disciple of Christ; which, when reduced to a unit, consist in being made like unto the Son of God. This glori-

ous hope immediately germinates or springs from the fact, that *the Lord is risen indeed*. This article, then, will be not only edifying, but ineffably cheering to every one that hath this hope in him.

As this argument was derived from no other source than an intimate acquaintance with the four Evangelists, it will form a new incentive to those who presume to read the New Testament, without the spectacles of any system before their eyes, and will furnish new proof of the entertainment, edification, assurance, and comfort to be obtained from a diligent, humble, and persevering perusal of the blissful volume. Oh! that all who acknowledge it to be the volume of salvation, the word of the living God, would read it! and, conscious of their need of that wisdom which cometh from above, would ask of God, who giveth liberally and upbraideth not!

EDITOR.

RESPECTING Jesus of Nazareth, the Jewish nation seems to have been divided into two principal parties—that which favored, and that which rejected his pretensions. That the views of his scheme too, entertained by both, were not almost, but altogether political, we have all the reason, I think, in the world, to believe. The opposition party regarded the whole as a political cabal, and its abettors as reformers of the state. Radicals, whose ultimate objects were to put down the prevailing party; to abandon allegiance to the Romans; to assert the independence of the Jewish nation; and, under the conduct of Jesus as their general, or, as his own party would have it, their King, to maintain it sword in hand. This is the only view that accords with the warlike spirit of the times, the popular belief respecting Messiah's reign and kingdom, and with what we read in the four Evangelists. Now it was to check the spirit of that enterprize that the leaders of the opposite party voted the destruction of Jesus, who was looked upon by the great men as the life's blood of this conspiracy. From the moment when Caiphas delivered his sentiments on the grand question, "*What was to be done for the safety of the state?*" the death of Jesus was eagerly desired by them all. These princes, preferring rank and honor with their present inglorious ease under foreign masters, to the distant and uncertain advantages of a noble and magnanimous declaration of the nation's independence—these lordlings conceived power and pomp to be the chief good and the only thing worthy of ambition. They conceived that to form the object of the Lord's ambition also, and endeavored by mean arts to draw from him this secret. The views of his followers were nothing different in kind from those of his opposers; they were equally worldly and political; and both parties, contemplating the destinies of the Lord Jesus under this mistaken and degraded point of view, it is not wonderful that his resurrection from the dead should be an event equally distant from the expectations of all. Both parties, too, seem to have considered his decease as an unequivocal refutation of his pretensions—as an event which at once reflected

the greatest discredit on the party, and great apparent ponderosity and importance to those who had slain him, and who, during the whole of his public ministry, had steadily persisted in rejecting and disproving his pretensions. Had the Lord then not appeared to some of his followers on that day on which he arose, the dispute of the two parties would not been whether he had risen from the dead, but only which of them had stolen the body from the sepulchre. This is evident from the easy assent which the two disciples gave to the hasty suggestions of Mary Magdalene. They believed that the opposite faction had stolen the body; John alleging for it as a reason, that the disciples knew not yet that he must rise from the dead. The anticipation of such an event was equally foreign from the conceptions of his murderers, who barricaded the tomb, and sealed it with the seal of the state, not to prevent his resurrection, but, as they themselves said, to prevent his followers from taking the body by stealth. I think too, that the rulers really and sincerely believed his followers to have taken away the body, and that, in the first instance, they regarded the wonders told them by the soldiers, of earthquakes and angels, to be nothing more than cunningly devised fables, trumped up by his disciples for the safety of the guards, who, as they believed, had permitted them (the disciples) undisturbedly, perhaps for a sum of money, to bear away the body in the dark. But their bribing the soldiers again, may seem to contradict this opinion. Well then, suppose, for argument's sake, that the rulers did believe the reports of the guards, viz. that the Lord had risen. If they did, then they must have believed that he would also immediately appear among them again in person to assert the reality of his claims, and maintain the certainty of the confession, for which he had been put to death; for of his ascent into heaven they had no conceptions. If they believed him to be risen, to have said that his disciples had stolen him, would have been a miserable invention, and nowise suited to the exigency of the case. Such an invention would never have counterbalanced one single well attested appearance of the Lord; and we have seen that they, having no just notions of his reign and kingdom, would have expected to see him again in person, to be they believed the reports of the soldiers. After all, if the Pharisees expected him to rise, why did they put him to death? The rulers, then, believed the guards to be telling a falsehood, and they bribed them to report what the Pharisees themselves conceived to be the true state of the case. As the opposing faction all along regarded the enterprize as a political one, they foresaw that if once its abettors should get the dead body into their possession, they might make it the instrument of greater mischief to the nation than it had been when alive. They foresaw that one of the reformers might personate their former leader, exhibit himself at a distance, and set up for Messiah on the grounds of having risen from the dead. Such an evidence they foresaw would be altogether irresistible; the Jews would

flock to his standard, and the cause would derive accessions from all quarters of the land—such accessions, too, as nothing but the arm of the imperial government would be able to break or dissolve. If once the Romans had engaged in the quarrel, their rulers would have seen a realization of all their former fears. The temple and the city, they foresaw, would ultimately have become the grand bone of contention, and this whole enterprize, or, as they called it, last error, issue in consequences more fatal to their place and nation than the first, under the conduct of Jesus of Nazareth. All these forebodings of the rulers seem to have arisen out of what the Lord said or dropt concerning his resurrection. The Pharisees then suspected his followers of having stolen the body, and his followers, with the exception of those who saw him on the first day, seem to have suspected the Pharisees or rulers; a circumstance which in itself indeed proves that neither party had done it; for if either party had stolen the body it never could have conscientiously blamed the other, as we have seen it did; if the rulers had it, the disciples would not have dared to say that it was alive; and if the disciples had it under their control and said it was alive, they would have embraced the first opportunity of exhibiting him in order to refute the calumny of the rulers, who said the body was in the possession of the party, but it was not alive. These things show us, at all events, that on the first day the body was not where it had been originally laid, and where both parties hoped to find it; they show us that both parties agree in this, viz. that the body was a-missing from the sepulchre, and now there seems to be only two possible ways of accounting for its departure. Seeing, then, it was not removed by any of the parties concerned, it must either have been taken off by some unconcerned party, or have departed itself; which last opinion, indeed, is the more probable of the two; for to suppose that any unconcerned party would endanger themselves, or bribe the guards for a dead person, about whose fate they had been altogether unconcerned whilst alive, would be nonsense. But to suppose that there was any unconcerned party in the capital where Jesus was crucified, would argue great ignorance of the spirit of the times. He was not stolen by any party, either concerned or unconcerned about his fate; and the only conclusion remaining is, that the body departed itself, that "*the Lord Jesus has arisen indeed.*" He hath also ascended up on high; he led captivity captive, and has given gifts unto men, who have announced to us by the Holy Spirit, the things which are given to us of God without any cause.

PHILIP.

* * *

From the Reformer.

A New Invention for Missionary Purposes

A MISSIONARY WHEEL has lately been established at Hartford, Connecticut. *The Boston Recorder*, in speaking of this new project for raising missionary funds, observes: "The Mission-

ary Wheel, in Hartford, for the purpose of giving ladies who may have leisure an opportunity to spin for the benefit of missions, is respectfully noticed and generally approved in political papers. Perhaps this simple design, like the *Missionary Field*, will become a source of great revenue to the cause of missions." The following is copied from the *Connecticut Courant*, printed at Hartford:—

The Missionary Wheel

IT is desired to be made public that a Wheel and open room are kept at the house of Mr. *George White*, Church street, for the use of those ladies who wish to contribute to the small streams which compose the broad river of missionary support. Happening in at the house of Mrs. P. between the hours of 9 and 10 in the evening, I was surprised and gratified by beholding the respectable mistress of the mansion turning the wheel and plying the distaff with all the grace and agility of five and twenty. On inquiry I found that this venerable mother in Israel, in the 84th year of her age, wished to encourage, by her example, the laudable work. Sisters, have we any thing to object to this easy mode of contributing our mite to the raising funds to assist in spreading the "*glad tidings of salvation*" in heathen lands?

While numbers are honorably engaged in cultivating the *Missionary Field*, it is hoped that the ladies (though their exertions prove less valuable) will neglect no opportunity of showing their attachment to the cause of all others the most important.

Donations of flax will be gratefully received by the well-wishers to the object.

A FRIEND TO MISSIONS.

* * *

From the Concord Observer, as copied by the Reformer of Sept. 1.

The Missionary Wheel.

THE ingenuity for which Yankees are proverbial, has never perhaps been exercised to a greater extent, or in ways more various and diversified, than in devising means for raising and equipping missionaries and missionary establishments. When the subject was first started in this country, innumerable societies and ramifications of societies were got up in almost every part of the union. Every town and village (not excepting our own) had its cent society, its rag society, &c. &c. with numberless auxiliaries and the avails of a thousand subscriptions to which the members subjected themselves, were most punctually forwarded to the person who acted as agent for the heathen nations. A book appeared every month or two containing the names of the pious donors, and announcing that so much of their money had been sent to Bombay, so much to Seringapatam, and other places on the most remote parts of the eastern continent for the support of missionaries and their wives—and this was generally all the information furnished on the subject to those who had thus parted with their substance. "*Missionary Boxes*" started

up in various places, appearing first in churches, but afterwards finding their way into private houses; and one could scarce enter a parlor without being stared at by "MISSIONARY BOX," in golden letters, on the mantlepice, or in some other conspicuous situation. After this expedient had lost its novelty, a sort of Saving Bank was instituted, in which children, young and old, wee encouraged to make deposits from *savings* made by abstinence from some article of food or dress. Then followed the cultivation of "*Missionary Fields*."

We have been led to these remarks from seeing in a late Connecticut paper that a *Missionary Wheel* was established at Hartford, where pious females may spin for the benefit of the heathen—Contributions of *flax* are solicited. Now we know not how this may appear to others, but to ourselves it seems to be bordering on the ridiculous. The plan of civilizing and christianizing the heathen world is, in itself, great and noble, though many considerate reflecting persons deem it a chimerical project, from which no good can be expected. But if it is to be accomplished, we are of opinion that it never will be done by such mean and contemptible artifices as are often resorted to, for the purpose of fleecing the rich and stripping the poor.

* * *

From the New England Galaxy, as copied by the Reformer of September 1.

Another Scheme to Defraud the Public.

"NOW let there be, in some central part of the town, a MISSIONARY STALL, kept by some pious old woman, who would thereby get her living in summer. Let those who cultivate gardens send thither their superfluous fruits, vegetables, garden seeds, lettuce, asparagus, radishes, melons split open, cucumbers, gooseberries, plums, and cherries, which the birds carry off. Even the young lady who has only a box of earth in her parlor window, by cultivating geraniums, hyacinths, monthly roses, &c. might dispose of enough in a year almost to educate a heathen child. Even trimmings of currants, grapes, and flowering shrubs, and scions of the finest pears and apples, might be sold to the country people, or bartered for produce which would sell, &c. &c. I am sure the thing can be done." *Christian Mirror.*

SURELY there can be no human employment in which so much ingenuity and fertility of invention are displayed, as the business of sponging the public of their money for missionary purposes. The pittance earned by the sweat of the brow is wrenched from the poor—the harmless rattle snatched from the hand of the infant—the food arrested on its passage to the mouth of the hungry—the sick are deprived of their restoratives; and the little enjoyments that would serve to eke out the remnant of existence in tolerable ease, are taken from those who are borne down by the weight of years. But this is not enough—it is not sufficient that all classes in society, from the highest to the

lowest, should contribute to support the missionary in his luxury, and to dress out the missionary's wife in her extravagance; but the very birds of the air are to be rendered subservient to these worse than useless purposes. The few berries provided for their support by Him, without whose knowledge not a sparrow falleth to the ground, are to be added to the mass of plunder accumulated for the *ostensible* purpose of "educating the heathen child," but which is *really* applied to disseminate the most unreasonable and unnatural sectarian opinions, and to support many a worthless person who might be better employed in trailing a wheelbarrow through our streets, or in sweeping our chimnies. A *Missionary Stall!* Some old woman to be employed to retail split open melons, and plums and cherries which the *birds carry off!* Contemptible articles! Is it possible that the Omnipotent Ruler of the Universe, who rides upon the storm and the whirlwind, and holds the mighty waters in the hollow of his hand, can have condescended to stake the eternal happiness or misery of his creatures upon such paltry contrivances? The very thought is sacrilegious.

Reformer.

* * *

From the American Eagle, of June 30, printed at Litchfield, Con.

IN the last *Boston Recorder* is an article copied from the *Christian Herald*, which, in speaking of the various missionary and other institutions of the present day, says, "They are all pouring their tributary streams into the MIGHTY RIVER OF GOD!!!!"

River of God! What! are the streams of bank bills, or certificates of deposit, or bags of Spanish milled dollars, flowing into the hands of the Board of Foreign Missions, &c. are they forming the *River of God?*

But, saying nothing of this *profane* use of God's name, as some will consider it, how much longer can such wild, hectic, and inflammatory suggestions be weekly flashed in the face of the public, before the sober, thinking part of the community, not carried along with the current, will believe that *some* engaged in the cause have become as absolutely phrenzied and as fanatical as they were in the days of Peter the Hermit and St. Bernard?

Reformer.

SO operates the present popular missionary spirit. Those who oppose this, in the religious and political papers of the union, as enthusiastic, unscriptural, and absurd, are, by its devotees, branded "deists," "profane," at best "misguided disciples." We are greatly mistaken, or the day is not far distant, when such measures will be viewed by all christians as fanatical as the ancient croisades. Indeed, the abettors of the popular schemes are rapidly ushering in a new religious vocabulary, in which the current words and phrases of the last centuries will have so far changed their meaning, as that the word "*religion*" will be said to mean a profound veneration for all the prescriptions of the clergy; "*practical piety*" will denote a ready acquiescence in

all the traditions, and an implicit obedience to all the commands of the clergy; "*the interests of religion*" will signify the interests of the clergy; "*the church in danger*" will mean the craft in danger; "*the mighty river of God,*" a mighty stream of money drained from the superstitious; "*a deist*" will mean a sceptic in the divinity and authority of the clergy; and "*the profane*" will denote those who obey God rather than men.

Ed. C. B.

* * *

M. HYDE DE NEUVILLE, deputy of France, and late minister to this country, in a speech on the budget for the use of 1824, observes—"It is painful to see, gentlemen, that we have yet been able to appropriate for the expense of the clergy, only a sum of 25 millions; and that in this sum but 200,000 francs are devoted for assistance to the communes for repairs, or purchasing churches or parsonages.***But think that there are yet thousands of communes in France deprived of the aid of religion, and a great many in which the children are born and die without receiving water baptism."

* * *

MR. WARD, Baptist Missionary at Serampore, died of cholera morbus, on the 27th of March, after an illness of one day.

* * *

No. 4.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1823.

VOL. I.

ON TEACHING CHRISTIANITY—No. II.

READER, you observe that this piece is entitled "*An Essay on Teaching Christianity.*" Perhaps you are at a loss to know what it means. You will understand it better by and by. My last paper was intended simply to intimate to christian bishops or pastors, that, in spite of the discrepant and inapt schemes of sermonizing that now prevail by means of learned and popular establishments, there yet exists a certain, uniform, authorized plan of preaching Jesus, a plan consecrated by the high examples of all the heavens, and the holy apostles and prophets.

I should immediately proceed to develop it, were I not thoroughly convinced that a recognition of a few preliminaries is absolutely necessary to the adoption of this authorized plan, and even to the understanding of it. These preliminaries, indeed, are neither very numerous nor very remote from vulgar apprehension—they are only two, and a very superficial glance at scripture will put the reader in possession of all that is necessary for understanding the writer of these papers. The first of these prefatory articles is, that the members of a church of Christ are united to one another by the belief of a matter of fact, viz. that "*Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,*" and not by any attribute of government, catholic or sectarian. The second is, that the scriptures propose the belief of this fact, that "*Jesus is the Christ,*" as the only means for increasing the body or church of God. Hence the didactical labors of a bishop or elder

who would wish to edify and increase the body of Christ, divide themselves into two several sorts. In order to increase the body, he proves to the world by means of these ancient and venerable monuments which God has put into his hands, the four gospels, that "*Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God;*" and, in order to edify the church, he points out in all the scriptures, as these holy and sublime interpretations which the Spirit has every where given of this illustrious fact. But if it is true (as we shall immediately see from scripture it is) that the body of Christ is united in its several members by the belief of this matter of fact, viz. that *Jesus is the Son of God*, and that it is increased by the confession and belief of it—then a number of very important corollaries are deducible from these two revealed propositions: *First*, the peace and union of a church of Christ are not the result of any sort of ecclesiastical government. *Secondly*, the increase of Christ's body is not predicated on any thing so exceedingly exceptionable as modern confessions of faith; but on the confession of the first truth. *Thirdly*, the worshipping establishments now in operation throughout christendom, increased and cemented by their respective voluminous confessions of faith, and their ecclesiastical constitutions, are not churches of Jesus Christ, but the legitimate daughters of that Mother of Harlots, the Church of Rome. In these establishments a breach of canon is punished with ejection, and to nauseate their vitiated creeds is a certain bar to induction, unless a man is rich, and then he may do or deny any thing. But, in order that the reader may entertain no doubt respecting the above mentioned propositions, let us attend to the scriptures—let us attend to the voice of the beloved Saviour, speaking in Matth: xvi. 13. "When he came into the coasts of Cesarea, he asked his disciples, saying, Who do men say that I the Son of Man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.* And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." In this beautiful, interesting, and highly significant passage, four things are particularly remarkable: *First*, the name, Christ, Son of the living God, which Simon gives to Jesus. *Second*, the name *Petros*, Stone, which Jesus gives to Simon. *Third*, the truth itself which Simon confesses. And *fourth*, the name *Petra*, Rock, by which the Saviour, figuratively, in allusion to Simon's name, *Petros*, Stone, designates this eternal truth, that *he is the Christ the Son of the living God*. On the belief of this fact, then, his church is founded, and by it is held together. I do not remember to have seen it remarked, but it is very much in our Lord's manner to reply in the very same words in which he is

addressed. For instance, the leper says, "If thou wilt;" Jesus replies, "I will." Thomas says, "How can we know the way?" The Lord answers, "I am the way." "Why do thy disciples transgress?" say the Pharisees; and "Why do ye also transgress?" says the Saviour. From want of attending to this, the vivacity of our Lord's reply to Simon is not felt, and the spirit of the whole passage, indeed, almost vanishes—thou art the Christ—and thou art stone, *Petros*. The Lord Jesus was very apt to speak in metaphor too. He styles Herod a fox; he calls his own body a temple, in allusion to the temple in which he at that time was. When he is on Mount Olivet among the vines, he styles himself the vine; he calls death a sleep; his own death a baptism; Simon a Stone, *Cephas*; and in the above passage he calls the grand truth that *he was the Son of the living God, a Petra, Rock*, in allusion to Simon's name, Stone, and on account of its stedfast and indestructible certainty; and he adds, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" *i. e.* as I suppose, his death, which was soon to be effected by the wicked Jews, should not disprove his pretensions to the Messiahship; or perhaps he means that the grave should not interrupt the fellowship of his church, which was to be founded on this imperishable fact, that *he was the Christ*. This passage sufficiently shows us what is the bond of union among the despised people; and it shows us even more, for it lets us know that the confession and belief of this bare fact, (Peter at this moment knowing nothing more, nothing as yet of his crucifixion for sin.) is attended with certain blessing and salvation—"Blessed art thou Simon," &c. To the same purpose Paul says, "If thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thine heart that God has raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." Now if modern confession of faith had such blessing and such salvation appended to them by such authorities, their abettors might well boast. But they who bow down to such idols shall go down to the grave with a lie in their right hand. The sword of the Lord's mouth is unsheathed against the man of sin, nor will it kiss the scabbard until his enemies are consumed. O Gamaliel! O Socrates! O Satan! save your sinking disciples whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not!

But that the glorious truth, and nothing else, holds the saints together in particular churches, is evident from the holy epistles which are addressed to them in their individual capacities. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, who were beginning to name themselves by their respective favorites, as the moderns do, informs that church, that, when he had first come among them, he had determined to know nothing among them but the bare gospel fact, that Jesus was the Christ, and had been crucified, nor did he attempt to ornament it with the eloquence of words, thinking, as I suppose, that a truth so supremely magnificent in itself, was perfectly insusceptible of extrinsic ornament, and in its own native excellency defied the united pens and tongues of men and

angels. His only aim was to demonstrate its reality by the spirit and power of God which filled him, that the disciple's faith might not stand in his word, but in the power of God—the miracles. Knowing that if this great argument, supported as it was with miracles, failed to reduce men to union and to Christ, he had nothing of equal importance to propose for this purpose. The apostle, therefore, in order to reduce them to unity, reminds them of the fundamental bond of union by which they had been originally congregated, thus: "According to the grace (apostleship) of God given unto me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation and another buildeth thereon; but let every man take heed how he buildeth thereon, for other foundation (of union) can no man lay than that is laid, which is *Jesus is the Christ*." These things may suffice to show that the bond of union among christians is the belief of a matter of fact, viz. that *Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God*. The reader may consult Ephesians, 2d, 3d, and 4th chapters, all the Galatians, Epistles to the Colossians, Romans, Timothy, &c. &c. where the apostles lay it down as a universal maxim, that this truth or word of salvation worketh effectually in all them that believe it!

But our 2d proposition, viz. that the body of Christ is increased by belief of the bare truth that *Jesus is the Son of God, and our Saviour*, is a scripture doctrine, which the populars nauseate, if possible, more than our first. It is so simple, so manifestly foolish, that the sons of Gamaliel and Socrates are equally scandalized and ashamed of it. Yet, says Paul, it saves them that believe it. But it is chiefly abhorrent to modern establishments on account of the consequences of which it is pregnant—it sets aside all canon, all confession, every thing indeed which opposeth and exalteth itself against Christ and the New Testament. Nevertheless, this second prefatory article, that the body is increased by the confession and belief of the truth, is perfectly obvious from scripture. "Whosoever shall confess me before men, says the Redeemer, him will the Son of Man confess before the angels of God." Peter, we have seen, confessed him to be the Son of the living God, though apparently a mere man; and the blessed Saviour honored his confession with a most gracious benediction—"Blessed art thou Simon, son of Jonas, for flesh and blood has not revealed this to thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Now Peter at this moment was perfectly ignorant of every thing besides this truth, which he had learned from the Father, by the miracles evidence which he had vouchsafed in support of it. It is wonderful the honor which the scripture writers every where do this single truth, that "*Jesus was the Son of God*." Paul would not dare to use learned words in speaking of it, cautions the Hebrews against letting it slip out of their minds, and says to the Corinthians, that they are saved by it if they keep it in mind! John, 1st Epistle chap. v. declared that the man who believed it is born of God; and wrote and recorded all the miracles in his gospel to prove this illustrious fact. "These things are written," says

he, "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." In John's days there were many antichrists; but that holy man did not dare to use any unlawful means for securing the disciples against their deleterious influence. He did not write to them that they should covenant like the Covenanters, form any sort of ecclesiastic government, make confessions of faith, liturgy, rubric, &c. &c. No—these things, says he, I have written concerning them that (would) seduce you—these things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have eternal life, and that you may (continue to) believe in the name of the Son of God. One has only to believe in this name, and his is eternal life. The body of Christ, thus, then, is also increased by the belief of this excellent truth; and to be convinced of this, the reader has only to turn up to any page of the New Testament, and he will read it in every line.

We have glanced at the vast honor every where in scripture put upon this majestic truth, that *Jesus is the Son of Almighty God*; we have seen how Paul and John exalted it, and also that it is the foundation and bond of union in the church of God, and how that the body of Christ is increased by the belief of it. But look at the marvellous evidence vouchsafed in support of it; the amazing concatenation of miracles drawn out to identify the person of the Christ; miracle after miracle follows each other in rapid succession, surprisingly diversified in manner, kind, and form; until the mighty chain terminates in that amazing and inscrutable wonder, his resurrection from the dead, a miracle which, for its transcendent peculiarities, the apostle, (Eph. i. 19.) singles out as affording the most illustrious display of the mighty power of God. But the Holy Spirit also, in all his diversified working of gifts and graces, in wisdom and knowledge, and miracles, and healings, discoursing of spirits, tongues, prophecy, and interpretation, was given to prove that Jesus was the Christ. And Peter makes this use of them on the day of Pentecost, when pointing to the multitude of separated tongues that crowned the heads of the apostles, he said, Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God has made that Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ. It was to preach and prove this that all the apostles were sent to the nations. But greater reverence could not be paid to any truth than the Lord himself pays to this, that *he was the Son of God*; when he bids all men worship him as they would the Father, he says, it is eternal life to know him; and in the moment of quitting this world enforces the belief of the truth with the sanctions of eternal life and death—"He that believeth (that he is the Son of God) shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." The philosophers indeed have stolen away these sanctions from the faith of Jesus, and have pinned them to their jejune, pretended science of moral philosophy, where the name of the Saviour is perhaps never once mentioned. But they had better confine themselves to their own

baubles, and let the truth of God alone, otherwise believe it; for if they do not, he will philosophize them when he comes to be glorified in his saints; when he shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on them that obey not God, and believe not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

PHILIP.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

* * *

THE CLERGY—No. II.

WE observed in our last number that one of those means by which the clergy obtained so complete a dominion over the Bible, the consciences, and the religious sentiments of mankind, was the *pretense* of a *divine call* to the work of the christian ministry. We now proceed to notice the second grand means employed to effectuate this object, viz. the confederation of themselves into associated bodies, called councils, synods, general assemblies, associations, or conferences. Though the organized bodies distinguished by those names do not all claim the same powers or the same extent of dominion, yet they all agree in one essential characteristic, which is, that they all profess to have some divine warrant, which authorizes them to have control over the members, whether considered as individuals or as churches, which comprise the religious community, over the faith, the practices, or destinies of which they preside. The systems of what is called "*church government*," which the respective sects have adopted, though differing in many respects, all agree in this, that whomsoever they will, they kill; and whomsoever they will, they save alive—not their bodies we mean, but their *reputation* for "*piety and orthodoxy*." Few of those confederations, now-a-days, even of those who propose authoritatively to determine matters of faith, cases of conscience, and rules of practice, literally kill those whom they condemn to suffer the vengeance of their censures. But there is a species of robbery which is worse than taking a man's property; and there is a species of murder worse than taking a man's life; and of both of these ecclesiastical courts are, even in this age, often guilty. But of this more hereafter.

Now although the forms of "*church government*" adopted by the respective sects, differ, as was said, in many respects, there is another grand point of coincidence, which fixes upon them all one and the same general character. This point of coincidence is, that they are all modelled after, and assimilated to the different forms of civil government which have obtained in the nations of the earth, and often according to the government of the state in which the sect originated. Thus we have an ecclesiastic monarchy, an ecclesiastic aristocracy, an ecclesiastic democracy, and an ecclesiastic mixed government. Yet, after all that has been said upon the subject of church government, lodged in human hands; after all the angry contests whether an episcopacy similar to a monarchy; whether a presbytery similar to an aristocracy or an

independency similar to a democracy, be the government instituted of God, or authorized in the New Testament—it might perhaps appear, upon an impartial examination of the scriptures, that the whole controversy was a mere “*vox et preterea nihil*”—a sound and nothing else; that there is no such a thing as “*church government*,” in the popular sense of the terms. But if we must, from the imperial power of custom, still retain the terms “*church government*” in our vocabulary, we will attach to the words the following meaning: We will say, that the government of the church is an *absolute monarchy*, and that the Lord Jesus Christ is the absolute monarch, on whose shoulders is the government, and in whose hands are the reins. That his *will*, published in the New Testament, is the sole law of the church; and that every society or assembly meeting once every week in one place, according to this law, or the commandments of this king, requires no other head, king, lawgiver, ruler, or lord, than this *Mighty One*; no other law, rule, formula, canon, or decrees, than his *written word*; no judiciary, court, or tribunal, other than *the judgment seat of Christ*. That every such society, with its bishops and deacons, is the highest tribunal on earth to which an individual christian can appeal; that whosoever will not hear it, has no other tribunal to which he can look for redress. To suppose that two churches have more power than one, that one hundred have more power than one, or that the bishops of one hundred churches, with any other delegates sent from the churches, have more power than one church, is to place the power of authority in men, and not in the one king or head. For if numbers create greater power, it is the power of men—it is human authority, and not the authority of God. That ecclesiastical authority which is capable of increase, which accumulates with the numbers that combine, is not the authority of God, nor of his word; for his authority and that of his word are one and the same in all circumstances. Now if one church has not the right or authority to make any law for the government of itself, all the churches on earth combined have not a right nor authority to make a law to govern it. If they have no right to make laws, they have no right to dictate doctrinal sentiments; and if they have no right to dictate doctrinal sentiments, they have no right to impose on it interpretations of scriptures; and if they have no right to do any of these things, they have no control, no jurisdiction, no authority over it whatever. So that in fact there is no other authority recognized, allowed, or regarded, by a society of christians meeting in one place as a church of Jesus Christ, than the authority of its king or head. The King appointed twelve men, to whom he gave authority to act in his name, and when his kingdom came he authorized them to sit on thrones, pronouncing statutes and judgments to the Israel of God. The remnant of the twelve tribes that believed in the Messiah, immediately yielded to the authority of those apostles, because of his authority commissioning them. Therefore, they continued stedfastly in the *apostles’ doctrine*, and

in the *apostles'* commandments. And thus the apostles spake, saying, We are authorized of God; "*he that is of God heareth us; he that heareth us not, is not of God.*" From this it is evident that the authority of the apostles is the authority of God, and that their commandments are the commandments of the Lord and Saviour. But the modern clergy have often placed themselves upon this *throne* which was given to the apostles only; and they have, if possible, in some instances, been still more impious—they have placed themselves upon the throne of God, and dealt damnation with a liberal hand to all their foes, judging, as they thought, correctly, that whosoever opposed them opposed God. But they have combined their engines and augmented their sway by confederating in one holy alliance, by which they carry their decisions into more powerful and speedy effects. Then let us ask, Whence is the divine warrant for such confederations. The 5th chapt. of the Acts of the Apostles is appealed to. The *incidental* meeting of the apostles at Jerusalem, and their being called together with the elders and the *whole church*, on one question, is converted into a warrant for an ecclesiastical council by Romanists and Episcopalians. It is converted into a presbytery, a synod, or general assembly by Presbyterians. It is converted into an association by Baptists. It becomes a conference in the hands of a Methodist. This is a flexible and pliant passage, if it answers all these purposes. But, strange as it may appear at the first glance, this meeting of the apostles and the church at Jerusalem, was not a Catholic nor Episcopalian council, summoned by a prince, king, or emperor, it was not composed of the bishops of two, ten, or a hundred churches; nor was it a Presbyterian synod, for they were not the preaching and ruling elders of two or three congregations, nor of any plurality convened; nor was it a Baptist association, for they were not the ministers and messengers of a number of churches meeting annually or biennially to hear the state of the churches and to give their advice in difficult cases. Nor was it a Methodistic conference composed of preachers of a certain grade, without a layman among them. And what renders it a meeting *per sé—sui generis*, a meeting of its own kind, is, that its decisions were the decisions of the Holy Spirit, and became *a part of holy writ, or of the law of Christ*. It was adjourned *sine die*, never to meet again. But we have said it was incidental, or, as some would say, accidental. The circumstances of the case were these: Certain brethren of the Jews, zealous of the law, came down from Judea to Antioch, where Paul and Barnabas were teaching, saying that they had a commandment from the apostles who happened to be at Jerusalem at that time, authorizing them to command the Gentile converts to be circumcised, and to keep the law of Moses, in order to salvation. After that Paul and Barnabas had no small dissention and disputation with them, the Judaizers persisting that they had a commandment from the apostles in Jerusalem to this effect, the church at Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas and certain others with them to

Jerusalem to see the apostles, who happened to be all there; thither they came and were all received by the apostles, and elders, and church. They told their errand; the apostles, and elders, and the whole church came together, called a meeting to consider this matter. The subject was the greatest ever agitated in the world since the christian era. It lay at the very basis of making of twain one new man, i.e. of uniting Jews and Gentiles in one associated body—the church. The question itself respected, too, the law of Moses, its perpetuity and universal obligation. This was a most delicate point. Moreover, the recent calling of the Gentiles astonished all the apostles, as an event they had not been looking for. It was the last evolution and development of the manifold wisdom and goodness of God to their minds; it was the discovery of the last secret in the admirably gracious plan of God, & with respect to the whole human race. From all these considerations it was not wonderful that it should have produced so much excitement in the minds of all. It was consequently necessary that the minds of all the apostles, or the revelation of the Spirit communicated to them all, should be fully and publicly expressed and recorded. It was also necessary that this should be done in the first and grandest church of the Jews, and in the metropolis of the Jewish nation, while the nation yet existed; so that the reception of the Gentiles, and the renunciation of the Jewish system, might be first approved and recommended by the Jews themselves; and that the most public refutation of the errors of the Judaizers might be afforded, and the whole scheme denounced by the very persons from whom, and in the very place from which, they said they had their instructions. It is a most precious fact to us Gentiles, that all the apostles who were Jews, all the elders of the church who were Jews, and the whole church of Christ in the metropolis, composed of Jews, should thus, by the revelation of the Spirit, publicly renounce the whole system, and declare that, with all their birthright and natural privileges and religion, *“they expected to be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus just as the Gentiles.”* And thus they exhilarated the Gentiles by telling them in their decrees, that it not only seemed good to the Holy Spirit, but *“also to us”* Jews, that those decrees should be established and proclaimed. Such was the nature, design, and utility of the interview at Jerusalem, like which there never was, and like which they shall never be another. This occurrence correctly viewed, and the whole scheme of a confederated priesthood appears in its naked deformity, unsupported by the most distant allusion to any scriptural warrant, a worldly scheme, the wickedness of which we hope to make fully appear.

We are at this moment called from home for some time, and deprived of the opportunity of bringing this article to a close. Hoping to resume it again, we must dismiss it for the present.

EDITOR.

ABUSES OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE following is an extract from a work of modern date, which though it may in some respects be exceptionable, is nevertheless deserving of the candid investigation of every advocate of primitive christianity.—Ed.

IT will be allowed that the best human institutions, through the lapse of time and the gradual encroachments of corrupt society, become changed in their nature and tendency, though they may retain their original names and pretensions. The art of building is architecture still, but from the difference in materials, plan, and construction, very different fabrics result. An African's hut is not a Solomon's temple. If, then, it fares thus with the institutions of men, was it to be expected that *christianity*, the supreme excellency of which no man can know only by the special teaching of Heaven, should share a better fate, and be mocked with *no spurious* imitations. Surely no. Let it not here be understood that man is void of sufficient intellectual faculties; were it so, he would be excusable in rejecting the oracles of God, and blameless in making him a liar. From man's perverseness and depravity *alone* his religious errors spring; it is hence that his views are perverted and corrupt, and he is said to be spiritually *dead in trespasses and sins, alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in him.*

Christianity was first propagated by apostolic agency. Their doctrine was a stream of *pure grace*, issuing from the throne of God. The light which first irradiated the earth was but a faint figure of the light held forth by the apostles; for they exhibited the Deity himself in all the grandeur and excellency of his character. The *focus* of this light was the resurrection of Jesus; hence whatever might be the exordium of their discourses, they always made haste to testify this fact. It was this which demonstrated *Jesus to be the Son of God*. It was this which shewed the design of his death accomplished; that death was virtually abolished, and "life and immortality" brought to light. The effect, in those that believed their testimony, was life; they were quickened by it; begotten, or born again; entering a life of friendship with God, which they did not previously possess. The resurrection of Jesus implies his previous death, an event which shows the peculiar character of Deity, as "*the just God and the Saviour;*" hence Jesus is called "*the image of the invisible God.*" To such a character all "baptized infidels" and professed deists are entire strangers; they worship another god, a god corresponding with their own imaginations.

By this statement may be seen the *rock*, the *foundation* on which the primitive churches were built. We may see what it was which gave them life, and animated with a boldness and confidence that often astonished and confounded their adversaries, who, imagining their gods to be offended by Christians refusing to do them honor, made no scruple to sacrifice them. At what period of time the teachers of christianity turned aside from

primitive simplicity is not necessary to say; but early as the days of Constantine, we see them engrossed with very different things. In his days was the great uproar with the Unitarians, which did not subside with his reign; for his successors being some unitarian and others orthodox, continued to convulse the religious world till orthodoxy finally prevailed. In those commotions the teachers of both parties appeared more like greedy wolves than imitators of the Lamb of God. Their rage for victory over each other seemed to be animated by the love of power and emolument. *Church livings* began then to be rich, particularly that of Rome, which, when it became vacant, set in motion all the clerical chariots in the empire, rolling towards Rome to obtain the fat living. As these things were too disgusting to christianity, some spoke boldly against them. But soon the arm of power was stretched out against all whose love of truth led them to oppose reigning *abuses*, and those of them who could not escape felt the vengeance of christianity, so called. Those who escaped took refuge in the mountains and vallies of the Alps, and in those wintry regions subsisted for ages by mechanical trades. Often were they invaded, harrassed, and nearly destroyed, but never exterminated till Louis XIV, of France sent an army to assist his son-in-law, the duke of Savoy, in accomplishing it. About the same time Louis had converted France into a complete slaughter house, that if he enjoyed the title of "*Beloved Son of the Church*," he showed himself worthy of it by his zeal in what he no doubt imagined to be her interests.*

Thus history shews us, that, instead of converting men by the plain *apostolic truth*, concerning "Jesus and the resurrection," simply, they were more zealous to improve upon Nebuchadnezzar's plan, who, in his zeal for the worship of God represented by the image on the plain of Dura, heated a tremendous furnace, and hurled the impious into it. He had music to draw and fire to drive, and imagined, no doubt that the heart must be hard, stubborn, and rebellious, which would not be melted by the influence of one, nor softened by the allurements of the other.

But since the great furnace is no more, our modern have recourse to means somewhat different in appearance, though not in effect. They make very little use of the tale concerning Jesus and the resurrection;" this is too stale for the improved ears of their audience; and what gave life to the *dead in sins* nearly eighteen centuries past, might seem (to them) to have lost its effect, and will by no means answer their purpose. Their plan is briefly this: First they set man to judge in his own cause—man whose heart the scripture declares "*is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it?*" is set to judge of himself;

*To allude to all the historic evidence contained in the volume of Mosheim, Gibbon, and others, would be too tedious. For a concentration of historical information upon the subject, from the most credible authors of various parties, and writers of different ages, see Jones' History of the Waldenses.

not, indeed, by the rules of justice, but by certain *marks and signs*, to distinguish himself from other men as *converted*, or partly converted; a *believer*, or desiring to believe; *religious*, or seeking to be religious. Those who are of neither class; but hardened to heedlessness, they endeavor to melt down by pouring upon them *fire and brimstone*, feeding them with the thunderbolts of heaven, answerable to Nebuchadnezzar's *furnace*. Those who imagine themselves distinguished from other men, are fed with very different things; the scriptures are cut up into piecemeal, and the very best given to the *first rates*; while those who are a kind of *half converts*, wanting something to complete their happiness, as decided favorites of heaven, receive every encouragement, and are set diligently to work, in one shape or other, to obtain the *ultimatum* of their wishes. In this manner Paul is despised when he says, "If by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace is no more grace; but if it be of works, then is it no more of grace, otherwise work is no more work."

Now, as those whose life springs from "Jesus and the resurrection" alone are never tired of this grand subject, but dwell upon it with sweet delight; so those whose life springs from another source never make it the soul of their discourse, but are ever harping upon *experimental faith, godliness, inherent holiness*, and the like; and though they swell their mouth with the word *gospel* five hundred times in a single discourse, yet they never hold the thing forth from the pulpit only in such manner as to have a very different effect to that which it produced in the days of Paul. Hence the striking difference between primitive christians and those of modern times, the latter being as zealous for the *doctrines and commandments of men* as the former were for the precepts of the Christian Lawgiver. The close attachment of professed christians to the traditions and precepts of men is not matter of wonder, if we consider again the high pretensions with which teachers array themselves. They speak of themselves in the words which apply only to the apostles. Instead of being content with the simple title, **TEACHER**, they swell themselves into all the importance of *ambassadors* from the court of heaven, "stewards of the mysteries of God," and the *channel* through which God conveys salvation. They seem "willingly ignorant of this," that the apostles can have no *successors*, seeing that none after Paul were *witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus*, not having seen him alive after that even. This was the first grand requisite in an apostle. "As stewards of the mysteries of God," the apostles too were guided into all *truth*; but can our moderns say this of themselves? In fact, the apostles *need* no successors; for as "the law and the prophets prophesied until John," so Christ and the apostles continue to preach and to testify in all ages. There is no new edition of the gospel, and, strictly speaking, no new preachers; for a preacher is a publisher, and a publisher is a preacher.

As for the office of *pastor*, very few possess the requisite qualifications laid down in the scriptures, and to give that title to

whom the scriptures does not, would be doing violence to those scriptures: the bare appellation of *teacher* is all that such can claim. Now the word *pastor* is equivalent to that of *shepherd*, or *bishop*; and the word *elder* is often used in reference to the same office, as will be seen by comparing the scriptures of Peter and Paul. It was these to whom Paul says, "I have coveted no man's silver, nor gold, nor apparel; yea, ye yourselves know that *these hands* have ministered to my necessities and to them that were with me. I have showed you all things, how that *so laboring* ye ought to support the weak, and remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, *It is more blessed to give than to receive.*" By this he evidently says, that they ought not only to support themselves by their own industry, but help to keep others also who are *weak*, unable to support themselves. This is a plain case, and is not contradicted by what he says to Timothy about the *elders* receiving "double honor." He there speaks of the *elders* and *widows*, as it were in one breath: the latter he allows to be supported by the church, only when their age and circumstances necessitate them. The same rule must be understood as applying to *elders* or *pastors*; for, says he, "this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat."

Thus we see the extravagant pecuniary claims, as well as the high sounding titles of reverend gentlemen, fall to the ground by the touch of the scriptures. But as questions opposing the scripture plan never cease, it will be asked, When are teachers to study? I answer, When they walk by the way, when they lie down, and when they rise up, as every saint does; and if they be taught of God, the word of Christ will dwell in them richly; so that with natural abilities for communication, they will be "apt to teach" and ready on all occasions. If, indeed, teachers cannot be prepared for want of time to study, why do they make a monopoly of teaching; for by attending to Paul's instructions to the churches at Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, and others, it will be seen that teaching is a thing not to be restricted to an individual of an assembly, but that every man in an assembled body of christians, possessing in a great or less degree the gifts for teaching or exhortation, should not be obstructed, but allowed opportunity to exercise the same. But this is not permitted where one man engrosses all, and drinks up too the resources of the congregation, which ought to be appropriated to the use of the poor, as Paul enjoins. "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him," that is, to form a "collection for the saints" in want. It will be said that inferior teachers must exercise their gifts at other times, and not when the whole church is assembled. I answer that the scripture knows nothing of such plan. The gifts of the saints ought to be exercised in love for edification of the whole body; but how can this be done except when they are come together? As for appointing other days besides the "Lord's Day, the first day of the week," no man who trembles at the word of God, would presume to "bind upon the

disciples" any such things it would be legislating for Christ, changing his "times and laws."

"The first day of the week" is the day on which primitive christians came together, and their example is as the law to christians of all ages; for they acted under the eye and instruction of the apostles, to whom the Lord Jesus said, "He that heareth you heareth me." The pulpits of the present day call "the first day of the week" *Sabbath*; but the New Testament does not speak so. As they please to call it Sabbath, so they legislate as to the manner in which it must be observed; for instead of obeying the injunction relative to the *seventh day Sabbath*, that they should make no fire in all their dwellings nor cook their victuals, they enjoin what they please, and very frequently enforce their precepts by the civil power. Thus the fear of man is substituted for the fear of God. Such proceedings can answer only one purpose—by compelling people to be at leisure they will be more likely to attend before the pulpits.

As our moderns do not keep the "first day of the week" as Sabbath, so neither do they observe it as the "*Lord's Day*." 'Upon "the first day of the week the disciples came together to break bread" in remembrance of the Lord's death; and as the "first day of the week" comes once in seven, the plain christian, whose inquiry is, "Lord, what wouldst thou have me to do?" needs not the finger of some great *divine* to point out his duty or privilege in respect to partaking of the "Lord's supper" every "Lord's day." But the customs or traditions of men have made void this institution. The same contempt of his authority who commanded his apostles to teach believers "to observe all things whatsoever he had commanded them," is often manifested in respect to baptism. The scripture very significantly places that ordinance between a confession of "the truth as it is in Jesus," and admission into the churches as members of the faithful body: but the authority of men has transferred that ordinance, or something under its name, to the speechless infant, making of "none effect" the ordinance of God.

It is tiresome to follow the steps of corruption. Another instance wherein the authority of God is supplanted by the will of man, shall suffice. It will be recollected that "the Author and Finisher" of the christian faith manifested an utter aversion to ostentation; hence he spoke against the practice of praying standing at the corners of the streets, and commanded his disciples to keep within doors when they wished to pray; and not only so, but to enter into the closet, praying in secret. The reverse of this is commanded by the pulpits, not indeed that men should attend to it in the streets; it is sufficient for their purpose that the devotee be seen or heard, praying in his family; this may strike sufficient awe into his neighbors to have the effect of proselyting, and may tend to rivet his domestics firmly to the church or sect to which he belongs.

These, out of many specimens of departure from primitive

simplicity, are enough to show that the authority of the Christian Lawgiver is not more regarded now than it was in the twelfth or fourteenth century; for though a great part of the professing world may reject this, that, and the other abuse; yet, whilst they do what they please, obey what they like, and cherish whatever abuses may suit their taste, prejudices or circumstances, how can it be said that they recognize the King of Zion? And, indeed what better could be expected, when such is the purity and sublimity of the christian faith, that none can know or appreciate its excellency but by the teaching of God—whilst such is the perversity and depravity of the human heart, that it seems to pervert or contaminate whatever does not correspond with its corrupt principles. Besides, a man might seem to be born in his religion as to his father's inheritance—it forms, as it were, a great part of his patrimony. And whatever it might be that induced some of our forefathers to suffer so nobly in opposing some abuses of christianity, yet they could not communicate their spirit to their children, and so posterity cease to advance in the work of reform. They prefer the *ipse dixit* of man to the labor of thinking for themselves. It is thus their prejudices become firm as the foundations of the mountains, and their abhorrence of change is in proportion.

But some will say that these are hard sayings, harsh and uncharitable, and seem like judging. I answer, that nothing is hard to him whose foundation is eternal truth, even the "*wrath which is to come*" he views with fearless countenance. No coming storm can move him to dismay. As for the harshness of truth, it will be harsh to the ear fostered and fed by flattery. But if it be uncharitable to speak truth, surely it is more uncharitable to poison with deceit and falsehood. And where is charity when the love of truth is absent? Charity rejoiceth not with iniquity, but "*rejoiceth in the truth.*" Charity regards the truth as its true mother, and will pine and die under a step-mother. As respects judging, no judging can be wrong which is measured by the truth on which we stand, and hope to stand in judgment yet to come. Nay, farther—a measure of judging is absolutely necessary to every christian. Is he not to discriminate and recognize the brethren of his Lord? Yes, verily, or he would be neglecting the "new commandment," that peculiar precept, by the observance of which HE will distinguish his sheep from the goats, who said, "*Love one another as I have loved you.*" This love, says John, is "*for the truth's sake as it is in Jesus,*" dwelling in those that believe it. This love cannot exist where the views of the professing body are not simplified as respects the truth being the sole ground of their only hope, joy, and peace. When, therefore, the plain christian looks for "the love of the truth" and brotherly charity in the gay and pompous assemblies of the professing world, he is constrained to say, They are not here.

From Plain Truth, a paper published at Canandaigua, N. Y.

MISSIONARY REPORT.

The Sixth Annual Report of the United Foreign Missionary Society, held in the city of New York, on Wednesday, May 7th, 1923. New York: printed by D. Fanshaw—1923. 8vo. p. 108.

WE have received from an attentive correspondent in New York, a copy of the above work, which we have perused with some attention. It consists of a kind of historical *outline* (and it is *only* an outline) of the "Union," "Great Osage," "Tuscarora," "Seneca," and "Cataaugus" missions, with the treasurer's account, account of donations, names of donors, of life members, &c.—Three of these missionary establishments, viz: the Tuscarora, Seneca, and Cataaugus, are situated but a little distance west of us;* and all so near, that by means of our acquaintance with the country, and many of the inhabitants around them, we can judge of their usefulness and their prospects. It is to that part of the book which relates to these three missions, therefore, that we shall *mostly* confine our remarks at this time—and for the following reason: The compilers of the work, we observe, have a most happy faculty of *secreting* whatever may not tell to their advantage; we, therefore, prefer examining their statements *in connexion with our knowledge of facts*.

The first in order, as they stand in the work before us, is the "Tuscarora Mission," of which we are told at page 31, "The state of this church and tribe, during the past year, has not been altogether as favorable as your managers had reason to expect." Then follows a statement that "prejudice" had operated upon the minds of the Indians, and produced a dislike to Mr. Crane, the missionary; but a council convened in October, had put all things right again. Upon the very next page, however, we read, "Your managers regret to add, that, at the date of their latest advices, the state of things in the tribe was AGAIN assuming an unpromising aspect." The reader cannot fail to see the *hide-and-seek* game here played by the "managers," as the compilers of the book very *appropriately* style themselves, for there is not one word of particulars upon the subject of this *unpromising aspect*." The "*managers*" ("I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word,") well knew that the Indians were not likely ever to know what had been said of them, and so the whole is charged to the account of "prejudice." We happen to be in possession of some facts touching upon this "unpromising aspect," which, in due time, shall be made public and when they are, we trust they will not all be placed to the account of *prejudice*." The Tuscarora Indians have matters in train for a full development of this whole "*aspect*," that the "*managers*" (there it is again) call so "*unpromising*." The

*The Tuscarora missionary station is at Tuscarora village, four miles east of Lewiston—the Seneca station, about 5 miles from Buffalo Village, on the bank of Buffalo creek; and the Cataaugus station, on the shore of lake Erie, about 40 miles from Buffalo.

whole business (and poor enough it is) of this mission, is *managed* in the same way. The missionary, (so the "managers" quote,) says, "The members of the church are, I fear, in a *low* state;" and of the school they say, "The success of the school at Tuscarora *has not* equalled the expectations of the Board." This is emphatically *lighting a candle and putting it under a bushel*." How can any one, from this statement, learn the real situation of things at Tuscarora? It is impossible.

Of the Seneca mission, the account is still more dry, dark, and unintelligible, than that of the Tuscarora. The "*managers*" begin the *management* of the subject by stating that "Miss Reeves and Miss Van Pattan, the female teachers mentioned in our last report, have both retired from this mission;" and that in place of these, "Miss Phebe Seldon, of Buffaloe, and Miss Asenath Bishop, of Homer," have joined the mission. The remainder of all that is said of this establishment (of the *expense* of which we shall speak at the close of this article) is in fact nothing more than that a school has been kept, when sometimes they had seventeen scholars and sometimes less; that some had been baptized, and others had joined the church; while other still had died by natural causes; and, for aught we know, just as white folks do. Now all this is very marvellous, we admit, and highly interesting, as is also the following from the closing paragraph of the *managers'* account of this station: "Your *managers* still view the situation of this mission as auspicious and interesting." *General terms* are all we can get of these wary "managers"—the remainder is all thrust under the bushel!

Third and last comes the "Cataraugus mission." This is under the command of Mr. William A. Thayer, the date of whose arrival is given. He went there in 1822, found the "christian party" very glad to see him, and the "pagan party" very sorry he had arrived. He attempted to build upon the Indian lands, but finding they would not suffer him to do so, he abandoned the place, and located himself beyond the bounds of their reservation. Here he opened a school, and in it taught such children who could get to attend, where he remains to this day—and so the story ends.

In looking over the expences of the various stations, we find that the Seneca mission is, indeed, as the "managers" say, "*interesting*," if expences can make it so. There are, we believe, seven persons belonging to this mission family, including the interpreter, (who is a white man in the costume of a native,) and including the children, nineteen in number. The following is a copy of the amount paid to this establishment in one year, ending March, 1822, as stated in the secretary's account of monies paid:—

1821.

June 12.	By cash paid the Rev. Mr. Harris' draft, (No. 9,)	\$776,79
	Do. Thomas Armstrong's draft, (No. 10,)	45,00
October 4.	Do. Rev. T. S. Harris and J. Young's draft, (No. 22,)	648,09

	Do. Thomas Armstrong's draft, (No. 23,)	45,00
Decem. 2.	Do. Messrs. Harris and Young's draft, (No. 32,)	688,12
	Do. Thomas Armstrong's draft, (No. 33,)	45,00
1882.		
Feb'ry. 24.	Do. Harris and Young's draft, (No. 43,)	758,07
March 1.	Do. Thomas Armstrong's draft, (No. 44,)	45,00
		\$3,051,07

These several sums were drawn for quarterly, by Messrs. Harris and Young, the missionaries at the Seneca station, and Thomas Armstrong, the interpreter, and amount, as the footing shows, to \$3,051,07 for one year's expences! The same book from which we copy this, states, that the Seneca mission was commenced in 1811, (of course it has been in operation 12 years,) and during the *last* year a church has been formed, consisting of *four* Indian members. What the expense of this mission was during the first eleven years of its existence, we know not; but putting that out of the account, and taking the expense of the twelfth year *only*, which is \$3,051,07, dividing it by 4, the number of Indians who have "joined the church," and we have a fraction over \$762,76 to each Indian "brought in." This, reader, is the account, as it stands in the missionary report, which, of course, must be taken and received as authentic. Whether the *four* who have joined the church are *better* than before, we are not told—of course we must infer they are *not*—for these people always brag of all *they* have.

* * *

From the Watchman, as copied by the Reformer, of October 1.
AFRICAN ISLAND—MADAGASCAR."

"COMMUNICATIONS received by the London Missionary Society from Mr. Griffiths, one of their missionaries, informs us, that the king of that island having consented to have his (long) hair cut off, which was done by an Englishman, (a high honor,) his male subjects earnestly solicited the same privilege, which, being granted, all the scissors and combs of the English residents were got in requisition to execute, &c. Previous to the example of the king, a thousand pounds (sterling) would have been insufficient to purchase what they were now so anxious to get rid of." [A great saving indeed to the society.] "But the female part of the king's subjects, more attached to the manners and customs of their ancestors, raised a powerful outcry against the procedure." (They had wit and sense enough to know that every other natural right would, after this act of submission, lie at the mercy of the missionaries, as surely as Delilah knew that Sampson would become a *prey* to the Philistines on the loss of his hair.) "The following extract," continue the London divines, "shows the degree of protection and favor which the missionaries may expect from the king, and also the promptitude

with which he punished the ringleaders of those audacious women.

“The next day about four thousand females arrived at a village a mile from town, and sent their *talk* to the king, saying, they were dissatisfied with his proceedings. The king sent to them to know their grievances. The leaders came forward and requested that his majesty would change his conduct, and put and end to,” (this is *one-sided* evidence) “or deliver the whites in town up to them. His majesty (mock title) sent them a second message to this effect; “Am not I king, and may I not do as I please in these matters without consulting you?” (I suppose the missionaries had instructed him, that, as in England, *the king could do no wrong*. “The next orders were to select the ringleaders out of the crowd. The next orders delivered were, to set four of the principal women apart from the rest; and as soon as the gun fired the soldiers ran, as they were ordered, with great speed, and put them to death with the bayonets”—(of British manufacture, no doubt.) Now for the *plaster* to this missionary priestcraft cancer. “When this unhappy affair was over, his majesty (quite a christian, to be sure,) sent for us, both missionaries and artizans, and informed us of the painful duty which he had been obliged to discharge in consequence of the insurrection of these silly women. “These women,” said he “were disaffected, because they wanted to remain forever in ignorance, and be like beasts, and because I would have them instructed and become wise, and like Europeans (Englishmen.) Because they were displeased with me for cutting my hair without consulting them, and also adopting European customs,” (some of them bad and sad enough!) he added, “that he had put four of the principal ones to death, and that we need not apprehend any evil on account of that for, said he, I will arrange all things so as to put an end at once to such wicked devices as these.” We thanked him for his gracious promises of regard and protection.

One is at a lose to determine where to place the fullest measure of contempt—whether on the conduct of the *Madagascar missionaries*, in this affair—on that of the *London Society*, in publishing their narration, or on that of the editors of the *New York Observer*, in republishing those shameful transactions, without a *comment* and without a *groan*. Where were the twenty odd divines, that not one of them could be *had in requisition*, to revise the paper and correct the stupidity of their *protogee* editors? Do they also approve of the use of *combs and scissors* as “means of conversion?”

How admirably does the above accord with the effect produced by the preaching of the primitive missionaries of the cross! “When they heard this,” that is, the preaching of Peter, “they were pricked in the heart, and said, What shall we do to be saved.” But the grand question in the above appears to have been, What are the customs of your country? Where are

your scissors, your combs, and your English barbers? Is, then, this that heaven-born structure whose corner stone was laid in the blood of the Redeemer, and which, by his apostles, was exhibited to the world as a covert to shelter the sons of men from the impending storm? Alas! how changed! How different its original from its present effect! Then its principles reached and reformed the heart. Now it appears to regard only the external appearance, the dress, the manners, and customs. Then its advocates could assimilate themselves to the peculiarities of the people to whom they came, in order that, by allaying their national prejudices, they might have a more effectual access to the unbiassed understanding. But its present advocates must carry with them all the pomp and vanity of European or American customs, and thus excite the prejudices of the people against themselves. Thus did not the Apostle Paul. His aim appears not to have been to reform the dress and manners of those to whom he preached, but only to instruct them in the truth as it is in Jesus.

But what gives the finishing stroke to this transaction, is contained in the two last sentences. "He added, I have put four of the principal ones to death, and that you need apprehend no evil on account of that; for, said he, I will arrange all these things so as to put an end at once to such wicked devices as these." We thanked him for his gracious promises of regard and protection.

Reader, look at this! First consider the words of the African prince—"I have put four of the principal ones to death," &c. and "I will arrange all things so as to put an end at once to such wicked devices as these!" How could the missionaries have understood this declaration? Why surely by comparing it with the preceding event, *i. e.* by putting to death all that should continue to advocate the primitive customs of their country, as he had the four above mentioned. But what was the reply to this inhuman and antichristian resolution? Did they embrace this opportunity to unfold to the prince the nature of christianity? Did they attempt to dissuade him from his diabolical project? Did they tell him that their doctrine did not depend for defence on such implements of warfare as bayonets? Did they say, The Lord delighteth not in the death of a sinner? Listen to the words of the missionaries themselves—"WE THANKED HIM!"—Friends to modern missions, see here the fruits of your benevolence and toil! What is it? Four bleeding mortals, with the probable accompaniment of many more. To such institutions as these, we say, *Give!!*

* * *

No. 5

MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1823.

VOL. 1.

THE CLERGY—No. III.

IN our last article under this head we had got so far in the exposure of the means employed by the clergy to establish their

dominion over the Bible, the consciences, the sentiments, and over the persons of men, as to shew that their confederation into councils, synods, &c. was entirely destitute of any divine warrant in the New Testament. The only passage adduced from the New Testament in support of such consociations, is the 15th of the Acts of the Apostles; and this we considered in our last, and, as we think, demonstrated to be no warrant for ecclesiastical courts or church judicatories. Indeed, the present *holy alliance* of the crowned potentates of Europe, for the purpose of sustaining the *assumptions* of kings against the *rights* of the people, is just as accordant to the genius and spirit of christianity, as the councils of priests, or the confederation of the clergy now existing among us. There is, in fact, a much greater resemblance between the holy alliance of kings and the holy alliance of clergy, than at first thought would appear. In the first place, kings and clergymen of this day find themselves pretty much alike. They have got both upon thrones by the common consent of the people. The king upon a golden throne, or a gilded one—the priest upon a wooden one, sometimes gilded, and sometimes crimson-cushioned too. The king wears a crown, and the priest a mitre. The king from his throne publishes his speeches and proclaims the laws of the state—the priest from his pulpit, or wooden throne, publishes his sermons and proclaims the canons of the church. The king is high in honor and lives upon the toils of his people—the priest is high in honor too, and lives upon the sweat and sacrifices of his people. The king pleads his divine right to rule, to be supported, and to be honored by the people of his realm—the priest pleads his divine right to instruct his people into the meaning of the Bible, and to be supported and honored by the people over whom he reigns. The king pleads the antiquity of his order, and goes back to Genesis to shew that his order is there mentioned and dignified in the person of Nimrod Amraphel, Tidal, and Chedorlaomer—the priest is equally fond of antiquity, and turns over to Genesis in support of his order, and pleads that his order is found in the person of Melchisedec and the priests of Egypt. The king pleads his right to peculiar immunities from immemorial usage—the priest pleads the same right from usage as ancient; he quotes Genesis, xlii. 22. “*The land of the priests Joseph would not buy, for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat the portion which Pharaoh gave them.*” The kings of ancient and modern times united in leagues offensive and defensive for the better management of their affairs, the securing of their interests, dominion, and rule. Of this sort was the confederation of the vale of Siddim nearly four thousand years ago. The priests of ancient and modern times have united in synods and councils, “ministerially to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship and government of the church.” Of this sort was the confederation of priests in all

ancient nations—in Egypt, in Chaldea, in Greece, and Rome. The Jewish sanhedrim, that condemned the Son of God to death, and that excommunicated the apostles, and would have silenced them, was of this complexion. In all these items we discover remarkable coincidences between the kings and the priests of ancient and modern times.

But in the nature and object of their alliances or consociations there are the most remarkable analogies. We shall take the existing holy alliance of kings in Europe and the existing holy alliance of American clergy, and examine their respective aspects. The holy alliance of monarchs have sworn and subscribed to certain articles of common faith, necessary, essentially necessary, to their salvation. They have pledged themselves to inculcate and support the same by all means and at every risk. Have not the confederated clergy of America done the same? Have not the respective ecclesiastical councils solemnly vowed and subscribed to certain articles of faith, deemed essential to salvation? Have not they pledged themselves to inculcate the same at the risk of their livings and sacred honor?

Again—the object of the holy alliance and that of the allied priests is one of the same, *ostensibly and really*. The *ostensible* object of the allied monarchs is the peace and prosperity of Europe—the *ostensible* object of the allied priests is the peace and prosperity of Zion. But the *real* object of most of the allied monarchs is their crowns, their thrones, and their revenues; and the *real* object of most of the allied priests is their mitres, their pulpits, and their stipends. The allied monarchs call those who write or speak against their schemes, “traitors, rebels, or enthusiastic demagogues,” whose object it is to sow discord, and to revolutionize that they may reign—the allied clergy represent those who speak or write against them as infidels, schismatics, heretics, or bewildered enthusiasts, who oppose them from some sinister motives. The allied monarchs have amongst their subjects such as they have honored with more than usual respect, and these plead their cause, defend their measures, and denounce those who plead for reform; these kiss the tyrant’s rod, and lick the dust on which he walks—just so, the allied priests have amongst those over whom they reign, certain ones whom they honor with more than ordinary respect; these plead the cause of the priests, defend their proceedings, and denounce those who plead for reform; these kiss the priest’s toe and hold his stirrup; these are the veriest bigots; these are the ass on which Balaam rides. When one of the allied monarchs is likely to become too powerful, or to be too strong for the others, the other sovereigns become jealous, begin to explain away the obligation of the alliance, and prepare themselves for his exclusion; when one of the allied priests becomes too popular or too powerful in the diocess, the others say it is better that one man perish, or be destroyed, than that the whole priesthood suffer. But in fact the analogy appears perfect in every instance, the allied mon-

archs and the allied clergy resemble a monstrous production of nature which we once saw, two bodies united and but one soul. Thus, though allied monarchs and allied clergy are two apparently distinct bodies, they possess but one and the same soul and spirit.

In this country we have no kings, and no king-craft. We are not, therefore, afraid to laugh at the impious and vain pretensions of the allied sovereigns. But in this country we have priests and priestcraft, and therefore many tremble to lisp a word against priests and priestcraft. But while we pity the condition, cordially pity the vassalage and privations of those under the despotic sway of the allied sovereigns of Europe, we see the approach—we hail the approach of their deliverance. Light travels with immeasurable force, with incalculable velocity. A fire is kindled that will burn and burn—that will, in proportion to the restraints imposed on it, burst forth with unquenchable violence, and consume the allied heads and hands that oppress Europe and the world. And as we sit and condole over the spiritual wickedness in high places; while we mourn for the blinded, the deluded, the oppressed, the robbed, and murdered subjects of the allied clergy, we lift up our eyes from the mournful and appalling picture with a hope that HE who has for some time been consuming with the spirit of his mouth the works of the Man of Sin, will continue with accumulated force to destroy and to consume, until iniquity ashamed shall hide its face—until allied priests shall be driven to confusion; or rather, as we would earnestly desire, led to repent, and become obedient to the truth.

EDITOR.

* * *

A REVIEW

Of an *“Extract of a Narrative of the State of Religion within the Bounds of the Synod of Kentucky;”* published in the *Pittsburgh Recorder of November 6th.*

THIS narrative of the state of religion, if we may judge of the whole from the specimen presented in the Recorder, is, as respects style, matter, and spirit, one of the poorest things we have ever seen from a body of men professing to be learned and religious. What renders it worthy of notice is its extraordinary character of imbecility, incongruity, superciliousness, and ignorance of christianity. But let it speak for itself. The first paragraph reads—

“It is with pleasure the Synod presents to the people a view of “the state of religion within our bounds. From some points this “view is dark—from others, encouraging.”

Reader, observe: the Synod with *pleasure* presents a view from some points of the compass *dark*, from other points of the compass *encouraging*, *i. e. light*. The Synod are of a happy turn of mind; they have *pleasure in presenting a view, dark or light*. But, stranger still, the Synod have *pleasure in lamenting!* for

after telling us that it is with *pleasure* the Synod presents to the people a view, &c. they utter seven lamentations. They lament the ravages of disease; they lament the death of four ministers of their communion; they lament that "in some places infidelity prevails;" they lament that "intemperance, profane swearing, and indeed vice of every kind, prevails" in certain parts of their bounds; they lament, or rather "deeply deplore, that in many places the Sabbath is greatly profaned;" they lament "the prevalency of lukewarmness in many of our churches, accompanied with a sinful conformity to the world;" and in the seventh place,

"They are sorry to state, that there are still many vacancies within our bonds. From these vacancies we hear the pitiable Macedonian cry, *Help us!*"

The Macedonian cry is become weak and curtailed in these vacancies! Amongst all the Synods whose narratives we have heard, we never heard one that could with *pleasure* utter seven such lamentations. This narrative of the Synod reminds us of a speech of king George IV. to the citizens of Dublin. The king was telling the citizens with what heart-rending grief he had just heard of the death of his beloved spouse, queen Caroline; and, in the same breath, while the crocodile tears were streaming down his cheeks, he expresses the great pleasure he then felt to be surrounded with his Irish subjects.

The Synod presents a view of the state of religion *within its bounds*. Is it the state of Presbyterianism, or the state of religion? or is the word Presbyterianism and the word religion synonymous? The Synod must identify the terms assuredly; for they never mention the state of any other sect. The Synod of Kentucky, then, must possess within its bounds all the religion in the state. But it may be said, that it only speaks of its own communion. Then, I ask, Why does it mention the prevalence of infidelity in Lexington, Frankfort? &c. Is this within the bounds of its communion? Does infidelity prevail within its communion? The bounds of the Synod must mean the whole state, or else infidelity and universalism prevail in some parts of its communion. The state of religion within its bounds is a most equivocal and deceitful sentence. And the Synod must either arrogate to itself all the religion in the state, or it gives a false representation of the state religion in the state. We are assured that the representation of the state of religion within Lexington is not correct, if it mean any thing more than the Synod's communion; for having been in Lexington immediately after the publication of this narrative, and having observed a little of the astonishment which it excited, I was led to inquire into the state of other religious sects in that town; and, from the best authority, ascertained that other religious sects had increased much more during the last year than for some years past. But the fact is, that the prevalence of infidelity in Lexington, means, that the Synod having lost the management of the

Transylvania University, and this Seminary having, since it was by the state put under the management of others, flourished exceedingly, it has become exceedingly mortifying to the Synod, which is about trying to get up another, for Synods have always aimed at the sovereignty of colleges, as subservient to their designs; consequently, whenever they lose the sway in any seminary, infidelity begins to rear its odious brow in that place.

And the first of the joyful things mentioned by the Synod is, that "several churches within our bounds which were vacant,"

A vacant church! O for a new dictionary!

"and almost without the means of grace,"

i. e. a learned priest.

"have within the last year been supplied with faithful pastors."

Let it be remembered that the Synod of Kentucky represent, and consequently consider, a faithful pastor *the means of grace*; for every church is *almost without the means of grace* who has not a faithful pastor. O ye poor! who are not able to hire a faithful pastor, pray to be *rich* that ye may be saved! O Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John! O Paul and Peter! James and Jude! what shall we say to you! Ye did not free yourselves from the blood of *all men*! Nay, ye shunned to declare unto us the whole counsel of God! You kept back many things, and ye spake so darkly, that, having *you all*, and wanting a faithful pastor from a theological school, we are almost destitute of the means of grace!!! The Synod adds—

"Thus your prayers have been answered, and God has sent some of you the desire of your hearts—men to break to you, and to your children, the bread of life."

Without this faithful pastor the bread of life would not have been broken! You must have starved to death, or eat it whole! O ye faithful pastors! O ye self-important! if the people starve wo! wo! wo! must await you!

The Synod answers the weak and faltering Macedonian cry thus:—

"We have it not in our power to answer their call. We have not laborers equal to the harvest. Do these vacant congregations say, What must we do? Must we and our children perish for want of the bread of life? The Synod would say, Two things at least they must do: they must look by fervent prayer to God. But this is not all—they, in conjunction with our churches that have regular pastors, must cheerfully and liberally engage in the support of our Theological Seminary. They must cheerfully and liberally contribute to the support of poor and pious youth in their preparatory studies. Were these two things perseveringly attended to, our vacant churches would soon be supplied and new churches formed."

Yes, yes—support the Theological Seminary, contribute money, give money to make faithful pastors, and then tell them, Freely you have received, *now freely give*. No, that will not

obtain them. Give money to make poor pious youths learned clergy, or vain pretenders to erudition; and then pray that they may preach to you; yes, and pay them too. Was there ever such a craft as priestcraft? No, it is the craftiest of all crafts! It is so crafty that it obtains by its craft the means to make craftsmen, and then it makes the deluded support them! The Synod rejoices at last, that there is a growing reverence for the Sabbath; that Sabbath schools have been organized; that in some congregations monthly concerts for prayer are well attended; that the principle of *intercommunion* is recognized and acted upon; that parochial visitation has been attended to in some churches with most encouraging results; and that though no revivals had taken place, yet in many places there are encouraging appearances. Such is the dark and light view which it presents to the people. Oh that the people would read the scriptures and think and act for themselves, and let those reverend Synoders pursue some honest calling! Let them work, or let them want; and then the people who fear God would learn his statutes, walk in his commandments, enjoy an intelligent mind, a comfortable hope, and would grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Then they would shine as lights in the world, they would live as the salt of the earth, and many would be reclaimed from the error of their way. Then they would choose from among themselves such as they had proved to be faithful men, and "apt to teach," for bishops, who would take the oversight, not for the sake of *filthy lucre*, but of a ready mind; not as lords over God's heritage, but examples to the flock.

EDITOR.

* * *

NOTES

On a Narrative of the State of Religion within the Bounds of the Synod of Pittsburgh.

THIS narrative is not only of the same logical genus, but of the same species, with the Kentucky narrative. The state of religion *within its bounds*, i. e. district of country, or its own communion; if the former, it is incorrect; if the latter, it is more "pitiable" than the Macedonian cry quivering in Kentucky. There are but five lamentations in the Pittsburgh Synod's narrative, but then they are louder and longer than the Kentucky seven lamentations. The Synod says—
 "It consists of nine presbyteries; and from the reports of the "state of religion within their bounds, we learn that the last "year has been marked with a prevailing lukewarmness and in-"difference, except in a few cases."

This is doleful, indeed.

"The Synod have still to lament over the prevalence of vice and "immorality within their bounds."
 Sad enough, if their bounds mean their communion; and if

district of country, when was it otherwise? "Nor," adds the Synod, "are we less affected with the general stupidity of sinners."—

"At the same time they lament that so few of the precious "youths of our congregations,"

Not the Lord's.

"who have been baptized into the name of Jesus, appear on the "Lord's side; that by living without God in the world,"

Strange! surpassing strange! members of churches living without God in the world! Baptized infidels! yet members of Christ's body, the church! made members of the church by baptism, or baptized because members of the church!

"practically deny their baptismal obligation—break the covenant "of God which was entered into by their parents on their behalf, "and disavow what was done for them in consecrating them to "the Lord."

This is a tremendous lamentation. Why does not the Synod cast out and excommunicate those baptized infidels, those baptized covenant breakers, those consecrated *unconsecrated* youths? Let them become more cautious in baptizing infants—let them not baptize *all the seed* of the righteous—let them not baptize the young Ishmaels and the young Keturahs—let them baptize the young Isaacs only; and then they will not have to lament and mourn, and clothe themselves in sackcloth and ashes, and weep and wail over the young covenant breakers, young wretches who never stipulated nor restipulated one item in the covenant of their father and mother, and yet had the strength to break it! Oh for a new dictionary to understand such covenants and such covenant breakers. Religious mysteries none but priests can comprehend!

The Synod goes on to state, that they "have farther causes of mourning and humiliation over the "condition of Zion, over the deadness and formality of Zion's "friends."

We have not time to hear all their lamentations; but we think a word of advice is due to the Synod. We would then advise the Synod to give back the money they have received from the people, and to tell them that as they have not given them value received, they cannot conscientiously pocket it. Tell the people to meet once a-week and read the Bible, and pray to the Father of Lights for the true wisdom which clergymen cannot give. In this course they may be wiser, and happier, and more useful; but they cannot possibly be worse than what they now are in these respects. And also, let the reverend Synod take a little of this advice themselves, and we will assure them that they will never meet to lament, and weep, and moan, as they have done at this late doleful meeting.

But the Synod glories in Jefferson College: There infidelity, vice, and immorality do not prevail. No, no. Since the day the present president delivered his inaugural address—since that

day infidelity, vice, and immorality fled with terror and affright; yes, they fled to Lexington and erected their temple under the tolerating system of Kentucky democracy. Oh, Washington, how art thou fallen! Since the day that thy president was employed as amanuensis for a Rabbi, whose name Pluto could call to thy remembrance, all grace and goodness have fled to Jefferson College. Yes, with the mantle of thy former president the spirit of Elijah has retired to the holy hill where dwell the hopes of Zion.

“But it is peculiarly gratifying to the Synod to learn that the “Spirit of the Lord has graciously visited many of the students of “Jefferson College, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Ohio. “From the statement of that Presbytery we learn, that of the “whole number of students, being between ninety and a hundred, “the majority are hopefully pious—others under deep conviction “of sin, and earnestly inquiring what they shall do to be saved: “and at the close of the last session there were few, if any, of the “whole number, who were not under serious impressions. It is “scarcely possible to think of a more animating consideration to “the church of God, than revivals of religion in colleges. From “these seats of science, thus visited of the Lord, are many youths “to go forth into the world to the help of the Lord against the “mighty. Here are the hopes of Zion. They are bred in the “nurseries of learning and piety. Here are the fountains whose “streams make glad the city of our God.”

Oh Canonsburgh! thrice happy, thrice happy thou! Ye fathers and ye mothers send your sons, your profligate sons, hither. Let them dwell under the pillar of fire, and under the cloud that hovers around this blessed fountain of grace. “*Credat Judaus Apella, non ego.*”

EDITOR.

* * *

ADDRESS

TO READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.—No. 1.

My Friends—

IN the different articles presented to your perusal in this paper, you will find some that you approve, and some likely that you disapprove. We need scarcely inform you that we approve of every item yet presented from our own pen, or those of our correspondents. There was a sentence or two, in an extract on the “*Abuses of Christianity,*” published during our absence, which, perhaps, we would have either not inserted, or have noted with a remark, had we been present at its insertion; but the general spirit and purport of the extract we approve. Our views of christianity differ very materially from the popular views. This we fearlessly and honestly avow. But while we remember our own mistakes, and the systems and teachings of our time, we must acknowledge many to be christians who are led away and corrupted from the simplicity of Christ. These cannot enjoy christian health. They resemble those who live in an unwholesome climate and inhale a sickening air—they live,

but they do not enjoy health or life. It is one thing to live, and another to enjoy life. One may be a christian, and yet a babe, and yet carnal. It is, however, the privilege, the happiness, and glory of christians, to be *men* in Christ—to be *free men* too, and to stand fast in, and enjoy the liberty, the glorious liberty of sons and heirs of God, is the grand desirable—the high aim of all the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty. To see christians enjoy their privileges, and to see sinners brought from darkness to light, are the two great objects for which we desire to live, to labor, and to suffer reproach. In endeavoring to use our feeble efforts for these glorious objects, we have found it necessary, among other things, to attempt to dethrone the reigning popular clergy from their high and lofty seats, which they have for ages been building for themselves. While we attempt to dethrone them, it is solely for this purpose, that we might enthrone the holy apostles in those thrones which Christ promised them; or rather, that we might turn the attention of the people to them placed upon thrones by the Great and Mighty King. Many will, from various motives, decry the clergy, as indeed they have rendered themselves odious to all who dare think for themselves, in every age and nation. They have made more deists or sceptics than christians, in every country, and amongst all people. In opposing and exposing them, and their kingdom, it is not to join the infidel cry against priests or priestcraft; it is not to gratify the avaricious, or the licentious; but it is to pull down their Babel, and to emancipate those whom they have enslaved, to free the people from their unrighteous dominion and unmerciful spoliation. We have no system of our own, nor of others, to substitute in lieu of the reigning systems. We only aim at substituting the New Testament in lieu of every creed in existence; whether Mahometan, Pagan, Jewish, or Presbyterian. We wish to call christians to consider that Jesus Christ has made them kings and priests to God. We neither advocate Calvinism, Arminianism, Arianism, Socinianism, Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, Deism, or Sectarianism, but *New Testamentism*. We wish, cordially wish, to take the New Testament out of the abuses of the clergy, and put it into the hands of the people. And to do this is no easy task, as the clergy have formed the opinions of nine-tenths of christendom before they could form an opinion of their own. They have, in order to raise the people's admiration of them, for their own advantage, taught them in creeds, in sermons, in catechisms, in tracts, in pamphlets, in primers, in folios, that they alone can expound the New Testament; that without them, people are either *almost*, or *altogether* destitute of the means of grace. They must lead in the devotion of the people; they must consecrate their prayers, their praises; and latterly they must even open a cattle show or an exhibition of manufacturers with prayers and religious pageantry!

Such readers of this paper as believe *that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God*, and consequently desire to understand his word,

to do, and to enjoy his will—we address, in a subserviency to our grand design, in the following words:—

That you may relish and understand the New Testament, and all the revelation of God, is our ardent desire. We will, therefore, suggest to you a plan of reading the blessed volume which reason, common sense, and the experience of all who have tried it, recommend and enforce. We will only premise one sentence, viz. that as God kindly revealed himself, his will, and our salvation in human language, the words of human language, which he used for this purpose, must have been used by his spirit in the commonly received sense amongst mankind generally; else it could not have been a revelation; for a revelation in words not understood in the common sense, is no revelation at all. You will then take, say, a New Testament, and sit down with a pencil or pen in your hand. Begin with Matthew's Gospel; read the whole of it at one reading, or two; mark on the margin every sentence you think you do not understand. Turn back again; read it a second time, in less portions at once than in the first reading; cancel such marks as you have made which noted passages, that, on the first reading appeared to you dark or difficult to understand, but on the second reading opened to your view. Then read Mark, Luke, and John, in the same manner, as they all treat upon the same subject. After having read each evangelist in this way, read them all in succession a third time. At this time you will no doubt be able to cancel many of your marks. Thus read the Acts of the Apostles, which is the key to all the Epistles; then the Epistles in a similar manner; always before reading an epistle, read every thing said about the people addressed in the epistle, which you find in the Acts of the Apostles. This is the course which we would take to understand any book. You will no doubt see, from what you read, the necessity of accompanying all your readings with supplications to the *Father of Lights*, for that instruction which he has graciously promised to all that ask him; praying that "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places." Eph. i. 17-20. "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. Eph. iii. 17-19.

In pursuing this plan, we have no doubt, in getting even three times through the New Testament, that you will understand

much more the christian religion that a learned divine would teach you in seven years. It will add, however, exceedingly to your advantage, should you find two, three, ten, or a dozen similarly disposed, who will meet and read, and converse and pray with you, and you with them once a-week; or should you be the member of a church walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord. Do, we entreat you, make the experiment, and if it prove not as useful as we have hinted, remind us of it; tell us of your disappointment, and then we will be deservedly worthy of blame. Beware of having any commentator or system before your eyes or your mind. Open the New Testament as if mortal man had never seen it before. Your acquaintance with the Old Testament will incalculably facilitate your proficiency in the New. The time requisite will be redeemed time. It will not interfere with your ordinary duties. Oh remember that this knowledge is better than all acquisitions! that "happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and the man that getteth understanding! For the merchandize of it is better than the merchandize of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold! she is more precious than rubies; and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto her. Length of days is in her right hand; and in her left hand riches and honor. Her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her; and happy is every one that retaineth her." Prov. iii. 13-18.

* * *

A SERMON TO FISH

THE following sermon to fish, though at the first inspection it appears without meaning, exhibits the *modus* and spirit of much modern preaching in a very striking light. Many of what are called the orthodox sermons address mankind as though they were fishes, as incapable of being moved, and yet commanded to the performance of many duties of which they are as incapable as fishes. Again, the ingenuity of making a scrap or a few scattering fragments of scripture speak any thing and every thing which a popular preacher pleases, is beautifully depicted. In the last place, the superstition of thousands called "christians," is convincingly exhibited by the effects which this sermon produced upon the persons attending its pronounciation, and by the reverence with which the Catholics of Padua regard it and the St. Anthony who delivered it. The correspondent who handed it to us for insertion, at the close of it says, "Christian bishops, we pray you to keep close to your Bibles. The great sectaries are losing ground. The word of the Lord will yet consume them."

EDITOR.

THEY sell at Padua in Italy, says Mr. Addison, the life of St. Anthony, which is read with great devotion. The most remarkable part of it is his discourse to an assembly of fish. When the heretics would not regard his preaching, he betook himself to

the sea shore where the river Marechia disembogues itself into the Adriatic. He here called the fish together in the name of God, that they might hear his holy word. The fish came swimming towards him in such vast shoals, both from the sea and from the river, that the surface of the water was covered with their multitudes. They quickly arranged themselves according to their several species into a very beautiful congregation, and, like so many rational creatures, presented themselves before him to hear the word of God. St. Anthony was so struck with the miraculous obedience and submission of the poor animals, that he found a secret sweetness distilling upon his soul, and at last addressed himself to them in the following words:—

“Although the infinite power and providence of God, my dearly beloved, discovers itself in all the works of his creation, as in the heavens, in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars; in this lower world, in man, and in other perfect creatures; nevertheless the goodness of the Divine Majesty shines out in you more eminently and appears after a more particular manner, than in any other created beings; for notwithstanding you are comprehended under the name of reptiles, partaking of a middle nature between stones and beasts, and imprisoned in the deep abyss of waters; notwithstanding you are tossed among billows, thrown up and down by tempests, deaf to hearing, dumb to speech, and terrible to behold; notwithstanding these natural disadvantages, the divine greatness shows itself in you in a very wonderful manner. In you are seen the mighty mysteries of an infinite goodness. The holy scriptures have always made use of you as the types and shadows of some profound sacrament. Do you think that without a mystery the first present that God Almighty made to man was of you, O ye fishes? Do you think that without a mystery, among all creatures and animals which were appointed for sacrifices, you only were excepted, O ye fishes? Do you think was nothing meant by our Saviour Christ, that, next to the paschal lamb, he took pleasure in the food of you, O ye fishes? Do you think it was by mere chance, that, when the Redeemer of the world was to pay tribute to Cesar, he thought fit to find it in the mouth of a fish? These are all of them so many mysteries and sacraments that oblige you in a more particular manner to the praises of your Creator. It is from God, my beloved fish, that you have received being, life, motion, and sense. It is he that has given you, in compliance with your natural inclinations, the whole world of waters for your habitations. It is he that has furnished you with lodgings, chambers, caverns, grottos, and such magnificent retirements, as are not to be met with in the seats of kings or the palaces of princes. You have the water for your dwelling, a clear transparent element, brighter than crystal: you can see from its deepest bottom every thing that passes on its surface. You have the eyes of a lynx or of an Argus. You are guided by a secret and unerring principle, delighting in every thing that may be beneficial to

you, and avoiding every thing that may be hurtful. You are carried on by a hidden instinct to preserve yourselves and to propagate your species. You obey in all your actions, works, and motions, the dictates and suggestions of nature, without the least appearance of contradiction. The colds of winter and the heats of summer are equally incapable of molesting you. A serene or a clouded sky are indifferent to you. Let the earth abound in fruits or be cursed with scarcity, it has no influence on your welfare. You live secure in rains and thunders, lightnings and earthquakes. You have no concern in the blossoms of spring or the glowings of summer, in the fruits of autumn or in the frosts of winter. You are not solicitous about hours or days, months or years; the variableness of the weather, or the change of seasons. In what dreadful majesty, in what wonderful power, in what amazing providence, did God Almighty distinguish you among all the species of creatures that perished in the universal deluge! You only were insensible of the mischief that had laid waste the whole world. All this, as I have already told you, ought to inspire you with gratitude and praise towards the Divine Majesty that has done so great things for you, granted you such particular graces and privileges, and heaped upon you so many distinguishing favors. And since for all this, you cannot employ your tongues in the praises of your benefactor, and are not provided with words to express your gratitude, make at least some sign of reverence; bow down yourselves at his name; give some show of gratitude according to the best of your capacities; express your thanks in the most becoming manner that you are able, and be not unmindful of all the benefits he has bestowed upon you." He had no sooner done speaking, but behold a miracle! The fish, as though they had been endowed with reason, bowed down their heads with all the marks of a profound humility and devotion, moving their bodies up and down with a kind of fondness as approving what had been spoken by the blessed father St. Anthony. The legend adds, that after many heretics who were present at the miracle had been converted by it, the saint gave his benediction to the fish, and dismissed them. Several other the like stories of St. Anthony, are represented about his monument in a very fine basso relievo.

* * *

The Rev. Thomas G. Jones and the Luminary

DURING my absence to Kentucky, while contending for an item of that faith and obedience once delivered to the saints, an article appeared in the *Wooster Spectator*, written by the Reverend *Thomas G. Jones*, once president of the famous Bank of Wooster, a Masonic brother, who teaches that no other than a Mason can understand the christian religion. This article was the first stone cast at the *Christian Baptist*, and as Mr. Jones was sinless, it became his right to sling it. This he did with his usual sagacity, in such a way as to kill, not only two birds, but even three at one fire. The *Galaxy*, the *Reformer*, and the

Christian Baptist all fell beneath his sturdy stroke. He killed the *Galaxy* by telling the readers of the *Spectator*, that, "neither the self-devoted missionary in pagan lands, nor the pulpit at home, nor even the theatre, has escaped its abuse." This is a grand climax—the missionary, the pulpit, and the theatre. He puts the last as best of all—"nor even the theatre!"—that most innocent and useful of all the three!! Really I do not know why Mr. Jones should advocate the cause of the theatre, and place it higher than the missionary and the pulpit, and then censure the *Galaxy* for abusing it, unless he honors it above all. Mr. Jones and I are at issue here. I condemn the theatre—he places it above the missionary and the pulpit. Perhaps he is wrong.

The Reformer, "as tow falls asunder by the touch of fire," gives up the ghost, on Mr. Jones' saying it is a catch-penny thing. But being more exceedingly mad at the *Christian Baptist*, he not only kills it, but pounces upon its dead body. He tells the people that it is "edited by A. Campbell, a sort of religious Ishmaelite, whose hand is against every man," (and Mr. Jones' hand and tongue have been a long time against him,) "opposing almost every thing the christian world has received as being the religion of Christ." Mr. Jones should have known better; he might have known that I oppose not one item of the christian religion. And I would say, as the Jews once said, "*Let my right hand forget her cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,*" rather than I should oppose one word, one doctrine, or one commandment of the Saviour or his apostles. But this I confess unto thee, Mr. Jones, that I do oppose, and will, by the grace of God, oppose, not only *almost*, but *altogether*, every thing received as the christian religion, not found in the New Testament, to the utmost of my ability and opportunity, as the risque of every thing—of even offending Mr. Jones or any other reverend gentleman. I have counted the cost, and put my hand to the plough, and while the Lord protects and enables me, I will not look back.

But Mr. Jones dwells much on my supposed gain from the *Christian Baptist*. He even employed the calculations of a printer to fix its cost and profit, that he might have whereof to accuse me of avarice. He supposes that I have 1500 subscribers, and that I will put into my pocket no less than 930 dollars per annum from this work. He says, "that all other periodical religious papers in the Union that he has seen, in favor of missionary and other benevolent institutions, (he has seen very few then,) give the nett proceeds to the support of those institutions." Now Mr. Jones has in this instance, as in every other in his piece, handed me the rod to correct him. The *Latter Day Luminary*, published by the great luminaries to the eastward, which, of course, will have, in nearly six years standing, a much greater circulation than the *Christian Baptist*, and which is a dearer paper, consequently more profit to the publishers, and the *profits of which are sacred to the cause of missions*, in five and a half years has netted \$168 31 cents; that is, according to

the last June No. page 190, its whole profits have been \$30 60 cents per annum. Yet I must have, on a cheaper paper, much less popular, \$930 per annum; that is, the Christian Baptist must be 31 times at profitable as the Luminary!!!

It would require, not only 1500 subscribers, but 1892, to equal the profits on the Luminary, according to its own account. As Mr. Jones is a good arithmetician, we will give him a question to work to find our profits:—

If 1892 subscribers will clear \$30 60 cents per annum, how much will 1500 clear? And if the Christian Baptist on 1500 subscribers, clears 930 dollars per annum, and the Luminary, on a subscription equal to 1892 of the Baptist, pays but \$30 60 cents per annum into the missionary funds, *can its profits be sacred to the cause of missions?*

We sincerely pity Mr. Jones; and we hope this honorable notice we have taken of his little first fruits will teach him a useful lesson. We do not feel disposed, by way of retaliation, to follow him to the banking house, the army, or the pulpit, to make calculations on his commercial, his military, or his ministerial reputation. We shall dismiss him at present, assuring him that had we been disposed to make shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience, we could have had 1000 dollars per annum in addition to all our *supposed* gains, and that too for mere breath, to appropriate as we might please; but we have been taught to know that *gain* is not godliness. We hope that he will repent and be forgiven.

EDITOR.

* * *

FOR THE "CHRISTIAN BAPTIST".

Mr. Editor,

SIR—HAVING read with considerable attention the numbers of the *Christian Baptist* already published, and approving of the general spirit and tendency of your work, I take the liberty of suggesting to you the necessity of avoiding extremes. I have, for some years, lamented that so many who have opposed prevailing errors with considerable ability and commendable zeal, have defeated their own good efforts by outstepping the fixed boundaries of truth, and thus introducing schemes and opinions, as subversive of the religion of the New Testament, and as fraught with mischief, in their ultimate operations, as the schemes which they opposed. In hastening out of Babylon they ran past Jerusalem. I would, with due respect, suggest to you, that I think your opposition to Bible Societies savors a little of this error. You have classed these most benevolent and useful institutions with schemes, as unwarranted of God as enthusiastic, as they are irrational and absurd. In this one instance, I honestly think, you have erred; you will please reconsider this matter. Consider only one fact, that it is owing to these benevolent institutions, that so many of the poor have the word of life at this moment in their hands. I readily allow that it is difficult, very difficult,

to keep within the limits of propriety, within the limits of truth, in taking up the pen against a world of errors. It is also possible to fall short of the proper bounds, as Luther and Calvin very plainly have done. These men were reformers of popery, not advocates of the religion of the Bible. They brought the pope's chair with them, and established a religion as political as that of Rome. The very essential principles of popery are to be found in the works of these reformers. As for instance, these words of Calvin, "The church did grant liberty to herself *since the beginning* to change the rites (ordinances) somewhat, excepting the substance." *Calvin's Com. on Acts viii.* 38. This principle recognized and acted upon, re-establishes popery on its proper basis. And the present appearance of Lutheranism and Calvinism shows how trifling the difference between the great mother and her elder daughters. Hoping that you will keep close to the grand model, I am your well-wisher,

ROBERT CAUTIOUS.

P—, Va. November 6th, 1823.

* * *

MR. ROBERT CAUTIOUS,

Sir—YOURS of the 6th instant came duly to hand. I am obliged to you for its contents. You think that it was rather going to an extreme to rank Bible Societies with other popular schemes. Perhaps a more intimate acquaintance with our views of christianity would induce you to think as we do upon this subject. We are convinced, fully convinced, that the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint of modern fashionable christianity—that many of the schemes of the populars resemble the delirium, the wild fancies of a subject of fever, in its highest paroxisms—and that these most fashionable projects deserve no more regard from sober christians, christians intelligent in the New Testament, than the vagaries, the febrile flights of patients in an inflammatory fever. We admit that it is quite as difficult to convince the populars of the folly of their projects, as it generally is to convince one in a febrile reverie, that he is not in the possession of his reason. Some of the actions, however, of these subjects of disease, approximate very nigh to the actions of those in perfect health, while others are extravagantly wild. The course pursued by physicians in such cases as we have alluded to, for the cure of the body, is analogous to the proper course to be pursued by those who would reduce the minds of the populars to views and practices consistent with scripture. It is not the administration of stimulants, but a system of depletion, that will effect a cure. It is not the recommendation of the popular schemes, it is not the prescription of zealously engaging in all the projects of converting the world, recommended by the popular clergy, that will heal the diseases of the people; but it is an abandonment of every human scheme, and a submission to learn and study christianity as developed in

the Bible. This is the course, and the only course, that will effect a cure and renovate the constitution. Every other course resembles the palliatives, and sedatives, and stimulants of quackery.

With regard to Bible Societies, they are the most specious and plausible of all the institutions of this age. No man who loves the Bible can refrain from rejoicing at its increasing circulation. But every christian who understands the nature and design, the excellence and glory of the institution called the *Church of Jesus Christ*, will lament to see its glory transferred to a human corporation. The church is robbed of its character by every institution, merely human, that would ape its excellence and substitute itself in its place. Should a physician of extraordinary skill exhibit a medicine as an infallible remedy of consumption, in all its stages, when administered according to his prescription; should he represent it as *perfectly adapted*, without any cemmixture, or addition, to the patient in every stage; should he also be a person of unbounded benevolence—what would be his feelings when some ignorant quack would bring himself into notice by recommending the grand specific as infallible, should a little sage tea or some innocent anodyne be added? Would not the physician feel his skill insulted, his character traduced, and would not his benevolence provoke him to anger at the impudent or ignorant quack who would thus strive to creep into notice at his expense, and at the same time, partially, if not altogether, defeat the real utility of his medicine. The case is parallel, at least sufficiently so, to illustrate our meaning. The infallible physician has exhibited an infallible remedy for sinners; he has also established a society to which he has committed it, to be preserved and exhibited in purity. This society he has called the *house* of the living God, the temple of the Holy Spirit. The honor and glory of this society, of this institution, and the honor and glory of its founder, require that in its *own character*, not in that of a heterogeneous association of Calvinists, Arminians, Mammonites, Socinian Philosophers, and Philosophical Sceptics, it presents and disseminates in their purity the oracles of God. Let every church of Christ, then, if it can only disseminate twenty Bibles or twenty Testaments in one year, do this much. Then it will know into what channel its bounty flows; it will need no recording secretary, no president, no managers of its bounty. It will send all this pageantry, this religious show, to the regions of pride and vanity, whence they came. Then the church and its king will have all the glory. The limits of my sheet command me to come to an abrupt close.—
Your friend,

THE EDITOR.

B—, Nov. 20th, 1823.

Two Hundred and Seventy-Nine Young Clergymen on the Wheel!

THE *Pittsburgh Recorder*, of November 6th, informs us that fifty-four Presbyteries of the General Assembly, reported, at their last meeting, *One Hundred and Thirty-Two Beneficiaries*; that is, poor pious youth of talents, educated, or assisted in obtaining an education, by alms of the munificent devotees of the church. It also informs us that the Philadelphia Education Society, organized in 1818, has since that time aided forty-four beneficiaries. It adds that the Presbyterian Education Society, which holds its annual meeting in the city of New York, existing for five years, is the most powerful institution of the kind in the United States, excepting the American Education Society. Now the *Luminary* of July last informs us, that at the fifth anniversary of this society, one hundred and three young men were reported on its list of beneficiaries. The aggregate of the poor pious Presbyterian beneficiaries is TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINE!

What a blessed prospect opens to *this* Zion! Thanks to Mammon for his pious aid to the cause of Heaven! He has come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty! O ye mines of silver! ye are the streams that make glad the city of our King! Flow on, ye fountains of pure metal! ye veins of grace! ye mines of salvation! Still continue to gladden the hearts of the poor! Ye can raise them from the dunghill and set them among princes, even the priests of Pharaoh! Hail Zion, thy millennial glory dawns! "*Blow ye the trumpet, blow!*" say unto Zion, TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINE YOUNG PRIESTS COME! Yes, they come, meek and lowly, riding upon the alms of the people, the colt of the asses of Judah. Yes, and TWO HUNDRED MORE MIGHTY MEN, riding in chariots, come to thine aid!—O Zion; thy Mammon is thy glory!!!

EDITOR.

* * *

THE following language from an English Protestant, where hereditary political prejudices give greater force to the religious, may be considered liberal, and indicates the prevalence of more benign and tolerant feeling than has, until lately, existed towards the Roman Catholic Church in that country.—
Nat. Int.

FROM BELL'S (LONDON) WEEKLY MESSENGER.

"AMONGST all grave and religious men, the ancient hostility to the church of Rome has entirely passed away, and has been succeeded by a kind of tenderness, a species of reverence, for what, in a historical point of view, is unquestionably the mother church. We avow, that we ourselves feel this tenderness and reverence, and we know that in this feeling we agree with some of the best and most learned men of every age and country. The late Dr. Johnson used to stop at once all invectives against the Roman Catholics, by saying, "Nay, sir, do not abuse a church

from which we all spring." The bishops of Rome are men, and have fallen in process of time into gross errors and vices; but still they are the successors of Saint Peter. Barrow, Clarke, and a hundred more of our most learned prelates and sages had the same feelings; and we have reason to believe, indeed to know, that they prevail very extensively in the present day. It is, in truth, a vulgar and most mischievous bigotry, to confound the papal power of the present times with the popes of the dark and middle ages, and to treat all the existing Catholics of the present day as if they shared in the guilt and sanguinary persecutions of those of that dark period."

This is liberal, charitable, just, and honest. It is honest; for assuredly every sect that holds a human creed and an ecclesiastical court, is a legitimate daughter of the Holy Mother; and it is no more than common honesty to own the relationship. But, indeed, we did not know, that "amongst all grave and religious men, the ancient hostility to the church of Rome had *entirely* passed away, and that it had been succeeded by a kind of *tenderness*, a species of *reverence*, for what, in a historical point of view, is unquestionably the *Mother Church*." Nor did we know that dissenters from the Mother Church would "*avow*" that they feel a "*reverence*" for the old Mother of Harlots, the Scarlet Whore, drunken with the blood of the saints of the Most High. Indeed, we have long seen a most striking family likeness between the numerous progeny of this crimsoned queen in their religious establishments and religious proceedings; but never before this "*era of good feelings*," did we hear that almost all grave and religious men reverence this venerable nurse of an adulterous brood. As every thing of English manufacture is so highly esteemed in this country, it is presumed that the style and sentiment of the above extract will be quite fashionable amongst us.

Editor C. B.

* * *

ANECDOTES

WE know the following to be a fact. It happened in the city of Pittsburgh:—

The baby of one of our citizens was lately more than ordinarily seized with some infantile disease; when the mother, alarmed at the increasing symptoms, craved the assistance of a neighboring lady, whose skill in such matters, it was supposed, gave her a right to be consulted. The child was apparently dying, and the whole family was thrown into that disorder which is common on such occasions, in houses that have not the hope. Immediately it occurred to the distracted mother that the child had not been baptized. The minister was sent for post, who, coming with all holy bustle, not only praised the religion and prudence of the misguided and mistaken mother, but actually sprinkled the child's face with water as it lay on the knees of the neighboring lady, who was thus compelled to become sponsor,

as one may say, for the child, although a Baptist, and of course opposed to this abuse of the Saviour's ordinance.

The child recovered; but then, as there was present also an amiable and sagacious physician, the query is, Whether the recovery is to be attributed to the wisdom of the physician, or the folly of the spiritual Doctor. P.

* * *

A PRESBYTERIAN clergyman began to be enlightened in the christian religion, and was about to give up a good living for conscience sake. A neighboring preacher and co-presbyter made him a visit, and began to exhort him to consider the interest of his family, which was numerous and helpless; beseeching him not to throw himself upon the mercy of the world. His more enlightened brother told him, that he could not reconcile his mind to officiate as a minister, nor even to continue a member of a church, whose constitution and discipline, whose views and practices, were so contrary to the church set in order by the apostles. His friend replied, that the apostles differed from each other in their views of some things, and you, said he, may differ from them all in a matter of so great consequence as your living.

* * *

DEBATE

A DEBATE took place in Washington, Mason county, Kentucky, between the Rev. *W. L. Maccalla* of Kentucky, and *A. Campbell* of Virginia, which commenced on the 15th and ended on the 22d of October on BAPTISM. This debate continued seven days, owing to Mr. Maccalla having collected documents and *written notes*, which he said, before the debate commenced, would require eight days to discuss. As this debate is about being put to press, we forbear making any remarks upon it. It excited great interest, and was patiently heard by a very numerous and respectable assembly, to its close. It is expected that it will make its appearance next spring. EDITOR.

* * *

No. 6.

MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1824.

VOL. I.

THE CLERGY—No. IV.

AS the clergy have occupied a most conspicuous place in the Egyptian, Chaldean, Persian, Grecian, Roman, and Anti-Christian empires, common courtesy requires that we should pay them more than common attention. Our present number shall be devoted to their training and consecration.

A lad, sometimes of 12 or 14 years, is, by his parents, destined for "*holy orders*." To the grammar school he hies away. In the course of two or three years he is initiated into the Latin tongue. The fables of *Æsop*, the *Viri Romoe*, the Wars of *Caesar*, the metamorphoses of *Ovid*, the conspiracy of *Cataline*, the wars of *Jugurtha*, the pastoral songs of *Virgil*, with his *Georgics* and *Æneid*; the amorous and bacchanalian odes of *Horace*, his satires

and epistles; the sapient invectives of Juvenal and Perseus; the amors, the debaucheries, the lecherous intrigues, the murders, and suicides of real and fictitious heroes and heroines; the character and achievements of Jupiter, Juno, Bacchus, and Venus, well relished and well understood, prepare him for introduction to the Grecian tongue. Now subjects of a similar character, written in a different alphabet, but written by men of the same religion and morals, command his attention for a year or two longer. He now enters college, perfects his knowledge in the *pantheon*, admires the beauties of Anachreon, is charmed with the sublimity of Homer, reveres the mythology of Hesiod, and scans with rapture the flights of Pindar. From the inspiration of the Muses, from the summit of Parnassus, he descends to the frigid contemplation of triangles, squares, and curves. For this he acquires a taste also. The demonstrations of Euclid, the algebraic process, and Newton's principia captivate his powers of ratiocination. The logic of Aristotle, the rhetoric of Longinus and Quintilian, the ethics of Plato, and the metaphysics of the Gnostics, elevate him to very high conceptions of himself. So far the candidate for law, physic, and divinity accompany each other. Each of these, having got his diploma of *Bachelor* of all these *Arts*, shakes hands with his classmates, and enters into a department of preparation consentaneous to his future destiny. One puts himself under a Doctor of Law, another under a Doctor of Physic, and the pupil with whom we set out puts himself under a Doctor of Divinity. His former classmates, with whom he was once so jovial, retain their former jocularities or sobriety—there is no alteration on their visage. But my young priest gradually assumes a sanctimonious air, a holy gloom overspreads his face, and a pious sedateness reigns from his eyebrows to his chin. His very tone of voice participates of the deep devotion of his soul. His words flow on with a solemn slowness, and every period ends with a heavenly cadence. There is a kind of angelic demeanor in his gait, and a seraphic sweetness in all his movements. With his Sunday coat, on a Sabbath morn, he puts on a mantle of deeper sanctity, and imperceptibly learns the *three* grand tones—the Sabbath tone, the pulpit tone, and the praying tone—these are the devout, the more devout, and the most devout.

Meantime he reads volumes of scholastic divinity, and obtains, from sermon books and skeletons of sermons, models for future practice. Bodies of divinity, adapted to the sect to whom he looks for maintenance, are closely studied; and the Bible is sometimes referred to as a book of proofs for the numerous articles of his creed. A partial acquaintance with church history is formed, and a minute attention is paid to the rules and manner of proceeding in ecclesiastical courts. Now he can descant upon "*natural*" and "*revealed*" religion; now the mysteries of scholastic divinity, viz. "eternal generation," "filiation," "the origin of moral evil," "the eternal compact," "the freedom of the human will," "eternal, unconditional election and reprobation," "the

generality or speciality of the atonement," &c. &c. are, to him, as common place topics. After being a year or two at the feet of this Gamaliel, he appears before the presbytery or some other ecclesiastic tribunal; he delivers a sermon on which he has spent two or three months first in collecting or inventing documents, then in writing, and lastly in memorizing the whole. When he has it well committed, the only thing preparatory, yet remaining, is to fix upon the proper attitudes of body, tones and gestures suited to the occasion; and, above all, he endeavors to conceal all art, that it may appear to flow from unfeigned sincerity. The sermon is pronounced and approbated, with a small exception or two. On the whole, it was a finished piece of mechanism. He lifts his indentures, and after another specimen or two, receives a license, which places him on a footing with those of other trades called journeymen. Indeed he is for a time hired by the day, and sent hither or thither at the will of his superiors. This, however, contributes to his ease, inasmuch as it saves him the toil of preparing new sermons, the same discourses being always *new* to a strange congregation.

Such is the common training of a clergyman. It may not be so extensive, or it may be more extensive; he may commence his studies at an earlier or later period; he may be sent by his parents or by others, or he may go of his own accord; he may be a beneficiary, or he may be able to pay his way. These circumstantial differences may and do exist, yet the training of a clergyman is *specifically* the same in *all* cases.

To this course, which is, with some very small differences, the course pursued by Romanists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians of every grade, Congregationalists, and, perhaps, by some others; it has been objected that there is not much *grace* nor much *dependance* upon grace in this plan. This is, perhaps, a futile objection; for what need is there of grace, or what cause for dependance upon the grace of God, in a person so well qualified by *art* for this reverend office? A clergyman, thus qualified, can deliver a very popular and orthodox sermon without any grace—as easily too as a lawyer can plead the cause of his client without grace. If a lawyer can be so much interested in the cause of his client as to be *warmly* eloquent; if his soul can be so moved by sympathy, as it often is, even to seek relief in copious tears, without the influence of grace or supernatural aid, why may not a clergyman be elevated to the same degree or to a higher degree of zeal, of warmth, of sympathy, of deep distress, in his pathetic addresses from the pulpit? Again, if one so well versed in theology, as to be able to comprehend, in one view, all the divinities, from the crocodiles, the gods of Egypt, up to Olympic Jove, or the venerable Saturn, as any clergyman from his youthful studies is; if a competent acquaintance with the sublimities of natural religion, and with the philosophical mysteries of scholastic divinity, cannot be eloquent, animated, and orthodox, with-

out grace, he must, indeed, be as stupid as an ox and as brutal as an ass.

But there are some who think that there is some kind of an almost inseparable connexion between clerical acquisitions and the grace of God—that none can be eminently possessed of the former, that does not possess a competent portion of the latter. How can this be? If a parent who has three sons, A, B, and C, educates A for a divine, B for a carpenter, and C for a doctor of medicine; why should A possess the grace of God or the faith of the gospel rather than B or C? If such were the case, how could it be accounted for? Has the parent any divine promise that A shall possess the heavenly gift rather than B or C? Is there any reason in the nature of things, that the training of A, B, and C, will secure grace to A rather than to B and C? If so, then there is a connexion between Latin and Grecian languages, mythology, science, and the grace of God, that does not exist between the education of a carpenter or a medical doctor, and that grace. If the education of A secures the boon of heaven, then it becomes the imperious duty of every father thus to educate his sons. But this is impossible. He has not the means. Then the gift of God is purchased with money!!! It is, then, unreasonable to suppose that the training of a clergyman, can, in any respect, contribute to his possessing the grace of God, even in the popular sense of that grace. Indeed we would cheerfully undertake to prove that the training of a carpenter or mason is more *innocent* and less *injurious* to the human mind, than the training of a clergyman in the popular course, and that there is more in the education of the latter to disqualify him to enter into the kingdom of God, than there is in the education of the former to unfit them for admission into this kingdom. From these considerations the most favorable opinion which we could form of the regular clergy, is, that if there be, say, for the sake of precision, five thousand of them in the United States, five thousand carpenters, and five thousand doctors; there is an equal number of christian carpenters, of christian doctors, or of any other trade, proportionally according to their aggregate number as there is of christian clergy. If we err in this opinion, our error is on the side of charity for the clergy. For we conceive it would be much easier to prove from the Bible and from reason, that, in five thousand carpenters, masons, tailors, farmers, there is a larger proportion in each of members of the kingdom of God, than in the same number of regularly educated ministers. If we were to form our opinions on this subject alone from the history of the regular orthodox clergy in the time of the Jewish prophets, or in the era of Christ and his apostles, alas! alas! for the regular orthodox divines of this time!

An objector asks, "Must our clergy, then, be ignorant and unlettered men?"—"is ignorance the mother of devotion?" Ignorance is often the mother of enthusiasm or superstition, either of which is, with many, equivalent to devotion. Many of those

unlettered divines who are supposed to speak entirely from the Spirit, for every one knows it is not from a fund of knowledge or from literary attainments which they possess, are indeed as evidently without the grace of God as his holiness the pope or his grace the duke of York. They speak from the spirit, but it is from the spirit of enthusiasm. Enthusiasm is frequently accompanied with a remarkable volubility of speech and pathos of expression. There are none more eloquent nor more ungrammatical than the enthusiastic. Indeed, some writers on eloquence of the highest order, say that this kind of eloquence is the creature of enthusiastic ardor. Thousands of ignorant unlettered men, not fettered by the rules of grammar, not circumscribed by the restraints of reason, not controlled by the dictates of common sense, nor limited by the written word of God, are nevertheless both fluent, and, though incorrect, eloquent speakers they are elevated by enthusiasm, and, like the meteors of the night, shine with more resplendence than the real stars. But to answer the above objector I would say, Let us have no clergy at all, learned or unlearned—let us have bishops and deacons, such as Paul appoints, such as he has described 1st Tim. iii. 1-14. Titus. i. 5-9.

But, to resume the young clergyman where we left him, working by the day as a licentiate: he preaches, he travels, he explores “vacant churches,” he receives his *per diem*, his daily compensation. Like a young gentleman in quest of a wife, who visits the “vacant” ladies; forms an acquaintance with the most charming, the best accomplished, until he finds one to whom he can give his heart and hand; the nuptial engagements are formed, and the ceremonies of marriage are completed; he settles down into domestic life and builds up his house. So the young priest, in quest of a “vacant church,” forms an extensive acquaintance as possible with all the unmarried establishments of this character, pays court to the most charming, *i. e.* the most opulent and honorable, if he be a young gentleman of high standing, until he find one that answers his expectations. A “call” is presented and accepted. His reverend seniors come to the celebration of his nuptials—with holy hands they consecrate him—he vows to be a *faithful* teacher of the doctrines of the sect; a *loving* pastor of the flock, and they vow to be to him a *faithful* congregation, to support him according to promise, to *love* him for the work’s sake, and to be *obedient* to his authority until God separate them—*by death*—no, but until he gets another and a louder call from some “vacant church” who falls in love with him, and for whom he is known to possess feelings incompatible with his present married state. Thus he is consecrated a priest for life of good behavior, and then he sets about building up his cause and interest, which is ever afterwards represented and viewed as the cause and interest of Christ. Here we shall leave him for the present.

ON TEACHING CHRISTIANITY—No. III.

“THOU art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” said Simon, and “thou art Stone,” replied Jesus to the son of Jonas. Both the speakers were human apparently, and had been introduced to each other by Andrew, on the banks of the Jordan, about the commencement of the Saviour’s ministry, when Simon had the name of Stone given to him, &c. To such an acquaintance the introduction of Andrew was sufficient, common civility seldom requiring more on such occasions, than “this is such a one, and this is such another one.” Simon, with others, seems to have had no higher views of the Lord Jesus, in the first instance, than the popular sect of our own day, called Socinians. Philip expresses these views to Nathaniel, “*We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth the Son of Joseph.*” But though Peter in the first instance conceived of him as the son of Joseph, yet afterwards, as is evident, he had his views corrected, and was introduced to him as the son of one infinitely august; not, indeed, by flesh and blood, not by his brother Andrew, but by God the Father. “*Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonas, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.*” All the Jews regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph. As such, they rejected his pretensions to the Messiahship; and, as such, he was reputed poor and vile by the rich and great of his own nation. If I am not wofully deceived, however, the noblest peculiarity of the christian books consists in their disproving the false conception of the Jews on this point, by showing that he was the Son of the living God. “*God manifest in the flesh*” is the grand arcanum of christianity—the sublime mystery it divulges to those who are initiated! But I must stop, for this would clash with the paradox of the Socinians, who are both gentlemen and philosophers, and Jews and saints.

I think, and, perhaps too, the reader thinks, that in my last paper it was showed by a series of New Testament quotations, that this peerless fact, that “*Jesus is the Christ,*” forms the sole bond of union among the holy brethren, and is also the means through faith for increasing the body of Christ in the earth.

Hence, it may be affirmed, without fear of being disproved, that the church of Christ is something essentially different from the popular establishments, that are maintained and increased by money, and their respective ecclesiastical constitutions and confessions. Let Mammon withhold his support from these schemes and they would instantly be dissolved. The church of Christ, however, is founded on a rock, and its union and fellowship are as indestructible as the eternal and imperishable fact by which it is knit together; yet, it could exist if there were no such things as silver and gold in the world, and, indeed, the church of Jesus is fast passing into a world where there are no such things. A spark of common sense might teach any of us that God and Mammon can have no communion, even in this world;

and this circumstance may well teach every person who has large annual contributions to make for the support of clergymen, that the society to which he belongs is not the church of Christ, that society requiring no such *support*.

But has the Son of God indeed visited our benighted planet? Has the Creator of the ends of the earth really stretched forth a human hand? Has the great God for certainty strode across the stage of this ephemeral existence, and acted so mighty a part? Why then, O Emanuel! why should we for a moment be in wonder if this matchless truth be made the bond of union among them that believe it! and the fact by which the sinful sons of men are born again into the everlasting kingdom! Reader, have your eyes been opened to this *illustrious truth*? The scriptures disclose this secret and lift it high above all the other revelations of God. It is the very sun of the spiritual system. Shut your eyes to it, and christianity is a most dark and perplexing scheme. Once behold it, and you behold the most certain and substantial argument for love of God and Men. This same Holy One died for sin, and if the knowledge of it fails to influence our hope, and love, and joy, it may safely be said that the scriptures have nothing of equal weight to propose for this purpose. That man is, or is not a christian, who is, or is not constrained by this grand truth to abandon sin and live unto God; and this is all the scriptures mean by the word *gospel*, in the noblest sense of that term. This is the grace and philanthropy of God, which, having appeared to all men, teaches us to deny all ungodliness, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present evil world. The word "gospel," I am bold to say, is a term more abused than any other in our language.

The religious public devoutly reckon a pulpit man to be explaining this term, and to preach the glad tidings of heaven, if he be but deducing some grace spiritual secret from such scraps of Holy Writ as the following—"Naphthali is a hind let loose"—"Ephraim is a cake unturned"—"Remember Lot's wife"—"Judas went and hanged himself"—"We took sweet counsel together," &c. &c. Such texts, "for Antichrist has made the word of God a mere text-book," such texts, I say, may afford the learned, subtle, and seraphic preacher an opportunity of exhibiting his own pretty talents before a polite and fashionable assembly; but they were never written by the Holy Spirit to establish the gospel fact, but for quite a different purpose; and the dry heathenish harangues spun from them are as dissimilar from the grand, certain, and divine evangelical narration, as the fabulous cosmogony of Epicurus is from the Mosiac history of the creation. In the mouth of the popular preachers the gospel is quite a fugitive thing—rapid, flitting, retiring, uncertain—it eludes the grasp of the most expert and attentive hearer; *accordingly few* or none of all who attend the heptdomidal levees of these spiritual courtiers, can ever tell, in precise terms, what the gospel of the New Testament means. I have heard of several pious Presby-

terians who would not accept of an excellent property in the western country, because they could not think of leaving the gospel; so that the Bible, which records the gospel, was to them a mere plaything of their preachers. *Appropos*: Two popular christians have this moment called to quarrel with me for saying, in my last paper, that the peerless gospel fact is the sole bond of union among the holy children; and that the testimony of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for this fact is recorded in the four evangelists. These two gentlemen will probably see this paper, and I here appeal to them whether the drift of their conversation with me was not to shew that the writings of the evangelists were intended for the Jews only, and that the Gentiles had no need of these four books to support the grand fact that Jesus is the Son of the living God.

The gospel is a question of fact. Is Jesus the Son of the living God, or is he not? If it is false, the popular preachers cannot make it true—if it is true, the four evangelists have the honor of recording the evidence for its truth; and this brings us at once to their writings. Let us look at the circumstance of this fact as found in Matthew, Luke, &c. and we shall at once see whether any thing the pulpit men can strip from texts like those quoted above, can afford the shadow of an opportunity for preaching, *i. e.* proving that Jesus is the Christ. The evangelists tell us that this same personage was born in a stable, or a poor, but a religious female, at a moment, too, when she seems to have been exhausted by a long and fatiguing journey; accordingly, he was cradled in a manger, until the king of the country getting intelligence of his birth, obliged his guardians to seek for safety in a flight by night to Egypt. On his return misfortune still seemed to pursue him, and the family were compelled to pass their native canton and to seek a wretched security in Zabulon. At the age of thirty, he preferred his claims to the Messiahship, *i. e.* to be the Son of the living God. His pretensions were instantly rejected, and his fellow-citizens *en masse* conspired against him and drove him from the city. From this time he lived a wandering life, without a place to repose his head. His own tribe did not receive him; his own brethren disbelieved him; the people who heard him, pronounced him mad; and the priests who argued with him, and who are never behind in reprehending the good, declared him possessed. He more than twice escaped being stoned, and was actually scourged publicly. He was a known friend to sinners; and so excessively poor, that when he wanted to see Ceasar's head, he had to ask for a penny. Thus he lived, insulted and abused, until an intimate acquaintance of his own betrayed him for the paltry sum of thirty shillings. When he was seized in a garden by a banditti of soldiers in the dark, and accused by many of seditions and blasphemy before the national senate, the petty officer of that court smote him on the cheek, and when afterwards brought before the Roman tribunal, it was only to receive the same contumely afresh. They dressed

him like a puppet, spit in his face, and struck him with the palms of their hands. He was adjudged to be crucified, and departed for the place of execution bearing his own cross. He was immediately nailed to it, and the malicious clergymen continued to persecute him with their pious scoffs, until, as if the world was in danger while the enemy to their power was alive, they sent a ruffian soldier to pierce his side with a spear. But these doctors of divinity shall look on him whom they have pierced. Thus he lived without a place to repose his head in life; and thus he died without a grave to hide his murdered form in death. Now all this is intended to humble us in the dust. And it is the history of one pretending to be the Son of Almighty God; and to believe him to be the Son of God, is to believe the gospel; and to preach the gospel, is to show by the writings of the evangelists that this same suffering was all voluntary, and that he was the only begotten Son of God. But the writings of Matthew, &c. bear no resemblance to a popular preacher's gospel, which, too generally, is little better than a song of logic or metaphysics.

Dear Lord, when I reflect that I have spent twenty years of my life under the noisy verbosity of a Presbyterian clergyman, without receiving the least degree of light from the holy word of God; when I see others led the same dark dance by the same blind leaders, I am prompted to address myself to the bishops and deacons of the church of Christ—Brethren, ye are not numerous in North America, and ye see the religion of our Lord and Saviour is still in the hands of schoolmen—boys brought from colleges, and sworn to maintain schemes that maintain them, as I suppose you to have adopted no system, permit me therefore to beseech you by your affection for the flock of God, by that great mystery which holds it together, by that dear name Jesus, by your fear of death and hope of life, by your bowels of love for a perishing world, throw wide open the boards of the Bible, and abandon the popular scheme of teaching our holy religion by scraps. O Jesus! let me ever lay hold of thee through the medium of the Bible, thy holy word, which defines an extrinsic ornament, and is the faithful compass which ever points to heaven. Thy pretended preachers have abandoned the holy commandment; they have adopted worldly schemes; they have usurped thy authority, and turned the people's ears away to fables. They have no guide. Methinks I see afar, tossed upon the billows of the never-sleeping Atlantic, a slender bark; the treacherous breezes have seduced her from the shore; the pilot, unable to retrace his course, stands upon the poop, and, in an agony of fearful anticipation, gazes on the wide and pathless ocean; around him the bewildered crew are seized with pale affright. But why this distraction—why this horror and dismay? An angel whispers me they have no compass; and already the winds are up, the sky lowers, and no friendly star appears to point them to their much loved port. How gladly would they

hie them away, but they have seen the spirit of the storm to flit athwart the heavens, and the rush of waters is in every soul. At last the tempest, the whole heaven descends, and the unbefriended bark sinks amid the tumult of conflicting waters. The mystery of this is manifest: the popular assemblies are without the Bible; and may be divided generally into *the superstitious, the unintelligently devout, the enthusiastic, and the philosophic or Socinian.*

Now, reader, in preaching the gospel or in arguing for the truth of this illustrious fact, that Jesus is indeed the Lord of heaven, do you think that, upon the whole, it is common among the pulpit men to argue from the same topics from which the Lord himself argued? After reading the above sketch of the life of Jesus, perhaps you may think that there is no topic from which any probable argument can be drawn in support of his claims. You will probably say, What in the world can a preacher have to say in proof of this, for all human testimony seems to be in array against? You will ask, What has he to oppose to the decisions of a Roman judicature, so famed for the inflexibility of its justice? What mighty argument to counterbalance the adjudication of the Jewish sanhedrim, the most ancient and most authoritative council that ever sat? And if it could be shown that these erred in condemning him, how is he to obviate the difficulty about the priest and the people who thought him a madman, and the testimony of his brethren who discredited him and his fellow-citizens? &c. &c. Dear reader, the modern preachers of christianity could prove any thing if you only give them a pulpit, on the terms that not a soul of all who listen shall have the right of questioning a single word they say, accordingly they will preach up the cross and the gospel from any text between Genesis and Revelations. The two popular christians, above alluded to, averred that the gospel could be preached at any time in five minutes; yet our Lord on his plan taught only very few, though he preached for three years, and his followers had all the glory of the miraculous evidence laid right before them. It took the Bereans two whole years before they could decide upon the reality of the report. But popular preachers can teach this truth, and nobody, even the taught, can tell how. This fact, by which we are saved, is nevertheless greatly proved—the testimony, the united testimony of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit has set it to rest; and though Jews and antichristian preachers have done all in their power to disprove and obscure it, *yet we are all taught of God*, and he that receiveth his testimony sets to his seal that God is true.

PHILIP.

ADDRESS

TO THE READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

No. II.

IT is presumable that some of you, my friends, read this paper with a prejudiced mind. If this were not the case, it would be, to us, matter of astonishment. Good men have their prejudices as well as others. Nathaniel, an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile, was so prejudiced, that when Philip told him that "he had found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth the Son of Joseph," he said, "*Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?*" To our prejudiced readers we would say as Philip said to Nathaniel, "*Come and see.*" Come and search the scriptures, and see whether these things are so—whether the popular schemes, or what we oppose to them, is founded on the divine word. This is all the favor we ask of you; and neither your candor, your honor, nor your interest will allow you to do otherwise. Philip said, Come see this Jesus, *this son of Joseph*, and judge for yourself. He came, and saw, and heard. From a very short acquaintance he received this Jesus—not as the *son of Joseph*, as Philip had designated him; but he received him as the *Son of God*. He, convinced from his interview, exclaims, "*Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou are the King of Israel.*"

The apostles themselves were long under the dominion of prejudice concerning Messiah's death, resurrection, and kingdom. The teaching of the scribes and the traditions of the elders—the popular notions of the times bewildered them. When plainly informed of his death, Peter exclaims, "*That be far from thee, Lord; it shall not be so done unto thee.*" When they were told of his resurrection from the dead by those to whom he appeared alive, "they were astonished," and the words of their informants "appeared unto them as *idle tales*, and they believed them not." Of his reign and kingdom they had no correct ideas until Pentecost. Till that day they looked for temporal rule and dominion to be given to Israel according to the flesh. They expected Messiah's kingdom to be a *continuation* of the old Jewish, enlarged and improved. The citizens of Berea are represented by the inspired Luke as more *noble* than the citizens of Thessalonica. And Why? Because they heard the word with all readiness of mind, and "*searched the scriptures daily* whether these things were so." My friends be thus *noble*, and go and do likewise. Perhaps the consequence may be similar to the history of the Bereans, marked with an emphatic *therefore*—"THEREFORE, many of them believed."

Good has been often called evil, and *evil* good. *Truth* has been piously called error, and *error* truth. *Pure religion* has frequently been called heresy, and *heresy* pure religion. Paul had to confess that he *worshipped* God in the way which the populars called *heresy*. So we frankly confess, that some of our

views have been by the populars called heretical and blasphemous. Because we have said, that we christians are not under Moses, but under Christ; not under the law as a rule of life, but under the gospel, we are said to have spoken "*blasphemous words against Moses and the law.*" Because we have said that the Jewish Sabbath is no more, we are represented as without religion, profane and impious; and, because we have called much of what is called *warm* preaching, and warm feelings, and great revivals, *enthusiasm*; we are said to deny "experimental religion" or the influence of the Holy Spirit, by the word, upon the minds of believers. "Yes," say our enemies, "you deny the moral law, the christian Sabbath, and experimental religion."

To the first of these charges we shall, in the present address, call your attention, reserving the others for a future day.

The "moral law," or decalogue, is usually plead as the rule of life to believers in Christ, and it is said that it ought to be preached "as a means of conviction of sin." The scriptures never divide the law of Moses into moral, ceremonial, and judicial. This is the work of schoolmen, who have also *divided* the invisible world into heaven, hell, and purgatory; who have divided the obedience of Christ into active, passive, and both; who have divided the members of the church into speechless babes, seekers of religion, and regenerated saints; who have divided the kingdom of heaven, or christian kingdom, into clergy, ruling elders, and laity; and who have philosophized, allegorized, and mysticised christianity into an incomprehensible and ineffable jargon of christianized paganism and judaism.

We published, seven years ago, a speech pronounced to an association on this subject, in which we objected to this division of the law; the substance of which, if we recollect right, was this: We objected to this division of the law, *First*, Because it was unauthorized by either the Old or New Testament, *i. e.*, neither God by Moses, his Son Jesus Christ, nor his apostles, had ever made such a division. They always spake of the law as *one grand whole*. "*The law was given by Moses, but the grace and the truth by Jesus Christ.*" "*The law and the prophets continued until John the Baptist.*" "*Ye are not under the law,*" &c. &c. Here is no moral, ceremonial, or judicial law—but "*the law.*" *Secondly*, Because this division of the law perplexes the mind of a student of the Bible, who, while he meets the words "*the law,*" is puzzled to know which of the three is meant; whereas, if he would always view the phrase, "*the law,*" when not otherwise defined, as the one and undivided law of Moses, he would never be perplexed. Because, in the third place, this division is illogical or incorrect, as respects the moral and judicial laws. All writers and speakers we have either heard or seen, blend, in their expositions, moral and judicial precepts, making the latter as moral as the former. They have no palpable or distinguishable criteria of distinction. Because, in the fourth place, they represent the ten commands as *the moral law*; where-

as they tell us that the law contained two tables—the former teaching religion, or our duty to God; the second teaching morality, or our duty to our neighbor. This moral law, then, is both moral and religious; for these same divines distinguish religion and morality. In the fifth place, Because one precept of this moral law was as ceremonial as any item in their ceremonial law, viz. the fourth commandment. For these reasons and others, we objected then to this division of the law. We have never heard any thing said, though much has been said on that subject, of the least weight to affect our views delivered at that time.

But, without going further into the detail on this part of the subject, we proceed to observe, that Moses, the great lawgiver to the Jews, delivered this law *as a rule of life to the Jews only*; and it was all equally important to them, and binding upon them. It was all holy, just, and good, as respected its design; and was equally divine and authoritative. He that touched the ark died the death, as well as he who stole the golden wedge. He that offered strange fire upon the altar was consumed, as well as he that cursed his father. He that gathereth fuel on the Sabbath, and he that blasphemed the God of Israel, were devoted to the same destruction. But the law of Moses was given for a limited time. The world was about twenty-five hundred years old before it was given; “for *until* the law sin was in the world,” and this law was designed only to continue till the promised seed should come, the great Lawgiver. Moses pointed Israel to this great Lawgiver. Malachi told the Jews to remember this law until Elias should come. The Messiah said plainly, “that the law and the prophets preached till John.” But, “*since that time*, the kingdom of God was preached.” Paul repeatedly affirms that christians *are not under the law*, but under the gospel, as a rule of life. In teaching the Jews he compared the law to a school-master until Christ came; but since faith or Christ came, he assured them they were no longer under the school-master. He declared they “were *delivered* from the law”—“they were *free* from it”—“they were *dead* to it.” He says, “it is *done away*”—it is *abolished*”—it is *disannulled*.”

Moses had a brother of great dignity, of illustrious fame, whose name was Aaron. This brother of the lawgiver was divinely ordained a high priest, and divine laws ordained concerning him and his successors. In process of time the son of Jesse was crowned king over Israel, under God, who still retained the sovereignty. Concerning this David and his successors divine laws were published. Israel were under Moses as a lawgiver, under Aaron as high priest, under David as king. These three were types of Christ as lawgiver, priest, and king. Now the pop-ulars and we agree in one grand point on this topic. They say that “Jesus Christ is our only prophet, priest, and king.” To this we cordially and fully agree. Therefore, we will not submit to Moses as our prophet or lawgiver, to Aaron as our high priest, to David as our king. If we would yield to Moses as our

lawgiver, we would yield to his brother Aaron as our high priest, and to the son of Jesse as our king. We honor Moses, Aaron, and David. We study their history, their offices, and their deeds. We revere them as Messiah's types. We will treat them with every due respect; but will not put ourselves under them. While we acknowledge Jesus to be the great lawgiver, the great prophet, the great high priest, David's son, and David's king, we are assured that every part of Moses' law *worthy of our regard* has been republished and re-enacted under more glorious circumstances and with more illustrious sanctions by him—that every item of Aaron's priesthood has been fulfilled by him—that every excellent trait in the character and government of David has been exhibited by him, free from imbecility and imperfection. Messiah, thou art my only prophet, priest, and king; for thou art worthy!

"Then," say the populars, "you have no moral law as a rule of life—no preaching of the law as a means of conviction of sin; you may live as you list—your doctrine is licentious—it is antinomian—it is dangerous to morals—to piety—to all good."

Blessed Jesus! art thou thus insulted by pretended friends? Are thy laws an inadequate rule of life? Guided by thy statutes, will our lives be licentious, our morals loose, ourselves abandoned to all crime? Was Moses a more consummate lawgiver than thou? Did his commandments more fully or more clearly exhibit the moral, the godly course of life, than thine? Were the sanctions of his law of more solemn import, of more restraining authority, than thy precepts? Is there no means of conviction of sin, of its evil and demerit, in thy doctrine, manner of life, or in thy death? What argument, what inducement, to cease to do evil and to learn to do well, in all the laws of Moses, in all the statutes of Israel, in all the examples of patriarchs, saints, and martyrs, speaks such language, exhibits such motives, conciliates such regard, denounces such vengeance, attracts so much reverence, inspires with so much awe, wins by so much goodness, and reconciles with so much power, as *thy death*? That heart, O Lord! that feels not the force of this argument, this omnipotent argument, to cease to do evil and to learn to do well, in vain will be assailed by moral suasion or by moral law. The thunders of Sinai—the flashing fluid of unmeasured force—the rending echoes of the celestial trumpet—the nodding summit—the crashing rocks—and the trembling base of the smoking mount, veiled in the blackest darkness, cannot constrain nor allure it to righteousness, humanity, and the love of God. Philosophy, marching forth in all her imaginary strength, clad in all her fancied charms, is perfect impotence compared to thy doctrine. The example of patriarchs, of prophets, of saints, and martyrs, from Abel to Noah, from Abraham to David, from David to John the Baptist, are inefficacious compared with thine. Moses and his fiery law, his statutes and his judgments, as the body without the spirit is dead, are lifeless and inoperative

compared with thy new commandment, thy piercing law, animated and quickened by thy life, confirmed and sanctioned by thy death. No—the statutes and ordinances commanded in Horeb, the meekness of Moses, the patience of Job, the zeal of Elijah, the piety of Daniel, the pathos of David, and the wisdom of Solomon, will not, cannot illumine that understanding, captivate those affections, purify those desires, purge those motives, subdue those lusts, which thy doctrine, thy example, thy law, thy love, thy sufferings, thy death, thy resurrection, thy exaltation, fail to accomplish. But did thy character, thy doctrine, thy life, thy death, thy resurrection and thy exaltation ever fail, when fully apprehended, ever fail to purify, to renovate, to reform? No! never! never! Who can know thee and not love righteousness, and not hate iniquity? When the dying thief, in his day, saw thy character and heard thy fame, he entrusted his soul to thee, and preached righteousness to his companion. When the persecuting Saul saw thee, O Saviour of the world! enthroned in glory—when he heard thy winning voice, he fell beneath the rays of thy majesty, and from a lion put on the meekness of the lamb.

Yet having thy New Testament, ratified in thy blood, are we without a rule of life? are we authorized to live as we list? The thought is impious! O Sun of Righteousness! thy salutiferous rays were long expected to enlighten, to cheer, and to quicken those sitting in darkness, in the region and shadow of death. Yet thou hast risen, and more glory shines from the *clouded* face of Moses than from thine!! Great Lawgiver, the Gentiles long waited for thy law, and hast thou left them without law, to live as they list? Moses and Elias waited on thee on the holy mount—they laid their honors and their commission at thy feet. When they ascended to the skies, thy Father's voice commanded thy disciples to *hear* thy law, to yield exclusively to thee—and shall we not? Forbid it Heaven!

Lord Jesus, may thy character open to our view as depicted in thy doctrine, thy miracles, thy sufferings, thy death, thy resurrection, and thy glory; and then we shall not fear to put ourselves exclusively under thee, as our lawgiver, our prophet, our priest, and our king.

* * *

EDITOR.

THE CONVERSION OF THE WORLD.

MAN has been often considered as a creature of circumstances. Diversified by climate, by language, by religion, by morals, by habit, he presents a most varied aspect to the contemplative mind. Betwixt "*the frozen Icelander and the sunburn'd Moor,*" the wandering Indian and the polished cit, the untutored savage and the sage philosopher, the superstitious pagan and the intelligent christian, what a difference! To the sceptic reasoner the human race presents an insoluble enigma. The questions, *What am I? Whence came I? and Whither do I*

go? are questions which philosophy in its boasted powers, deism in its bold excursions, infidelity in its daring enterprizes, attempts in vain. The Bible alone answers them with satisfaction and certainty. To the disbeliever of it the world has neither beginning, middle, nor end. The sceptic feels himself a speck of matter, floating down the stream of time into a region of impenetrable darkness, alike ignorant of his origin and his destiny. Whether there is in him a spark of immortality, or whether he is all annihilated in the grave, are, to him, things unknown and unknowable. The reptile, encased in its kindred shell, the oyster clinging to its native rock, could easily calculate the rapidity of the particles of light, or measure, by its powers, the orbit of a comet, as the most gigantic genius, by its own vigor, unaided by the Bible, could prove that there is a God, that there was a creation, that there is an immortal spirit in man, or that there will be an end of this mundane state of things. We know what deism, philosophy, and natural religion arrogate to themselves; but their pretensions are as vain as their efforts to give assured hope are impotent and unavailing. Deism steals from the Bible the being of a God, the immortality of the soul, the future state of rewards, and shutting the volume of light, impudently arrogates to itself that it has *originated* those ideas from its own ingenerate sagacity. But we are insensibly falling into a disquisition foreign to our present purpose.

The world, as respects religion, is divided into four grand divisions—the Pagan, the Mahometan, the Jewish, and the Christian. In the first of these there are some fragments of divine revelation mutilated and corrupted. The knowledge of God once communicated to Noah, was transmitted to his descendants; and although many of them were never favored with any other revelation than that committed to him; and although that revelation was vitiated and corrupted with thousands of the wildest fancies and most absurd notions, yet it never has been completely lost. Hence the most ignorant savages have some idea of a God, and offer him some kind of worship. They endeavor to propitiate him by sacrifice, and consider themselves under some kind of moral obligation to one another. They view certain actions as pleasing, and others as displeasing to him.

The Jewish religion, though once enjoined by divine authority, as exhibited in the Old Testament, has, by the same authority, been set aside as having answered its design. In the best form in which it could *now* appear on earth, it would be as dry and useless as a shell when the kernel is extracted. The good things once in it are no longer to be found; and, as corrupted by the modern Jews, it is quite another religion than that instituted by Moses. There is no salvation in it.

The Mahometan religion recognizes three hundred and thirteen apostles, of whom six brought in new dispensations, viz. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Mahomet. The last vacated or rendered obsolete all the preceding. It consequently

contains many items of divine revelation; but these are, like the fragments of revelation found in the pagan establishments, so perverted as to be *darkness* instead of *light*. The Mahometans have, like the modern christians, their different sects, their orthodox and heterodox teachers and opinions.

The "christian nations" have the Bible, but many of them have, like the Jews, rendered it of little or no effect by their traditions, Dividing the whole family of man into thirty parts, five parts are professed Christians; six parts are Mahometans and Jews; and nineteen parts Pagans. This is the mournful state of the world according to the most correct statements. Add the Mahometans, Jews, and Pagans together, and they amount to twenty-five thirtieths of the whole human race. So that but one-sixth of Adam's offspring possess, and but few of these *enjoy*, the revelation of God.

To what is this doleful state of the world attributable is a question that deserves the attention of every christian. If there were no *hereafter*, the *temporal* wretchedness of ignorance and superstition presents an object that must awaken the sympathies of every benevolent mind. And if there be a hereafter, and if future happiness were attainable to those immersed in pagan and Mahometan gloom, wretchedness, and crime, still the amelioration of their earthly condition, the rational and christian enjoyment of this present life are objects of such importance as to excite all that is within us to consider whether those possessing the light of heaven are, in any sense, chargeable with the crimes and miseries of the heathen world.

If, as some affirm, every man is accountable not only for what *he has done*, but for what *he might have done*, the question would not be of difficult determination. But as we would wish to see this point established on more solid and convincing ground than abstruse speculations, we shall appeal to the New Testament. The Saviour of the world charged the scribes and pharisees of that age with having "shut up the kingdom of heaven against men," with having "neither gone in themselves, nor suffered those that were entering to go in." He charged the lawyers or doctors of divinity with having taken away the *key of knowledge* from the people. The apostle Paul taught the christians that it was possible for them so to walk as to give occasion to the adversaries of their cause to speak reproachfully of it and them; that they might so walk as that the *name* of God, of Jesus, and his *doctrine* might be *blasphemed*. And Peter declared, that, in consequence of false teachers and disciples, "*the way of truth should be evil spoken of.*" He also teaches that christians may so conduct themselves as that those who behold their conduct may be allured in the belief of the gospel. [See Matt. xxiii. 13. Luke xi. 52. 1st Tim. v. 14. vi. 1. 1st Pet. iii. 1. 2d Pet. ii. 1, 2.] Those records show that professed disciples may, both by *omitting* to do their duty, and by *committing* faults, prevent and greatly retard the spread of the gospel, the enlarge-

ment of Messiah's kingdom. We are convinced that the *character* of the "christian communities" is the greatest offence or stumbling block in the way of the conversion of the world. And that therefore the only hopeful course to convert the world is to reform the professors of christianity.

But what kind of a reformation is requisite to this end? It is not the erection of a new sect, the inventing of new *shibboleths*, or the setting up of a new creed, nor the adopting of any in existence save the *New Testament*, in the form in which it pleased the Spirit of God to give it. It is to receive it as it stands, and to make it its own interpreter, according to the ordinary rules of interpreting all books. It is not to go back to primitive Calvinism, or primitive Methodism, or primitive Lutheranism, but to *primitive Christianity*. The history of the church for many but to *primitive Christianity*. The history of the church for many centuries proved, the history of every sect convinces us, that it is as impossible for any one sect to gain such an ascendancy as to embrace as converts the others and thus unite in one grand phalanx the christians against the allied powers of darkness, as it is to create a world. Every sect, with a human creed, carries in it, as the human body, the seeds of its own mortality. Every sect has its infancy, its childhood, its manhood, and its dotage. Some die as soon as they are born, and others live to a good old age, but their old age is full of grief and trouble. And die they must. As it is appointed unto all men once to die, and after that the judgment, so it is ordained of God that all sects must die, and that because their *bond of union* is under the *curse*. Where are the hundreds of sects that have already existed? They only live in history as beacons to posterity.

It need not be objected that some sects have already taken the *New Testament* and run into the wildest extreme; for either they interpreted it according to the reveries of Swedenburg, the fanaticism of Shakerism, or the enthusiasm of New Lightism, or they apostatized from a good profession. Recollect, we say, that the scriptures are to be their own interpreter, according to the common rules of interpreting other writings.

Christians, as you honor the Saviour and the Father that sent him; as you love the peace and prosperity of the kingdom of thy Holy One; as you love the souls of your children, your relatives, your fellow-citizens; as you deeply deplore the reign of darkness, of paganism, of horrid cruelty over such multitudes of human beings; as you desire and pray for the salvation of the world, the downfall of Antichrist, of Mahometan delusion, of Jewish infidelity, of pagan superstition;—return, return to the religion of our common Lord, as delivered unto us by his holy apostles! Model your churches after the primitive model, erected under the agency of the Holy Spirit—and then the churches of the saints will have *rest* and will be *edified*, "and walking in

the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, they will be *multiplied*" with accessions until all flesh shall see the salvation of our God. EDITOR.

* * *

From the R. I. Farmers' and Manufacturers' Journal.

BLUE LAWS OF CONNECTICUT.

THE following is a transcript from the primitive judicial code which existed in the state of Connecticut during the time of the first settlement and their immediate descendants, commonly called "*the Blue Laws of Connecticut.*"

NO one shall be a freeman or give a vote, unless he be converted or a member in full communion of one of the churches allowed in this dominion.

No one shall hold any office who is not *sound in the faith*, and faithful to this dominion; and whoever gives a vote to such person shall pay a fine of one pound. For the second offence he shall be disfranchised.

No Quaker, or dissenter from the established worship of this dominion, shall be allowed to give a vote for the election of magistrates or any officer.

No food or lodging shall be afforded to a Quaker, Adamite, or other heretic.

If any person turns Quaker, he shall be banished, and not suffered to return on pain of death.

No priest (Roman) shall abide in this dominion. He shall be banished, and suffer death on his return. Priests may be seized by any one without a warrant.

No one shall cross a river with an authorized ferryman.

No one shall run on a Sabbath day, or walk in his garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from church.

No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep houses, cut hair, or shave on the Sabbath.

No woman shall kiss her child on Sabbath or fasting days.

No one shall buy or sell lands without a permission of the selectmen.

A drunkard shall have a master appointed by the selectmen, who is to debar him the privilege of buying or selling.

No minister shall keep a school.

A *debtor in prison*, swearing he has no estate, shall be let out and *sold* to make satisfaction.

Whoever sets fire to the woods, and it burns a house, shall suffer death; and persons suspected of the crime shall be imprisoned without the benefit of bail.

No one shall read common prayer, keep christmas or saint's day, make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of music, except the drum, the trumpet, and the jewsharp.

Every male shall have his hair cut round according to a cap.

From Plain Truth.

THE first *Baptist church* in America was founded in Providence in 1639. Their sentiments spreading into Massachusetts, in 1651, the general court passed a law against them, inflicting banishment for persisting in the promulgation of their doctrines. In 1656, *Quakers* making their appearance in Massachusetts, the legislature of that colony passed several laws against them. No master of a vessel was allowed to bring any one of this sect into its jurisdiction on penalty of £100. Other still severer penalties were inflicted upon them in 1657, such as cutting their ears and boring their tongues with a red hot iron. They were at length banished on pain of death; and four, refusing to go, were executed in 1656.

* * *

No. 7.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1924.

Vol. I.

THE CLERGY—No. V.

WE left the young clergyman in the arms of his lately espoused congregation, living upon the dowry of his spiritual consort; duly trained, divinely consecrated, formally wedded, and actively employed in building up the cause of God, in which his own cause is deeply interested. Here again we find him, and hear him teaching that "they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel." With great eloquence he remonstrates against "muzzling the ox that treadeth out the corn;" and with zeal for justice and righteousness, he exclaims, "the laborer is worthy of his hire." That his congregation may not consider themselves doing him a favor when they pay him five hundred or a thousand a-year, he argues with great pathos: "Our debtors ye are, for if we impart to you *our spiritual things*, it is a matter of poor return if you impart unto us *your carnal things*."

Indeed, *money* is of vital consequence in the kingdom of the clergy. Without it a clergyman could not be made, nor a congregation supplied with a "*faithful pastor*." O Mammon, thou wonder-working god! well did Milton sing of thee—

*There stood a hill not far, whose grisly top
Belch'd fire and rolling smoke; the rest entire
Shone with a glossy scurf, undoubted sign
That in his womb was hid metallic ore,
The work of sulphur. Thither wing'd with speed
A numerous brigade hasten'd; as when bands
Of pioneers, with spade and pickaxe arm'd,
Forerun the royal camp to trench a field
Or cast a rampart. Mammon led them on;
Mammon, the least erected sp'rit his looks and thoughts
From heaven; for e'en in heav'n his looks and thoughts
Were always downwards bent, admiring more
The riches of heav'ns pavement, trodden gold,
Than aught divine or holy else enjoyed*

*In vision beatific: by him first
Men also, and by his suggestion taught,
Ransack'd the centre, and with impious hands
Rifled the bowels of their mother earth
For treasures better hid. Soon had his crew
Open'd into the hill a spacious wound,
And digg'd out ribs of gold. Let none admire
That riches grow in hell; that soil may best
Deserve the precious bane.*

Mammon thus speaks—

—————*This desert soil
Wants not her hidden lustre, gems and gold;
Nor want we skill or art from whence to raise
Magnificence; and what can heaven show more?*

Yes, Mammon, thou hast “skill,” and “art,” and treasure. Thou ledest the stripping to the grammar school, and for years thou givest him *skill*, and *art*, and *science*; and when thou hast fed and clothed, and educated him with books and pedagogues, thou teachest him divinity, and crownest him master of every art, and, chief of all, the art of winning thee. God of this world, who is insensible to thy charms? Thy brilliant countenance sheds a charming lustre on every thing! Thou distillest into the souls of priests and people an animating sweetness, and when every other “call” is disregarded, thy voice awakens into ecstasy, zeal, and piety, the slumbering ear—it wakes obsequious to thy nod.

Money is the bond of union, the *associating principle* in all popular establishments. There is a “christian congregation.” I think it is christened *Associate Reformed*, or, perhaps, *Episcopalian*, or *General Assembly*, or some other name. It has not met for three months. Why? It is “*vacant*.” What do you mean by “*vacant*?” It has not the bread of life broken to it by a faithful pastor. Why? It is “*weak*”—not able to hire a pastor. It is not able to pay “*supplies*.” Whenever they can “raise” four or six dollars, this sum brings them all together, and a faithful pastor with his mouth full of the bread of life. The *little flock* sit sweetly entertained under the “*droppings of the sanctuary*” for a few hours. He bids them God speed. They go home, and in the course of some time a similar sum brings them together a second time. May be they get so “*strong*” as to be a sixth or a fourth part of the “*support*” of one of “*the watchmen of Zion*.” He is half his time in one congregation, a fourth in another, and a fourth in a third. Three churches, one pastor—one husband, three wives! Married to the three! To one congregation he gives half his time and half his divinity, and receives half his living, half his stipends for it. To the other two, share and share alike, because they are alike weak. Thus the strong becomes stronger, and the weak, weaker. Now who is so blind as not to see that *money* is the cause of this mystery. It is another proof of the old text, “*no pay, no preach*.”

But let us look at this matter again. A young gentleman of fine talents comes forward; and from the same "divinity school" another one of slender talents, but he is "*a well meaning man,*" a pious soul, humble and plain. They both push their fortune. The one is placed on the frontiers over a charge of \$300; the other in the city over a charge of \$2000. What is the cause of this mystery? Another text explains it. It is found in the chronicles of the British parliament. It reads thus, "*Every man has his price.*" Yes, and every congregation has its own *taste*. A wealthy and a polite congregation sits very uneasy under the pious efforts of a homespun, coarse, and awkward mechanic. His sing-song monotony, and sawing gesticulation, animated by the zeal of Elijah, freezes the genial current of their souls. It will not do. He tries it again. The pews are empty. Worse than ever. To the west he goes. In the wilderness he is like John the Baptist. His disgusting elocution, his awkward figure, and his frightful gestures, are all unsullied sanctity, unfeigned devotion. The rural saint is full of his praise. Of his whole performance and appearance he says—

Behold the picture! It is like? Like whom?
The things that mount the rostrum with a skip,
And then skip down again; pronounce a text;
Cry hem! and, reading what they never wrote,
Just thirty minutes, huddle up their work,
And with a well-bred whisper close the scene.—*Cowper*.

The young divine of fine talents is admired, is adored, where his class-mate would not be heard; not because of his supposed want of piety, but his want of talent and politeness. But when the fashionable orator places himself in the pulpit, the house is crowded, the galleries are full.

Forth comes the pocket mirror. First he strokes
An eyebrow; composes next a straggling lock;
Then, with an air most gracefully performed,
Falls back into his seat, extends an arm,
And lays it at his ease with gentle care,
With handkerchief in hand depending low.
The better hand, more busy, gives the nose
Its bergamot, or aids the indebted eye
With opera glass, to watch the moving scene,
And recognize the slow-retiring fair.—*Cowper*.

And yet, with all his reputed talents, he is often a mere retailer, a mere reader:

He grinds divinity of other days
Down into modern use; transforms old print
To zigzag manuscript, and cheats the eyes
Of gallery critics by a thousand arts.—*Cowper*.

Money, I think, may be considered not merely as the bond of union in popular establishments, but it is really the rock on which the popular churches are built. Before church union is

proposed, the grand point to ascertain is, Are we able to support a church? Before we give a *call*, let us see, says the prudent saint, what we can "*make up*." A meeting is called—the question is put, "How much will you give?" It goes around. Each man writes his name or makes this mark. A handsome sum is subscribed. A petition is sometimes presented to the legislature for an act of incorporation to confirm their union and to empower them to raise by the civil law, or the arm of power, the stipulated sum. All is now secure. The church is founded upon this rock. It goes into operation. The parson comes. Their social prayers, praises, sacraments, sermons and fasts commence; every thing is put into requisition. But what was the *primum mobile*? What the moving cause? *Money*. As proof of this, let the congregation decrease by emigration or death; the money fails; the parson takes a missionary tour; he obtains a louder call; he removes. *Money failed* is the cause; and when this current freezes, social prayers, praises, "sacraments," sermons, and congregational fasts all cease. *Money*, the foundation, is destroyed, and down comes the superstructure raised upon it. Reader, is not this fact? And dare you say that money is not the basis of the modern religious establishments? It begins with money; it goes on with money, and it ends when money fails. Money buys Æsop's fables for the destined priest; money consecrates him to office, and a monied contract unites him and his parish. The church of Jesus Christ is founded upon another basis, nourished by other means, is not dissolved by such causes, and will survive all the mines of Peru, all the gold of Ophir. The modern clergy say they do not preach for money. Very well; let the people pay them none, and they will have as much of their preaching still. Besides, there will be no suspicion of their veracity.

EDITOR.

* * *

ADDRESS

TO THE READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

No. III.

THE subject of our present address is the Sabbath Day and the Lord's Day. Either christians are bound to observe the Sabbath Day, or they are not. If they are, let us see what the nature of that observance is, which was prescribed for the Sabbath Day. The law reads thus: "Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it holy. "Six days shalt thou labor and do *all* thy work: the seventh "day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: In it thou shalt not do '*any work*, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger 'that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made 'heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the 'seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath Day and 'allowed it." You will observe that, in this command, God posi-

tively prohibits all manner of work or labor on this day. Son, daughter, servant, cattle, stranger, are commanded to be exempted from all manner of work. In examining the particular precepts originating from this law, recorded in the Old Testament, we find the following specifications: —

1. "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath Day." Ex. xxxv. 3.

2. "Abide ye every man in his place, (house or tent:) let no man go out of his place, (house or tent,) on the Sabbath Day." Ex. xvi. 29.

3. "He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days, Bake that which ye will bake this day, and seethe that ye will seethe, and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning." Ex. xvi. 29. 23.

4. "Bear no burden on the Sabbath Day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath Day." Jer. xvii. 21. 22.

5. "Not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." Is. lxii. 13.

6. "From evening unto evening shall you celebrate your Sabbath." Lev. xxiii. 32.

7. "Whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath Day he shall surely be put to death. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death." Ex. xxxi. 14. 15.

"And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath Day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died, as the Lord commanded Moses." Numbers, xv. 32-36.

The above items are a few of many that might be selected out of the Old Testament on this subject. We believe them to be a fair specimen of the law given by Moses, as explained and enforced upon the nation of Israel.

Now the question is, Are we under this law? If we are, we pay little or no respect unto it. For who is there that does not *habitually* violate *the rest* enjoined on this day? Those who make the most ado about Sabbath-breakers are themselves, according to the above law, worthy of death. They kindle fire in their houses. They go out of their houses, and travel on their cattle miles. Their sons and their daughters do some kind of work; they bring in burdens of water, wood, and prepare food. They celebrate if not from evening to evening, but from morning to evening they violate it. They speak their own words, and do many things worthy of death. Why then is not the penalty en-

forced? Assuredly their observance of this law is mere mockery. It is an insult on the Lawgiver!

We know that some of the clergy have given if not sold them indulgences to violate it. They have told them that certain "*works of necessity and mercy*" are allowable. But who told *them* so? They tell them they may prepare food, bring in fuel and water. But God forbade those under this law to do so. So far was he from countenancing such "*works of necessity*" that he wrought three miracles to prevent the necessity of doing a "work of necessity." He sent two days' portion of manna from heaven the sixth day—he sent none the seventh—he preserved that gathered on the sixth from putrefaction until the close of the seventh; all of which were special miracles, for the space of forty years. If he wrought *three miracles* to prevent an Israelite from crossing his threshold to gather up a little manna for his daily food, how dare any give a dispensation, in his name, to do that which is tenfold more laborious!!!

Because the Saviour of the world put to silence those who accused him of breaking the Sabbath, by appealing to their own conduct in relieving animals in distress, this doctrine of "works of necessity and mercy" has been represented as of divine origin. What a perversion! An *argumentum ad hominem* converted into a general maxim!! But such a perversion shews consummate inattention to the laws of Israel. While Israel kept the law there never would occur an opportunity for a work of necessity or of mercy, such as these lawgivers tolerate. For while they kept the law, they should be blessed in their basket, stores, fields, houses, children, flocks, herds—no house would take fire—no ox would fall into a pit, &c. And if they transgressed the law, they should be cursed in all these respects, and no toleration of a violation of the law was granted as a means of mitigating the curse.

Again—Let me ask, Was there ever a law published relaxing that rigid observance of rest enjoined upon the Sabbath? Was there a law published, saying, You must or you may observe the Sabbath with less care, with less respect; you may now speak your own words, kindle fire in your houses, and prepare victuals? &c. &c. I say, Was there ever such a law published? No, indeed—either the law remains in all its force, to the utmost extent of its literal requirements, or it is passed away with the Jewish ceremonies. If it yet exist, let us observe it according to law. And if it does not exist, let us abandon a mock observance of another day for it.

"But," say some, "it was *changed* from the seventh to the first day." Where? when? and by whom? No man can tell. No, it never was changed, nor could it be, unless creation was to be gone through again: for the reason assigned must be changed before the observance, or respect to the reason, can be changed!! It is all old wives' fables to talk of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. If it be changed, it

was that august personage changed it who changes times and laws *ex officio*—I think his name is DOCTOR ANTICHRIST.

But was not the Sabbath *given to the Jews only*? And again, Was it not a *shadow* or *type*? This deserves attention.

The preface to the law, of which it was a part, saith, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage; *therefore*, remember the Sabbath day," &c. The preface to this law, as the inscription or address upon a letter, ascertains whose property it was. It was the property of the Jews. But Moses tells them this, not leaving it to an inference, Deut. v. 15. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; **THEREFORE**, the Lord thy God *commanded* **THEE** to keep the Sabbath day." Ezekiel says the same, or rather the Lord by the prophet saith, chap. xx. 12. "Moreover, also, I gave **THEM** my Sabbath to be a **SIGN** between *me* and *them*. Yes, said the Lord by Moses, "The Sabbath is a **SIGN** between me and the children of Israel forever. Ex. xxxi. 17. It is worthy of note in this place, *that of all the sins in the long black catalogue of sins specified against the Gentiles, in all the New Testament, THE SIN OF SABBATH-BREAKING IS NEVER ONCE PREFERRED AGAINST THEM!!* We conclude, then, that the *Sabbath day was as exclusively the property of the Jews as circumcision*.

But was it not a *shadow* and a *type*? Let us hear Paul. "Let no man judge you (condemn you for not observing) in meats and drinks, (for eating and drinking,) or in respect of a holy day, or of a new moon, or the Sabbath, which are a **SHADOW** of things to come; but the body is of Christ," or, according to Macknight, "*the, body is Christ's body.*" Paul, then, says it was a *shadow*. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, 4th chapter, he makes *it* and Canaan types of "that *rest* which remained for the people of God." The Sabbath then was a shadow—a type given to the Jews only.

Since beginning this article, we noticed, for the first time, a very correct note of Dr. Macknight's the celebrated translator of the apostolic epistles, which expresses our view of this matter. With many, we know, his views will be received with more readiness of mind than our. He was, strange as it may appear, a dignitary in the Presbyterian church; yet he expresses himself in the following manner, on Col. ii. 16. "The *whole* of the law of Moses being abrogated by Christ, (Col. ii. 14.) christians are under no obligations to observe any of the Jewish holy days, not even the seventh day Sabbath. Wherefore, if any teacher made the observance of the seventh day a necessary duty, the Colossians were to resist him. But though the brethren, in the first age, paid no regard to the Jewish seventh day Sabbath, they set apart the first day of the week for public worship, and *for commemorating the death and resurrection of their master by eating his supper on that day*; also, for private exercises of

devotion. This they did, either by the precept or by the example of the apostles, *and not by virtue of any injunction in the law of Moses. Besides, they did not sanctify the first day of the week in the Jewish manner*, by a total abstinence from bodily labor of every kind. That practice was condemned by the council of Laodicea as *judaizing*. Lec. Suiceri Thes. Eccl. voce *Sabbaton*."

The Sabbath was, by the Lord of the Sabbath, set aside, as well as every other part of the law of Moses, as stated in our last address. The learned Macknight is with us also in this instance. His words on Col. ii. 14. "It is evident," says he, "that the law of Moses, *in all its parts*, is now abolished and taken away. Consequently, that christians are under *no obligation to obey even the moral precepts of the law, on account of their being delivered by Moses to the Jews*. For if the obligations of the moral precepts of his law is still continued, mankind are still under its curse." I would just observe, on this item, that the Lord Jesus Christ observed the last Sabbath that was obligatory on any of the human race, by lying in the grave from evening to evening. In the silence of death and the grave he celebrated it literally, "*not going out of his place*" until the Sabbath was past. Then, very early in the morning, when the Sabbath was past, the Jewish religion being consummated, he rises and becomes the beginning of the new creation.

Christians, by apostolic *example*, which to them is the same as *precept*, are, in honor of the commencement of the new creation, constrained by Christ's authority and grace to meet on the *first day of the week*, to show forth his death and to commemorate his resurrection. When they assemble they are to be instructed and to admonish one another; they are to learn his statutes, and "to continue *stedfastly* in the apostles' doctrine, in breaking bread, in fellowship, and in prayers, praising God." Such was the practice of the primitive church, as the epistles demonstrate. The first day of the week is *not regarded to the Lord* when these things are not done. For if professors of christianity were to keep in their houses from morning to evening and celebrate this day as the Jews did the Sabbath, instead of honoring they are dishonoring Christ. No two days are more unlike in their import and design, than the Sabbath and *the first day*. The former commemorated the consummation of the old creation, the cessation of creation work; the latter commemorates the beginning of the new creation. The former was to Israel a memorial that they were once slaves in Egypt—the latter assures us that the year of release has come. The former looked back, with mournful aspect, to the toils and sorrows entailed upon the human body, from an evil incident to the old creation—the latter looks forward, with an eye beaming with hope, to perpetual exemption from toil, and pain, and sorrow. The Sabbath was a day of awful self denial and profound religious gloom—the resurrection day is a day of triumph, of holy joy, and religious

festivity. The Jew, on a Sabbath morn, from his casement surveyed the smokeless chimnies and the bolted doors of the silent tribes of Israel. A solemn stillness holds the streets of the city and the hamlet, and not a vagrant foot disturbs the grassy field. The flowers breathe forth their fragrance to the gentle breeze—no hand plucks the blooming rose—no ear is charmed with the mellifluous notes of the tenants of the groves. The banks of the limpid streams are not frequented by the noisy youths, nor does their clamor mingle with the murmurs of the vocal rills. Striking emblems of the silent rest allotted to the tenants of the grave. The christian welcomes the dawn of the triumphant morn. The new heavens and the new earth open to his view. The incorruptible, the immortal bodies of the saints, rising from the ashes of the grave, in all the vigor and beauty of immortal youth, fill his soul with unutterable admiration of the wondrous victory of the all-conquering Chief. While he surveys his mortal frame and feels the sentence of death in every department of his earthly house, his soul forgets the infirmities of its partner, and soars on the pinions of faith and hope to the resurrection morn; it is lost in the contemplation of millions of every tribe and tongue clothed in the indescribable beauties of immortality. While overwhelmed in the extatic admiration of the glorious bodies around him, his eye ultimately fixes on the FIRST BORN of many brethren. While he adores him at the head of the innumerable host of ransomed immortals, his memory musters up the recollections of Gethsemane, Pilate and his judgment seat, Mount Calvary, and the sepulchre in the garden. To the assembly of the saints with eagerness he hastens, and, anxious to share in the praises of his glorious chief, to join in the recollection of his humiliation unto death, and to participate in the triumphs of his resurrection, his soul is feasted with the abundance of his house and with the communion of those whom he hopes to embrace in his immortal arms on the day of the resurrection unto eternal life.

Christians, what a difference between the Jewish Sabbath and this day of triumph!! They have much to learn of the glory of christianity who think that going to a synagogue, and hearing a harangue, and returning to their firesides, is suitable to the design or expressive of the import of this joyful and triumphant day. On this day Messiah entered Jerusalem as Son of David, as King of Judah. On this day he rose from the dead. On this day, after his resurrection, he generally met with his disciples in their assemblies. On this day he sent the Holy Spirit down from heaven and erected the first christian church. "On this day the disciples came together to break bread." On this day the christians joined in the fellowship of the saints, or in making contributions for the saints. And, on this day, the Spirit finished its work of revelation on the Isle of Patmos, in giving to John the beloved the last secrets of the divine plan ever to be uttered in human language while time endures. If no authoritative pre-

cedent enforced the assembly of saints on this day, and the observance of the *order* of the Lord's house, the very circumstance of such a coincidence of glorious wonders would point it out as the Lord's day; and love to him, the most powerful principle that ever impelled to action, would constrain all saints not to forsake the assembling of themselves on this day; but to meet, to animate, and to be animated; to remember, to admire, to adore, to hymn in songs divine the glorious and mighty King. Christians, *could you say no!*

EDITOR.

* * *

QUERIES.

AGAINST whom did the holy prophets of the Jews, the Saviour of the world and his apostles inveigh with the utmost severity?

Ans. The popular clergy. Never were any things spoken by the Saviour of the world, or by the holy apostles with so much keenness, with so much severity, as their reproofs of, as their denunciations against, the popular clergy.

Who were the popular clergy in those day?

Ans. Those who pleased the people, taught for hire and established themselves into an order distinct from the people.

Who are the popular clergy now?

Ans. Those who are trained for the precise purpose of teaching religion as their calling, please the mass of the people, establish themselves into a distinct order, from which they exclude all who are not so trained, and, for hire, affect to be the only legitimate interpreters of revelation.

What are the most effectual means to diminish the power and dominion of the popular clergy?

Ans. The same means which the Lord and his apostles used in their day against those of that time—chiefly to persuade the people to hold fast the holy commandments of the apostles, and to build themselves up in the christian faith. Jude. 2d. Pet. iii. 2.

* * *

ON TEACHING CHRISTIANITY—No. IV.

THE ultimate design of these papers on christianity is to exhibit a plan of preaching Christ to mankind, having for its authority the example of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, together with that of the apostles and others, who, in the beginning, were commissioned to promulgate the new doctrine. The design, indeed, may at first sight seem as adventurous as it is novel; but what of that? Christian pastors, for whom these sheets are more immediately designed, are not to be startled at the apparent presumption or novelty of my attempt. Their principal concern must be about the reality of what I propose. Is there one way, and only one, of preaching Christ to sinners; and is that *one* way supported by the above authorities? I answer in the affirmative: there is but one authorized

way of making Christ known to men, in order that they may believe and be saved. And now it is my business to shew, by scripture, that this is the case. The reader will remember that it has been shown in a former paper, that Jesus having died for sin and arisen again to introduce the hope of immortality, the great fact to be believed in order to be saved, is, that *he is the Son of God*; and this being a matter-of-fact question, the belief of it as necessarily depends upon the evidence by which it is accompanied, as the belief of any other fact depends upon its particular evidence. No one thinks of accrediting a mere assertion. Our blessed Saviour scrupled not to tell those among whom he alleged his divine authority, that if he alone said "he was the Messiah," his testimony was not to be regarded, and then reminded them of the testimony given by John the Baptist whom they held to be a prophet; the testimony of the Father too, and of the Holy Spirit, and of the scriptures; and we shall see by and by that to preach the gospel is just to propose this glorious truth to sinners, and support it by its proper evidence. We shall see that the heavens and the apostles proposed nothing more in order to convert men from the error of their ways, and to reduce them to the love and obedience of Christ.

I am not ignorant that there are thousands, who, like a certain able divine in Canonsburg, stupidly suppose that there is something else far more necessary than this. They are ready to say that every body believes Jesus to be the Son of God, and to have been put to death for sin. To this it may be proper to reply, that not a single soul who attends the popular preachers has ever been convinced of this fact, that "*Jesus is the Saviour*," by its proper evidences. Clergymen do not preach the gospel with its proper evidences. They proceed in their annual round of sermonizing on this capital mistake, that the audience have believed Jesus to be the Saviour; so that their very best harangues, generally denominated gospel sermons, seldom deserve a better name than rants about the everlasting fire that shall consume the despisers of the offered salvation. But every body who has read the New Testament must have observed that the scriptures never propose the rewards and punishments which are appended to the belief and rejection of the gospel as a proof of its truth; and every one who knows how the apostles preached the gospel, must know also that they never did so; that they never produced the sanctions of everlasting burning in order to secure the faith and obedience of their hearers. If, indeed, their hearers were sometimes refractory, and would even dare to despise the gospel when set before them with its proper evidences, the gifts, the miracles, and the prophecies, then, indeed, the apostles made known the terrors of the Lord—not the terrors of the law. Then, indeed, they made it known that the Lord should be revealed from heaven to take vengeance by fire on them that obeyed not God, *i. e.* believed not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ; but this, not to prove the truth of their gospel, not to

prove that Jesus had been put to death for sin, and was the Son of God; but only to warn those who might be disposed to despise or neglect that splendid evidence of gifts, miracles, &c. which proved their gospel to be true, which proved Jesus to have been crucified for sin, and to be the Son of God. In short, the apostles proceed thus: They first proposed the truth to be believed; and secondly, they produced the evidences necessary to warrant belief; and thirdly, if any seemed to despise the gospel, or resist the Holy Spirit, *i. e.* the evidence afforded by the Holy Spirit in gifts, miracles, and prophecy, then they warned these despisers of the consequences, and thus freed themselves from the blood of all men.

But let us see if this be the method of making the truth known, pursued by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the apostles; and to begin with the last, the apostles. Did the apostles begin to preach Christ on a plan of their own; or at the time when, and the place where, they themselves judged most proper? By no means! In every thing that regarded time, place, and manner, they acted in entire subjection to the commandments of the Saviour; and this we learn from the first chapter of the Acts. Our blessed Saviour did not treat mankind as modern ministers do—scold and insult them for not believing or having faith in a proposition, for which they are no way careful to adduce the proper evidence. He well knew that such a wonder as his being the Son of God, crucified for sin, and raised from the dead, could not be believed without the most transcendent testimony; and, therefore, not permitting the apostles immediately to blaze abroad his resurrection, he ordered them to remain in Jerusalem until they should be endowed with power from on high, *i. e.* until the Holy Spirit should descend and furnish these unlettered preachers with proper evidences to establish the gospel fact! With regard to place, the Lord Jesus was very precise, telling them to begin at Jerusalem; then to proceed to the country of Judea; then to Samaria; and lastly to the gentiles, the uttermost parts of the earth. Now if we would ascertain the apostles' plan of preaching Christ, we must follow them to these several places, and examine, in train, their sermons in Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and among the gentiles, and to begin with them in Jerusalem. The day of Pentecost was fully come, and the apostles were in Jerusalem, when the Spirit of the Almighty, moving as he listeth, blew athwart this valley of dry bones, and lo! a noise from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind—in a moment blazing tongues like fire shone upon the heads of the disciples of Jesus; they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak in languages as the Spirit gave them utterance. Great was the shaking in Jerusalem. The dry bones came together to be clothed with sinews, flesh, and skin, and to receive breath; to repent, believe, and be baptized, and receive the Holy Spirit! Parthians and Medes, Elamites and the dwellers Mesopotamia, in Judea, in

Cappadocia; in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphilia in Egypt, in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, all, either Jews or proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, rushed to the place where the apostles stood, in all the grandeur of this fiery spectacle. They beheld and were amazed. They listened and were in doubt, exclaiming, "What meaneth this? Do we hear them speak in our own tongues the wonderful works of God? Are not all they who speak Galileans? Others mocking, said, These men are full of new wine." Illustrious crisis! Great and glorious day! The moment destined of Heaven for proclaiming the mystery of Christ was now arrived; the Spirit was already poured from on high; the apostles were now constituted able ministers of the New Covenant; the truth and its evidences were now both in their possession; and men, devout men from every nation under heaven, stood calling for an explanation of the surprising phenomena before them—What meaneth this? The Apostle Peter, (Acts ii.) standing up, addressed them solemnly; and having showed them that all they saw and heard was agreeable to the prediction of their own prophet Joel, he takes occasion to introduce the truth, the saving truth, viz. that Jesus was arisen from the dead. "Men of Israel," says he, "hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth," &c.—Will the reader please to read the second chapter of the Acts? "Him," says the apostle, "being delivered by the determined counsel and foreknowledge of God, you have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain. Him God hath raised up from the dead," &c. The apostle then shows that this fact also was according to prophecy; and having cleared both the truth to be believed and its evidences from all suspicion, by showing that they had been plainly foretold by their own prophets, he tells them that Christ was in heaven, and that having received the promised Spirit from the Father, he had shed down what they all saw and heard—the multitude of separated tongues that blazed on the apostles' heads and the gifts of languages—concluding thus, "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ."

The first of all christian addresses merits a more than ordinary share of our attention, if we would preach Jesus as the apostles did; moreover, the reader ought to watch *Philip* very closely here. He says that there is but one authorized method of proposing the saving truth in order that men may believe it. Now he must have learned this from an induction of particulars, i. e. from an examination of particular addresses, or preachings, found in the New Testament. And if Philip's scheme is true, it follows that all samples of apostolic preaching recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, or in the Evangelists, or any other where, are essentially the same. The truth to be believed and its evidences will form the spirit of every gospel address made by the apostles. Is there any thing else in the Pentecostian address?

Does Peter speak for any other purpose than to convince them that he who had been slain was now in heaven? or does he employ any other means for convincing the crowd of this fact, but the testimony of the Holy Spirit, the power of miracles, and the gifts of tongues, with which he and his fellows had been endowed from on high? The apostle, (verse 36,) in the conclusion of his address, makes use of the illative conjunction, *therefore*. "Therefore," says he, "let all the house of Israel know," &c. The word "therefore," has reference to the evidence which was then before the multitude; and the apostle pointing to what they saw and heard, told them from these things to know *assuredly* that Jesus was the Lord and the Christ. The evidence was so obvious that it pierced them to the heart; and, in agony of terror, they exclaimed, "*Men and brethren, what shall we do?*" And now we see that in this most primitive of all christian speeches, there are just two things that are essentially obvious—the fact of the Saviour's resurrection, and the testimony of God which proves it. That is what all men are called to believe in order to be saved; and this is what warrants their belief, the gifts, the miracles, and the prophecies. And now it will be necessary to compare with this the other apostolic addresses delivered in Jerusalem, to see whether they are essentially the same; this, however, must be the business of some future paper. At present I shall only remark, that if Heaven intends that the belief of this glorious fact shall save the world, it has certainly afforded a most glorious evidence in support of it. In furnishing the christian with such accounts of our Saviour's miracles and the miracles of the apostles, Heaven has certainly put it in a preacher's power to proclaim the truth with success; and he who, contrary to all scripture examples, would select a scrap, and prefer this to preach Christ from, instead of displaying before his hearers that glorious chain of miracles recorded for the very purpose of preaching Christ, must certainly have a very bad taste. And let no one think that any things more is necessary to our salvation than to believe this fact—it is perfectly operative in all who receive it in the love of it. The three thousand Pentecostian converts had nothing else proposed for their belief; and when they received it gladly they lived together, had all things common, sold their possessions and goods, and distributed unto all as every one had need. The belief of this same fact caused them to continue in the apostles' doctrine, and to praise God in public and private; and we may well say that if the belief of this glorious fact fails to make a man obey the Lord Jesus, every thing else must fail.

PHILIP.

* * *

THE following extracts of letters received, will afford a specimen of that variety of opinion which we hear so often expressed relative to this work:—

—, OHIO, NOVEMBER 30.

SIR—I request you to send me the *Christian Baptist no more*. I will pay for the present year, but I do not care if I never see another number of it. My conscience is wounded that I should have subscribed to such a work. I was deceived by the person who handed me the subscription paper. It is a religious incendiary, and will do a world of mischief. It denies the clergy, the Lord's anointed, and speaks evil of dignitaries. O! sir, consider how unlike the spirit of him you profess to serve, you are, and repent of your rashness and malicious spirit; and, O! think how many poor souls you may deceive.

—, Ohio, December 13.

SIR—Your paper is, I fear, a disorganizer, and I doubt it will prove deistical in the end. The clergy tell us we ought not to read it; it is dangerous to our children, and is only fit for the fire. If you do not reform, we shall be under the necessity of giving both it and you up for lost.

Western Reserve, Dec. 19.

I HAVE read the *Christian Baptist* with pleasure, believing it to be founded on truth, and is calculated to expose the popular and prevailing errors of the present times. It has appeared; but has not brought peace, but a sword; and is setting the father against the son, and the daughter against the mother. Shall we condemn it on this account, or be discouraged from using exertions in disseminating truth? No—while we have Christ and his apostles as our example, we have nothing to fear. They worked miracles, healed the sick, cast out devils, propagated truth, and were called disturbers of the peace, babblers, subverters of the truth, blasphemers against God and against Moses; yet they did not lose energy in prosecuting their intentions; and those men, though they were charged with turning the world upside down, have prevailed, and will prevail until their works will be coextensive with the habitable earth. They were sensible they could do nothing against the truth, but for the truth. I know you have many opposers; and those of whom we might have hoped better things, have raised their little horns in opposition, and are pleased to hear Presbyterians, Methodists, and Roman Catholics say they are right, and are encouraged to the conflict by those whom they always opposed and considered to be practising the institutions of men for the ordinances of God. But such is the nature of all errorists, however diversified and opposite one may be to another, they will combine their force to oppose truth—Pilate and Herod made friends when our Lord was crucified. We have many honest men who have been long under the influence of superstition. These begin to see—

—, Kentucky, Dec. 30.

SIR—I have perused with much pleasure the *Christian Baptist*; and I take a pleasure in assuring you that every exertion

shall be made by me to enlarge the list of subscribers to that useful paper. Please send six complete sets to this place, as directed below.

—, Kentucky, Dec. 27.

DEAR SIR—Since I wrote you on the 13th instant, I have received an additional number of subscribers for the *Christian Baptist*, viz. _____, all of whom wish to have the work from its commencement sent to this office. I would again suggest the propriety of your forwarding a few extra sets, that persons can get on application, as I believe the demand will yet continue.

—, Kentucky, Dec. 10.

SIR—Please send ten sets of the *Christian Baptist* to this office to the following addresses. I trust the work will do great good. Many are beginning to see men as it were trees, like the blind man coming to his sight. I hope you will be guided by the Spirit of Truth.

—, Penn. Jan. 4.

SIR—Day is dawning in the minds of many. I hear a rattling among the dry bones. The clergy are mad. Dagon is confounded—he is standing upon his stumps. Go on and prosper. Send us—copies of the *Christian Baptist*, and be assured that no exertions shall be wanting on my part to disseminate the truth as far and as fast as possible.

—, Virginia, Jan. 1.

YOUR enemies, or rather the enemies of truth, are waiting for your falling. Your pamphlets are read with more anxiety by those differing from you, than by your friends. Avoid extremes as far as consistent with truth. Keep close to Paul, and the truth will not fail in your hands.

* * *

FROM the above specimen, which we believe to be a fair one, of the many letters we receive, the necessity of our keeping in view the grand principles stated in our preface, appears. We are making an experiment whether a paper perfectly independent of any controlling power, other than the Bible, will be read; or whether it will be blasted by the poisonous breath of an aspiring priesthood and their dupes. So far we are encouraged to hope for good results. Whenever the public says to us “hush,” we are perfectly satisfied to be silent. But until then, by the divine favor, we will speak out. EDITOR.

* * *

I WAS lately asked by a very intelligent gentleman, who had long viewed the law of Moses as *the rule of life* to Christians, what ideas I attached to the phrase “*rule of life*.” I answered, that a *rule* was a measure, which, being applied to any substance, showed its length, breadth, or thickness; that, whatever substances were to be submitted to a certain rule, in order to any

particular use, they must correspond to that rule to the smallest possible variation, or else they would be rejected. This, said I, is the *literal* import and use of a rule. Now when used figuratively, and applied to human actions, a *rule of life* is a measure or standard of conduct to which we must conform in every item, without one possible variation, or else we must be rejected. If, then, the law of Moses is the rule of life to christians, conformity to it, in every iota, is essential to christian perfection—short of, or beyond its requirements, we are not to move. To talk of a law as a rule of life, to which we are not to be conformed in every respect, and beyond the requirements of which we are commanded to move, in other respects, is as absurd as to say, that a beam of timber, for a certain purpose, must measure precisely *ten feet*, neither more nor less; and in the same breath to say, that if it is six or sixteen feet long, it will do.—*At his suggestion I publish the above to prevent mistakes.*

EDITOR.

* * *

“WILL you,” said an honest inquirer, “allow the clergy no salary at all? Will you not allow the *poorer class* of the clergy a decent little competence? I replied I have no *allowances* to make. Let them have what the Lord has allowed them. “How much is that?” said he. Just *nothing at all*, said I. “Well,” said he, “I thought you were a great advocate of primitive christianity, and for reading the New Testament, and what do you make of these plain words, “*Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they that labor in the word and doctrine.*” Again, Paul commands, “*Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things.*” “Sure money is one good thing.” But stop, my friend, I replied; were these clergymen in respect to whom these commandments were addressed? No, assuredly—there is no such an order of men authorized of Heaven. You might as well say, that because the apostle Peter once said, “Silver and gold I have none,” therefore the present Pope ought to be paid £200,000 per annum in bank paper, as to attempt to argue from what is said of the elders or bishops of the churches set in order by the apostles, to the fraternity of the clergy. A church constituted upon New Testament principles, having its own bishop or bishops, or, as sometimes called, elders, will not, and ought not, to suffer them to be in want of any thing necessary, provided they labor in word and doctrine, and provided also, they are *ensamples* to the flock in industry, disinterestedness, humility, hospitality, and charity to the poor. Such bishops will be esteemed very highly in love for their work’s sake; but especially those who, by their own hands, minister not only to their own wants, but also to the wants of their brethren. The most worthy bishops are those who give evidence that they believe these words of Christ, “*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*”

Ibid.

TITHES are much talked of in some regions of the earth. A *Rev. Divine*, whose name and coat are synonymous, in a western city, has repeatedly taught his people, that the *tenth of all* yet belongs unto the Lord, (*i. e.* the Priest.) That the tithe system was never done away, and that it never will, and while there is a "*visible church*;" that they are all robbers of God. (*i. e.* the Clergy) that will withhold this small portion, only the tenth, from the holy ministry he has instituted for their benefit. One of his hearers said that he should have the tenth all *he had*, even to the tenth hair in his cat's tail.

Ibid.

* * *

COVENANTING.

THE devout Seceder clergy are busily employed in swearing in their loyal subjects to never hear the instruction that causeth to err, that is, every other kind of instruction except what drops from their own *infallibles*.) This is, in fact, the purport of their oath as we understand it. One of my neighbors has only found a small remnant in his congregation willing to bind themselves in a solemn oath (I was going to say to kill Paul—pardon the association of ideas,) to hold fast forever under the traditions of the elders.

EDITOR.

* * *

A CASE OF CONSCIENCE.

ELEVEN members of one congregation made a covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers, (*i. e.* the fathers of the Secession) and to do what Israel did, or what Israel swore to do, 2 Chron. xv. 12-15. xxii. 16. (for these texts were cited by the priest as precedents for covenanting.) Now in maturely considering the point over, it appears that the old Israelitish covenanters were bound to put to death man or woman, small or great, that would not take the oath, or abandon false religion. The query then is, Whether will it be better for the eleven to kill all that will not take the oath, and to pull down all the meeting houses belonging to all other sects, or to violate the oath which they have sworn? Perhaps their consciences may be relieved by reflecting upon the New Testament covenanters. The question then will be, Whether would it have been better for those covenanters, who bound themselves in an oath to kill Paul, to have violated their oath, or to have killed the apostle? You say neither of the two would have been better. Well, then, avoid covenanting. But what comes of the eleven? We cannot help them. They are past cure.

Ibid.

* * *

From the Reformer, January 1, 1824.

A PIOUS KING.

SAINT Ferdinand the restored legitimate.—"In casting my eyes on the Most High, who has deigned to deliver me from so many dangers, and to lead me back as it were by the hand,

among my faithful subjects, I experience a feeling of horror when I recollect all the sacrifices, all the crimes which the impious have dared to commit against the Sovereign Creator of the Universe.

“The ministers of religion have been persecuted and sacrificed—the venerable successor of St. Peter has been insulted—the temples of the Lord profaned and destroyed—the Holy Ghost trodden under foot—lastly, the inestimable inheritance which Jesus Christ left us, the right of his Holy Supper, to assure us of his love, and of our eternal felicity, the sacred Host have been trampled under foot. My soul cannot be at rest, till, united with my beloved subjects, we shall offer to God pious sacrifices that he may deign to purify by his grace, the soil of Spain from so many stains. In order that objects of such importance should be attained, I have resolved that in all places in my dominion, the tribunals, the juntas, and all public bodies, shall implore the clemency of the Almighty in favor of the nation, and that the archbishops, bishops, and capitula vicars of vacant sees, the priors of orders, and all those who exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, shall prepare missions, which shall exert themselves to destroy erroneous, pernicious, and heretical doctrines, and shut up in the monasteries of which the rules are the most rigid, those ecclesiastics who have been the agents of an impious faction.

“Sealed by my royal hand.”

* * *

From the same.

CHRISTIAN CHARITY!

IT is mentioned as an evidence of the tolerating spirit which at present pervades the [professed] christian world, that, on the opening of the supreme court in Boston, on the 4th inst. the Rev. Mr. *Taylor*, pastor of the Roman Catholic church, was requested to offer up the customary [a well adapted adjective] prayer. Mr. Taylor expressed himself highly gratified in contrasting the liberality existing at this time with the bigotry of former ages; and remarked on the singularity of his being invited to pray for a Protestant court [of law,] and that on the anniversary eve of the gunpowder plat; [said to have been laid by the Papists in the reign of James I, and in a prayer in the book of George I. mention is made of “a deliverance from the secret contrivances and hellish malice of Popish conspirators.”]

The writer of this article had it from the best authority that the priests of the Roman Catholic church, for many years, have taken their regular turns with those of various [once] *Protestant* sects, to “offer up *the customary prayers*” at the daily opening of the New York legislature; although, at times, none, nor ever more than one professed Papist has been known to sit among them. Now who does not perceive, from the foregoing extracts, that when the popular religion of a country becomes a mere formal system, it can easily unite with the outward religion

of any other country? In the present case, both have uniformity of dress, (long gowns, &c.) both employ music in the "*performance of divine service*"—both use bells—both have their holy days, thanksgiving, preparation, fast days, and Christmas—and both collect money on those occasions—both have priests, with titles of Reverend, D. D. &c.—and both "*offer customary prayers*" at legislatures, courts, celebration dinners, parades, laying corners of churches and "stone bridges," locks and dams, &c. &c.

* * *

From the same.

SYNODICAL ACT, OR CLERICAL ARROGANCE.

IN the journal of the proceedings of congress, of December 17, we find the following:—

"Mr. *Lowrie* laid on the table a resolution of the Synod of Philadelphia, approving the course taken by the government in relation to certain tribes of Indians."

Was this approbation awarded on account of the government giving to the Choctaws lands equal to 101,000 dollars, to make up for that sum which the Board of Missions got from them?

There is another point of light in which this synodical act presents itself. If a clerical body of men begin to pass resolutions of approbation to the general government for the course which is taken in relation to certain matters, with the same propriety it may begin to pass resolutions of disapprobation, or of censure, on account of its acts and proceedings. The design of such resolutions is always to make an *impression*; and by and by, congress may be awed into measures not warranted by any convictions of their utility, for fear of coming under the public censure of such clerical bodies of men, whose people, ever influenced by their decisions, will exert themselves to remove and keep from the general government all who are not favorable to the schemes and wishes of their teachers. We have, as yet, got along very well, without any clerical tribunals being set up in this country, to sanction or disapprove the measures of the general government, (as though they were to be submitted to their revisal,) and it is to be hoped we shall see no more of this species of clerical arrogance until the yoke is more completely on our necks.

* * *

From the same.

ENGLISH METHODISTS.

THE Wesleyan Methodist ministers, says a late publication, have issued forth to the connexion a sort of official notice for the correct observance of the *popish fast*, called "Good Friday," which, they say, "we judge to be highly expedient and useful, and in retaining it among us as a body, we not only act on our own experience of what we have found to be advantageous to the interests of truth and piety, but in conformity also to the *judgment and practice of the Church of England.*" See Wesleyan Methodist Magazine, for March, 1823.

From Plain Truth.

TITHES.

A CERTAIN woman found by the way side a lamb perishing with cold and hunger. She had pity upon the lamb, and took it unto her house and nursed it and brought it again unto life. And it came to pass, that the lamb grew up and was a goodly ewe, and had a large fleece. And the poor woman sheared the ewe; when, lo! the priest came unto the woman and said, "The first fruits of every thing belong unto the Lord—and I must have the wool." The woman said, "It is hard;" the priest said, "It is written"—and so he took the wool. And it came to pass, that soon after the ewe yeaned and brought forth a lamb; when, lo! the chief priest came again unto the woman and said, "The first-ling of every flock belongeth unto the Lord—I must have the lamb." The woman said, "It is hard," the priest said, "It is written"—and he took the lamb. And when it came to pass that the woman found that she could make no profit from the ewe, she killed and dressed it; when, lo! the chief priest came again unto her, and took a leg, a loin, and a shoulder, for a burnt offering. And it came to pass that the poor woman was exceeding wroth because of the robbery; and she said unto the chief priest, "Curse on the ewe! Oh! that I had never meddled therewith!" And the chief priest straightway said unto her, "Whatsoever is cursed belongeth unto the Lord"—so he took the remainder of the mutton, which he and the Levites ate for their supper.

* * *

From the Reformer.

SOMETHING NEW.

THE following advertisement appeared a few weeks since in one of the papers of this city:—

WANTED—A Minister of the Gospel, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Parish of St. Michael's, Talbot county, Eastern Shore of Maryland; who will receive \$600 per annum. A clergyman, willing to engage in and take upon himself the care of the Parish, will please address himself to the subscribers.

WILLIAM HAYWARD,
CHAS. GOLDSBOUGH.

Easton, Md. November 15.

* * *

No. 8.

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1824.

VOL. I.

ADDRESS

TO THE READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

No. IV

WE have, in the two preceding numbers, presented our views on two charges that have been generally rumored against us. There yet remains another which we have promised to notice. On these points we wish to be clearly understood. The charge now before us, is, that we deny "*experimental religion.*" Before

we plead "guilty," or "not guilty," of this impeachment, we should endeavor to understand the subject matter of it. Not having been in the use of the phrase "*experimental religion*," I could neither affirm nor deny any thing about it. The question, then, is, What is the *thing*? The *name* we have not in our vocabulary; and, therefore, could only deny the thing constructively. We will first ask, What does the Bible say about it? Upon examination, I found it says not one word about "*experimental religion*." The Bible is as silent upon this topic as upon the "*Romish mass*." I then appealed to the Encyclopedia. The only thing like it, which I could find, was "*experimental philosophy*," which is a philosophy that can be proved by experiment. I then looked into the theological dictionaries, and soon found different kinds of religion, such as "*natural*," "*revealed*," &c. but not a word about "*experimental*." I then applied to a friend who had once been deeply initiated into the modern sublimities of the refined popular doctrine. I was then informed that there were two kinds of religion much talked of in the pulpit and amongst the people—the one called "*heart religion*," and the other "*head religion*"—the latter dwelling exclusively in the head, and the former in the heart. I also learned that the former was sometimes called "*christian experience*," and this was presumed to be the thing intended by the words "*experimental religion*." As the *New Testament* is my religious creed, I appealed to it again. But it was as silent as the grave on all these distinctions. I then began to philosophize, in the popular way, upon the *head* and the *heart*, with a design of deciding which of these two religions was the better one. I had heard that "*head religion*" consisted in *notions*, and "*heart religion*" in *feelings*. Finding that all the learned agreed that the spirit of a man dwells in his head, and not in his heart, I had well nigh concluded that "*head religion*" must be the better of the two, as the human spirit is concerned more immediately with what takes place in its habitation than elsewhere. I reasoned in this way—that if the spirit of a man dwells in his head, then head religion must be better than heart religion, and heart religion better than hand religion, &c.* Being unwilling to conclude too hastily on this subject, I thought of examining the phrase "*christian experience*." On reflection I found that this phrase represented a very comprehensive idea. Every christian has considerable experience, and some have experienced a thousand times more than others. Paul experienced

*To prevent mistakes let it be understood that, in speaking of the head and heart, in the above connexion, we speak after the manner of vain philosophy. The term heart is often met with in the scriptures, and it has ascribed to it every exercise of the understanding, will, and affections. The moderns suppose it to have respect to the affections and dispositions only. But in scripture it is said, "to know, to understand, to study, to discern, to devise, to meditate, to reason, to endite, to ponder, to consider, to believe, to doubt, to be wise," &c. See Deut iv. 39. Ps. xlv. 1. xlix. 3. Prov. x. 8. xv. 28. xvi. 9. xix. 21. Eccl. viii. 5. Jer. xxiv. 7. Matt. xiii. 15. Mark ii. 6-8. xi. 23. Luke ii. 19. 35.

many perils by land and by sea—by his own countrymen—by the heathens—in the city, in the wilderness—among false brethren. He experienced weariness, painfulness, watchings often, hunger, thirst, fastings, cold and nakedness, stripes and imprisonments. From the Jews he experienced five whippings, each of forty stripes, save one. He was thrice beaten with rods—once stoned—thrice shipwrecked—a day and a night in the deep. Besides this, he experienced all the anxieties and griefs, all the sorrows and joys that arose from the care of the churches. This was, indeed, the experience of a christian, and this I never denied. Many christians can tell of similar experiences, but none can give a narrative so long, so varied, and entertaining, as that of Paul. Even Peter the apostle, was not able to detail such an experience.

But on reading this to a friend, I am told that I have not yet hit upon the point in question; that the christian experience of which the populars speak, is "*the inward experience of grace upon the heart.*" What is the meaning of this grace upon the heart, said I? I know that the *glad tidings* is sometimes called the grace of God. Thus saith Paul, "the *grace of God* that bringeth salvation has *appeared* unto *all men*, teaching us," &c. Here the gospel is called "the grace of God appearing to all men." Again, saith Paul, whoso seeks to be justified by the law, is fallen from *grace*; or has renounced the gospel. Indeed, nothing is so worthy of the name "*grace of God*," as the gospel. Now if this gospel, which is sometimes called "the word of God," "the spirit," "the grace," and "the truth," dwell in a man, that is, be believed sincerely, like a fruitful vine it yields in his heart and in his life the heavenly cluster of love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance. These are the fruits of the Spirit. Like precious ointment is diffused in his heart heavenly odors, and the sweetness of its perfume exhales in his life, in the work of faith, the labor of love, and the patience of hope.—This, said I, is just what I contend for. If you call this "*christian experience*," I never denied it; yea, I have always taught it. But I cannot approve of the name, since it is altogether an ambiguous name.

My friend replied, "This is not precisely the popular use of the phrase. It denotes, amongst most of the populars, a certain mental experience to becoming a christian, an exercise of mind, a process through which a person must pass before he can esteem himself a true christian, and until we know from his recital of it that he has been the subject of it, we cannot esteem him a christian."

Then it is some invisible, indescribable energy exerted upon the minds of men in order to make them christians; and that, too, independent of, or prior to, the word believed. I read in the New Testament of many who were the subjects of energies and diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit, but it was "after they had believed." The gifts of the Holy Spirit by which the gospel was confirmed, by which it was demonstrated to be of God, were

conferred on the Jews and Samaritans after they had believed. Even the apostles themselves did not receive those powers and gifts of the Holy Spirit until they became disciples of Christ. On the gentiles was poured out the Holy Ghost, or his gifts, while they heard Peter preaching the glad tidings, which they believed; for they came to hear Peter in such circumstances as disposed them to believe every word he said. The age of those gifts has passed away, and now the influence of the Holy Spirit is only felt in and by the word believed. Hence saith Peter, "Ye are born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever"—and "this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you."

This *descriptive* preaching, of which we hear so much, is the most insipid and useless thing in the world. An orthodox divine of my acquaintance spends about one-fourth of every year in preaching up the necessity, nature, and importance of regeneration. He usually tells the people his own story; that is, the history of his own regeneration. He sometimes comes to "visions and revelations." He tells the people they are "as *spiritually dead* as a stone;" "there is not one spark of spiritual life in unregenerate sinners;" nor can they, "in the state of nature," do any thing that can contribute to their regeneration. "It depends entirely upon the Spirit of God, which, as the wind bloweth where it listeth, worketh when, and upon whom it pleaseth. If there were not a thousand preachers like him, I would not disturb his mind by thus noticing the burden of his message. The spirit by which he speaks is doubtless not that Spirit which was promised the apostles; for that Spirit, Messiah said, would not speak of himself, but of HIM. But this preacher's spirit speaks of himself and not of Christ. It is worthy of notice that the twelve apostles, in all the public addresses, on record, which they delivered, there is not one sentence of this kind of preaching. And suppose it were as true as the gospel, that such is the state of mankind, we can conceive of no possible good which could result from such descriptive harangues. They resemble a physician, who, instead of administering a remedy to his patient, delivers him a lecture on the nature of his disease. Miserable comforters are such preachers! They have no glad tidings of great joy to all people. Methinks I see a poor unfortunate sinner, lying in a slough, up to the neck in the mire, perishing with cold and hunger; and one of the orthodox divines riding along observes him. Methinks I hear him tell him, Fellow-sinner, you are in a miserable condition—mired from head to foot. Believe me, you are both cold and hungry, and I can assure you that you are unable to help yourself out of this calamity. You could as easily carry one of these hills upon your shoulders as extricate yourself from your present circumstances. Perish with cold and hunger you must: it is in vain for you to attempt an escape. Every effort you make to get out only sinks you deeper in distress. Your Creator could, if he pleased, bring you out; but whether

he listeth or not, is uncertain. Fare ye well!—The unfortunate sinner exclaims, What good is in your address?—He is assured that it is an article of precious truth, worthy to be believed. But when believed, what good is in the faith of it? The gospel is glad tidings of great joy to all people; and whatever is called “gospel,” that is not good news and worthy of all acceptation, is not gospel.—But I have wandered from my subject.

The popular belief of a regeneration previous to faith, or a knowledge of the gospel, is replete with mischief. Similar to this is a notion that obtains among many of a “*law work*,” or some terrible process of terror and despair through which a person must pass, as through the pious Bunyan’s slough of *Despond*, before he can believe the gospel. It is all equivalent to this, that a man must become a desponding, trembling infidel, before he can become a believer. Now the gospel makes no provision for despondency, inasmuch as it assures all who believe it, upon the veracity of God, that they are forgiven and accepted in the Beloved.

A devout preacher told me, not long since, that he was regenerated about *three years before he believed in Christ*. He considered himself “as born again by a physical energy of the Holy Spirit, as a dead man would be raised to life by the mighty power of the Eternal Spirit.” Upon his own hypothesis, (metaphysical, it is true,) *he was three years a “godly unbeliever.”* He was pleasing and acceptable to God “*without faith*,” and if he had died during the *three years*, he would have been saved, though he believed not the gospel.* Such is the effect of metaphysical theology.

I read, some time since, of a revival in the state of New York, in which the Spirit of God was represented as being abundantly poured out on Presbyterians, Methodists, and Bap-

*We would observe, that we conceive the great error of the modern philosophers, concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit, to be, that they are the same physical operations *now* which were exhibited in those days which were emphatically called “*the days of my spirit, saith God*,” when men spake with tongues, healed diseases, and wrought every species of miracles, by the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit, for the confirmation of their testimony; when they spake, prophesied, discerned spirits, and interpreted oracles, by the *immediate* impulse of the Spirit. We do not suppose that they contend for an agency to the same degree, but only of the same species. But we are taught that since those gifts have ceased, the Holy Spirit now operates upon the minds of men only by the word. With respect to pagans and all those incapable of hearing the word, the scriptures do not teach us what Plato has taught thousands of modern divines. The regeneration of pagans without the word, is a dogma not quite so rational as the dogmas of a regeneration after death in purgatory. In spite of all our efforts, the vortex of metaphysical jargon will draw us in. I wrote this to prevent mistakes—perhaps it may create some. But, “*to the testimony*,” believe us not if we speak not its dogmas. We doubt not, but in the above we speak a mixed dialect; perhaps half the language of Ashdod and half the language of Canaan. We are positive on one point, that the scriptures teach us not the modern doctrine, or the ancient philosophical doctrine of “physical operations of the Divine Spirit,” in order to faith.

tists. I think the converts in the order of the names were about three hundred Presbyterians, three hundred Methodists, and two hundred and eighty Baptists. On the principles of Bellamy, Hopkins, and Fuller, these being all regenerated without any knowledge of the gospel, there is no difficulty in accounting for their joining different sects. The Spirit did not teach the Presbyterians to believe that "God had foreordained whatsoever comes to pass;" nor the Methodists to deny it. He did not teach the Presbyterians and the Methodists that infants were members of the church, and to be baptized; nor the Baptists to deny it. But on the hypothesis of the Apostle James, viz. "Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth." I think it would be difficult to prove that the Spirit of God had any thing to do with the aforesaid revival.

Enthusiasm flourishes, blooms under the popular systems. This man was regenerated when asleep, by a vision of the night. That man heard a voice in the woods, saying, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." A third saw his Saviour descending to the tops of the trees at noon day. A thousand form a band, and sit up all night to take heaven by surprise. Ten thousand are waiting in anxiety for a *power* from on high to descend upon their souls; they frequent meetings for the purpose of obtaining this power. Another class removed so far south, by special illumination, have discovered that there is no hell; that the Devil and his angels will ultimately ascend to the skies; and that Judas himself, Herod and Pontius Pilate, will shine like stars forever and ever. And, to encourage the infatuation, the preacher mounts the rostrum, and with his sermon, either in notes or committed to memory, he "prays to God for his Spirit to guide his tongue, and to send a message that he will bless to the salvation of that *dear congregation*." Thus the people lay themselves out for *operations* and new revelations. Like the Phoenix in the fable, they and the preacher have gathered a bundle of dry sticks, and they set about clapping their wings with one accord, that they may fan them into a flame—which sometimes actually happens, if our faith could be so strong as to believe it.

From all this scene of raging enthusiasm, be admonished, my friends, to open your Bibles and to hearken to the voice of God, which is the voice of reason. God now speaks to us only by his word. By his Son, in the New Testament, he has fully revealed himself and his will. This is the only revelation of his Spirit which we are to regard. The popular preachers, and the popular systems, alike render the word of God of none effect. Some of them are so awfully bold as to represent it as "*a dead letter*." According to them it ought never to have been translated; for the reading of it in an unknown tongue, if accompanied with some supernatural power, with some new revelation of the Spirit, would have been as suitable to the salvation of men, as though read in our own tongue. The jarring elements of which their systems are composed, do, however, by the necessary laws of

discordant principles, in the act of combustion reflect so much light as to convince us that the *written word* is the last appeal. Let us make it the first and the last. It comes to us in the demonstration of the Holy Spirit, and with the power of miraculous evidence. The word of Jesus Christ is "*spirit and life.*" "*The word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword;*" yea, it is the *SWORD of the Spirit: it is the spirit of his mouth.* "The entrance of thy word, O Lord, giveth light, and makes the *simple wise.*"

EDITOR.

* * *

IN a work so small as the present, we should aim at brevity and variety in the articles inserted. This has always been our intention, though we have not been able to conform to it. The following article requires an apology on account of its length, but this we have in its importance. The argument may be called a *new* one, as far as any thing that is now discovered in the scriptures can be called *new*. We know that Mr. *Wardlaw* in his reply to Mr. *Yates*, and other writers, have urged the same passages in support of their views; but not in the same manner, nor with half the effect. We think it is unanswerable. Small as our work is, we would not hesitate to allow half a dozen of pages to any writer that will attempt to answer it, provided that the reply be *exclusively* confined to this *one* argument. On this condition *alone* could we admit it. We publish it on two accounts; the one, its own intrinsic merit—the other, as proof positive of our innocence of a recent charge brought against us, as favoring the Socinian hypothesis. While we renounce the metaphysical jargon found in creeds, on what is called the doctrine of the "trinity," such as "eternal generation," "filiation," &c. We regard both Arianism, semi-Arianism, and Socinianism, as poor, miserable, blind, and naked nonsense and absurdity.

EDITOR.

THE presumptuous Socinians call themselves christians. Alas! poor men! they are drivelling philosophers. The polite and the stupid may, indeed, suppose that on their heretical paradox these doctors reason divinely. Well, be it so. "Jesus," say they, "is the son of Joseph." Excellent christians! If ye, gentlemen, interpret nature as ye do religion; if ye unlock the mysteries of the material world with the same adroitness and perspicacity with which ye usher into the open day the spiritual abortions of your own disordered brains, indeed ye are divine philosophers. I have always thought the paradox of the Socinians a little too barefaced even for the vulgar. The devotees of the popular religion are very stupid, because their teachers generally leave them, in point of information, just where they find them, prodigiously ignorant of holy scriptures; nevertheless, if they should at all look into the sacred volume, they will not be apt, I should think, to gather up Socinianism.

We have got a nest of these little creatures in our good city, where, with the incredible industry of pismires, they have succeeded in throwing up an earthen shell over their heads; and this they call a church!

Let us hear them in religion. "Jesus," say they, "is the son of Joseph." Now the twelve apostles, and all whom they taught the religion, worshipped Jesus; *ergo*, the apostles and all whom they taught worshipped the son of Joseph: *ergo*, the apostles and all whom they taught were idolators!

But now, beloved, if we should show that the Socinian sect fails of a peculiarity which distinguished the first christian church, and those by whom it was gathered and instructed, the apostles, from all other worshippers besides, even from those who held many other things in common with them, what then? Again, if we should show that it was this very peculiarity which the Socinians have wiped from their creed that procured the disciples of Jesus the name of Christians at Antioch; and, lastly, if we should make it appear from reason and scripture that the Socinian paradox is a mere quibble, what then? Will it not inevitably follow that these little bigots act very fondly when they assume the name of christians?

To our first proposition, then. But let not the reader suppose that I go out of my way to break my lance over the steel cap of the poor Socinians. I am no churchman militant—but a layman, as Antichrist would call me, because I reckon a New Testament a better tutor in the kingdom of the Saviour than all the doctors of divinity in christendom. *From my heart* I pity the Socinians—I compassionate their temerity—and would not, the Bible being in my hand, rush into the presence of the Judge of quick and dead with their sentiments, for twice the value of the universe. But this only by the way.

And now to discover that peculiarity in the sentiments of the first christians, which then distinguished them from their own infidel countrymen, the Jews; and now from our own countrymen, the Socinians; let us away to the New Testament and rummage it in search of the mighty cause of that dreadful persecution which commenced with the death of Stephen. Acts vii.

To find out this, let it be noted that the two great prevailing parties in Jerusalem, at the moment of publishing the new institution, were the Pharisean and Sadducean. Now what were the more prominent doctrines of these two sects? The scriptures, and I desire no better authority, the scriptures inform us that the Sadducees denied the resurrection and the existence of angels and human spirits; but that the Pharisees maintained both. These two sects divided between them the inhabitants of the capitol; and, as the Pharisaic party was at all times vastly more numerous than the Sadducean, it follows that a very large proportion of the citizens of Jerusalem held the resurrection of the dead and the existence of angels and spirits. Now what aspect did the apostles' doctrine bear to the respective

sentiments of these sectaries? Why it confirmed, in the most illustrious manner, the dogmas of the Pharisees; it set the doctrine of the resurrection on an entire new footing; and, at the same time, covered with shame and contempt the sentiments of the Sadducean materialists. The apostles first delivering with great power of miracles their testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus, they immediately grounded the general doctrine of a resurrection on that splendid and well attested event, and gave such a blow to the pretensions of the Sadducees, as completely excited the odium theologicum of these incomparable doctors. But here it is but reasonable to suppose that the apostles' doctrine would irritate. This supposition, indeed, agrees well with the fact; for the chief priest (Caiphas) and all his party, the sect of the Sadducees, were filled with zeal, and laid their hands on the apostles and put them in the common prison. Acts v. The reader may perhaps wish to know why the Sadducees liked the doctrine of a resurrection so ill from the mouths of the apostles, and yet made this tenet a matter of forbearance in the cast of the Pharisees. St. Paul says that we suffer fools gladly when we know that we ourselves are wise. The Sadducees well knew that the doctrine of a resurrection was not appended to the law of Moses, and these five books were all that these men held sacred; consequently, the Pharisaic arguments in proof of a resurrection must always have appeared very impotent and unsatisfactory to the Sadducees, because they were drawn chiefly from the lesser prophets' writings, which that party did not recognize as canonical. But the apostles grounded the general doctrine on the specific certainty of Christ's resurrection, and this was what irritated the Sadducees; they were grieved that the apostles preached "*through Christ*" the resurrection from the dead, Acts iv. 2. But now as this particular in the apostles' doctrine incurred the resentment of the Sadducees, whose sentiments it condemned; so it is but reasonable to suppose that it would conciliate the favor and protection of the Pharisees, whose sentiments it confirmed. This in fact was the case, for when the Sadducees, who had imprisoned the apostles, consulted about putting them to death, as the sharpest and surest refutation of their hated argument for a general resurrection, there stood up a man in the sanhedrim, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel, a teacher of the law, in great esteem among all the people, (Acts v.) and this divine plead the cause of the christian teachers with such moderation and eloquence, that "to him they agreed." The apostles were dismissed, but charged by the Sadducees to teach the doctrine no more by the resurrection of Jesus, though, indeed, they had already filled the city with it. Now here it is wonderful and entertaining to behold the workings and contortions of religious bigotry! The Sadducees thought they saw in the apostles their last worst enemies, and they could have worried them. On the other hand, the crafty Gamaliel saw in the apostles' doctrine the most cer-

tain argument for a resurrection, the favorite tenet of his own party, and with what art does he procure them their dismissal. However, all this had occurred at the moment of publishing the new religion, before either party, Sadducean or Pharisaic, could well determine what was the grand peculiarity. I dare say that both these sects, in the first instance, were induced to think christianity nothing more than some modification of Pharisaism; for the great tumult and conversion which the new doctrine at its first appearance excited in the city, together with the confusion of feeling caused by the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus, which was always very prominent in the public addresses of the apostles, had prevented these sectaries from inquiring more minutely into the faith and practice of the apostles.

The church must have already consisted of many thousands by this time. The first address of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, proselyted three thousand; and we are told that the Lord continued to add to the church daily the cured. Afterwards it amounted to five thousand, and still multitudes, both of men and women, were the more added unto the Lord; myriads of the priests were obedient to the faith, and the word or doctrine of the Lord increased mightily in Jerusalem. Now all these had hitherto enjoyed the favor and protection of Gamaliel and his sect, and had been, perhaps, chiefly Pharisees themselves. We have seen how the Sadducees opposed them, and how artfully Gamaliel procured the release of the apostles who were at the head of the church. These things bring us to the end of the fifth chapter. The death of Stephen and a horrible persecution of the church generally, are the very next events which follow in the order of the Acts of the Apostles. And here a reader, awake to what the author of this treatise recounted, must pause in astonishment—must be confounded at the fickleness of religious favor. Stephen is murdered by the sectaries, and the disciples of that very Gamaliel, who had, but this moment, employed all his eloquence in the defence of the Nazarenes, are now imbruing their hands in their blood, entering into houses and dragging out both men and women. Paul, the scholar of Gamaliel, committed them to prison. What was their crime? By what unheard of practice did the brethren forfeit the favor and protection of the people, for hitherto they were in favor with them all? Were they still only the Sadducees who persecuted the disciples? Alas! the Pharisees were turned against them also, and had now discovered a peculiarity in the christian doctrine, which made them as much the enemies of the apostles as the Sadducees had been before. But did not both parties just now agree to let the christians go on unmolested? Did not Gamaliel say, "Let them alone?" resolving all into this pious conclusion, that if this counsel, or this work, were of men, it would come to nought; but if it were of God it could not be overcome. What had the christians done? Why all this horrible persecution? It was not because they had violated any legal institute—any of

the external Mosaic observances. For though the word of God increased mightily in Jerusalem, though multitudes of men and women were the more added to the Lord, and myriads of the priests were obedient to the faith; yet were they all zealous of the law. The new doctrine, however Pharisees and Socinians may have rated it, seemed only to make those who received it better men, for they were daily with one accord in the Temple praising God and having favor with all the people. Now if the brethren were not persecuted for abandoning the law, for this they carried with them into the new religion, then they must have been persecuted for the apostles' doctrine, and yet not for *all* the several points in that doctrine; for we have seen that the Pharisees favored their method of preaching the resurrection, and protected them on account of it from the outrages of the Sadducees. Indeed, it was formally agreed by both these parties to let the christians alone; to let them proceed unmolested, as long as nothing worse than the doctrine of a resurrection marked their religious creed. But this they did at a time when they had not as yet thought that the apostles' doctrine merited a more minute investigation. Still, however, the question returns, What had the christians done to excite the united fury of these two sects? Is there no scriptural answer to this important question? Is there nothing which might serve as a clue to bring us to the bottom of this persecution? We have seen who inflicted the punishment, and who had to endure it. But the cause—what was that? Not the doctrine of the resurrection. What then? Let us follow the scholar of Gamaliel to Damascus; let us accompany this pious student of divinity to the place of his destination; the place whither he was commissioned by letters (no doubt clerically patent) for the godly and religious purpose of hunting up the poor innocents of the *Lord of Glory*. The time was come when those who slew them thought they offered an acceptable service to God. Alas! mistaken men! they shall give an account to him who is ready to judge the quick and the dead. Paul tells us that in this affair he carried with him to Damascus letters of authority from the high priests, but he does not himself mention the very crime which characterized a christian; the peculiarity which distinguished a follower of Jesus from other Jews, that made him obnoxious to the persecutors, and liable to be carried off by Paul to Jerusalem. And this leaves us as much in the dark as ever concerning the particular point in the apostles' doctrine, which lay at the root of this persecution. However, the apostle was converted on his way to Damascus, and the surprising phenomena which accompanied his conversion were obvious to those who accompanied him. The whole party was struck to the earth by the splendor of the Saviour's glory. And the change in Paul's sentiments—his conversion from judaism to christianity, was soon blazed throughout the city. Paul (Acts ix.) immediately associated with those whom he had come to persecute and to carry bound to Jerusalem; and had even the

courage to enter the Jewish synagogue, and to preach Jesus that he was the "Son of God;" at which all the Jews and proselytes of Damascus who heard his address, who listened to his arguments and were as yet unsuspecting of the change, were surprized, were confounded! The young scholar of the great Gamaliel, the famous zealot, who had carried it against the christians with such a high hand at Jerusalem, was now an abettor of the supposed heresy of the Nazarenes—in short, was, in the pious estimation of the synagogue people, lost! an apostate! an idolator! What were the reflections of those who witnessed all this—who heard him speak, who heard him argue, who knew the tenor of his commission, and the particular crime of those whom he persecuted in Jerusalem and had come hither to seize? Reader, attend! the following are their very words: "Is not this he who made havoc of them at Jerusalem who call on (invoke) this name, and came hither to carry such bound to the chief priests?" Surprising sentence! "Carry such." Carry who? All who INVOKED the name of "*the Son of God.*" We have hit at last, then, on the particular point in the apostles' doctrine which made the church so obnoxious to the Pharisees and Sadducees after they had discovered it. The brethren, then, it was found, lived in the idolatrous practice, as the Socinians would call it, of "invoking the Lord Jesus." Now, then, we can see the full import of that passage in the ninth chapter, where Ananias manifests such reluctance to visit Paul, even after the Lord Jesus bade him. Ananias, poor man, was guilty; he was one of those who invoked the name of Jesus, and was probably doing so at the hour of prayer, when the Lord Jesus vouchsafed him this vision. Reader, hear his own words. When the Lord desired him to go visit Paul in the house of one Judas, "Lord," says he, "I have heard from many concerning this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints in Jerusalem, and he is here with authority from the chief priests to bind all who INVOKE THY NAME." Acts ix. 13. Now, in these two quotations, the church in Jerusalem, and the brethren in Damascus, are alike obnoxious, and are guilty of the same crime—the invocation of Jesus. Yet the church of Jerusalem was gathered and instructed by the apostles; nay, it was the first of all christian churches, and is to be imitated by all. Is christianity really a system of idolatry? Is the Son of God, whom christians have been taught by the apostles to adore, the son of Joseph, the carpenter? Take these words of the Apostle John, 1st Epistle, v. 13. "These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have everlasting life," &c. "This also is the confidence which we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, HE hearkeneth to us. Now if we know that HE hearkeneth to us in whatever we ask, we know that we obtain FROM HIM the petitions which we have asked." This is a very odd sort of sentence on the Socinian scheme. John says that he had entire confidence in being heard: perhaps the reader does

not know what the apostle alludes to in this expression. The allusion, reader, is to an expressive declaration made by the Saviour himself, whilst on earth; (John's Gospel, chapter xiv.) The apostles were dreadfully alarmed at the idea of his leaving them, being ignorant of the nature of his kingdom; so, in order to comfort them, he tells them that though he must leave them, yet he would return, and then whatever they would ask in his name HE WOULD DO IT FOR THEM—I am going away, *i. e.* to heaven; but, reader, mark the Lord's own words—"but whatever you ask in my name that I WILL DO." Again, "That the Father may be glorified in the Son, *if you ask any thing in my name I will do it.*" Amen! It was this promise that made John confident that Christ would hear us. Thus Jesus corrupted the apostles, and they corrupted the church of Jerusalem, and all others who would wish to shape their faith and practice by their example and teaching in the New Testament. And thus we see the origin of Stephen's dying prayer, "LORD JESUS, RECEIVE MY SPIRIT—LORD, LAY NOT THIS SIN TO THEIR CHARGE." And now the Socinians may themselves query whether this characteristic of the first of all christians, and christian churches, belongs to them. No man, however, can triumph over these little creatures. I know them well. A Socinian is a little mortal—

*"Destroy his fib and sophistry. In vain!
"The creature's at his dirty work again."*

O.

* * *

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

Sir—YOUR having received with so much candor the few lines I sent you some time since, emboldens me to be so intrusive as to address you again. I have carefully read seven numbers of the "*Baptist*," and I can assure you that the work, taken as a whole, merits my unfeigned approbation. To say that it has no defects, would be saying more than I dare say of any work of fallible authors. Your remarks in reply to my few lines of the 6th November last were satisfactory upon the item on which I addressed you; so far as this, that you advocate the circulation of the Bible only on principles, or in a manner, different from the present popular plan. Your plan is no doubt more accordant to the genius of the christian religion; however, as Paul rejoiced that Christ was preached, whether in pretence or sincerity, so I rejoice that the Bible is widely diffused by Bible societies, whether in pretence or in sincerity. You will not however, understand me as disagreeing with your plan; for I can assure you I think well of it, and would wish to see the churches of Christ all doing so. I would much rather see the Bible disseminated in this way than the present; as I have no doubt but the apostle would rather have seen Christ preached sincerely, than in pretence. But until I see your plan carried into effect, I will aid the present plan of distributing the Bible.

I have thought much on the missionary plan since I read the first number of your paper, and I have read a good deal on the subject; and your views, as far as I understand them, appear to accord with mine. I have sent you, some time since, by a friend, *Brown's History of Missions*, which I wish you to read if you have not. I would, were I disposed to expose the missionary mistakes, desire no other documents than what come from the pens of missionary men and their advocates, to show their folly and the ignorance of christianity which appear in this popular project. I hope you will kindly receive these few hints from the pen of a friend, whose heart desires the success of truth, and who wishes you all success in opposing Antichrist in the various forms which he assumes. The plainness of these remarks forbids their appearance in your magazine; but I know you will respect the motives which dictated them.

Your sincere friend,

ROBERT CAUTIOUS

* * *

P—, Va. Feb. 23, 1824.

TO MR. ROBERT CAUTIOUS.

DEAR SIR—THE “plainness of your remarks,” as respects myself, should not, in my judgment, preclude their insertion in this work. I thankfully receive them, and in general acquiesce in their correctness. They are, indeed, such as had occurred to my own mind, and your statement of them confirmed me in the truth of them. I thank you for *Brown's History*—I will read it carefully as soon as I find leisure. I have but partially read it, and at considerable intervals.

Our objections to the missionary plan originated from the conviction that it is unauthorized in the New Testament; and that, in many instances, it is a system of iniquitous speculation and speculation. I feel perfectly able to maintain both the one and the other of these positions. What charity, what lawless charity would it require, to believe that a Reverend Divine, for instance, coming to the city of Pittsburgh, some time since, under the character of a missionary, and after “preaching four sermons” of scholastic divinity to a few women and children in the remote corners of the city, called on the treasurer of the missionary fund in that place, and actually drew *forty dollars* for the *four sermons*: I say, what lawless charity would it require to consider such a man a servant of Jesus Christ, possessed of the spirit of Paul, or Peter, or any of the true missionaries!! My informant is a very respectable citizen of Pittsburgh. He assured me he had the intelligence from the treasurer's own lips. Ten dollars for a sermon one hour long! preached to the heathen in the city of Pittsburgh by a regularly educated, pious missionary!! How many widow's mites, how many hard-earned charities were swallowed in one hour by this gormandizer!! Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon! “But,” says an

apologist, "it required the good man a week to study it; besides he gave them prayers into the bargain." A week to study a sermon! for a graduate at college too!! Why his sermon was not worth a cent! There is not a lawyer in Pittsburgh who could not prepare an orthodox sermon in a week, and deliver it handsomely too, *for ten dollars*. From the prayers and sermons of such missionaries, may the pagans be long preserved!

Not questioning the piety and philanthropy of many of the originators and present abettors of the missionary plan, we must say that the present scheme is not authorized by our King. This, I think, we proved some time ago; and no man, that we have heard of, has come forward publicly to oppose our views. Indeed, I think we have few men of any information who would come forward openly to defend the plan of *saving* the world by means of *money* and *science*; of converting pagans by funds raised indirectly from spinning wheels, fruit stalls, corn fields, melon patches, potatoe lots, rags, children's play things, and religious newspapers, *consecrated* to missionary purposes, and from funds raised directly by begging from every body, of every creed, and of no creed whatever. By sending out men to preach begging sermons, and to tell the people of A's missionary patch of potatoes producing twice as much per acre, as those destined for himself and children; of B's uncommon crop of missionary wheat, a part of which he covetously alienated from the missionary to himself, and, as a judgment upon him, his cow broke into his barn and ate of it until she killed herself; of E's missionary sheep having each yearned two lambs a-piece, while his own only yeaned him one a-piece; and a variety of other miracles wrought in favor of the missionary fund. I say, what man of good common sense and of a reasonable mind would come forward to defend a scheme of converting the world by such means, and by the means of that very "*vain philosophy*," and "*science falsely so called*," condemned by the apostles. Hoping always to hear from you when you have any thing deemed worthy of my attention, I remain your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

* * *

From the Reformer, printed in Philadelphia.

MISSIONARY SOCIETIES

WHATEVER may have been the origin of *Domestic Missionary Societies*, it is now pretty clear that their whole zeal and attention are directed to extend the influence of, and make proselytes to, the respective sects to which they belong. We have seen no instance in which this is more apparent, than in a circular set forth by the Domestic Missionary Society of Connecticut. The following is from the circular:—

"*Reverend and dear Brother*—By direction of the Board of Directors, the Committee of the Domestic Missionary Society of Connecticut submit to your consideration the following statements and observations.

“The society has been in operation seven years. In this period it has extended its assistance to twenty-five different churches, and has been instrumental in the settlement of thirteen ministers.

“The labors of the missionaries, in many instances, have been blessed with revivals of religion; and, in all, with the increase of the churches and societies where they have labored. These blessings have been procured at an expense not exceeding one thousand dollars a-year; which has been furnished by the contributions of not more than one-fourth of the churches of the state, in any one year. If all the churches, *from the beginning*, had contributed 10 dollars annually, every destitute church might have been blessed long ago since with stated ordinances; or if one half of the churches will contribute fifteen dollars each, and the other half only five dollars annually, every waste in our Zion may speedily and with great ease be repaired, and similar dilapidations of the churches, by the blessing of God, prevented forever. There never was, probably, in the world, a christian denomination so numerous, so compactly located, so harmonious in doctrine and in discipline; and which possessed the means of extending to every church at so cheap a rate, the stated ordinances of the gospel, and of securing, by an effort so slight, their own integrity and perpetuity, as the Congregational churches of this state. Our obligations and motives, as ministers, to avail ourselves of these advantages, upon evangelical principles, are obvious. The novelty and peculiarity of our circumstances, demand that, as ministers, we see eye to eye, and act in concert with unhesitating cordiality. The withdrawal of civil aid has thrown upon all denominations the responsibility of supporting their religious institutions by moral influence and harmonious effort; has quickened around us exertions which will go far to embody, under some form of religion, the entire population of the state, which is not within the enclosure of our vineyard; and, we may add, the entire population *within*, whose edification we neglect. But each feeble church and society, alienated and lost, impairs the strength and endangers the existence of another, which, by the same neglect, will be lost. Our example has called forth the laudable exertions of other denominations to build up their own feeble churches. And if with such union quickened into activity around us, such neglect prevails among us, as preceded and has attended the operations of this society, *no spirit of prophecy is necessary to see that the balance of population in this state will progressively change sides, and throw the Congregational churches into a minority, both as to numbers and religious influence.* Nothing can be more certain than that such united and persevering *adverse moral influence* as will be brought to bear steadily on the mass of our people, will, if unbalanced by united and steady influence on our part, produce its result. *Moral power unresisted is as certain in its result as physical power is unresisted.* A slight effort now will place our churches in as high a state of prosperity and moral safety as was

ever granted or can be conceived: and what account, brother, can we give of our stewardship, if, with our eyes open on this state of things, we *refuse* to feed the sheep and lambs in our enclosure, and thus compel them to starve or scatter?

“We are not insensible that some difficulties have been felt in the way of contributions. The *law* of the state has been thought, by some, to prohibit congregational contributions to aid feeble churches and societies of our denomination; but we have examined the law, and are persuaded that no such construction can justly be attached to it.

“Urged to the work, as we now are, by an energy of *moral influence*, so certain and *disastrous* if not *counteracted* by our faithful and united efforts, are we not called upon, in the prospect of so great a good, and in the prescience of so great an evil, to surmount *little difficulties* and to lay aside *little objections*, and to unite in the glorious effort of giving a pastor to every feeble church and society in the state? If we should still hesitate and divide, and finally abandon the attempt, would it not constitute a fearful indication of spiritual infatuation and judicial blindness, and the utter abandonment of heaven? We beseech you, brother, to *pray* over the subject, as we doubt not you have done, and to use your influence with your own church and people, to obtain, *this fall*, a contribution to our funds. Already we have reason to believe that some are in heaven as the fruits of our labors—many on their way thither—and that in the result, if we persevere, we shall meet, ere long, a multitude, to whom the gospel, preached by the charity of our churches, was made a savor of life unto life.

“SAMUEL MERWIN,
“NATH’L. TAYLOR,
“TIMOTHY DWIGHT,
“Committee of Missions.”

NEW HAVEN, September 16, 1823.

* * *

On the subject of the circular, the editor of the *American Eagle* has addressed a letter to the leaders of the Congregational clergy, from which we select the following:—

“If you will listen to no suggestions that you have abandoned and perverted the precepts of the gospel to accomplish your favorite object, will you hearken to suggestions that your *policy* is a mistaken one, and likely to end in the defeat of your object?

“You have for your object, 1st, The spread of the gospel only— or, 2d, The accumulation of funds— or, 3d, It is a mere *policy*, and that policy the increase of *our* sect, and your own ascendancy over other sects, and the people.

“The first you allege is your only motive; but it is very much doubted. The second you deny; but many believe it. But that the third comes in for a principal share in your motives, is not only too evident to deny, but is now proved by confessions in the foregoing circular.

“And was it policy to send such a thing as that about the state, to each of the clergymen of our order? Was it policy to put such a weapon in the hands of enemies? Was it policy thus to increase towards you, as a body of men, the jealousy and suspicions of the legislature of the state and the people at large, by thus urging the violation of a statute of the state, which protects worshipping assemblies in the sanctuary on the Sabbath from your incessant demands for missionary funds? Is there a statute in the revised laws containing a plainer command than that you shall be subject to a penalty if you read your briefs without being first allowed to do so by the governor? Have you forgotten that you, only about three months before, petitioned the legislature for liberty to do it, and by that act acknowledged that you knew the statute was against you? Have you forgotten that it was on that petition that Mr. Plant, the lieutenant governor, gave the casting vote in the senate against you, and thereby did himself so much honor as a man, a christian, and a statesman, by showing his firmness in endeavoring to protect the worshippers of God from your incessant trespasses on the Sabbath and the sanctuary? With this public act of yours last spring, acknowledging you knew better, how could you so soon come out with your circular, alleging there was no law against it? or did you suppose that these circulars would be seen by none but the clergy? Did you suppose that no statesman who had his eye upon you would dare to send one of them to a press for general publicity? Did you suppose that no press would be sufficiently bold and free to call your conduct in question? If so, how much mistaken in that, as well as in giving such evidence of *ambition and impatience of restraint* under the laws of the state.

“Was it policy to let our your secret motives in that circular, and thus, by your own confessions, prove that *sectarian* ascendancy is your aim in this missionary scheme—that you must have more money, or “*the balance of population of the state would change sides, and throw the Congregational churches into the minority, both as to numbers and religious influence?*” These are your own words in the circular. They are indeed true—but it is not more missionary money you want to prevent it—you must have more RELIGIOUS HONESTY. You want, not *more* ministers, but *better* ones. Those who do not “the work of the Lord deceitfully,” nor worship Mammon more than the true God, are much wanted. You must do away the growing impression that you are shepherds caring for nothing but the *fleece* at home, under the pretence of clothing others abroad, before the sheep at home will flock to your folds.

“*Moral power unresisted, being equal to physical force unresisted,*” is an avowal to one another that your object is to obtain that *entire dominion* over the *minds* of men, as will be equal to *physical force*—that is, as will be equal to having the government in your own hands. An entire clerical dominion

over the minds of men, which you acknowledge to be your aim, would indeed be equal to that; but were you not rather weak in policy to put the secret *on paper*, and thus let it so early get out?

“Only a word more of your circular. You, or, it seems, these three men, by your order, call breaking over the laws of the state “*little objections*,” “*little difficulties*,” and advise to “*pray over the subject!!!*” What, *pray over breaking the laws*? Why, you have got to be as bad as old Oliver Cromwell in mingling *devotion with violence*; or did you mean to *fight for the cash*, and then *pray* for getting the *moral power* equal to the physical power you mention?”

WHEN the Messiah was crowned Lord of All, he sent out missionaries, called and qualified to proclaim salvation to the ends of the earth, and to set up his kingdom in the world. Behold their success in the following abstract from Paley's Evidences, p. 235.

“The institution, which properly began only after its author's removal from the world, before the end of thirty years has spread itself throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria; almost all the numerous districts of the Lesser Asia, through Greece, and the islands of the Ægean Sea, the sea coast of Africa, and had extended itself to Rome and into Italy. At Antioch in Syria, at Joppa, Ephesus, Corinth, Thessalonica, Berea, Iconium, Derbe, Antioch in Pisidia, at Lydia, Saron, the number of converts is intimated by the expressions “a great number,” “great multitudes,” “much people.” Converts are mentioned, without any designation of their number, at Tyre, Cesarea, Troas, Athens, Philippi, Lystra, Damascus.—During all this time, Jerusalem continued not only the centre of the mission, but a principal seat of the religion; for when Saint Paul returned thither, at the conclusion of the period of which we are not considering the accounts, the other apostles pointed out to him, as a reason for his compliance with their advice, “how many thousand [myriads, ten thousand] there were in that city who believed.” Thus the work goes on in which the Lord has a hand.”

* * *

NUMBERS of our neighboring clergy read the *Christian Baptist*, and having read it, as public censors of the press, tell their people, on “the Sabbath,” that they ought not to read it; that it is dangerous to families to admit it within their walls. (Because it recommends the scriptures as their own interpreter, and exposes the tricks of the clergy.) This is like themselves. On all occasions when the craft has been in danger, they have acted thus. The clergy once obtained a decree that every man's goods should be confiscated, who admitted into his house the writings of a monk, who opposed the priesthood, and recommended the Bible. But, to save the clergy from the sin of “Sabbath-breaking,” we will give any of them an opportunity of publishing in this paper, *literatim et punctuatim*, any thing they have to offer

in their own defence, or against us. We shall give them page for page. Do, then, gentlemen, come forward manfully, and speak out against us. We speak openly. Come and do likewise.

EDITOR.

* * *

QUERIES.

DID God ever *call* a man to any work for which he was not fully qualified, and in the performance of which he was not successful?

Ans. No, if we except the modern preachers at home, and those called missionaries abroad. They say they are *specially called*, but neither their qualifications nor their success warrant the belief of these professions. With an open Bible in my hand, I must say that God never called a man to any work for which he was not fully qualified, and in the performance of which he was not successful.

If you believed yourself specially called of God to preach the gospel to the Birman, what would *you* do?

Ans. I would not ask the leave of any Board of Missions, nor their support; but, confiding in the power and faithfulness of him that called me, I would, without conferring with flesh and blood, depart, and look to Heaven for every provision, protection, and support, by land and sea, necessary for safe conduct thither, and also for success when I arrived. If I could not thus act, I could not believe myself called, nor expect success in the undertaking. This reason requires. But enthusiasm, superstition, or covetousness would prompt one to apply to flesh and blood for patronage and support, and at the same time to profess to be called of God and to rely upon him for protection and success.

EDITOR.

* * *

AMERICAN INDIANS.

A PERSON on a tour through a part of New York and Canada, in a letter published in the American Daily Advertiser, speaking of the *Six Nations*, observes:—

“To these people, and to every Indian nation of our continent, has the approach of the white population been fatal—fatal in depriving them of their property by degrees, of their independence in the end, and almost immediately of their morality. Even those remnants of their former possessions, which they have been left in the enjoyment of, under the title of reservations, are continually exciting the cupidity of the whites.”

Reformer.

* * *

ANECDOTE.

THE University of Louvain complained to Margaret, sister of Charles V. and governess of the Netherlands, that Luther, by his writings, was subverting christianity. “Who is this Luther?”

said she. "A poor illiterate monk," was the reply. "Is he so?" said Margaret. "Then do you, who are so very learned and so very numerous, write against this ignorant monk, and the world will pay more regard to so many scholars than to one blockhead."

Ibid.

* * *

THE Church Missionary Society are about to establish a Seminary for the education of Missionaries. The cost of the premises, buildings, furniture, &c. is expected to amount to nearly £10,000, or *forty-four thousand, four hundred and forty-four dollars.*

Ibid.

* * *

No. 9.

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1824.

VOL. I.

ESSAYS

On Ecclesiastical Characters, Councils, Creeds, and Sects.—No. I.

HAVING paid little attention to the clergy of our time, we shall now examine the principles, views, and circumstances, that gave rise to such an order of men. The modern clergy are much indebted to those who laid the foundation of their empire. Other men have labored, and they have entered into their labors. Little do many think, and indeed little do they know, that the modern clergy are indebted to Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Epicurus, and a thousand Pagan philosophers, Jewish and Christian theorists, for the order of things which they found ready to their hand, soon as they put on the sacerdotal robes. Philosophers originated opinions, opinions obtained disciples, disciples made sects, sects adopted creeds, creeds required councils, councils published canons; and all these created and required priests to illustrate, to approbate, and to fulminate their decisions. The consolidation of systems of measures for establishing and perpetuating a flourishing spiritual commonwealth, required a thousand ingredients that escape public notice, because not submitted to public inspection.

Our plan requires us to notice the ancient philosophers and the sects which they established, as many of their opinions were early imbibed by most of the christian teachers, and were soon a constituent in their creeds. We shall begin with Pythagoras.

This philosopher flourished about 550 years before Christ. He travelled extensively, and spent twenty-five years in Egypt in quest of knowledge. He opened a school at Croton in Italy, which was much frequented by Grecian and Italian youths. He was the first man that called himself a philosopher, and gave currency to the name. He inculcated on his pupils the austerities of the Egyptian priests. He obliged them all to put their property into a common stock, and thus to have all things in common. He used the three sorts of style adopted by the Egyptians in teaching their mysteries—the simple, the hieroglyphical, and

the symbolical. He preferred the last. He first called the word *kosmos*, from its order and beauty; and became famous for his skill in geometry, astronomy, and arithmetic. But this theological principles are those which we have in view. He taught that

“All mankind lived in some pre-existent state, and that for the sins committed by them in that state, some of their souls were sent into human bodies, and others into brutes, to be punished for, and to be purged from, their former sins. Viewing the whole brutal creation to be animated by human souls, he held it unlawful to kill any animal, and to eat animal food. In order to purge themselves from sins committed in a pre-existent state, he taught his disciples to practise long fastings, and other severities, to subdue their bodily appetites, and to subordinate all desires to the soul. These were the grand peculiarities of his system.”

Socrates flourished 400 years before Christ. He is said to have taught (for he left nothing in writing behind him) that

“The soul of man is immortal, because immaterial; that there is but one supreme God; that there are demons that superintend the affairs of this world; that man ought not to pursue riches or worldly honors, but to cultivate their minds and to practise virtue. It is believed that he borrowed some of his ideas from the Jewish scriptures.”

Plato, the scholar of Socrates, flourished 348 years before Christ. It is chiefly from his writings that we learn the sentiments of Socrates. He improved upon the principles of Socrates, and his fame transcended that of all other philosophers, in the department of religion and morality. He taught that

“The universe was governed by a being of glorious power and wisdom, possessed of perfect liberty, and independence. That there were a certain *invincible malignity* and *corruption in matter*, insuperable by the power of God. That the human soul is an *emanation* from God, so, necessarily immortal; that evil must necessarily exist from the union of matter and mind in the human person; that demons were an order of beings inferior to the Diety, but superior to men, and that they governed the world; consequently, that they should be worshipped because of their agency in human affairs. Some of them he viewed as mediators, “carrying men’s prayers to God and his answers to men.” In his *Timaeus* he declares, that “it is neither easy to find the parent of the universe, nor safe to discover him to the vulgar when found.” He therefore taught, that in matters of worship, his disciples ought to govern themselves by the laws of their country (*nomos poleos*.) This was the maxim of Socrates, and to it Plato agreed. In his Book viii. De Rep. he orders “worship and rites to be performed to the gods, and to demons, and to Esculapius, lest he should too much shock the prejudices of the vulgar.”

Aristotle, the disciple of Plato, flourished 332 years before Christ. He taught that

“*Matter* was eternal; that the world, by powers natural to matter, hath continued from all eternity the same as we see it, and that there exists nothing in the universe distinct from matter; that the present course of things, consisting of the motions of the heavens, and of the successive generations and corruptions of animals and vegetables, can neither be interrupted nor destroyed by anything extraneous, but must continue forever. As for the Deity, if there were any, he taught that it is a nature happy in the contemplation of itself, and entirely regardless of human affairs.”

Epicurus, founder of the Epicurean system of philosophy in Greece, flourished 270 years before Christ. The Epicureans maintained that

“The world arose from chance; that the gods, whose existence they did not dare to deny, neither did nor could extend their providential care to human affairs; that the soul was *mortal*; that *pleasure* was to be regarded as the ultimate end of man, and that virtue was neither worthy of esteem nor choice but with a view to the attainment of pleasure.*

Zeno, the first teacher of the Stoic system, flourished in Greece 264 years before Christ.

“The god of the Stoics is described as a corporeal being, united to matter by a necessary connexion, and subject to the determination of an *immutable fate*. This *fate* is, however, explained by the Stoics to be the wise counsels of their sovereign, to which he is obliged to conform, and from which he can never depart. When the Stoics say Jupiter is subject to *fate*, they mean he is subject to the wisdom of his own counsels, and must act in conformity with his supreme perfections. They said that the existence of the soul was confined to a certain period of time. They looked with indignant contempt upon effeminate vices. Simplicity and moderation were carried to the extreme of austerly, and external good and evil were viewed with haughty contempt.”

The Cynic philosophy, taught first by Antisthenes, was so similar in its moral discipline to that of the Stoics, that we shall subjoin the sum of moral doctrine of Antisthenes and the Cynic sect:

“Virtue alone is a sufficient foundation for a happy life. Virtue consists, not in a vain ostentation of learning, or an idle display of words, but in a steady course of right conduct. Wisdom and virtue are the same. A wise man will always be contented with his condition, and will live rather according to the precepts of virtue, than according to the laws or customs of his country. Wisdom is a secure and impregnable fortress—virtue, armor which cannot be taken away. Whatever is honorable is good—whatever is disgraceful is evil. Virtue is the only bond of friendship. It is better to associate with a few good men against a vicious multitude, than to join the vicious, however numerous, against the good. The love of pleasure is a temporary madness.

The following maxims and apothegms are also ascribed to Antisthenes: As rust consumes iron, so doth envy consume the heart of man. That state is hastening to ruin, in which no difference is made between good and bad men. The harmony of brethren is a stronger defence than a wall of brass. A wise man converses with the wicked, as a physician with the sick, not to catch the disease, but to cure it. A philosopher gains at least one thing from his manner of life—a power of conversing with himself. The most necessary part of learning is, to unlearn our errors. The man who is afraid of another, whatever he may think of himself, is a slave. Antisthenes, being told that a bad man had been praising him, said, What foolish thing have I been doing?"

The *Academics*, who, with the Epicureans, were the most numerous of the Grecian sects at the christian era, despaired of finding truth in such a variety of opinions, and therefore taught that

"It was *uncertain* whether the gods existed or not; whether the soul was mortal or immortal; whether virtue were preferable to vice, or vice to virtue."

The Eclectics supposed that many things were unreasonable and absurd in all the systems of philosophy, and therefore set about forming a new system, comprising, what they supposed, the most reasonable tenets and doctrines of all the sects." This eclectic philosophy was taught with great success in Alexandria in Egypt, when the Messiah was born. And Philo the Jew, who was a member of this sect, represents it as very flourishing in Egypt at that time. The Eclectics held Plato in the highest esteem, yet they made no scruple to join with his doctrines whatever they thought conformable to reason in the tenets and opinions of other philosophers.

Hitherto we have mentioned only the systems of philosophy that obtained first among the Greeks, and afterwards among the Romans. We shall just, in the same brief manner, notice the oriental philosophy, denominated by orientalists, not philosophy, but *science*. The votaries of the oriental science were numerous in Persia, Syria, Chaldea, and Egypt. Of this science there were many sects. It is worthy of remark, that while "the Grecian and Roman sects of philosophy were much divided about the first principles of science, all the sects of the oriental science deduced their tenets from one fundamental principle." This science supposed that

"The origin of evils which the universe abounds, was to be found, not in God, whom they viewed as essentially good and benevolent; but as there was nothing *beyond* or *without the* Deity but *matter*, therefore *matter* is the centre and source of all evil,

*Pleasure is supposed by some to mean, in this system, not only sensual, but to comprehend moral and intellectual pleasures. "If so," says a learned writer, "in what does the scheme of Epicurus, as respects virtue, differ from the opinion of those christian philosophers, who maintain that self-love is the only spring of all human affections and actions."

of all vice. That matter was eternal and derived its present form, not from the will of the supreme God, but from the creating power of some inferior intelligence, to whom the world and its inhabitants owed their existence. Some imagined *two eternal principles* from whence all things proceeded, the one presiding over *light* and the other over matter; and by their perpetual conflict, explained the mixture of good and evil that appears in the universe. Others maintained that the being that presided over matter was not an *eternal* principle, but a subordinate intelligence, one of those whom the supreme God produced from himself. They supposed that this being was moved by a sudden impulse to reduce to order the rude mass of matter, and to create the human race. A third sort fell upon another system, and said that there was a triple divine principle, or a triumvirate of beings, in which the supreme Deity, was distinguished from the material, and from the Creator of this world. The Supreme Being they supposed to be as a radiant light, most pure, diffused through the immensity of space, called the *pleroma*. The eternal nature, having dwelt long in solitude, produced from *itself* two minds of a different sex, which resembled the Supreme Parent in the most perfect manner. In process of time from these *two* proceeded a celestial family. These were called *Æons*. How many of these there were was not decided. The Creator of this world they called *Demiurge*.

“Man, they considered a compound of terrestrial and celestial nature—of the evil principle matter, and of the Divinity. Those who subdue the evil principle that propels them to sin against the Supreme ascend directly to the Pleroma. Those yielding to the evil principle shall be sent after death into other bodies until they awake from their sinful lethargy. In the end the Supreme God shall come forth victorious, and, having delivered from their servitude the greatest part of those enslaved souls, shall dissolve the frame of this visible world and involve it in ruin. After this, primitive tranquility will be restored in the universe, and God shall reign with happy spirits in undisturbed felicity through endless ages.”

Such were the prominent features of the oriental philosophy. Among the Jews, prior to the birth of the Messiah, there was also a variety of opinions and sects. They imbibed many of the opinions popular among the sects of philosophers, and even some of the superstitious notions of the Egyptians, Syrians, and Arabians, who lived in their neighborhood. In Palestine the Jewish and Samaritan religions flourished at the christian era. The Samaritans originated in the time of king Rehoboam. Shalmanesser, king of Assyria, having besieged Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of Israel, contradistinguished from the capital of the kingdom of Judah, carried the people captive and filled their place with Babylonians, Cutheans, and other idolators. These having obtained an Israelitish priest to instruct them in the ancient religion of the land, embraced the Jews' religion, with

which they mixed a great part of their own idolatry. After the return of the Jews from their captivity they entirely quitted the worship of idols. They, though united in religion with the Jews, quarreled with them about the rebuilding of the temple; and when they could not prevail they erected a temple on Mount Gerizim, in opposition to that at Jerusalem. The Jews and Samaritans, like many sects in our time, who approximate very nigh to each other, but go not the whole length, cherished a cordial antipathy against each other; so much so, as to have no dealings with one another. The Jews were divided into *three* principal sects, besides many subordinate ones, at the christian epoch—the Essenes, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees. The Essenes dwelt generally in solitude, and maintained that

“Religion consisted wholly in contemplation and silence. They practised a most religious abstinence. Many of them lived in celibacy, and observed a variety of penitential exercises and mortifications, borrowed from Egypt, where many of them dwelt. The Essenes of Syria thought it possible to appease God by sacrifices, though in a manner quite different from the Jewish. Others maintained that a serene and composed mind, addicted to the contemplation of divine things, was the only sacrifice acceptable to God. They viewed the law of Moses as an allegorical system of spiritual and mysterious truths, and renounced all regard to its *letter* in the explication of it. They held absolute predestination and that only the soul would be punished in a future state.”

The Sadducees maintained that

“Only the *written* law was divine authority; that neither the oral law nor the prophets were to be regarded as of divine authority; that the written law was to be interpreted literally; that there was no resurrection, nor future state, angel, nor human spirit; that there was no predestination; that man was an absolute master of all his actions.”

The Pharisees taught that

“The law of Moses, the prophets, and the oral law, or the traditions of the elders, were of equal authority; that there was a resurrection of the dead, a future state, angels and spirits; that the children of Abraham alone should be raised from the dead and enter into future happiness; that there should be eating and drinking in a future state; and that every man would be reunited to his former wife. They held absolute predestination, and at the same time, with the Sadducees, they held free will. They separated from all they deemed sinners, and would not so much as eat or drink with them. They held that the words of the Old Testament had a *double* sense—the one *literal*, the other *mysterious*. They were strict observers of all the traditions of the elders, and cultivated a very sanctified appearance in the presence of the people.”

Such were the leading moral and religious philosophical sects that were flourishing when the Messiah was born. Besides these

there was an endless variety of subdivisions. Nearly three hundred different opinions were entertained amongst the Romans concerning the *summum bonum*, or chief good. Thus the Messiah found the world with respect to opinion; and as respected the worship of idols in all its variety, volumes could do no more than give their names. Their gods, their temples, their priests, their sacrifices, and their festivals, would require an age to unfold.

The use we intend to make of the preceding documents in the course of this work, demanded this brief notice of them. We hope our readers will ultimately agree with us in the necessity of giving this abstract.

EDITOR.

* * *

EXTRACTS FROM MY SENTIMENTAL JOURNAL.

[*Never before published*]

No. 1

IN approaching the city we met multitudes of men and women flying in every direction, some of them having literally forsaken all that they had; husbands had left their wives, parents their children, and children their parents. I asked every one who would stop to hear me, what was the matter. I always heard in reply, "The barbarian foes, the ruthless band, the merciless Scythians are approaching our city." Have they yet entered it, replied I. "No," said they. Are they yet in sight, I rejoined. I was again answered in the negative. Why then do you hasten? was the last question their trepidation would afford me time to ask. The answer which I received was pronounced with uncommon vehemence. Every feature in their face, and every tone corresponded with the import of their reply. It was this—"Twelve heralds of undoubted veracity gave the intelligence that they were just at hand, arrayed in all the vengeance of savage ferocity, stimulated to furious excess, from the ills they had received from our nation." I joined the fugitives, and, after retiring to a cave, fell into the following reflections:—

What an advantage to mankind that they have received from their Creator the capacity of faculty of being so certain of what they have not seen, of that for which they have not the evidence of sense, as to be moved, excited, and impelled to every kind of exertion, suited to the nature of the case, from what they have believed, as though they had seen it. The uncultivated citizen, as well as the sage philosopher, are equally certain, and equally moved by the belief of testimony. It is a blessing, thought I, an inexpressible favor, that we have this capacity of being assured of what we have not seen, of what we have not felt, upon the testimony of others, and that this is as common to all mankind as instinct is to brutes, and so perfect at first that it is not capable of improvement; for a child believes as firmly, what it can apprehend, as a hoary-headed sage. This people, thought I, have been saved by faith—saved from the jaws of destruction,

by believing what the twelve heralds reported. I could not but reflect with surprise at the stupidity of those rabbinical doctors who have made so many nonsensical distinctions about the way and manner of believing, and the different kinds of faith. I found those people saved their lives by faith, without ever stopping to inquire of what kind their faith was; the only inquiry was about the evidence—about the number, character, ability, and faithfulness of the witnesses. Being satisfied upon these points, they were never thought of consulting their own feelings upon the occasion. But the fact which they believed operated upon all that was within them, just according to its own nature. It produced all its natural results; for every fact believed has its natural or necessary results, and from the nature of all things it must necessarily be so. It was not their belief or their faith, abstract from the fact, that saved them; but the fact believed, that produced such a change upon them and upon their conduct. In one word, these people were saved by the belief of one fact, and that fact was of so great importance as to change their views and practice.

Leaving the cave, and making my retreat into the interior of the country, I met, after a few days, an old acquaintance, *Timothy Stedfast*, who used to be rather of a melancholy temperament, when employed as a menial servant in the service of Lord A. His countenance, attire, and gait astonished me. Instead of that downcast aspect, and evil-boding, melancholic appearance, a peculiar cheerfulness overspread his countenance, and an eye beaming with joy, indicated that some marvelous change had taken place in the views and circumstances of Timothy. His raiment, too, was not of that rough and homespun texture as that in which he formerly performed his services in the fields and gardens of his former master. He was sumptuously appareled, and even his style of address and demeanor participated in the general elevation and improvement in his aspect. What! said I, so far from home, friend Timothy! "Yes," said he, "and I must be farther yet; I am just going to the sea coast to embark for Jamaica." What! to Jamaica? "O yes, and I would go much farther on the same errand." Pray can you inform me of the nature of your errand? "Yes, with pleasure, and no doubt it will give you joy to know it." Say on. "You know I had an old uncle, of whom I once told you, living in Jamaica, who was very rich; his children being all dead, he has left me his vast estate, and now I am going to possess it; it is said to be worth half a million, and the old gentleman having lately departed this life, has bequeathed the whole of it to your humble servant." Indeed! said I. But how do you know that such is the fact? He replied, that three persons whom he once knew, men of undoubted veracity, had written to him informing him of the fact; "besides," said he, "a copy of his last will and testament has been forwarded to me, to which the seal of the chief magistrate is appended. I am certain, I am certain," exclaimed he. "It is

a fact." O then, said I, I wish you all possible happiness; but be mindful that you were once poor. We parted.

I began to muse again on the excellency and power of faith. Truly I thought it was *the "confidence of things hoped for, and the conviction of things not seen."* And what first struck me with irresistible force, was, *that the fact believed always operates according to its own nature.* What a change in the views, feelings, appearance, and pursuits of Timothy! Once a rough, unpolished, downcast, desponding servant; now he possesses a smooth and polished exterior, a cheerful countenance, and a joyful heart; rich in faith, though not yet in actual possession of the inheritance. How powerful the principle! What an impulse to activity, industry, and perseverance! He forsakes the land of his nativity, his father's house, his kindred, and the companions of his youth; he encounters the toils of a long journey, perils by land and dangers by sea, from the influence of faith. This is the cause, the sole cause, of this extraordinary change. He cultivates the manners, the style, the demeanor, suitable to his anticipated circumstances; and though yet not in possession of the inheritance, rejoices in hope of realizing all his expectations. And what still astonishes me *the belief of one fact* thus converts the man—not the way and manner of believing, but the fact believed is the whole mystery.

I was roused from my meditations upon this striking instance of the nature and power of faith, by meeting a friend whom I had met a few days ago, in all the cheerfulness and joy of good health, of good circumstances, of the finest animal spirits, light, gay, buoyant; but now clothed in mourning, and of a sad and dejected appearance. A heavy sigh and a cheek washed with tears indicated the bitterness of her grief. With querulous accents she told me that two friends, of great respectability of character, had written to her that her aged father, her younger brothers, and sisters, had perished by the victorious barbarians in the late invasion; that her father did not hear the tidings in time to effect an escape. I told her not to faint in the day of adversity; besides, said I, it may not be so bad as you expect: perhaps your informants were not assured of the fact. "Oh!" exclaimed she, "I could wish I could not believe their testimony; but I know their character and their competency to give certain information; and I am certain, yes, undoubtingly certain, that such is the fact." I dismounted and retired to an inn, where I spent the evening in meditating upon the simplicity, the power, and excellency of faith. The following conclusions were the necessary results of the scenes through which I had recently passed:—

1. In the first place the singular power of faith is manifested in all places and amongst all people. It demonstrates itself to be one of the common, the most common, and intelligible principles of action; and produces the greatest changes in human character, in the views and pursuits of mankind. It overcomes the greatest

difficulties, and impels men to the highest achievements known in the world.

2. It always operates according to the fact believed. Joy and sorrow, love and hatred, fear and hope, are the effects of the fact believed, and not of the manner of believing, so much talked of.

3. Evidence alone produces faith, or testimony is all that is necessary to faith. This is demonstrably evident in every case; and therefore the certainty felt is always proportioned to the character of the testimony produced. Faith is capable of being greatly increased in many instances; but only in one way, and that is, either by affording additional evidence, or by brightening the evidences already produced. To exhort men to believe, or to try to scare them into faith by loud vociferations, or to cry them into faith by effusions of natural or mechanical tears, without submitting evidence, is as absurd as to try to build a house or plant a tree in a cloud.

4. Faith, abstract from *facts*, produces no substantial, no real effect. Faith and opinions have nothing to do with each other—there is no consanguinity between them. A man might as reasonably expect to support animal life by the simple act of chewing, as to be saved by the mere act of believing. It is not a man's eating that keeps him alive, but what he does eat; so it is not a man's believing that saves his soul, but what he does believe.

5. All controversies about the nature of faith, about the different kinds of modern faith, are either learned or unlearned nonsense, calculated to deceive and bewilder the superstitious multitudes that hang upon the lips of spiritual guides. The only, the grand question with every man is, What is *fact*, or *truth*? This ascertained, and let there be no inquiries about *how* a man believes, or whether his faith be of the right kind. If a man really believes any fact, his faith soon becomes apparent by the influence of the fact upon him.

6. No person can help believing when the evidence of truth arrests his attention. And without evidence it is as impossible to believe, as to bring something out of nothing.

7. The term *faith* is used in the Bible in the commonly received sense of mankind, and the faith which we have in the testimony of God differs from that we have in the testimony of men in this one respect only—that as men may be deceived, and may deceive others, so the confidence we repose in their testimony, in some instances, may be very limited, but as God cannot be deceived himself, neither can deceive others, so the confidence we have in his testimony is superior to that we repose in the testimony of men; and as the word comes to us in demonstration of the Holy Spirit, or attested unto us by the supernatural gifts which accompanied the testimony of the original witnesses; so it affords the highest possible evidence, and therefore produces the greatest confidence. If we receive the testimony of men, saith John, and act upon it in the most important concerns, the

testimony of God is greater, and is capable of producing greater certainty, and infinitely worthy of being acted upon in the all important concerns of the world to come. EDITOR.

* * *

THAT JESUS IS THE CHRIST.

GEORGE King is the name of a man; but that George is king, is a proposition that expresses what either is, or is not a fact. And that *George is the king* is a proposition not only more definite than *George is king*, but it expresses something more. It expresses that he is either the chief of kings, or that he is *the king* spoken of or referred to by the speaker. This, we presume, is apprehended by all. Now, Jesus Christ is the name of a person, but that *Jesus is Christ*, or that *Jesus is the Christ*, is a proposition that is either true or false. In the four gospels, or during the lifetime of the Messiah, the term Christ was never applied to him as a proper name, but as an appellative. After some time it was used as a proper name, and frequently without the name Jesus attached to it, designated the Saviour. Thus, when Matthew wrote "*the lineage of Jesus Christ*," he uses the word as a proper name; but it is obvious to all, from the perusal of the four gospels, especially in the original, or in Campbell's improved translation, that the term *Christ* was never addressed to the Saviour, while on earth, as a *proper name*, but as an *appellative*. The use of the article in the Greek is lost in many places in the English by the negligence or misapprehensions of king James' translators.—Dr. Campbell observes in his Preliminary Dissertations, vol. i. p. 223, "If we were to judge by the common version, or even by most versions into modern tongues, we should consider the word as rather a proper name than an appellative, or name of office, and should think of it only as a surname given to our Lord. Our translators have contributed greatly to this mistake, by very seldom prefixing the article before *Christ*, though it is rarely wanting in the original. The word *Christ* was at first as much an appellative as the word *baptist* was, and the one was as regularly accompanied with the article as the other. Yet our translators, who always say *the baptist*, have, one would think, studiously avoided saying *the Christ*. This may appear, to superficial readers, an inconsiderable difference; but the addition of the article will be found, when attended to, of real consequence for conveying the meaning in English, with the same perspicuity and propriety with which it is conveyed in Greek. So much virtue there is in the article; which, in our opinion, is never prefixed to the name of a man, though it is invariably prefixed to the name of office, unless where some pronoun or appropriating expression renders it unnecessary; that, without it, the sense is always darkened, and sometimes marred. Thus, in such expressions as these, *This Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ—Paul testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ—Showing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ*—the unlearned reader forms no distinct apprehension, as the common application of the words leads him uni-

formly to consider Jesus and Christ, as no other than the name and surname of the same person. It would have conveyed to such a reader precisely the same meaning to have said, *Paul testified to the Jews that Christ was Jesus*; and so of the rest. The article alone, therefore, in such cases, adds considerable light to the expression, yet no more than what the words of the historian manifestly convey to every reader who understands his language. It should be, therefore, *Paul testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ, or the Messiah, &c.* Many other examples might be brought to the same purpose; but these are sufficient."

That Jesus is the Christ is proposed to us as a fact in the New Testament. But what is implied in the term Christ? John tells us that it is a correct translation of the word *Messiah*. Now both terms denote one and the same thing; for *Messiah* is Hebrew, and *Christ* in Greek, signify *anointed*. That *Jesus is the anointed*, is, in our tongue, equivalent to *Jesus is the Christ*. But still a question may occur, What is the meaning or peculiar import of the term *anointed* in this connexion? To this we answer from the Bible, that persons designed for the office of king, for the office of high priest, and, sometimes, for the office of a prophet, were, by a divine command, *anointed with oil*, and thus empowered and consecrated by God to the office for which they were designated. Thus Saul was called the Lord's anointed, and this consideration prevented David from taking away his life when obnoxious to his wrath and in his power. David also, and the kings of Judah were thus consecrated and empowered to act as kings, as viceroys, under God, over Israel. In allusion to this ceremony of inauguration, Paul applies to our King these words, "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy associates in office," above all the prophets, priests, and kings that were ever sent to Israel.

Three eminent prophets, David, Isaiah, and Daniel, represent the promised Deliverer as an anointed prophet, an anointed priest, and an anointed king. Isaiah represents him as an anointed prophet, chap. lxi. 1. "The Lord has anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor." Daniel represents him as an anointed priest, chap. ix. 25. 26. "And after threescore and two weeks shall the anointed, Messiah the Prince, be cut off, but not for himself," &c. David, in the second psalm, represents him as an anointed king. He represents the alliance of the kings of the earth against the Lord's anointed, and sings his coronation upon Zion the hill of his holiness. The whole of the salvation which sinful men require is comprised in the performance of these three offices. We are ignorant, guilty, and enslaved. To remove ignorance is the office of a prophet; to remove guilt, the office of a priest; and to emancipate and lead to victory, to defend and protect, the office of a king. Now, to believe that *Jesus is the Christ*, is to receive him as the only prophet, the only priest, and the only king, qualified and empowered by our Heavenly Father to instruct us, to atone and intercede for us, to reign over our conscience, to guide, defend,

and lead us to victory. His qualification for these offices, being *the Son of God*, the ONLY BEGOTTEN of the Father, renders him infinitely worthy of our confidence, and constrains us to trust in him with all our hearts. To his word, as our prophet, we look for instruction; to his sacrifice and intercession we look for pardon and acceptance; and to him, as king on the throne of the universe, we yield implicit obedience, and are assured, if we put ourselves under his guidance, he will lead us to complete and triumphant victory. As we have used, and may often use the phrase, "*Jesus is the Christ*," we thought it expedient to give this brief statement of the ideas attached to that phrase.

EDITOR.

* * *

THE FOUNDATION OF HOPE AND OF CHRISTIAN UNION.

MESSIAH is born in the city of David, in the awful crisis alluded to in the first essay in this number. Science had proved itself systematic folly; philosophy, falsely called *moral*, had exhibited its utter incompetency to illuminate the understanding, to purify the heart, to control the passions, to curb the appetites, or to restrain the vices of the world. A scepticism that left nothing certain, a voluptuousness that knew no restraint, a lasciviousness that recognized no law, a selfishness that proscribed every relation, an idolatry that defied every reptile, and a barbarity that brutalized every feeling, had very generally overwhelmed the world, and had grouped those assimilated in vice, under every particular name, characteristic of every species of crime. Amidst the uncertainty, darkness, and vice that overspread the earth, the Messiah appears, and lays a foundation of hope, of true religion, and of religious union, unknown, unheard of, unexpected among men. The Jews were united by consanguinity, and by an agreement in a ponderous ritual. The Gentiles rallied under every opinion, and were grouped, like filings of steel around a magnet, under every possible shade of difference of thought, concerning their mythology. So long as unity of opinion was regarded as a proper basis of religious union, so long have mankind been distracted by the multiplicity and variety of opinions. To establish what is called a system of orthodox opinions as the bond of union, was, in fact, offering a premium for new diversities in opinion, and for increasing, *ad infinitum*, opinions, sects, and divisions. And what is worse than all, it was establishing self-love and pride as religious principles, as fundamental to salvation, for a love regulated by similarity of opinion, is only a love to one's own opinion; and all the zeal exhibited in the defence of it, is but the pride of opinion.

When the Messiah appeared as the founder of a new religion, systems of religion consisting of opinions and speculations upon matter and mind, upon God and nature, upon virtue and vice, had been adopted, improved, reformed, and exploded time after time. That there was always something superfluous, something defec-

tive, something wrong, something that could be improved, in every system of religion and morality, was generally felt, and at last universally acknowledged. But the grandeur, sublimity, and beauty of the foundation of hope, and of ecclesiastical or social union, established by the author and founder of christianity, consisted in this, that **THE BELIEF OF ONE FACT**, *and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation.* The belief of this **ONE FACT**, and submission to **ONE INSTITUTION** expressive of it, is all that is required of Heaven to admission into the church. A christian, as defined, not by Doctor Johnson, nor any creed-maker, but by one taught of Heaven, and in Heaven, is one that believes this *one fact*, and has submitted to *one institution*, and whose deportment accords with the morality and virtue taught by the great Prophet. The one fact is, *that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah.* The evidence upon which it is to be believed is the testimony of *twelve men*, confirmed by prophecy, miracles, and spiritual gifts. The *one institution* is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Every such person is a christian in the fullest sense of the word, the moment he has believed this one fact, upon the above evidence, and has submitted to the above mentioned institution; and whether he believes the five points condemned or the five points approved by the Synod of Dort, is not so much as to be asked of him; whether he holds any of the views of the Calvinists or Armenians, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, or Quakers, is never once to be asked of such a person, in order to admission into the christian community, called the church. The only doubt that can reasonably arise upon these points, is, whether this *one fact*, in its nature and necessary results, can suffice to the salvation of the soul, and whether the open avowal of it, in the overt act of baptism, can be a sufficient recommendation of the person, so professing, to the confidence and love of the brotherhood. As to the first of these, it is again and again asserted, in the clearest language, by the Lord himself, the apostles Peter, Paul, and John, that he that believeth the fact that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, overcomes the world, his eternal life, and shall, on the veracity of God, be saved. This should settle the first point; and as to the second, it is disposed of in a similar manner; for the witnesses agree that whosoever confesses that Jesus is the Christ, and is baptized, should be received into the church; and not an instance can be produced of any person being asked for any other faith, in order to admission, in the whole New Testament. The Saviour expressly declared to Peter, that upon this fact that he was the Messiah, the Son of God, he would *build his church*; and Paul has expressly declared, that "other foundation can no man lay (for ecclesiastical union) than that **JESUS IS THE CHRIST.**" Our translation reads simply, "Jesus Christ," but the article is in the Greek, and it means just as above. The Point is proven that we have assumed, and this proven, every thing in established requisite to the union of all christians upon a

proper basis. Every sectarian scheme falls before it, and on this principle alone can the whole church of Christ be built. We are aware of many objections to this grand scheme, revealed of God, to establish righteousness, peace, and harmony among men; but we know of none that weighs a grain of sand against it. We shall meet them all (*Deo volente*) in due time and place. Some of them have been anticipated in one or two articles preceding. But of these more fully hereafter.

It must strike every man of reflection, that a religion requiring much mental abstraction or exquisite refinement of thought, that calls for the comprehension or even apprehension of refined distinctions and of nice subtleties, is a religion not suited to mankind in their present circumstances. To present such a creed as the Westminster, as adopted either by Baptist or Paido-Baptists; such a creed as the Episcopalian, or, in fact, any sectarian creed, composed, as they all are, of propositions, deduced by logical inferences, and couched in philosophical language, to all those who are fit subjects of the salvation of Heaven—I say, to present such a creed to such for their examination or adoption, shocks all common sense. This pernicious course is what has paganized christianity. Our sects and parties, our disputes and speculations, our orders and casts, so much resemble any thing but christianity, that when we enter a modern synagogue, or an ecclesiastical council, we rather seem to have entered a Jewish sanhedrim, a Mahometan mosque, a Pagan temple, or an Egyptian cloister, than a Christian congregation. Sometimes, indeed, our religious meetings so resemble the Areopagus, the Forum, or the Senate, that we almost suppose ourselves to have been translated to Athens or Rome. Even christian orators emulate Demosthenes and Cicero; christian doctrines are made to assume the garb of Egyptian mysteries, and christian observances put on the pomp and pageantry of pagan ceremonies. Unity of opinion, expressed in subscription to voluminous dogmas imported from Geneva, Westminster, Edinburgh, or Rome, is made the bond of union, and a difference in the tenth, or ten thousandth shade of opinion, frequently becomes the actual cause of dismemberment or expulsion. The New Testament was not designed to occupy the same place in theological seminaries that the carcasses of malefactors are condemned to occupy in medical halls—first dommed to the gibbet, and then to the dissecting knife of the spiritual anatomist. Christianity consists infinitely more in good works than in sound opinions; and while it is a joyful truth that he that believes and is baptized shall be saved, it is equally true that he that saith “I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.”

EDITOR.

* * *

FROM A BAPTIST IN OHIO TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—I WOULD ask you, in the name of my calling, are you trying to raise the dead? Why do you make so much ado about

primitive christianity, which I had thought had been buried together with the scriptures for 1600 years? It is true Luther, Calvin, and some others took some pains to raise some part of it, while the remainder was out of reach of their popular views, and would not be suitable to the taste that then prevailed. Now, sir, let me ask you if you are not afraid that your efforts will terminate to your injury? Were not these men as capable of judging for themselves as you are? and did they not know that modern things were better suited to modern people, than old fashions? Besides, sir, christianity has been so long buried, that it may be said of it as was said of Lazarus—it gives an offensive smell—it is disgusting to our taste. Hence, when you recommend any primitive practice, the moderns cannot endure it, but cry out, “Away with it! away with it!” Do you think that it would avail any thing to tell the ladies of fashion that the old fashions were better than the modern? Would they not reply that it makes no matter—the modern are now in vogue, and the ancient are out of vogue. Just so the people in religious matters. When I say that the Bible is buried, do not mistake me—it is only the simple and plain meaning of it, that has been long since discarded.

As for the clergy, why do you assail them? Do not you know that it is as easy to remove mountains as to convince a man that the very object of his dependance, the very thing that procures him an easy, if not a luxurious living, is all a foolish device—an imposition on the credulity of mankind? What could be more suitable to an indolent man than to have to work only one day in seven to maintain himself and family, and to be esteemed too as a gentleman of the first rank; to march at the head of grand processions; to be placed in the uppermost seats in public assemblies; nay, to be placed, as you once told us, on a wooden throne in the midst of a popular assembly. I think, sir, you would betray no ordinary ignorance of human nature, if you would persevere to convince a man so circumstanced it was the belief of a falsehood put him in such snug and happy circumstances.

I fear, sir, you read the Bible in the old-fashioned way—such as, “Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock; and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” Whereas the clergy read it thus to one another, in its modern sense, “Feed yourselves on the flock of God which is among you, by constraining them to feed you if they do it not of a ready mind; taking the oversight of the flock for filthy lucre’s sake, and not from a willingness to give, but from a willingness to receive. Being as lord’s over God’s heritage, and by no means ensamples to the flock; and when we ministers sit in council you shall have double honor.” I will only refer you to another instance of the modern reading, that you may

be admonished to abandon the project of getting the people to read in the old style. The clergy read Acts viii. 36-39. thus: "And the parents took their child to a certain meeting-house, and said, See here is water in the basin, what does hinder us to have our infant christened? The minister answered and said, If either of you believe, it may be done. The father then answered, saying, I believe in the *Westminster Confession of Faith, and Catechisms Larger and Shorter*. Then the priest, the parents, and the child drew near to the basin, and after consecrating the element, the priest besprinkled the infant's face. Then the spirit of Antichrist caught away the parson and he was found in the sacred desk, and the parents went on their way with the child, crying, until its tears mingled with, and washed off, the sacred dew." Unless you can get the people to read the Bible in the old-fashioned way, your efforts, sir, will be unavailing. Yours truly,

STEADY SEEKTRUTH

* * *

From the Reformer.

[OUR readers are informed that we never insert such pieces as the following without knowing the responsibility of the writer; and in the present instance it is entitled to the fullest credit.]

A gentleman of high respectability as a citizen, as well as a magistrate of distinguished eminence, in the state of New Jersey, related to me, not long since, an occurrence relative to the missionary cause, which highly merits publicity. As your periodical publication has for its object the laudable design of exposing the *arts and stratagems of priestcraft*, in its various forms; for the purpose of undeceiving a *priestridden* community, I send you the narration as nearly verbatim as my memory serves me, withholding at the same time the names, which, however, you can be furnished with, if required. Of the truth of the facts there cannot remain a doubt.

The Rev. Mr.—was, some years since, sent by the missionary society of Connecticut to labor for a limited time as a missionary to the state of Ohio. He entered on his mission; and during his itinerations on the missionary ground a favorable opportunity presented to purchase a large tract of land at a very reduced price. This temptation was too alluring to be misimproved, as the probability of a *fine speculation* would be the result. As he had some *ready funds* on hand, and *more* at command on his return, he ventured to hazard the purchase. Having fulfilled his mission, and rendered an account of his stewardship to the board, he declined any further appointment from them, and immediately prepared to secure the *darling* object of his speculation. This he speedily accomplished, and took up his residence on his recent purchase. Some few years after, having already realized a nett profit of about twenty thousand dollars from his purchase, he was at a certain time

travelling in Ohio, when he happened to fall in company with the gentleman already mentioned from New Jersey, then on a journey in that state. To him that late *reverend* missionary, related the circumstance of his appointment as a missionary, which resulted in the *fortunate speculation* which he had made. On the inquiry being put to him by the magistrate which was the most *pleasant* employment, to *preach the gospel* as a missionary, or to *engage in land speculation*? he replied, "D—n the *preaching*, so long as I can *make more money by speculation!*"

[To deduce a general conclusion from particular occurrences is very bad logic. To infer that because one domestic or ten domestic missionaries act in this way, therefore all missionaries, foreign and domestic, are wicked speculators, would be a very illogical and unjust conclusion. The object of giving publicity to the above, is not to foster such an idea in the minds of any; but to put all on their guard against imposition. Our grand objections against the missionary schemes now in vogue, are not founded upon such occurrences; but upon other premises; and, indeed, one of our objections to the scheme is, that it is very liable to such abuses from the temptations it holds out to a certain class. And although to some the monied considerations attached to missionary laborers could be no object; yet it must be remembered that to some, nay, to many minds, a very small sum is a very great object—*Editor.*]

* * *

ANECDOTES

A LADY in the neighborhood, a member of the Presbyterian church, had not long since lost her young child, and sent for the pastor of the church to preach a funeral sermon. When he arrived he found the good lady in company with a lady not a member of any church, and who had a little time before lost her child too. The ladies were in great affliction about their respective losses, and were endeavoring in the best manner they could to comfort each other. The grave parson addressed his sister with an intention of giving her consolation, and told her she ought not to grieve as those who have no hope, inasmuch as she was a member of the church, had had her child baptized and brought within the pale of the church, and that she, therefore, had every reason to believe her child had gone to happiness. This holy parson, knowing the other lady had lost her child, and was a member of no church, by way of additional comfort to his sister, continued by stating that the case was different as to parents who had not taken the course she had, but neglected the ordinances of the church, for they could have no such hope. This delicate and affectionate conduct of this holy father almost threw the other lady into a state of distraction about the fate of her own child.

THE preceding occurrence, which happened in the vicinity of Paris, Kentucky, reminds us of a similar occurrence in a Roman Catholic country:—

A Catholic and protestant lady who had lost all their children in infancy, sailing together in a packet, were discoursing on their mutual losses, and comforting one another on the happy escape of their infant progeny from the troubles, temptations, and sorrows of this evil world. A Catholic priest who had heard their conversation, took occasion to remark that there was no doubt of the truth of their remarks, provided their children had escaped the pains of purgatory; but, adds he, they who have availed themselves of the benefits of the clergy, and have obtained a release for their relative from that purgatorial prison, may, no doubt, console themselves on the timous escape of their infant offspring from this evil world. The Protestant lady inquired of what nature were the pains of purgatory? His holiness gave her a terrible description of that region, and of the long continuance of many in it. How, replied she, could the term of their suffering be shortened and the acuteness of their pains diminished? By engaging, he answered, the power of the priesthood in their behalf. By what means, was her reply, could they be engaged in their behalf? By the pious oblations of their relatives, according to their ability, and according to the age and character of the sufferer, was his answer. Money, then, said the lady, could do something to enlist the fathers in their behalf. Yes, said he, accompanied by faith. I had, added she, three children, of the age of one month, of six months, and of fourteen months, the last of which died three years since—how much would suffice for their release? How much would you give? said he. I wish to know, sir, how much would suffice. He answered, I will obtain, for £3 10s. their immediate release. My faith fails, exclaimed she; I cannot think that *metal*, however precious on earth, can be of any consequence in those *melting regions* of which you speak.

The difference between his Roman holiness and his Kentucky holiness, in point of delicacy and good sense, is so metaphysically minute as to elude my search; and, in respect to their means of saving infants, so trifling, as not to be worth a conscientious demur. I think the *three pound ten* and the few drops of holy water equally available to the salvation of an infant. And as to the motives of the two priests, they seem more akin than silver ore and water.

Had it not been from the respectability of the gentleman who voucheth for the correctness of the above occurrence, we could scarcely have thought that any Calvinist in Kentucky could have been capable of such an aberration from all that is "manly, good, and true," for the paltry consideration of scaring one into his congregation who might increase his stipend somewhat. And to suppose that it proceeded from any other cause, would be to impeach the understanding of the gentlemen, which would be, indeed, more grievous still; according to a certain philosopher, who teacheth that any man would rather be supposed to be a knave than a simpleton.

Can the rite of sprinkling an infant with consecrated water, O! Calvinists! alter the decree of Heaven? Can your administration of this rite to an infant open the gates of paradise to whomsoever you please? And can the neglect of a parent to bring to you their infant offspring, seal the destruction of that infant? Who gave you the right of thus consigning to endless woe unsprinkled infants, and of opening heaven by a few drops of water to those impaled in your fold? Have you visited the invisible world, and returned fraught with intelligence respecting the destinies of those that submit to your prescriptions, and of those that question your infallibility? Do give us some information on these topics, that we may put our souls, our bodies, and our estates under your direction and management.

EDITOR.

* * *

No. 10.

MONDAY, MAY 3, 1824.

VOL. I.

ESSAYS

**On Ecclesiastical Characters, Councils, Creeds, and Sects—
No. II.**

HAVING in the preceding number introduced the opinions and speculations of the philosophical religionists, before, and at the christian era, we will now give our readers an account of the corruption of the christian religion by those opinions and philosophical religious teachers. This we shall do in the words of one who cannot be much suspected for an extraordinary attachment to primitive christianity. Mosheim, from the mass of evidence upon this subject to which he had access, satisfactorily shows that the first "theological seminary," established at Alexandria in Egypt, in the second century, was the grave of primitive christianity. Yes, it appears that the first school instituted for preparing christian doctors was the fountain, the streams whereof polluted the great mass of christian professors, and completed the establishment of a paganized christianity in the room of the religion of the New Testament. But let us hear a popular Doctor tell the awful tale in his own words:—

"Toward the conclusion of this century, new sect of philosophers arose of a sudden, spread with amazing rapidity throughout the greatest part of the Roman empire, swallowed up almost all the other sect, and was extremely detrimental to the cause of christianity. Alexandria in Egypt, which had been for a long time the seat of learning, and, as it were, the centre of all the liberal arts and sciences, gave birth to this new philosophy. Its votaries chose to be called *Platonics*, though far from adhering to all the tenets of Plato. They collected from the different sects such doctrines as they thought conformable to truth, and formed thereof one general system.

“This new species of Platonism was embraced by such of the Alexandrian christians as were desirous to retain, with the profession of the gospel, the title, the dignity, and the habit of philosophers. It is also said to have had the particular approbation of Athenagoras, Pantaenus, Clemens the Alexandrian, and all those who, in this century, were charged with the care of the public school* which the christians had at Alexandria. These sages were of opinion that *true philosophy*, the greatest and most salutary gift of God to mortals, was scattered in various portions through all the different sects; and it was, consequently, the duty of every wise man, and more especially of every christian doctor, to gather it from the several corners where it lay dispersed, and to employ it, thus reunited, in the defence of religion, and in destroying the dominion of impiety and vice.** The christian eclectics had this also in common with the others, that they preferred Plato to the other philosophers, and looked upon his opinions concerning God, the human soul, and things invisible, as conformable to the spirit and genius of the christian doctrine.

“This philosophical system underwent some changes, when Ammonius Saccas, who taught with the highest applause in the Alexandrian school about the conclusion of this century, laid the foundation of that sect which was distinguished by the name of the New Platonics. This learned man was born of christian parents, and never, perhaps, gave up entirely the outward profession of that divine religion in which he had been educated. As his genius was vast and comprehensive, so were his projects bold and singular; for he attempted a general reconciliation of coalition of all sects, whether philosophical or religious, and taught a doctrine which he looked upon as proper to unite them all, the christians not excepted, in the most perfect harmony.† And herin lies the difference between this new sect and the Eclectics, who had, before this time, flourished in Egypt. The Eclectics held that in every sect there was a mixture of good and bad, of truth and falsehood; and accordingly they chose and adopted out of each of them such tenets as seemed to them conformable to reason and truth, and rejected such as they thought repugnant to both. Ammonius, on the contrary, maintained that the great principles of all philosophical and religious truth were to be found equally in all sects; that they differed from each other only in their method of expressing them, and in some opinions of little or no importance; and that,

*These were similar to our Rev. D.D.'s, presidents of theological schools—the great luminaries of those days, as famous as our Andover and Princeton professors and schools.

**This is the argument now used in defense of the study of “moral philosophy” by those who advocate a learned priesthood.

†This was similar to Dr. Mason’s “Plea for Catholic Communion,” predicated upon grounds different from the one foundation already laid by divine authority.

by a proper interpretation of their respective sentiments, they might easily be united into one body. It is further to be observed, that the propensity of Ammonius to singularity and paradox, led him to maintain that all the gentile religions, and even the christian, were to be illustrated and explained by the principles of this universal philosophy; but that, in order to this, the fables of the priests were to be removed from paganism, and the comments and interpretations of the disciples of Jesus from christianity.

“This arduous design, which Ammonius had formed of bringing about a coalition of all the various philosophical sects, and all the different systems of religion that prevailed in the world, required many difficult and disagreeable things in order to its execution. Every particular sect and religion must have several of its doctrines curtailed or distorted before it could enter into the general mass. The tenets of the philosophers, the superstitions of the heathen priests, the solemn doctrines of christianity, were all to suffer in this cause, and forced allegories were to be subtilly employed in removing the difficulties with which it was attended. How this vast project was effected by Ammonius, the writings of his disciples and followers that yet remain, abundantly testify. In order to the accomplishing his purpose, he supposed that true philosophy derived its origin and its consistence from the eastern nations; that it was taught to the Egyptians by Hermes; that it was brought from them to the Greeks, by whose vain subtleties and litigious disputes it was rendered somewhat obscure and deformed; but was, however, preserved in its own original purity by Plato, who was the best interpreter of Hermes, and of the other oriental sages. He maintained that all the different religions that prevailed in the world, were, in their original integrity, conformable to the genius of this ancient philosophy; but that it unfortunately happened that the symbols and fictions under which, according to the eastern manner, the ancients delivered their precepts and their doctrines, were, in process of time, erroneously understood, both by priests and people, in a literal sense; that, in consequence of this, the invisible beings and demons whom the Supreme Deity had placed in the different parts of the universe as the ministers of his providence, were, by the suggestion of superstition, converted into gods, and worshipped with a multiplicity of vain ceremonies. He therefore insisted that all the religions of all nations should be restored to their original purity, and reduced to their primitive standard, viz. “the ancient philosophy of the east;”^{*} and he affirmed that this his project was agreeable to the intentions of Jesus Christ, whose sole view in descending upon earth was to set bounds to the reigning superstition, to remove the errors that had crept into the reli-

^{*}*This is analogous to making the “Westminster Creed” the grand standard of christian truth and the bond of union.*

gions of all nations, but not to abolish the ancient theology from whence they were derived.

“To this monstrous coalition of heterogeneous doctrines, its fanatical author added a rule of life and manners, which carried an aspect of high sanctity and uncommon austerity. He, indeed, permitted the people to live according to the laws of their country and the dictates of nature; but a more sublime rule was laid down for the wise. They were to raise above all terrestrial things by the towering efforts of holy contemplation, those souls whose origin was celestial and divine. They were ordered to extenuate, by hunger, thirst, and other mortifications, the sluggish body, which confines the activity and restrains the liberty of the immortal spirit; that thus, in this life, they might enjoy communion with the Supreme Being, and ascend after death, active and unencumbered, to the Universal Parent, to live in his presence forever.† As Ammonius was born and educated among the christians, he set off, and even gave an air of authority to these injunctions, by expressing them partly in terms borrowed from the sacred scriptures, of which we find a vast number of citations also in the writings of his disciples. To this austere discipline he added the pretended art of so purging and refining that faculty of the mind which receives the images of things, as to render it capable of perceiving the demons, and of performing many marvellous things by their assistance. This art, which the disciples of Ammonius called *theurgy*, was not, however, communicated to all the schools of this fanatical philosopher, but only to those of the first rank.

“This new species of philosophy, imprudently adopted by Origen and many other christians, was extremely prejudicial to the cause of the gospel, and to the beautiful simplicity of its celestial doctrines.* For hence it was, that the christian doctors began to introduce their subtle and obscure erudition into the religion of Jesus, to involve in the darkness of a vain philosophy, some of the principal truths of christianity that had been revealed with the utmost plainness, and were indeed obvious to the meanest capacity, and to add to the divine precepts of our Lord many of their own, which had no sort of foundation in any part of the sacred writings.†† From the same source arose that melancholy set of men, who have been distinguished by the name of Mystics, whose system, when separated from the Platonic doctrine concerning the nature and origin of the soul, is but a lifeless mass, without any vigor, form, or consistence. Nor did the evils which sprung from this Ammonian philosophy end

†Modern religious fasts and austerities are just the same as those of Ammonius and the Egyptians.

*This Origen was the greatest Doctor of Divinity that ever lived, and dissiminated more error and absurdity than any other writer of ancient or modern times. He got it from Egypt.

††Many of these remain unto this present time, and are adopted by Catholics and Protestants.

here. For, under the specious pretext of the necessity of contemplation, it gave occasion to that slothful and indolent course of life, which continues to be led by myriads of monks retired in cells, and sequestered from society, to which they are neither useful by their instructions nor by their examples. To this philosophy we may trace, as to their source, a multitude of vain and foolish ceremonies, proper only to cast a veil over truth, and to nourish superstition; and which are, for the most part, religiously observed by many, even in the times in which we live.‡ It would be endless to enumerate all the pernicious consequences that may be justly attributed to this new philosophy, or rather to this monstrous attempt to reconcile falsehood with truth and light with darkness. Some of its most fatal effects were, its alienating the minds of many, in the following ages, from the christian religion; and its substituting, in the place of the pure and sublime simplicity of the gospel, an unseemly mixture of platonism and christianity.

The number of learned men among the christians, which was very small in the preceding century, grew considerably in this. Among these there were few rhetoricians, sophists, or orators. The most part were philosophers attached to the eclectic system, though they were not all of the same sentiments concerning the utility of letters and philosophy. Those who were themselves initiated into the depths of philosophy, were desirous that others, particularly such as aspired to the offices of bishops or doctors, should apply themselves to the study of human wisdom, in order to their being the better qualified for defending the truth with vigor, and instructing the ignorant with success.* Others were of a quite different way of thinking upon this subject, and were for banishing all argumentation and philosophy from the limits of the church, from a notion that erudition might prove detrimental to the true spirit of religion. Hence the early beginnings of that unhappy contest between *faith* and *reason*, *religion* and *philosophy*, *piety* and *genius*, which increased in the succeeding ages, and is prolonged even to our times, with a violence that renders it extremely difficult to be brought to a conclusion. Those who maintained that learning and philosophy were rather advantageous than detrimental to the cause of religion, gained, by degrees, the ascendant, and, in consequence thereof, laws were enacted, which excluded the ignorant and illiterate from the office of public teachers.† The opposite side of the question was not, however, without defenders; and the defects and vices

‡Reader, mark this well. Read it again, and see if you can find out any of those "vain and foolish ceremonies which cast a veil over truth."

*This is just in modern style; but remember this notion came from Egypt.

†This is similar to the laws of many sects yet existing, which decree that so many years must be spent at colleges and theological schools to qualify a man "for defending the truth," and, most frequently, error, "with vigor."

of learned men and philosophers contributed much to increase their number, as will appear in the progress of this history."‡

Mosheim's Ecc. Hist. p. 163-173.

Let the reader bear in mind that a high churchman unequivocally represents primitive christianity as having been buried in the rubbish of Egyptian philosophy by the first *doctors of divinity* in the first theological seminary that ever existed in the christian church, and that many of those vanities, ceremonies, mysteries, and Ammonian institutes are come down to our times, and inserted in our creeds. Christians, read your Bibles, and be admonished to explode from your religious faith and practice what you cannot find in the scriptures. The New Testament is the creed, discipline, and formula of christianity. Most of the popular schemes, and dogmas, and institutes are Egyptian, Babylonish, or Roman.

* * *

From the Wooster Spectator of March 13.

A Letter Addressed to Alexander Campbell, Editor of the Christian Baptist.

Dear Sir—YOU will confer a particular favor on the christian community by proving—

First, That clergymen can subsist without either eating or drinking.

Secondly, That the clergymen who provide for their own households are worse than infidels.

Thirdly, That clergymen should not receive a liberal education.

Fourthly, That clergymen should not study divinity.

Fifthly, That if clergymen can preach without compensation, you can publish your *Christian Baptist* without compensation.

Sixthly, That you are the only pious clergyman on the face of the earth.

Seventhly and lastly, That you are the only clergyman since the days of the apostles that has taught the genuine and undefiled doctrines of the gospel of Christ. From the spirit and zeal with which you labor to establish truth and expose error, I have no doubt but that you will cheerfully and promptly prove the above stated points. And when you *shall* have proved them, I will then willingly become a member of your church. I will, in conclusion of this note, assure you that I am no clergyman; that I am neither jealous nor envious of great talents, or of your unexampled piety; but that I am merely

A LAYMAN.

* * *

REPLY TO SOME UNKNOWN LAYMAN.

YOU did me the honor of addressing me a note in a late *Spectator*, in which you salute me "*dear sir*." I suppose in a cere-

‡We must thank Heaven that all did not worship this beast, that a few names in Sardis escaped this awful calamity.

monious age I should, in return, salute you *Very Dear Sir*. Be this as it may, I am certainly indebted both the laity and clergy, as well as to the poets in and about Wooster, for their very marked attention to me. I hope soon to have so much leisure as to pay them a visit for their kindness, and salute them face to face. You propose to me no less than *seven* positions to prove. This is another proof that the number 7 is a symbolic number. As you say I "will confer a favor on the religious community by proving them," I will, at all events, pay them a respectful notice.

Your first position is, that "*Clergymen can subsist without eating or drinking.*" This you desire me to prove. You ought to have defined this *being* you call a clergyman, for whose interest and welfare you are so solicitous. As I, the Bible being judge, view those gentlemen as an order of men unauthorized of Heaven; as the creatures which laymen have made, and not the workmanship of Heaven, I have no concern about their eating and drinking. Let them that created them feed them. But as I prefer experiment to theory, I will tell you how you can prove the position most satisfactorily. Do you, then, and all your lay brethren, give them nothing to eat or drink for seven years, and I predict many of them will be no longer clergymen, but will transmigrate into other more innocent and more useful beings.

Your second position now offers itself, that "*the clergymen who provide for their own houses are worse than infidels.*" This proposition will become intuitively evident and infallibly correct by the insertion of a word of two, thus, "The clergy who provide for their own houses by making the people called laymen support them, and who pursue no honest calling for means of subsistence, have denied the faith and are worse than infidels."

Your third position is, that "*clergymen should not receive a liberal education.*" For what? To qualify them to reign as kings and priests over the laity? Certainly, for these important purposes, they should receive a very liberal education; and the more liberal their education the more *liberal* their support. But, if it requires a liberal education to cause them to understand the christian religion, then the laity require a liberal education too; except you think that it is the clergyman's duty to expound the revelation of God, and the layman's duty to receive, believe, and practise whatever his clergyman tells him. In this case it matters not how ignorant the laity are. But, sir, knavery and finesse have always been eloquent in advocating the cause of a learned priesthood; and this "*liberal*" order have, when fully saddled upon the shoulders of the people, gravely told them they should not read the Bible at all—it belonged to the priesthood to understand it. This is the legitimate issue of the common talk about a liberally educated priesthood. I argue, if it be necessary to have a liberally educated clergy, we should have a liberally educated laity to understand them; for it is more difficult to understand the clergy than the Bible.

Your fourth position, that "*clergymen should not study divinity,*" is akin to the third. The Episcopalian clergy should study Episcopalian divinity; the Presbyterian clergy should study Presbyterian divinity, &c. &c. for in whatever sort of divinity a man deals, he ought to be well versed in it; besides, an Episcopalian layman would not thank you for Presbyterian divinity, nor a Presbyterian layman receive Episcopalian divinity.

Certainly, then, it behoves every *divine* to be master of that divinity which he is to retail to his customers for a livelihood. But, sir, believe me or not, the greatest students of divinity are amongst the most ignorant of the Bible. And I will pledge myself to find as many women of plain education as you have divines in your county, who can teach them for months the meaning of the scriptures. I do not mean any disrespect to your divines: I suppose them to be quite as intelligent as their neighbors.

Your fifth position now comes, that "*if clergymen can preach without compensation, you can publish your Christian Baptist without compensation.*" Any young damsel knows better. All that the clergy sell is *breath*, and that is one of the most common things amongst the living. It is as little expense to a man who can talk, *to talk*, as it is for the laity to hear. He sells you divinity, which is supposed to be a heavenly commodity, and costs no money; but our Christian Baptist is a terrestrial thing and requires many earthly things to furnish one page, which are not like *the grace* of divines, without money and price. I wish, my friend, your education had been a little more liberal, and then I could easily have convinced you that types and press, paper and ink, are not divinity.

Your sixth proposition approaches, that "*you are the only pious clergyman upon the face of all the earth.*" So said the Papists, both clergy and laity, of Luther. I wish you could find out the meaning of the term *clergyman*. Don't look into the Bible for it—it is only found in theological dictionaries. I am no clergyman at all, sir, pious or impious. I once was, but I have renounced it as one of the hidden things of darkness. As I am no clergyman, you will excuse me for not determining who is the most pious one—whether the Pope or the Vicar of Wakefield.

Your seventh is now arrived—that "*you are the only clergyman since the days of the apostles that has taught the genuine and undefiled gospel.*" While I was a clergyman I did not teach the genuine gospel; therefore I am not contained in your last proposition. But I do know, and you *might* know, that there *are* myriads, and that there *were* myriads on earth, who have protested against the clergy as Antichrist, who have witnessed a good confession against all the popular schemes of the times. When I see you and know you, I will tell you more of this.

Now, sir, I will, in return for your kindness, propose you seven questions for your consideration and exposition, which I hope your christian candor and sense of justice will prompt you to explain—for I have a high opinion of your ability.

1. What is your name? Should you honor me with another epistle and suppress your name, I cannot answer it; because I could not *then* consider you an honest and well meaning layman who fears not the light.

2. What is the office and duty of a christian bishop?

3. Did the author of the christian religion declare it to be his will that one christian in fifty or a hundred should obtain a liberal education in order to make a living, or to get rich by *interpreting* his will to the forty-nine or the ninety-nine,

4. Whether is the christian bishop, who is chosen by the church for his piety, gravity; and ability to teach the christian books; who labors in the word and doctrine, and by his own hands ministers to his own wants and those of his house, or the college-bred gentleman who makes a gain of his godliness, more worthy of the honor, esteem, love and credit of the church or congregation to which they respectively minister?

5. Does the character of the christian church, drawn by the apostles in their writings, correspond to that of a modern congregation with its clergyman at its head?

6. Is it compatible with the character of the father of our spirits in giving us but one book to make us wise unto salvation, to have it expressed in such language as none but linguists, philosophers, and rabbins can understand?

Averaging the stipend paid to the learned clergy at 500 dollars a-year; in ten years, 5000 dollars—*query 7th*, Whether would it be more conducive to the spiritual and temporal interest of a congregation to spend this \$5000 in ten years upon giving their youth so good an education as to make them so well acquainted with their mother tongue as to understand any book written in English without the aid of an interpreter, or to give it to the priest?

Your answer to these queries will confer a favor on the christian community. A. CAMPBELL.

* * *

From the Pittsburgh Recorder of April 20.

NOTIFICATION.

THOSE friends of the Western Missionary Society who may have seen or heard of a piece in a publication which has assumed the name of the "*Christian Baptist*," which asserts that 40 dollars were paid to a certain missionary "for preaching four sermons to a few women and children" in the remote corners of this city—are informed that the said piece is utterly destitute of any shadow of truth, and that it in fact a false and libellous fabrication. As the author declares that the statement was received from me, I think it proper to say, that I have never made "to a very respectable citizen of Pittsburgh," or any other person, any such representation.

SAMUEL THOMPSON, *Treas'r. pro tem.*

West. Miss. Society.

THIS is the first "*notification*" of the Christian Baptist with which the Pittsburgh Recorder has favored us. His politeness and good intentions are very apparent. It must be evident that if he had had an earlier opportunity of exhibiting them to advantage, he certainly would have embraced it. But who is this *Samuel Thompson* that lends his name to the *reverend* defamer; that comes forward with so bold and so daring language? I say again, who is this Samuel Thompson who has the assurance to come forward and accuse me of having maliciously published "a false and libellous fabrication, utterly destitute of any shadow of truth;" and who convicts himself of being a "*suborned witness*" at the first blush? He says that "the author declares that the statement was received from me." Where, Mr. Thompson? In what page? No where, sir. I might here repeat your words, "It is a false and libellous fabrication;" but however just this application of them might be, I will not be so impolite. I am not the author, sir, of that statement, nor does "the author" of it mention that it came from Samuel Thompson. The *reverend* gentleman who is said to have written the above "*notification*," either imposed on you or you have imposed on yourself by not reading it before you signed it; for it is no where said in this work that Samuel Thompson made such a statement, nor that a "*treasurer, pro tem.*" made it. It was a deeply laid project, believe me, Mr. Thompson, to impose upon the obtuseness of your apprehension by that high priest who is said to have obtained your signature. Were you made *treasurer pro tem.* a few days or weeks ago, in order to exculpate the managers and *regular* officers of this society from this waste, this scandalous profusion of the widows' mites and the orphans' cents, on the avarice of a cupidous divine? or did the high priest make you a mere scape goat to carry off their iniquity into the wilderness of oblivion? I forbear, and honestly advise you to be more cautious hereafter in lending your name to any article written or dictated by a divine, intended to cover the conduct of the fraternity from the eyes of the community. You must tell the *reverend* gentleman who machinated this deep plot of putting me into the mire, to go to Matthew B. Lowry, esq. an alderman of your city, and to obtain from him his name, or a certificate from him that he neither paid nor *said* that he paid forty dollars to a preacher for four sermons "preached in the remote corners of your city." To help the recollection of all concerned in tracing up this matter, which the Recorder has made so interesting, I will add that my informant, a very respectable citizen of Pittsburgh, says, that two of those sermons were preached up at "the paper mill" to a few women and children, and that two of them were preached down at "the Point" to similar congregations; and the *reverend* gentleman who then acted the missionary is now a resident of Pittsburgh, and by calling upon him they can obtain his certificate that there is "no shadow of truth in the above statement," which I have published from what I conceive the best authority. If

these arrows will not bring conviction to the hearts and understandings of all concerned, I have others in my quiver; and Solomon tells me that "a fool uttereth all his mind, but a wise man keepeth it in till afterwards."

* * *

A WORD TO THE PITTSBURGH RECORDER.

You see, sir, that I have published your whole "notification," *literatim et punctuatim*, and have thus done justice to my readers. I hope you will now display your regard to justice by publishing my notification to your readers, and do them the same justice that I have done to mine. The same hint I wish to give to the *Washington Examiner*, who, I am told, published your notification. In the midst of our zeal for "religion," let us hold in our right hand the balance of justice. And be assured, sir, while you breathe, you will never convict me before the public of having falsely fabricated any statement made concerning the religious or moral conduct of men.

* * *

IT seems that the managers of the Western Missionary scheme are very much mortified that it should be openly avowed that a missionary in Pittsburgh should have received forty dollars for four sermons. Let us have a word of comment on this strange occurrence. The mortification must arise from one of two causes—either because it should be published that there was *need* of a missionary in this enlightened city, or because it should be known that the Board should have been so profuse, and the preacher so avaricious, of the charities drawn from the hands of the sympathizing. Now as to the first, *it is a fact* that the Synod of Pittsburgh did, in the month of May, 1821, report to the General Assembly that "the missionary ground in the bounds and on the outskirts of our Synod is **EXTENSIVE AND NEEDY.**" Why then blush to have it proclaimed that there was *need* of missionary labor in Pittsburgh. Is it not in the bounds of the Synod? But this is not the only city in the bounds of the Presbyterian Synods that the Assembly think to be in *need* of missionary labors; for *it is a fact* that the Rev. Samuel Cornish performed a mission of *three months* in the city of Lancaster, Pa. in the towns of Columbia and Marietta and in their vicinity, and reported the same to the Assembly in May, 1821. See *Presbyterian Magazine*, vol. i. p. 474, and for the above, p. 516. *It is also a fact*, if we can believe the reports published in the *Presbyterian Magazine*, that the Rev. Isaac Bard, a student fresh from the Seminary, was appointed by the Assembly, May, 1821, to labor in the bounds of the Missionary Society of Lexington, Ky. for *three months*; yes, in the bounds of the Synod of Kentucky; p. 425. *It is a fact*, on the same authority, that the Rev. Jabez Chadwick was appointed to labor two months as a missionary in the bounds of the Presbytery of Onondaga. It is a fact that the Rev. Charles Webster reported that he labored as a missionary for three months in the vicinity of the congregation of Hampstead,

Long Island. And it is a fact that about twenty others are mentioned in the report as having fulfilled similar appointments, mostly within the bounds of Synods and Presbyteries under the superintendance of the General Assembly.

And it is also a grievous fact, that the Board of Trust of this same Western Missionary Society, in their report the same year, state, that *eleven* missionaries have been for different periods employed in Ohio and Pennsylvania by the Board, some of them too to labor in the bounds of *their own residence!* Thus "the Rev. S. Cowles labored *three months* in the destitute settlements contiguous to *his residence* in the Presbytery of Steubenville, Ohio." Things, then, are in a heathenish state in the bounds of the General Assembly, when cities, towns, and villages, as well as the wilderness itself, call for so many missionaries. Why then, I ask, should the Board of the Western Missionary Society be so much mortified at my statement of their deplorable condition in Pittsburgh.

But to the other cause of their chagrin. Why startle at the mentioning of *forty* dollars, when the Board of Missions allowed 40 dollars per month to those missionaries? Did not the Rev. Samuel Porter, when appointed on a mission of two months, retain, by the allowance of the Board, all that he collected, viz. 38 dollars for the one month that he spent over his appointment. See p. 513. And was not his annual salary "going on" at home all the while? We ask this last question for information. Did not the Western Missionary Board declare that they expended in one year 700 dollars, "better than 230 dollars on the Indian school," leaving something less than 470 dollars for, as they say, "from 10 to 12 months of missionary services." Now if we should say that 11 months were spent in this way, and that only 440 dollars were paid for eleven months service, would it not be apparent, from *their own pen*, that *forty* dollars a-month were given for those services? And again I ask, was not the annual salary of *some* of those divines "going on" at home while they were receiving this monthly allowance? It appears, then, from the reports penned by those very gentlemen, and sent up to the "supreme court" at Philadelphia, that they have actually been as extravagant in many other instances as in the alleged one.

But why ashamed to have it made known that ten dollars have been paid for one Sabbath day's services in the city of Pittsburgh, when some members of the same fraternity, in the same city, are wont to receive from 20 to 30 dollars per Sabbath? Divide \$1200 per annum by 52, and, if I mistake not, the quotient will be 21 dollars and a fraction. Now it is to me a problem more difficult to solve than any in the science of algebra, how it is that one Presbyterian sermon can be worth only *ten* dollars, and another of the same species worth *twenty*, when it depends upon supernatural agency whether the twenty dollar sermon is to be more profitable than the ten dollar sermon. If twice as much "*grace*" accompanied the twenty as the ten dollar sermon, then I could

find a *ratio* of calculation which would bring the problem within the bounds of common arithmetic. But, perhaps, sermons are not to be valued by any such standard. It is not their intrinsic efficacy, their real utility, nor their happy results, that are to be taken into consideration; but the goodness of the style, the elegance of the gestures, and the gentility of the whole exterior, that give them their value. I repeat it again, it is this monied speculation, this hireling scheme, that, in my opinion, renders all exertions to evangelize the world abortive, or as good as abortive. I am opposed, conscientiously opposed, to such missionary schemes; but will go heart and hand into any measure that is authorized by the New Testament, having for its object the salvation of the world.

EDITOR.

* * *

OUR ESSAY ON EXPERIMENTAL RELIGION

HAS been received with considerable diversity of feeling. Some are pleased with it, others displeased, and not a few know not whether to approve or disapprove. We are sorry to find that almost all the objections we have heard against it have arisen from a misunderstanding of our design and meaning. It is said that we have taught that there is no necessity of being born again by the Spirit of God; that we have denied that christians are new creatures, and that we have confined all divine grace to the apostolic age. Now we must confess that we did not intend to communicate such ideas; nor do we think that such can be fairly gathered from our words. But so consecrated is the phrase "*experimental religion*," that if you make the least freedom with it every feeling is excited, and it is like calling in question a man's title to his estate.

But in exposing the vain conceits of many about the *nature* and *manner* of this *renovation*, we were led, as we hinted, into a species of the same kind of metaphysical reasoning, which we feared would lead to mistakes. It is universally acknowledged by those who have attended to the operations of their own minds, that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to form any tolerable idea of the nature or manner of those operations. But it is agreed that the mind operates in its own way, whether we adopt a right or a wrong theory about its method of operating. Just so with respect to divine operations, or the operations of supernatural intelligences. We know such operations exist, but the *modus* or manner of these operations are inscrutable; and let our theory be right or wrong, these operations proceed in their own way—neither guided, controled, nor prevented by our theories. But wrong views of this subject may greatly injure both the peace and happiness of those that entertain them. And whenever any theory leads us to disregard the *written word of God*, or to neglect the constant reading and examination of it, and the practice of its plain injunctions, that theory is erroneous and dangerous.

As to the effects attendant upon the truth believed, we are clearly taught that these are such as to fitly characterize the believer as a *new man*. He is possessed of three principles of action, the most powerful and triumphant: these are *faith*, *hope*, and *love*. All *revealed truth* is the matter, or, as some call it, the object of faith. Future good things promised by God are the object or matter of hope, and the *Lovely One*, and every one that is like him, is the object of the christian's love. These principles purge, purify, elevate, and ennoble the mind that possesses them. "The gospel," as one in a certain place beautifully observed, "presents a *faithful testimony* to be believed, *good things* to be hoped for, and the *most amiable One* to be loved." The purification of our hearts, the refinement of our feelings, the elevation of our character, the reformation of our lives, are the inseparable fruits of the belief of the one fact, upon the evidence contained in the faithful record.

We have been censured for our manner of treating the enthusiastic and sectarian religion of our times. Perhaps, in this instance, we were too much in the spirit of Elijah, who thus addressed the false teachers of his time, and in relation to their god, said to them, "Cry aloud, for he is a god; either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked." 1 Kings; xvi. 29. Yet this Elijah was one that feared, and loved, and served the God of Israel, though "a little profane," as some would say, on this occasion. Paul, in the same spirit, said, "Ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise;" and also besought the Corinthians to "forgive him the wrong" he had done them, in not being burdensome to them. On sundry occasions he speaks thus "profanely," especially when he said, "The things which the gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God." It was also "very impudent" in him to say, "The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies."

We have discovered that something under the name of "experimental religion," is the very *soul* of the popular system, and that this subject is worthy of a very serious and profound discussion; we will therefore promise our readers a series of essays on the office assigned to the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men, as this is developed to our views in the holy scriptures. Every thing called grace in the heart, christian experience, experimental religion, regeneration, &c. will come under this head. Patience, however, will be necessary on the part of our readers, and let them who are disposed to know what is truth upon this subject, as well as every other, in the mean time devoutly examine the scriptures for themselves.

We have just got out of our hands a heavy job of writing, which has engrossed much of our time and attention during the winter and spring. We hope to be able to bestow more time and labor on this work than we have hitherto been able to bestow on it.

EDITOR.

DEBATE ON BAPTISM.

THIS day is put into the hands of the book-binders our Debate with Mr. *Maccalla*, and it is expected that in four weeks we will be able to commence supplying our orders. This volume contains 420 pages, duodecimo; and had we not exhibited much matter in small type, it would have exceeded 450 pages. The addition made to this volume above our proposals is worth 375 dollars on the whole edition, at one dollar and twenty-five cents per volume of 400 pages. This we *bestow* upon the work for the sake of doing justice to our proposals, and to the merits of the questions discussed; and will, therefore, sell the volume at one dollar and twenty-five cents as stipulated. It will be, in our opinion, as to the *quantity* of matter and the general *execution* of the work, the cheapest religious work issued from the press in this western country. It contains a great variety of matter, and is nearly as much a controversy about the nature of the Christian and Jewish institutions as about Baptism. We do not wish to raise too high the expectations of our readers, nor to forestall their opinion; and shall therefore refer them to the volume, as containing a fair, full, and impartial exhibition of this lengthy discussion.

This discussion has been much talked of, misrepresented, caricatured, extolled, and reprehended, in the colloquial interview and in the public prints of a considerable portion of the Union. An exceedingly false representation, or rather a most unwarrantable caricature of this discussion, was put into circulation in the neighborhood of West Union, Ohio, by the Paidobaptists we believe, which has echoed along the Atlantic coasts and re-echoed along the meanderings of the Missouri. We saw it carried its own condemnation on its forehead, and deigned it no reply. Mr. *Maccalla*, however, deemed it worthy of his notice, and thus expresses himself upon the subject in the *Kentucky Gazette* of the 19th of February:—

“In West Union, Ohio, the *Village Register* of the 25th November last, published, or professed to publish an account of the Debate on Baptism which had but a short time before taken place between Mr. Alexander Campbell and myself. This was soon republished in the National Intelligencer, and again in a Missouri paper, called the Independent Patriot.”—“If, as the Register says, their information was gathered “from persons who were present,” it will only shew that conscientious caution should be exercised in such cases by retailers, hearers, and reporters. If the West Union editor had known that our audience contained not only many pious and orderly farmers, mechanics, and merchants, and many respectable ministers of different denominations, but also members of the bar from several counties, I do not suppose that he could have called this assembly a *mob* as he has done. If Mr. Gales had known that I never heard, nor heard of the *exclamations of several voices*, “Don’t fight gentlemen—keep cool,” until my brother, the present editor of the *Kentucky Gazette*, informed me that he had seen such a state-

ment in the National Intelligencer; if he had known that our presiding moderator during the whole debate, was an enlightened member of the Kentucky bar, a respectable member of our legislature, since appointed a circuit judge of Kentucky, and much more fit for the office of speaker in congress than the chairman of a *mob*, he could not have given currency to such a groundless report. It contains as many as three mistakes in only four lines. 1st. "The assault was commenced by Mr. Maccalla." Mr. Campbell opened the debate. 2d. "On the 5th of October." It was the 15th. 3d. "And the contest was continued by these champions nine days." It was only eight including the Sabbath, and only seven excluding that day, during which it was suspended. The character of the debate during the sixth day is well recollected.—No *respectable* witness will say, and none of any description can shew that the sixth or any other day "closed with *both* parties losing sight of the question in violent abuse and personal invective."

"So far is pretty well said and tolerably correct." The subsequent part of this article is noticed in my preface to the debate.

But what surprized me no little was that some, from whom I would have expected better things, pronounced an absolute and unconditional condemnation of *all* religious debates. Thus condemning not only the ancient prophets, the holy apostles, but even the Saviour himself. On this topic we shall present our readers with an *extract* from the preface to the late debate—p. 6.

"It is long since religious controversy began. The first quarrel that arose in the human family was about religion; and since the proclamation "*I will put enmity between thy seed and her seed,*" the controversy has been carried on by different hands, by different means, and with various success. It is the duty of the christian, and has ever been the duty of the saint, to contend for the truth revealed in opposition to error. From the days that James and Jambres withstood Moses, down to the present time, every distinguished saint has been engaged in controversy. The ancient prophets, the Saviour of the world, and his holy apostles, were all religious controversialists. The Saviour's life was one continued scene of controversy and debate with the scribes, the elders, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and with the established priesthood of his era. The apostles were noted disputants and the most successful controversialists that ever lived. Paul the apostle was more famous in this department than Alexander or Bonaparte in the field. Whether a Stoic or an Epicurean philosopher, a Roman orator, a Jewish high priest, or a Sadducean teacher encountered him, he came off victorious and triumphant. Never was he foiled in battle—never did he give back; the sword which he wielded, and the arm which directed it, proved irresistible in the fight.

There are not a few who deprecate religious controversy as an evil of no small magnitude; but these are either the ill-informed, or those conscious that their principles will not bear investiga-

tion. So long as there is good and evil, truth and error in this world, so long will there be opposition; for it is in the nature of good and evil, of truth and error, to oppose each other. We cheerfully confess that it is much to be regretted that controversy amongst christians should exist; but it is more to be regretted that error, the professed cause of it, should exist. Seeing then that controversy must exist, the only question is how it may be managed to the best advantage. To the controversies recorded in the New Testament we must appeal as furnishing an answer to this question. They were in general public, open, plain, and sometimes sharp and severe. But the disputants who embraced the truth in those controversies, never lost the spirit of the truth in the heat of conflict; but with all calmness, moderation, firmness, and benevolence, they wielded the sword of the Spirit; and their controversies, when recorded by impartial hands, breathe a heavenly sweetness that so refreshes the intelligent reader that he often forgets the controversy in admiration of the majesty of truth, the benevolence and purity of their hearts."

Public discussion is, we are convinced, one of the best means of propagating the truth and of exposing error in doctrine or practice.

We now reap the benefits of the public debates of former times, and we have witnessed the beneficial results of those in our own time. And we are fully persuaded that a week's debating is worth a year's preaching, such as we generally have, for the purpose of disseminating truth and putting error out of countenance. There is nothing like meeting face to face in the presence of many witnesses and "talking the matter over;" and the man that cannot govern his own spirit in the midst of opposition and contradiction, is a poor christian indeed.

May 13th, 1825.

EDITOR.

* * *

A Letter from a Gentleman in Pittsburgh to the Editor of the Christian Baptist.

Dear Sir,

A CORNER stone of an Episcopal chapel was yesterday laid in our city; and as the scene was novel and partly religious, I beg leave to submit to you the following account:—

The place consecrated for the "Sanctuary of the Lord," (as they styled it,) was the Golgotha of the Episcopal sect. The Free Masons, with music religious and profound, entered the place of skulls between the hours of 3 and 4 o'clock, where they were received by the Rev. Mr. Hopkins and the rich members of his congregation, whose names I might give you, but to do so is unnecessary, and it might be thought invidious. It may be remarked by the way, that the clothing of the Free and Accepted Masons was beautiful and rich generally. The stone was, as I supposed, about 3½ feet long, 2 feet broad, and 1¼ thick.

The Rev. Mr. Hopkins commenced the ceremonies by reading a prayer from a manuscript, which he had partly concealed from

the glances of the vulgar by thrusting it within the capacity of his good new hat. I make no remarks upon the pinch to which the reverend gentleman was evidently put when he attempted to give elevation to his eye, and to his petition thus immersed. The Grand Master then advanced, and, with the politeness and candor of a Mason and a citizen, confessed the apparent insignificance of the ceremonies they were about to perform; at the same time assuring the ignorant and unaccepted that to a Mason these things were nevertheless both dear and pregnant of meaning. He then, in a short address, descanted on the grandeur and antiquity of the fraternity, and in the *finale* gave orders for the elevation of the stone. The innocent cause of all this parade was accordingly whirled up on high between the legs of a triangle by means of a block and tackle. This pitiable scene caused all the fraternity mystically to flap their aprons. Then the stone, to an air (I forget whether religious or masonic) was lowered into the place of dead men's bones, where it was squared and plumbed by the Free and Accepted Masons. An engraved plate with specimens of American coins were deposited in the stone; and the labor being now over, the fraternity, at a signal given, again flapped their aprons, when the Grand Master presented the square and plumb to the operative master builder.

Here the staring multitude were entertained with a hymn by a motly choir upon the ground, composed of Baptists, Episcopalians, &c. and led by, as I suppose, a quondam clerk of the Rev. Francis Heron's congregation, who, at the same time, squeaked up an old ditty on the fiddle, with the bow in his left hand.

Mr. Hopkins then read an address, in the beginning of which he attempted to justify this ridiculous scene. He then thanked the Grand Master for the great interest he had taken in the matter, and gravely complimented the whole brotherhood by pronouncing the following superb eulogy on Free Masonry—"Free Masonry is a good thing." After which he addressed himself to the wealthy gentlemen of his own congregation, who stood uncovered to receive his admonition.

He actually had the courage to tell them that no labor or expense they should be at in erecting the church would be in vain; but on the contrary, God would restore it into their bosom "a hundred fold." He concluded by prayer; and again the choir struck up a hymn, "*How beauteous are the feet,*" &c. This being ended the whole crowd withdrew from the semetry.

But, sir, I was most of all surprized at the idea which seemed to be entertained by the speakers concerning the nature of this brick building. Mr. Hopkins actually styled it "a labor of love," "a sanctuary for the Lord," &c. &c. and the Grand Master called it "a temple for the one living and true God." This is Jewish. But if it be the "Lord's temple," where is the "holiest of all?" It must be the pulpit. And how dares Mr. Hopkins go so often into it? The high priest dared not to be so bold.

But why do these mistaken men always carry the sanctuary of their God to the grave yard? Strange inconsistency, thus to pollute the house of God in its very roots!

Dear sir, I do not expect you to publish the above. I send it merely to give you an opportunity of saying something on the stupid idea these sectaries entertain of the brick building.

Yours, &c.

A. B. C.

Pittsburgh, May 1824.

[Our present opportunity forbids us to make any remarks upon the above. The writer, we assure our readers, is a faithful witness; and the mere recitation of this affair is sufficient for the wise.]

* * *

PULPIT HONESTY.

WHEN I was a boy, I sometimes played truant, and fearing the *ferula*, I would sometimes write off my lesson on a slip of paper, cut according to the dimensions of my book; and with this before me, I was enabled to translate with some degree of fluency. I was lately reminded of my boyish tricks, when attending the "divine service" of a popular divine, of a neighboring county, whose divinity has been valued at 1000 dollars a-year. This being the interest of the capital stock, we may value the whole of his divinity at 16,666 2-3 dollars. This gentleman had once been a lawyer of some note. But he was tired of the bar and mounted the rostrum. His text was, "*Among whom shine ye as lights in the world.*" After a "solemn prayer" for divine assistance in delivering a suitable message, he opened his Bible, in which he had very ingeniously inserted his manuscript. He held the book in his right hand, and with a considerable sleight of hand turned the leaf seven or eight times during the pronunciation of this heaven-dictated message. He must have read fourteen or sixteen pages of matter, no doubt well arranged and condensed. His eyes, turned askance to the right, at proper intervals, furnished his tongue with inspiration. Thought I, this is a sure method of obtaining an answer from heaven for a suitable message—*first* to have it in writing, and *then* to ask it from God. But the recollection of the double portion of the rod which I used to receive for such a trick, (for I was whipped when detected—*first* for not having my lesson, and *secondly* for striving to cheat my preceptor,) brought such a train of reflections to my mind, that I was ready to charge the person with having been the cause of my "thinking my own thoughts," while he was "shining as a light in a dark place.

I thought that the sacred desk was never elevated to be a protection against the detection of theft. I thought how deleterious to morals was such an example—to see a character so sacred, on so sacred an occasion, strive to cheat the eyes of gallery critics by the agility of his fingers and the charms of a well directed glance of the eye. In vain to remonstrate against hypocrisy, when the finger is separating the concealed leaves; in vain to

recommend honesty to the youth, when the pen, and perhaps the words of another, are made to speak what was never felt, and to act the part of a prompter behind the curtain; in vain to teach sincerity in our prayers to God, when the parson prays with apparent sincerity for a sermon, while he has it in his pocket. In fact, I was so mortified with this clerical fraud, that I could not but commend the honesty of the Catholic priest and the Episcopalian curate, who, when he reads his sermon, manfully and honestly lays it before him in the presence of all, and never dares to ask from heaven what he has in writing, as if to impose upon the superstition of his hearers. I will engage to furnish the same congregation with 52 better sermons, and to find as good a reader, for less than the hundredth part of what they pay the reverend parson.

EDITOR.

* * *

REVIVAL.

A REVIVAL of reading the scriptures has taken place in one of Mr. Samuel Ralston's congregations. Whether this revival was begun by the Doctor's Letters on Baptism I am not able to say; but so it is, that a very important revival of reading the true record has commenced and is progressing in the Dr's bounds, for *three* members of one of the Dr's congregations, by reading the scriptures, became so enlightened as to renounce Presbyterianism, to profess the ancient faith, to receive christian baptism, and have actually joined the church of Christ which is in Pittsburgh. The editor knows the above to be a fact.

* * *

EARLY INSTRUCTION.

JAMES DARSIE, a lad of twelve years of age, the son of a christian widow, of the city of Pittsburgh, lately made in intelligent profession of the "one faith" and received the "one baptism." This is another evidence of that blessing which attends the performance of that most delightful and important of all relative duties—the bringing up of our offspring in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. It was no meagre commendation of the grandmother and mother of the famous Timothy, that the unfeigned faith of the grandmother dwelt in her daughter and in her grandson; and that Eunice had, from the first dawnings of reason, taught her little son the holy scriptures. What a blessing is such a mother and such a son! Christian parents, go and do likewise. Sow the seed betimes, and trust in Heaven for the early and the latter rain.

* * *

AWFUL CALCULATION.

AN ingenius, authentic, and valuable statistical work, published a few years since, calculates that the number of inhabitants who have lived on the earth amount to about 36,627,843,275,075,846. This sum, the writer says, when divided

by 3,096,000, the number of square leagues of land on the surface of the globe, leaves 11,830,698,732 persons to each square league. There are 27,864,000 square miles of land, which being divided as above, give about 1,314,522,076 persons to each square mile. Let the miles be reduced to square rods, and the number, he says, will be 2,853,273,600,000, which being divided as above, gives 1283 inhabitants to each square rod, which rod being reduced to feet and dividing as above, it will give about 5 persons to each square foot of terra firma on the globe. Let the earth be supposed to be one vast burying ground, and, according to the above statement, there will be 1283 persons to be buried on each square rod; and a rod being capable of being divided into 12 graves, it appears that each grave must have contained 100 persons, and the whole earth have been *one hundred times dug over* to bury its inhabitants, supposing they had been equally distributed! What a lesson to human pride, vanity, and ambition.

N. A. Eagle.

* * *

No. 11.

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1824.

VOL. I.

WE omit, in the present number, our third *Essay on Ecclesiastical Characters*, &c. to give room for the following article written by one of our correspondents. It is not intended that it should be considered as occupying the place of any of those essays we have proposed on the office of the Holy Spirit, as promised in our last. These essays we shall defer commencing in the present volume, but we shall attend to them in our second. The following letter is worthy of the examination of our readers:—

* * *

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

Sir—WHEN your eighth number of the Christian Baptist came to hand, upon reading your animadversions on experimental religion, I was persuaded that it would likely give offence to many of your pious readers; and that, instead of obviating the charge brought against you and your associates, of “*denying experimental religion*,” it would rather increase it. This I have since understood to be actually the case. I, therefore, for my part, could have wished, that you had treated that very delicate, and, at the same time, very important subject, in a different manner. I am not to be understood as objecting to the detection and exposure of a false and unscriptural experience, which, from your words, appears to be the thing intended; for, in your foot note, page 141, you assert, that we are taught, that “since those gifts have ceased, the Holy Spirit now operates upon the minds of men only by the word;” and at the close of said note, you further assert, that “we are positive of one point,” namely, that “the scriptures teach us not the doctrine of physical operations of the Divine Spirit in order to faith.” With these declarations, as I understand them, I am quite satisfied; for, since the sacred

canon has been completed, it seems to be the general opinion, at least of all the most eminent Protestant writers that have adverted to this subject, that we are not to look for any new revelations of the Spirit; and that, of course, his saving operations, in the production of faith and repentance, and of every other gracious effect by which we are made partakers of a Divine nature, (2 Peter i. 4.) is by the *word of truth* being put into the mind and written upon the heart, (Heb. viii. 10.) for this certainly is one of the exceeding great and precious promises above referred to, (2 Peter i. 4.) by which the Lord has graciously engaged to save his people, (Heb. viii. 10.) As to regeneration itself, or, as it is commonly termed, *the new birth*, we are divinely assured, that it is effected by the *word of truth*, James i. 18. Of his own will begat he us by the *word of truth*; and 1 Peter, i. 23-25. Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth for ever. And this is *the word* which by the gospel is preached unto you.

Again—Both the beginning and progress of Messiah's kingdom are ascribed to *the word*. Compare Matthew xiii. with Mark iv. and Luke viii. "Behold, a sower went forth to sow," namely, *the word* of the kingdom; for the sower soweth *the word*. "And he that received seed into the good ground, is he that heareth *the word* and understandeth it; who, in an honest and good heart, having heard *the word*, keepeth it, and bringeth forth fruit with patience." Again, Matt. xvi. 16. 18. Simon said to Jesus, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus answered and said unto him, Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Accordingly, John, in his first Epistle, chapter v. verse 1. asserts, that whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. And Peter, in his first Epistle, chapter ii. verse 2, exhorts all such, that, "as new born babes, they would desire the sincere milk of *the word*, that they might grow thereby." Again, Christ's farewell prayer for his disciples is, "Holy Father, sanctify them through thy truth—*thy word* is truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe in me through *their word*." John xvii. 17-20. and Paul to the Ephesians, v. 25. asserts that "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by *the word*." Also, Peter, in his first Epistle, chapter 1. verse 22. addresses the brethren to this effect: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying *the truth* through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another with a pure heart fervently." Lastly, to close this chain of quotations, it is worthy of remark, that the whole body of the persecuted disciples of Jesus is represented as overcoming the grand adversary by the blood of the Lamb, and by *the word of their testimony*. Rev. xii. 11. Now "who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith? 1 John v. 4. Upon the whole of the evidence

before us respecting the instrumentality of *the word* in the salvation of men, we find that it is the beginning, middle, and end; that every thing is done by it, and that there is nothing done without it. That where *the word of the truth of the gospel* is not published, the Spirit of Christ has *nothing to do*, is farther evident from John xvi. 3-14. where his reproofing or convincing the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, is confined to his *testifying* the things concerning Jesus. In short, his very character as the spirit of Christ, as the spirit of wisdom and revelation, for enlightening, convincing, comforting, and establishing in the knowledge and belief of *the truth*, is ascribed to him exclusively as revealing and testifying the *things concerning Jesus*. Compare John xiv. 26. and xvi. 14. 15. with 1 Cor. xii. 3-13. with Eph. i. 13-18. and I Pet. i. 10-12. and ii. 18. 19. with Jude 14. 15.

For the more full illustration of the truth and certainty of this conclusion, let us again review and examine the evidence, that we may clearly perceive the connexion of *the word* with the kingdom of Christ in its rise, progress, and consummation, or ultimate triumph and perfection in this world:—

I. And first, we shall find that the word of the gospel is the seed of the kingdom; that every subject of it is begotten by, and born of that seed. See John i. 13. James i. 18. 1 Peter i. 25. 1 John iii. 9. Upon this point of the testimony three things are expressly evident:—

First. That every subject of Messiah's kingdom is born of God.

Second. That his birth is by the *means*, or through the *instrumentality*, of the word of truth.

Third. That this seed is in each the very and imperishable substance of his new being. Consequently, till this seed is sown and takes effect, there cannot be an existing subject of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth.

II. Again, it appears from the evidence before us, that the radical formative truth, the inwrought perception, and real persuasion of which gives birth and being to the new creature, is that expressed by our Lord in his declaration to Peter, Matt. xvi. 16—18. with 1 John v. 1. It farther appears that it was for the demonstration of this truth, that both the predictions, types, and promises of the Old Testament were exhibited and recorded, and also the things that are written concerning Jesus by the four Evangelists. See Luke xxiv. 25. 27. 44. 45. John xxiii. 30. 31. Consequently, there cannot be one born of God, but by means of the scriptural persuasion and hearty reception of this truth, in the light of its proper evidence, and true scriptural import; for if Jesus be truly received as the Messiah, the Christ, he must be received in character; that is, in the true scriptural import of his personal, relative, and official appellations. But who sees not that all this is virtually and truly implied in the belief of the great fundamental truth under consideration, viz. "*That Jesus is*

the Christ, the Son of the Living God." For whosoever is really persuaded of the truth of this grand fundamental article, upon the evidence which God has afforded, the same is heartily disposed to receive whatever this glorious personage has affirmed, or caused to be taught concerning himself, and his Father, and the salvation which he has accomplished.

III. Hence thirdly, according to the evidence before us, we are justified, sanctified, nourished, and obtain a final victory and triumph over all the power of the enemy, *by the belief of the truth*; that is, *by the word of the truth of the gospel*, believed and acted upon.

First. We are actually justified by believing the apostles' testimony concerning Jesus, that is, the gospel. Compare Mark xvi. 15. 16. Rom. v. 1. with Acts xiii. 38. 39. and 1 Cor. ii. 1. 2. and xv. 1—6.

Second. We are also sanctified by the same word believed. See as above. John xvii. 17. Eph. v. 26. 1. Peter i. 22.

Third. By the same word the believer is nourished, comforted, and made to grow in grace. 1 Peter ii. 2. Jer. xv. 16. 1 Thess. iv. 18. 1 Tim. iii. 6.

Lastly. By faith, which is belief of the divine testimony concerning Jesus, believers are made victorious over sin, Satan, the world, and death. See Rom. vi. 14. 17. 18. 1 Peter v. 3. 9. James iv. 7. Rev. xii. 11. 1 John v. 4. 5. Heb. ii. 15. Therefore, may all believers say, "Now thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv. 57. Upon the whole, it is evident that all the salvation that is known or experienced in this world, is in consequence, and by virtue of, the knowledge and belief of *the truth*, which worketh effectually in them that believe. 1 Thess. ii. 13. Neither is there any other means *appointed* or *acknowledged* of God for the salvation of men, but the scripture revelation of Jesus Christ. Compare Mark xvi. 15. 16. with Luke xxiv. 46. 47. and Acts iv. 12. That where this scripture revelation is not heard, not known, there neither is, nor ever was, nor indeed can be, any faith in Christ Jesus (see Rom. x. 9. 14.) nor of course any regenerate, any purified in heart, (see Acts xv. 7. 9.) nor any endued with the spirit of adoption, crying Abba, Father. Rom. viii. 14. 16. with Gal. iv. 6. 8. But, instead of such characters, the debased and stupid practisers of horrid cruelties and abominable idolatries, "do service to them who by nature are no gods." This all *may know* to be the present, as it most certainly was the ancient state of the heathen world, in the days of the apostles and long before: Nor can it be shown, that since the gospel was first preached to the nations, from the day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 1.) until this day, that any portion of the human family were ever reformed from their idolatries and disgraceful immoralities by any supposed physical operations of the Holy Spirit without the word. To talk, therefore, of christian experience by any supposed operations of the Holy Spirit without the word, or previous to, and independent of, the knowledge

and belief of *the truth*, is not only contrary to most express declarations of holy scripture and universally established fact, but to reason also. It supposes a fact without a proper and adequate cause. It supposes a conversion from error and wickedness, without the proposal of truth and goodness to the understanding and heart of the creature. It supposes faith without the exhibition of a testimony to be believed, a thing absolutely impossible. It also supposes love to God in his true and lovely character, of just and holy, merciful and gracious, which the gospel alone manifests, which, without the knowledge and belief of that gospel, is a thing equally impossible with the former. Love and devotion to an unknown God!!! Again, to speak of experimental religion by way of contradistinction to a false religion, appears equally absurd. Who ever heard of a religion, Jewish or Christian, Pagan or Mahomedan, Popish or Protestant, that is not productive of some kind of experience—that produces no sensible effect upon the mind of the sincere professor of it? Can such a religion be found upon earth? Let us have done, then, with this unscriptural, indefinite, unmeaning phrase, which, at best, is only calculated to perplex, mislead, and deceive. When we speak of our holy religion, let us speak of it, and distinguish it by proper epithets, such as the scriptures afford, instead of those vain delusive epithets, which the wisdom, or rather the folly, of men has invented.

Yours respectfully,

T. W.

* * *

EXTRACTS FROM MY SENTIMENTAL JOURNAL

[*Never before published.*]

No. II

BEING shipwrecked on the island of Ila, on Friday, the 7th of October, 1808, on the first day of the following week I went to the parish church, and was entertained with a specimen of good old Scotch divinity, pronounced with all the gravity of aspect and solemnity of tone for which the Scotch divines of the Presbyterian establishment, in the pulpits purified by the fire of the Scottish apostle John Knox, are eminently distinguished. The nobleman, who was Laird of the island, a distinguished member of the Duke of Argyle's family, was present with his family; and as his patronage extended over the pulpits as well as the lands of the island, they occupied a very ostensible pew in the kirk, and a very conspicuous place in the prayers of the good parson. His temporal and spiritual welfare and that of every branch of his illustrious family, next to that of king George III. and all the princes and princesses of the royal blood, were the burthen of his concluding prayer. Pleased with the aspect, pronounciation, and gravity of this venerable parson, I visited the same kirk the next *first day*, called in Scotland, "the Sabbath." Archibald Campbell, esq. for that was the name of the

Laird of the island; was absent, being about to take his seat in the British parliament. His pew being empty, the good old parson forgot to give him any place in his prayers, and the king's place in his petitions was considerably contracted since the preceding "Sabbath." Being detained by adverse winds and the inclemencies of the season until a third "Sabbath," I revisited the synagogue again. The doctrine was precisely orthodox, according to the standards of that kirk; but as the nobleman's pew was still empty, he had no portion in the prayers of the day. I bade adieu to the island and its hospitable inhabitants, the recollection of whose kindness yet awakens many grateful feelings, and sincere desires for their happiness.

How a man so devout as the parish parson, could forget to pray for his patron when absent, and be so mindful of him in his addresses to Heaven when he was present, remained deeply impressed upon my mind, and was frequently a subject of curious reflection. I had not, however, travelled very far, nor continued many weeks amongst the pious highlanders, till I found that it was a general practice in all parish churches, when the patron was present, to give him a large portion of the evening prayer, but always when absent he was forgotten. Being but just arrived at the period of reflection, and determined to study men as well as things, I became very attentive to the prayers of not only the parish clergy, but of all others. I observed it to be a general rule, that when two or three ministers of the same party happened to be present in the same pulpit, which ever one prayed, he made particular supplications for his ministering brethren. Thus the parson A prayed very ardently for his brothers parson B and C, when they were present; but when B and C were absent A asked for no blessing for them. I do not recollect that I ever saw it otherwise in any sect or in any country. I noted this fact in my pocketbook of memorandums, and placed it under the same head with those of the prayers of the parish ministers for their patrons. I think I headed this chapter, in my juvenile fancy, with the words 'COMPLIMENTARY PRAYERS, OR PRAYERS ADDRESSED TO HUMAN BEINGS NOT YET DEIFIED.' In process of time I happened to make a tour with a very devout divine; and as he always spent the night in the house of some of his "lay brethren," in offering up his evening sacrifice, or what is more frequently called "leading in family worship," he never forgot to pray in an especial manner for his host, earnestly desiring that the family amongst whom he spent the night might be peculiarly blessed. During fourteen days and nights which I spent in his company, he never once forgot to pray for the proprietor of the house that gave him his supper and bed. In justice to his devotion I should remark, that one evening was spent in an inn, where he asked the liberty of attending upon family worship; and there he also prayed as fervently for his landlord and landlady as if in a private family. In justice to the landlord too, I should observe that he remitted to him his

bill in the morning, with an invitation to give him a call when convenient. Now custom has so familiarized the practice, that it was as natural for me to expect to hear the householder and his handmaid prayed for, as it was for me to kneel down when the prayer commenced. But even yet I was struck with curious nature of that devotion which led his reverence to pray for X and his family, and for Y and his family, when he was in their house, and that although so very fervent this night in praying for X and his family, the next evening he forgot X and prayed for Y only, and so on without variation. This I also noted down under the head of "COMPLIMENTARY PRAYERS."

I would not be understood as censuring the practice of one christian praying for another, when it is by request, or when from any consideration it becomes necessary; or of a whole church praying for another church, or for one member, or for those that are not members, either in their presence or absence. But this is quite a different thing from those prayers which we call *complimentary*, which, if not intended as a mere compliment, most certainly appear so, in the above instances at least, and in many others which might be adduced.

But there is something very incongruous in these complimentary prayers. A enters the house of B and his wife C, and joins with them in prayer: he speaks in the first person plural, "we ask," "we pray," "we beseech," &c. By and by he begins to supplicate blessings on the persons of B and C. He still uses the same style, "*we*." Now B and C either join with him or they do not. On either hypothesis the prayer is no longer social. It is A praying for B and C, and B and C praying for themselves. A does not merely pray for them—they pray for themselves—and he is only included in such petitions as are of a general nature. He acts the part of an intercessor in one part of his petitions and they, in another part, pray for him equally as themselves. Custom familiarizes, recommends, and sanctions every thing. But there is neither reason nor scripture for such a practice. If two or three persons unite in prayer they should have some definite object which mutually interests them all alike.

It is usually allowed that it is one of the greatest and best of blessings that we should be admitted to lift up our voices to the throne of the universe. But if ever there be a moment in a christian's life when humility and sincerity become him well, this is the moment, when he is speaking to that glorious and Mighty One, before whose throne seraphs veil their faces and "angels prostrate fall." Our words assuredly should be few and well ordered; no pomp of language, no vain parade of words, no compliment to men, when we claim the audience of our Almighty Maker.

In visiting the family of an old friend ten years ago, I heard him confess the sins of his childhood, youth, and manhood, and pray for their forgiveness. I continued with him for one week.

As often as he prayed in his family he made a repetition of the same confession of his and his family's sins, and a similar petition for their remission. In the course of a few years I visited him again, and heard the same confessions and petitions. Not long since I spent an evening with the same old gentleman, and heard the same without any sensible variation.

Methinks this aged professor has yet to learn the import of the "*glad tidings of great joy unto all people,*" one item of which most certainly assures the believer of the remission of all his sins committed previous to the hour he trusted in the Saviour. Hence the primitive christians *never once prayed for the remission of the sins of their childhood, youth, manhood, or old age, committed previous to their reception of the good news. Not one for instance can be produced of any saint, from the full revelation of the gospel of Christ on the day of Pentecost, praying for such a remission; but we find them thanking God that he had already, for Christ's sake, forgiven them all trespasses. They were commanded by the apostles to forgive one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, HAD FORGIVEN THEM.*

In short, to have prayed for the remission of the sins of childhood, youth, &c. committed while they were ignorant of the salvation of the gospel, would have evinced a total want of faith; for the asking for any favor plainly implies that the person who asks is not in possession of it. Suppose, for illustration, that I should go to my creditor and say, "I confess, sir, that I owe thee a thousand talents, and as I am unable to pay thee, I beseech thee to forgive me." He replies, "Whatsoever you ask of me, of this nature, believe that you shall receive it, and you shall have it. Do you believe that my benevolence and ability are adequate to remit you this debt?" I answer, "Yes." Now suppose I should, every evening and morning, go to this rich and benevolent friend, and say to him, "I owe thee a thousand talents—I am unable to pay thee—I beseech thee to forgive me that debt"—might he not, with propriety, say to me every time I went to renew my request, "Sir, you insult me. You profess to believe my word, and, in fact, you declare every day that you do not believe that I have been as good as my word. You either distrust my ability, my disposition, or my veracity. You dishonor me. Begone from my presence! but know assuredly, that whenever you trust in my ability, benevolence, and veracity, you are remitted." I must hang my head and remain speechless. Alas! the gospel of the blessed God is sadly mistaken by thousands who profess to believe it; who, not only in their ordinary deportment, but even in their religious observances, declare they believe it not. Alas! how many teachers of the gospel are in the habit of confessing and praying in the public assembly, as my old friend; and thus proving to the intelligent that, believe the gospel who may, they do not. Under the law, in their great sacrifices, there was a remembrance of sins made *once-a-year*, which the apostle adduces as an evidence of the imperfection of that state; but if

there is to be a remembrance of sins *once-a-week* or *once-a-day* by the priests and the people now, we are in worse circumstances than the Jews. It is, indeed, evident that few of the popular worshippers have received that *one* purgation which leaves no consciousness of sins.

EDITOR.

* * *

ADDRESS TO CHRISTIAN MOTHERS.

Daughters of Zion,

THE christian religion has elevated your sex to a very high degree. To it you are indebted for that amelioration of your circumstances, that mitigation of your present grievances, incurred by your having been first in the transgression, that important place you occupy in the christian affection and esteem of him to whom you were put in subjection. Although some of your sex, in the history of the Old Testament, shine with distinguished lustre; yet it is in the New Testament alone where you appear to the highest advantage. Never, we presume, was Gabriel despatched upon a more honorable or a more acceptable errand, than when he visited the cottage of her that was espoused to the son of Jacob; than when he addressed the humble and virtuous virgin in these transporting words, "Hail! favorite of Heaven! The Lord is with thee! Blessed art thou among women!" From that moment your sex, as the sun after a long gloom, bursts forth with more attractive splendor. All the queens of eastern palaces, in all the pomp of eastern grandeur, never tasted the sweets of such an interview as that between Elizabeth, the mother of the harbinger, and the mother of Israel's King. All the expressions of imperial courtesy, how meagre in comparison of the welcome with which Elizabeth received that visit of her cousin, the salutation with which she embraced her! "How have I this honor, that the mother of my Lord should come to me!" The pious and virtuous Mary, and the humble swain that was made her husband guardian, exhibit a new scene of matrimonial bliss of which mortals never before tasted. He derives all his honor and his bliss from her entrusted to his care. A woman now elevates not only her own sex by the favor of Heaven, but also renders conspicuous in the annals of the world a descendant of that royal family that once reigned over Israel.

But we do not dwell at present on these illustrious incidents in your history, as if they were the only occurrences that gave importance and elevation to your sex. Let us just glance at a few others. The first miracle of this incomparable child, born, this only begotten Son given, was wrought in honor of the mother that nursed him, and in honor of the first commandment with promise. His mother, at the famous marriage of Cana of Galilee, with all the deep solicitude of one concerned in every circumstance that concerned the reputation of the family with which she was in the intimacies of friendship, prompted her to

appeal to her son, saying, "they have no wine." He shows it to be an occurrence which was of no concern to him, abstractly considered; but in honor of his mother, who commanded obedience to his will, the water when presented—yes,

*"The modest water, aw'd with power divine,
"Beheld its God, and blushed into wine."*

This was the beginning of his fame, the first exhibition of his glorious power. And the last expression of solicitude for the temporal welfare of one of our race, which dropped from his lips amidst the agonies of the cross, was prompted by the keenest sensibilities of humanity, by that grateful recollection of the care of a mother, which is never to be forgotten; by that profound respect which every wise man exhibits to the woman that watched and wept over his childhood; yes, his last concern was for the future welfare of his mother. He saith to John, his favorite disciple, casting his eye towards his mother, "Son, behold thy mother," and to his mother, "Behold thy son." Thus he bequeathed his mother, as his richest legacy on earth, to that disciple whom he loved most of all.

Christian women, your praise and your fame, your zeal, your affection, and even your courage, shine with so much resplendence in the New Testament history, as to throw the most distinguished of our sex much, very much into the shade. The fame of that Mary who sat at the feet of the Messiah, who anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, transcends the fame of all the statesmen, warriors, monarchs, philosophers, and poets, that ever lived. Yes, while the fame of the statesman is bounded by our tenure of the soil on which we live; while the laurels that deck the brow of the warrior are stained with the blood he shed, and wither near the cypress that covers the tomb moistened by the tears of the widow and the orphans which he made; while the gems that sparkle in the crown of the monarch are dimmed and obscured by the cankering hand of time; while the renown of the philosopher fades in the presence of every insect, and of every plant, which saith to his wisdom, "How limited thou art!" and while the praises of the poet and the charms of harmony live only in the fastidious taste of men, O Mary, thy memorial, the sweet perfume of thy fame, extends to all generations! and that which thou hast done shall be told with extacy unalloyed, when time itself shall be no more!

And let the christian heroes remember, that when the highest and noblest names on their list of eighteen centuries fled like cowards from the scene of danger, and in the hour of darkness and terror deserted their suffering chief, christian women kept their place, and stood spectators near the cross. Yes, to the eternal praise of female piety, let it be published in all lands that women were the last at the cross, and the first at the tomb of their great and mighty Saviour. And as a token of his remembrance and acknowledgement of their devotion, pious courage,

and unabated affection, to them he first showed himself alive after his death, and alleviated their sorrows.

But as it is not our intention to make these illustrious incidents in your history a theme from which to deduce all the reflections which they naturally suggest, we proceed to our design.

Your usefulness to the church is not curtailed by the apostolic injunction which allots to you that silence and submission which comport with that modesty and diffidence which are now and ever have been the highest ornaments of female character. You are to nurse and nourish every one that cometh into the world; and the God of your offspring has given to you an authority over the mind in its most pliant state, paramount to every other. The babe that smiles in your arms, and finds its support and its refuge in your bosom, receives its first impressions from you. It recognizes a relation existing between you and it before it forms an idea of a father. It views you as its best friend, and most willingly submits to your control. Your countenance is the first volume it reads, and it is a volume which conveys to its apprehension more ideas than perhaps any of us imagine. Its articulations are formed from yours, and your language is the first it can understand. You can converse with it, and communicate to its tender mind ideas which the greatest linguists and philosophers that ever lived could not. You, then, occupy a place which cannot be rivalled, and which, if discreetly managed, may, under the blessing of Heaven, be of eternal importance to it. Do not be startled when I tell you that you are, by the law of nature, which is the Law of God, as well as by his *written word*, ordained to be the only preachers of the gospel, properly so called, to your own offspring. You can tell them in language more intelligible to their apprehension, the wonders of creation; you can, from the lively oracles, teach them the history of our race; you can preach the gospel to them better than any Doctor of Divinity that ever lived. You can narrate to them the nativity and life, the words and deeds of Messiah; you can open to their minds how he died for our sins, and how he rose for our justification. You can tell them of his ascension to the skies, of his coronation in heaven, and that he will come to judge the world. When you have done all this, in a style which you can adopt, more easy of apprehension than any other—if Paul the apostle was again to visit the world and call at your house, he could not preach to them with greater effect. Nay, you have anticipated all that he could say, and done all that he could do, to give the word effect. If he were to attempt to make known the glad tidings of great joy, to announce the good news to your children—when he had done they might say, “Kind and benevolent friend, this is no *news* to us; we rejoice to have heard it all from a preacher before; a preacher too, whose love and benevolence were equal to yours, and whom we understood as clearly as we understand you.” If he were to ask who the preacher was, and by what authority he spoke, the children might reply, It was

from a preacher which you, beloved friend, yourself *licensed*, it was our mother whom you commanded "to bring us up in the *nurture and admonition* of the Lord." O yes, replies the apostle, I did authorize an order of preachers which were to take my place after my decease, amongst whom your mother was one. My place and my office was to *make known* to all my contemporaries those glad tidings *in the first place*; for I was ordained a *preacher* as well as a *teacher*, and your parents can best occupy my place, as they can **FIRST** *make known* to their offspring the same good news.

These hints, my dear friends, go to show you what is expected from you, and what you ought to do. And surely you will agree with me that the word of God, thus communicated by the fire side, from your own lips, under the blessing of Heaven, is just as efficacious as if pronounced from a pulpit of mahogany, covered with scarlet, and decked with tapestry, from a pontiff, or a rabbi covered with silk and a wig as white as Alpine snow. Remember Lois, Eunice, and Timothy, and Paul's commands to you. The giving of such an injunction to fathers and mothers implied that they were competent to perform them to the best advantage. The efforts of the clergy to take from you the office of preachers, under a pretence that either their authority or their ability is superior to yours, believe your friend, or rather believe the apostles, is an unjust encroachment upon your rights and privileges. Your example and your prayers, your authority, and your well proved affection and sincerity in all that you say, are worth more than all the logic, mathematics, algebra, and rhetoric, which ever were collected in all the seminaries upon earth, to give efficacy to your sermons. How blissful the privilege, and how high the honor conferred on you! Do then, christian matrons, from your love to your own offspring, and from your love to him that raised your sex to honors so illustrious, and from your hopes of immortality and eternal life in that world where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels, being the children of God and of the resurrection, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

EDITOR.

* * *

WE design to give our readers every opportunity of judging for themselves, suppressing nothing written by friend or foe that respects our views. We have so far given them a specimen of what our opponents have said concerning this paper. The following letter, received a few days since, is from the pen of a very intelligent writer, who is the bishop of a respectable church, and with whom we are very sorry to differ in any opinion connected with the christian religion. We have the highest opinion of the integrity, uprightness, and christian deportment of this correspondent. I trust he will have the goodness to forgive me for publishing what was merely intended for my own

consideration, when I assure him that it is purely for the benefit of my readers, as I have no doubt but it will be profitable to many.—Ed.

APRIL 22, 1824.

Dear Sir—I HAVE deferred writing to you longer than I designed when you left us.

I have received regularly your numbers of the *Christian Baptist*, and have read them with some care that I might understand with certainty the leading opinions which you design to defend, and those which you purposely oppose. I find much to condemn, and many things to approve.

Your opposition to the *principle* of missions is based upon an opinion which is altogether a new one, and which, I think, you have adopted without consideration, and is palpably erroneous. It is this, That the church is now in the place of the miraculous gifts, and is, "*in propria forma*, the only institution of God left on earth to illuminate and reform the world," as contradistinguished from preaching the gospel, the commission to preach having ceased with the cessation of miraculous gifts. No. 2. p. 54.

I understand that *the Record* is in the place of the miracles wrought by Christ and the apostles, and the words they used explanatory of them in proof that Christ is the Son of God; and that this record is the mean, preached and read for building up the church, so far from the church being in the place of the miraculous gifts. The conversion of individuals, by whose *association* the christian church is, and ever has been formed, is *effected* by the gospel record, comprehending the miracles. Yes, the Record is in the place of the miraculous gifts, and not the church, which is in fact the effect of the Record believed and acted on. The miracles are written and they are preached for the same purpose they were originally wrought, viz. that men might *believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*, which is the great principle of christian church union. They are as competent for that purpose *now* as they were when they were actually and sensibly exhibited. The church is of no use in illuminating and reforming the world, except so far as the saints who compose it are engaged in the work of the ministry, not only in preaching the gospel, but in illustrating its truths by a righteous and godly life. These two requisites ought never to be separated. A word to the wise is sufficient.

I regret exceedingly the opposition you have made to the Missionary and Bible Society cause. It has greatly injured your usefulness, and put into the hands of your Paido-Baptist opposers a weapon to break the heads of the Baptists. They associate all that are peculiar to Baptists with your peculiar and strange notions on the subject of the Bible and a preached gospel, that they may the more effectually destroy the effect of your debate with Mr. Maccalla.

My dear sir, you have begun wrong, if your object is reformation. Never attack the principle which multiplies the number of

Bibles, or which promotes the preaching of the gospel or the support of it, if you desire christianity to prevail. As I informed you when here, I repeat it again, your opposition to a preached gospel, to the preachers and Bible Societies, secure to you the concurrence of the covetous, the ignorant, the prayerless and Christless christians. Should they have had any religion, they cease to enjoy it as soon as they embrace your views, at the same time you wound the hearts of the zealous and devout christians. These are not the expressions of one who has an interest in defending *the kingdom of the clergy*, or the *hireling system*, but of one who, like yourself, has been providentially thrown into the possession of a competency of the good things of this world. I am anxious as you can be for the correction of all errors, but in making the correction, or in aiming at it—spare, I beseech you the grand mean that God has employed and is still using for extending Christ's kingdom—I mean a preached gospel. I agree with you in the use and operation of every other mean in its proper place; but I must insist on it, that the preaching of the gospel is a most powerful one. Would to God that all the saints were engaged in the work of the ministry for building up the body or church of Christ, and that they were all *New Testament saints*.

I am yours, &c.

Very Dear Sir,

I AM much obliged to you for the above letter, knowing the sentiments which dictated it; and I trust you will consider that it is purely from a sense of its importance that I have published it without first soliciting your consent.

Your remarks upon what you call “a new opinion,” on which is based my opposition to the *principle* of missions, and which you think is “palpably erroneous,” I perfectly approve. But it never was an opinion of mine that the church, *without the Record*, was left on earth to illuminate and reform the world. As you considered this to be my meaning, and as I now assure you that I never entertained such an opinion, you will perceive that we both agree in calling such an opinion *erroneous*. I am pretty certain that you and I view the church of our Immortal King in one and the same light. I am taught from the *Record* itself to describe a church of Christ in the following words:—It is a society of disciples professing to believe the one grand fact, voluntarily submitting to his authority and guidance, having all of them in their baptism expressed their faith in him and allegiance to him, and stately meeting together in one place, to walk in all his commandments and ordinances. This society with its bishop or bishops, and deacon or deacons, as the case may require, is perfectly independent of any tribunal on earth called ecclesiastical. It knows nothing of superior or inferior church judicatories, and acknowledges no laws, no canons, nor government other than that of the Monarch of the Universe and his laws. This

church, having now committed unto it the oracles of God, is adequate to all the purposes of illumination and reformation which entered into the design of its founder. If I thought there was any difference in our views on this topic, I would be more definite and explicit. But to be more explicit in expressing my views of the means which the church is to use for the salvation of the world, I would remark, that having the Record, or testimony of God in it, and *every* member professing it, it becomes the duty and the high privilege of every member of it to be a preacher of the gospel, in the only sense in which any person can now be called a preacher.

I need not tell you that I do not mean to say that every man and woman that believes the gospel is to commence traveling about as the popular preachers do, or to leave their homes and neighborhoods, or employment, to act as public preachers. But the young women are to declare to their coevals and acquaintance—the elder women to theirs—the young men and elder men to theirs, the glad tidings; and to shew them the evidence on which their faith rests. This, followed up by a virtuous and godly life, is the most powerful mean left on earth to illuminate and reform the world. In the mean time the bishop of the church in their weekly meetings, *teaches* the religion in its sublime and glorious doctrine and bearings, and thus the members are still educating or building up in the most holy faith, and thus the church, in all its members, “speaking the truth in love, *grows up into HIM in all things, who is the HEAD, even Christ; with whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love.*” When the bishop rests from his labors, the church, of which he had the *oversight*, by his labors, and by the opportunity afforded all the members of exercising their faculties of communication and inquiry in the public assembly, finds within itself others educated and qualified to be appointed to the same good work. The church of the living God is thus independent of theological schools and colleges for its existence, enlargement, comfort, and perfection; for it is itself put in possession of all the means of education and accomplishments, if these means be wisely used.

The spread of the gospel, the multiplication of the number of the faithful in the apostolic age, is, in a great measure, attributable to the great company of them that declared the faith. The whole church of Jerusalem became preachers in a very short time. We are told (Acts viii.) that there was a great persecution against the congregation that was at Jerusalem; and *all*, except the apostles, were scattered through the regions of Judea and Samaria—“*They however, who were dispersed, (all but the apostles,) went about proclaiming the glad tidings of the word.*” No wonder, then, that so many myriads of the Jews were converted. No wonder, then, that so many congregations of chris-

tians were formed throughout Judea and Samaria, when one church sent out such a swarm of publishers of the glad tidings.

Dear sir, my very soul is stirred up within me, when I think of what a world of mischief the popular clergy have done. They have shut up every body's mouth but their own; and theirs they will not open without they are paid for it. This is the plain blunt fact. And if I cannot bring facts, and documents, and arguments to shew that the paganism of the world is, in a great measure, attributable to them; that the ignorance and prejudice of our times, and that the incapacity of the believers to publish the glad tidings is altogether owing to them; that they, as a body collective, are anti-christ—then I will say that I cannot prove any proposition whatever.

But to return. Moses we are told was *preached*, being *read* in the synagogues. Paul tells us that he was ordained a *preacher* and a *teacher* of the truth among the gentiles. We are told that, daily in the temple, and from house to house, they ceased not to *teach* and to *preach* that Jesus was the Messiah. I need not say to you, that to preach is merely to publish news; but as this will be read by many, for their sakes I say that myriads may be qualified to preach either as Moses was preached, or *viva voce* to publish what Paul published to the nations, that are not qualified to *teach* the christian doctrine. And no man believes any fact but he can tell the reason why, and produce the evidence on which he believes it. This is all the New Testament means, and all I mean by *preaching*. A bishop must be "apt to teach," but nothing is said about being *apt to preach*, and you and I agree that *preaching* and *teaching* are two things essentially different. To have said that a bishop must be *apt to preach*, in that age, would have been absurd—when even women as well as men could preach. Paul mentions women of note who were his fellow-laborers; and all know how Priscilla explained to the eloquent Apollos the way of God more accurately. Euodia and Syntyche are mentioned as women who labored with the apostle Paul in the publication of the gospel. Yet in the church they were not allowed to teach, nor even to speak in the way of asking questions.

These hints are not submitted as proof of my grand proposition, "*that the association called the church of Jesus Christ is, in propria forma, the only institution of God left on earth to illuminate and reform the world,*" only as illustrative of the means by which the church is to illuminate the world. I know many will attribute it to my vanity, nevertheless I will hazard the expression that I can fill a volume of at least four hundred pages in illustration and proof, with facts, and documents, and arguments, in confirmation of the truth of the above proposition. My reason for so saying, is not to convince any person of its truth, but to form an apology for the disadvantage under which such a proposition must appear, detached from the demonstration and proof on which it rests in my mind. This work is en-

tirely too small to do justice to the numerous topics that call for notice and exposition. Our first volume is but an outline, and a very imperfect outline, of the course we design to pursue; and with all our exertions we will not be able, this year, to even introduce all the topics in our prospectus.

But to come more particularly to those items to which you object, I observe, that with respect to the preaching of the gospel, you see that, instead of being opposed to it, I advocate it on a principle and scale that leaves far in the rear all the popular expedients; and I can assure you that I know some churches in the United States that are already so far advanced in their knowledge of, and conformity to the primitive model, that *all* their members are now either almost, or altogether, accomplished preachers. I know personally, and by credible report, several Phebes, and Euodias, and Syntyches, and Eunices, and Eclectes, and Priscillas, as well as several Philips and Aquilas, &c. &c.

I am aware that there is no proposition nor course of conduct to which objections may not be made; but I must say, that I know of none that weighs a feather against this divine plan of preaching the word; and it affords me some pleasure to know that the Baptist society in former times acted in a good measure upon this principle; but I am sorry to witness their rapid strides in imitation of the corrupt systems around them in this day. I am determined, if the Lord will, in some future number to demonstrate that if a few doctors of divinity in the United States succeed in their plans, the Baptist society will inevitably be so like Babylon the Great, that no man will be able to distinguish between it and its idolatrous neighbors. I need not to inform you that some of them have actually recommended, in *base imitation* of the Paido-Baptists, the dedication of infants in the church by the parson, or shall I call him the bishop. Yes, they are determined to have the young St. Giles in lieu of the old St. Giles.

As to the missionary plans, I am constrained to differ from many whom I love and esteem, and will ever esteem if we should never agree upon this point, as well as from many whom I cannot love for the truth's sake. At the same time I am very sorry to think that any man should suppose that I am either regardless of the deplorable condition of the heathen world, or opposed to any means authorized by the New Testament for either the civilization or salvation of those infatuated pagans. But, my dear sir, how can I, with the New Testament before my face, approve the Catholic, the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, &c. missionary schemes. Are they not evidently mere sectarian speculations, for enlarging their sects, and finding appointments for their supernumerary clergy. Look again at the sums of money squandered at home and abroad under the pretext of converting the world; and again, wherein is the heathen world benefited by such conversions? Is the hand of the Lord in this business? Does he work in it as in the days of yore? Look at our own country—our Indian neighbors and our African bondmen. Are

not these, equally as the Japanese or Birmans, objects worthy of our sympathy and regard? I do not oppose, intentionally at least, the scriptural plan of converting the world. My opponents, amongst whom I am very far from ranking you, (for I know your personal regard and your attachment to the cause of our King do represent me as opposing the means of converting the world, not wishing to discriminate, in my case at least, between a person's opposing the abuses of a good cause, and the cause itself. I did contribute my mite and my efforts to the popular missionary cause, until my conscience forbade me from an acquaintance with the abuses of the principle.

In the multiplication of the copies of the scriptures I do rejoice, although I conceive even this best of all good works is managed in a way not at all comporting with the precepts of the volume itself. And shall we not oppose the abuses of any principle because of the excellency of the principle itself? It might as reasonably be alleged, that while I oppose the abuses of the divine word, or of the ordinances of Christ, that I oppose both it and them.

As to the Christian Baptist securing "the concurrence of the covetous, the ignorant, the prayerless," &c. I cannot help it. I hope it may do them good—they have the most need of instruction. But I cannot conceive that this should be an argument against it; for you will say it is no argument against the Baptist system, that men of the world, deists, statesmen, &c. prefer it, as more rational and more conducive to civil liberty than any other. But I have no doubt it will give you pleasure to be informed that, as far as my acquaintance with the subscribers extends, a very considerable proportion of them are such christians as you yourself would cheerfully embrace in christian communion. And I will farther add, that a majority of them are amongst the most intelligent, the most respectable, and the most devout members of the community. I will also add, that its greatest opposers are, for the most part, the interested priests, the young beneficiaries, ruling elders, those aspiring to posts of honor and profit in the kingdom of the clergy, and their friends and relatives. I confess there is nothing in that state of things which the New Testament authorizes, that flatters the prospects and aims of most of the popular leaders.

My circumstances, I thank God, are such, as with a moderate attention to the things of this world, will afford me the necessaries of life; but they are such as would authorize me to receive a few hundreds a-year without any material injury to myself or family. I know some of the neighboring clergy who are in better circumstances than I am, that complain of great difficulties in "getting along," who receive as good as \$500 or \$1000 a-year. I do not mention it with any other reference to your remarks, than because they afford me an opportunity of dropping a hint to some who have ascribed my course of what is called "preaching" for ten or twelve years without any compensation whatever, to

my not having *need* of support; that when I arrived a stranger in this western country, without any other property than my education, I did, from a confirmed disgust at the popular schemes, which I confess I principally imbibed when a student in the University of Glasgow, determine that I should, under the protection and patronage of the Almighty, render all the services I could to my fellow-creatures, by means of the Bible, without any earthly compensation whatever. On these principles I began, and having no other prospects than to turn my attention to some honest calling for a livelihood, I prosecuted this design without looking back. At the same time I did not censure, nor do I censure, any christian bishop who receives such earthly things as he *needs* from those to whose edification and comfort he contributes by his labors. And I do know many professed teachers who ought rather to impart a considerable per annum to their poor brethren, than to receive from them one cent. I know there are extremes on every side—I wish to avoid them. And I do know that the popular clergy are not entitled to receive one cent from the people, because they have put themselves into an office which Heaven never gave them, trample upon the rights of the people, keep them in ignorance, and *practically* deny that heavenly aphorism of our Lord, which saith, "*It is more blessed to give than to receive.*" They *practically* say, "It is more blessed to receive than to give."

I trust, from this lengthy reply to your friendly letter, you will see that there is much less difference between our views than you anticipated. There is but one saying in your letter that I cannot reconcile to your own views, nor to the fact as it occurs to my observation; which is, "that my readers cease to enjoy their religion when they embrace my views." If they do, I think their religion is of such a kind that the sooner they get rid of it the better.

As to the Paido-Baptists endeavoring to destroy the effects of my debate with Mr. Macalla, by alleging my "peculiar views," it matters nothing. If they had not these means they would find some others. Remember how Mr. Pond attacked Mr. Judson, how Mr. J. P. Campbell attacked Mr. Merrill, and how all the Paido-Baptists attacked Mr. Robinson. I am told that a certain beneficiary from Kentucky, on his way to Princeton, stopped at Washington, Pa. to inquire into my reputation, and wrote home to Kentucky that I was a very bad character, and an exile from religious society. This rite that maintains the clergy must be maintained at any rate.

Desirous of hearing from you as soon as convenient, and assuring you that no difference of opinion upon these two points which you have mentioned shall ever alienate my affection and esteem for you, I remain your fellow-servant,

EDITOR.

May 25.

PULPIT ORATORY.

THE Principal of a western college, famous for piety and erudition, has lately pronounced some of the most eloquent sermons that have ever been heard. He was appointed in the room of one that was displaced by some curious manoeuvres, which are not unfrequent in the West, under some sort of a charge of incompetency. Some of the students of the former President are said, however, to read the *Graeca Majora* very much to the satisfaction of the present Principal, and to the benefit of the whole seminary and faculty. This is no doubt owing to the superlative erudition of this prodigy of genius. A few tropes and fine sentiments treasured in the memory of his hearers, and lately handed us by a correspondent, will, no doubt, be of use to all the young divines in the West—and for their benefit we insert them.—

“It will drive the soul into shivers.—It will drive the bottom
“out of the soul.—Cold-blooded, black copperhead snake
“preachers, all rotten to the core.—All that oppose this revival,
“oppose the Holy Spirit’s work, sin the sin unto death, sin
“against the Holy Ghost, and bring upon themselves swift de-
“struction.—Brethren, the revival cloud passed over the college
“last summer, from which a few drops fell on some of our dear
“youths; the cloud has winged its way—is gone—not one drop
“since—all is now dead. We hope there is yet some praying
“persons amongst us. Pray! pray! Erect up your prayers like
“so many lightening rods, ready to catch the electric fluid which
“bursts out of the passing cloud, and pull it down on the dear
“youths.”

As this college is famous for the manufacturing of priests, we may soon expect *clouds* and *constellations* of the brightest luminaries filling the western pulpits with a new species of eloquence unknown to Greece and Rome.

* * *

EXTRACTS FROM A SERMON.

Preached at Finnick, August, 1662, by Wm. Guthry, upon Matthew xvi. 25—Reprinted by B. Franklin, 1743, in Philadelphia.

“WE may as well gang and speak to stocks and stanes, and they will not persecute us, since the thing we speak will have a like effect upon both. *Whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, speak ye my word to them, or their blood will I require at your hand.* Speak when God bids you speak, whether there come evil or good of it; if ye will not, God will make your tongues to fry and flutter upon the hot coals of hell; he will gar it blutter and bleeze upon the burning coals of hell. Speak, sir, when God bids you speak, or he will gar that tongue that he hath put into your mouth, papple and play in the how pot of hell. Ye have a bonny pretence of it, man; your bare testimony will not turn the chace. Sir, did those two witnesses in the *Revelation*, that prophesied in sackcloth, by their testimony turn the

chance? Yet they were to witness against the abominations of the times till they were slain." "In truth, then, if he deny you, I know not who will own you in that day; none of all that court and side that he is on will own you: But I know another court that will own you, believe, even the court and side of all the devils in hell, they will own you; they will know you well enough. Believe, they will gather all together about the poor soul, as so many greedy crows about a gushorn, every one gripping it straiter in their cluiks than another."—"All that he doth shall be but fuel to the curse of God that shall light broad flaught upon him."—"He shall hold bed and board on the curse of God, and the curse of God shall hold bed and board on him."—"Hell's terror shall seize upon him; the worm that never dies shall begin an inward gnawing at his heart, the worm of ill conscience rugging at his heart and intrals of him like a cankerworm drawing at his liver, an inward flame, like the fire of hell, ready to burn him up within, ere ever death come to take away the cursed carcase of him; the gnawing worm that never dieth shall ever draw at the conscience of him like a greedy glade riving at a gushorn; aye, as if the devil were within going to rive out the soul at his broad side, and to run away to hell with it. God will kindle the fire of hell in the heart of him, wherein he shall find that hungry worm, like the devil, drawing out the soul and intrals him, like a few hungry glades riving at a gushorn. Thou shalt never have rest henceforth, but an inward gnawing and rugging at the heart, till thou be fully possest in everlasting flames. Gang thy way, man, if thou hast wronged the cause of Christ for fear of thy life, I would not have an hour of thy life for all the gold of Gowry."

[This comes the nearest to the eloquence of the President of any thing we have met with, and is a fair specimen of that divinity which was popular A. D. 1662, and which, when modernized, is still fashionable amongst the orthodox. Alas! how has the gospel and the christian institutes been handled for ages by schoolmen and popular divines!—*Ed.*]

* * *

No. 12.

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1824.

VOL. I.

ESSAYS

On Ecclesiastical Characters, Councils, Creeds, and Sects.—No. III.

IN the two preceding essays under this head, we partially adverted to the causes that concurred in ushering into existence that "*monstrum horrendum informe ingens cui lumen ademptum*;" that "monster horrific, shapeless, huge, whole light is extinct," called an ecclesiastical court. By an ecclesiastical court, we mean those meetings of clergy, either stated or occasional, for the purpose of either enacting new ecclesiastical canons or of executing old ones. Whether they admit into their confederacy a lay representation, or whether they appropriate every function

to themselves, to the exclusion of the laity, is, with us, no conscientious scruple. Whether the assembly is composed of none but priests and Levites, or of one-half, one-third, or one-tenth laymen, it is alike anti-scriptural, anti-christian, and dangerous to the community, civil and religious. Nor does it materially affect either the character or nature of such a combination whether it be called Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or Congregational. Whether such an alliance of the priests and the nobles of the kirk be called a session, a presbytery, a synod, a general assembly, a convention, a conference, an association, or annual meeting, its tendency and result are the same. Whenever and wherever such a meeting either legislates, decrees, rules, directs or controls, or assumes the character of a representative body in religious concerns, it essentially becomes "the man of sin and the son of perdition."

An individual church or congregation of Christ's disciples is the only ecclesiastical body recognized in the New Testament. Such a society is "*the highest court of Christ*" on earth. Furious controversies have been carried on, and bloody wars have been waged on the subject of church government. These in their origin, progress, and termination, have resembled the vigorous efforts made to obtain the Saviour's tomb, or like the fruitless endeavors of the Jews to find the body of Moses.

As we intend to pay considerable attention to this topic, and to give details of the proceedings of ecclesiastical courts, &c. we think it necessary, in the first place, to attend to the import of the phrase "*church of Jesus Christ*," and also to the nature of the bishop's work. In the present essay I will introduce a few remarks from the "*Reasons of Alexander Carson, A. M. for separating from the General Synod of Ulster*." These will cast some light on the import of the phrase "CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST."*

Matt. xviii. 15-18. "*Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that, in the mouth of one or two witnesses, every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he shall neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.*"—Here the last appeal is to the church. He does not say, If he does not hear the church, take him to the presbytery; and if he does not hear the presbytery, take him to the synod, &c. but if he hear not the church, "*let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican.*" I know, indeed, that various subterfuges have been invented to evade the force of this plain scripture. Every sect has attempted to find its own discipline in this passage; whilst individuals, to

*Mr. Carson, as to talent, erudition, and high standing among the Presbyterians in Ireland, was not surpassed by any minister of that denomination. We shall give his preface to these reasons in the present number. He is now the bishop of a christian church at Tubermore, Ireland.

apologize for what they cannot, justify, have attempted to darken its meaning so as to make it of no practical use. The multiplicity of interpretations, in the opinion of Dr. Stillingfleet, is an argument to prove that it is totally inexplicable; in my opinion it proves only what is proved by the variety of sentiments on every other point in scripture, the perversity, the selfishness, or the prejudice of professing christians. What! has the Lord Jesus given a precept, in a case of such importance, and of such frequent occurrence, which cannot be understood? Did he wish to be, or could he not avoid being unintelligible? Must the Holy One of Israel speak with the darkness and evasion of a heathen oracle? If he did not mean to be understood, why did he speak? If he meant to be understood, why did he not speak in intelligible language? If we cannot find out who are the divinely appointed arbitrators of our differences, he might as well have said nothing on the subject. What an insult upon the Holy Ghost to represent his language to be so vague and indeterminate that it cannot be understood? Christ has said, "*tell it to the church.*" Is there no way of coming at his meaning? Has the word *church* no determinate meaning in the New Testament? But Dr. Stillingfleet is of opinion, that if the discipline Christ has appointed be executed, it is not material by whom. Is it then the same thing whether a law be enacted by the lawfully appointed legislators, or by any other body of self-constituted men? or that a criminal be tried by a lawful judge and jury, or by men who assume the right of judgment, without the countenance of lawful authority? If Christ has appointed any particular referees, it is as really a breach of his injunction to appoint any other, as it would be totally to neglect that instance of discipline. But is there any native, necessary obscurity in the precept arising from the promiscuous use of the word *church* in the New Testament? If it is now in any measure obscure, it has been rendered so not from the ambiguity of the scripture use of the word, but from its prostituted application in modern acceptation, and the sophistry and subtleties of interested, prejudiced, or bigoted men: we find no difficulty in the passage until we hear the forced explanations of it given by controvertists, and our mind begins to be distracted, and the subject obscured by the smoke of their unhallowed fires."

"I lay it down, then, as an axiom, that Christ meant some *determinate* thing by the word *church*, and that there must be sufficient evidence in the New Testament to lead the humble, teachable inquirer into that meaning. Christ must have spoken intelligible language. Now, to investigate the scriptures use of the word *church*."*

"*Ekklesia* literally signifies an assembly *called out* from others, and is used among the Greeks, particularly the Athenians, for their popular assemblies summoned by their chief magistrate, and in which none but *citizens* had a right to sit. By inherent power it may be applied to any body of men *called out* and

*Of his remarks on this topic we select only a few.

assembled in one place. If ever it loses the ideas of *calling out* and *assembling*, it loses its principal features, and its primitive use."

"Such being the origin and use of this word among the Greeks, to what may it be legitimately applied when used in sacred things? It may signify any *assembly called out* from the world, and *united in Christ*. Agreeably to this, whenever it is used in scripture in a sacred sense, that is, as applicable to believers, we find that it is invariably appropriated to an individual assembly of christians, meeting to enjoy the ordinances of Christ, or the christian community in general."

"But with equal propriety may this word be applied either to all the christians on earth, or all both in heaven and earth, as assembled in Jesus. Nor does this application stretch it a whit beyond its natural and intrinsic meaning. It is as literally and as truly applied to the one as to the other. All the saints on earth, all the saints in heaven, are assembled in him, as really as the branches of a vine are united in the trunk, the stones of a building upon the foundation, or the members of the body with the head. With the strictest truth all christians may be said to be already "in heavenly places in Christ." This double application of the word is neither foreign nor forced, incorrect nor indistinct. When it is used indefinitely, it applies to the community of believers assembled in Christ: when it is used with respect to an individual church, which is its most general application, the context or the nature of the circumstances gives sufficient intimation. Let any one take the trouble to run over all the places where it is found in the New Testament, and I will be bold to say, he will not find a single text which will not fairly explain on this hypothesis. The cases where it may occur in the civil or unappropriated sense, are not accompanied with the smallest difficulty; the context, or a note of appropriation, as "church of Christ," &c. sufficiently marking the difference."

"Having stated the literal meaning, the profane and sacred application of the word *ekklesia*, let us next examine the claims of its modern† acceptations. It is quite a chameleon. It is as various in its meaning as the necessities of each party require. Sometimes it is a church session, sometimes an individual church; sometimes a classical presbytery; sometimes a synod; sometimes a general assembly; sometimes church rulers; sometimes all the churches of a province or kingdom. Truly, if the scripture gives ground for all these, it is more dark and perplexing than was ever an answer of the Sybil. Is not the bare statement a refutation of the fact, and the supposition a calumny on the oracles of God? But the practice of Presbyterians themselves, is a complete refutation of this hypothesis. They do not speak promiscuously of all their assemblies by the name church, but have a distinct name for each, as the congregation, the session, the presbytery, the

†I call them modern, because they are later than the New Testament.

synod, &c. Now, if each order of these courts be a church, as well as each congregation, and the collective congregations, why do they not speak of them by the scripture name? Why have they imposed upon them names of their own invention? Evidently because they would otherwise be unintelligible. If one of their writers on church discipline was to speak of all their assemblies by the name church, without additional marks of distinction, his readers would not understand him; yet this is the very inaccuracy they charge upon the writers of the New Testament. They suppose them to speak promiscuously of the greatest variety of subordinate courts, as well as assemblies of a different nature, by the same name, without any mark of distinction to guide the reader. Now, I think this is a very fair criterion; scripture ordinances should be sufficiently intelligible by scripture names, without the use of any other. I believe it will be found a very just conclusion, that *the institutions which have not a name in scripture, have not an existence in scripture*. Let Presbyterians, then, use nothing but the scripture names, and their doctrine of subordinate courts will be jargon. By their unnatural extension of this word, they have taken it in modern use from that which alone deserves it—the individual assemblies of the saints. Let us suppose, then, that *ekklesia* might have been legitimately appropriated to denote any one of these assemblies, this appropriation will take it from all the rest. If a session is a church, then a congregation cannot be a church; if either of these be a church, then a presbytery cannot, without confusion, be usually so denominated; and if a presbytery is a church, then it will take that name from all inferior and superior courts. Now, if these courts be scriptural, let their advocates produce their distinct scriptural names. No word can have two appropriate meanings upon the same subject; *ekklesia* may be a civil assembly and appropriated also to a religious assembly; but in neither civil nor religious matters can it be appropriated as the distinctive name of two different assemblies, the one subordinate to the other. It may denote a particular assembly of saints, and the community of christians assembled in Jesus; but without confusion, it cannot be used as the appropriated name of a particular and general assembly of the same sort. This is clear from the names of civil courts. Though some of these be such as to be literally applicable to all, yet they are not so appropriated. Thus sessions, assizes, &c. Thus also in the church of England, though each of the orders are called clergymen, yet for this very reason it could not be the appropriated distinctive name of any one of them. There is curate, rector, bishop, &c. For the same reason, though *bishop* was the common name of all presbyters originally, yet when it was appropriated to one of the number, it was taken from all the rest. If, then, the word *church* be generally applicable to such a variety of assemblies, each assembly must have a distinctive name besides; to produce which out of scripture will be rather an arduous task. Besides, in speaking particularly of each of these assemblies, the common name could not be used,

any more than the name clergyman would distinguish a bishop from a presbyter. When our Lord says, "*then tell it to the church,*" if he intends Presbyterian ecclesiastical courts, to which does he refer? If to the session, then all higher appeals are cut off; for if the offending brother will not "*hear the church, let him be a heathen man and a publican.*" if it means a general synod or assembly, then all inferior courts are cut off. But if *church* be also the scripture name of an individual assembly of saints, consisting of pastors and church members, is not the obscurity still increased? Whether must the congregation or the session be appealed to?"

"There is not the least intimation in any part of the New Testament of a representative government. Nothing is said about a number of church rulers being selected as an ecclesiastical council over a number of individual churches; nor any such use of the word church, as including a number of individual churches. When the inspired writers speak of a singly assembly of saints, they invariably call it a church; when they speak of a number of churches, or the churches of a province or district, they do not call them a church, but churches. Thus when Paul writes to the Corinthians, he addresses the "*church of God which is at Corinth;*" but when he writes to the Galatians, he addresses *the churches of Galatia*. Thus also when the church of Jerusalem is spoken of it is called *a church* but when the aggregate of the individual churches of Judea and Samaria are spoken of, they are not called the church of Judea, or the church of Samaria, but the *churches of Judea*, and the *churches of Samaria*. Thus also *the church of Cenchrea*, (Rom. xvi. 1.) and the *churches of Achaia*; the *church of Ephesus*, the *church of Smyrna*, &c. But when they are spoken of in the aggregate, it is the seven *churches of Asia*, not the *church of Asia*, (Rev. i. 4. and ii. 1. &c.) I know indeed that with respect to Jerusalem and Corinth, it is alleged that the saints in those cities must have been too numerous to have assembled in one place. But I need not take up my time in shewing how or where they might assemble, or in ascertaining their numbers. They are not more numerous than I wish them to have been; and the scripture itself refutes the objection in both instances. Acts ii. 44. 1 Cor. v. 4. and xi. 18. In these passages they are expressly shewn to have met in the same place."

* * *

PREFACE.

To "*Reasons for separating from the General Synod of Ulster.*"

BY A. CARSON, A. M.

EVERY christian is a member of two kingdoms perfectly distinct, but perfectly compatible in their interests. In each of these, he has peculiar duties, in the discharge of which he is to pursue a very different conduct. As a subject of civil government, he is called to unreserved, unequivocal obedience, without waiting to inquire into its nature and quality, or even the legitimacy of the title of those in power. If he understands his Bible, he knows

that "the powers that be are ordained of God," and that he must "submit to every ordinance of man, not merely for wrath, but also for conscience sake." In Britain he will submit to monarchy; in America, to a republic; and in France he will obey, without puzzling himself in determining whether Bonaparte is a legal governor or a usurper.* But it is not so in the kingdom of Christ. Here it is his duty in everything to judge for himself, and in no instance to be the disciple of man. He is commanded to examine, not blindly adopt the dogmas of his spiritual guides. He is no where required to conform and submit to that form of church government under which he has been educated, or to which he may at any time have thought it his duty to attach himself. He is enjoined to "prove all things and to hold fast *only* that which is true." He is Christ's freed man and should not suffer himself to become the servant of man, nor to be fettered by human systems.

Convinced that this is both the duty and privilege of every christian, I have largely and leisurely examined the *original nature and present state* of that church† in which I was educated, and in which I have for some years acted as a minister. I have examined, and am convinced, that both in *plan and administration*, it is contrary to the word of God. It must appear to every man of candor that I could have no interest in deciding as I have done. Every interest of a worldly nature was surely on the other side. The day I gave up my connexion with the general synod, I gave up all that the world esteems. I sacrifice not only my prospects in life, and my respectability in the world, but every settled way of support. It is usual for men to desert a church under persecution; I have deserted one in the tide of her prosperity, or, as some of her friends speak, in her "*meridian glory*." If people never begin to think any thing amiss in their religion till they are persecuted for it, or till superior honors and advantages are held out to view, they have reason to suspect their judgments. But when the wealth and respectability in society are in the gift of the church, when one of her members sits in judgment upon her, she is likely to get a fair trial. A man is not apt, upon slight grounds, to reason himself out of his living, his friends, and his reputation. It will not be out of whim he will exchange ease for labor, respect for calumny, present competency for the naked promise of God. Notwithstanding this, I am perfectly aware that the worst motives and designs will be attributed to me. I would indeed know little of human nature, and less of the Bible, if I did not expect the reproaches of the world. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, much more those of his

*We Americans think that it is not incompatible with christianity to make our own rulers by all constitutional means; and that the members of every state, not governed according to the maxims of reason and justice, have a right inalienable to effect a revolution, by all lawful means, or to emigrate. Mr. Carson here speaks of submission to the constituted authorities, and in this he doubtless speaks as a christian.—Ed.

†I am obliged sometimes in this pamphlet to use the word church in this common acceptation, though not so used in any part of the New Testament.

household. He himself experienced such treatment from the world, and he knows how to succor his children in like circumstances.

The divine right of the Presbyterian form of church government, it may be expected, will now become the *present truth* among all sects of Presbyterians in this country. Their inveterate rage against each other will for a time be suspended that they may unite against the common enemy. Every pulpit will resound with the cry of innovation; many an affecting representation will be given of the sufferings of our worthy forefathers, in erecting the *venerable fabric*. I would caution christians not to suffer themselves to be imposed on by such senseless declamations. The appeal on both sides must be to the scriptures; not a stone of the fabric can be lawfully rested on any other ground. If classical presbytery is in the New Testament, let its advocates come forward and fairly refute my arguments. I have no object but truth, and whatever may be published against my pamphlet, in a christian and candid manner, shall receive every attention. But let them not lose their temper, nor substitute railing for argument. Neither let them nibble round the surface of the subject, but let them enter into the essence of the debate. If any are convinced, let them beware of stifling convictions. Let them not suffer interest, prejudice, or the fear of reproach, to deter them from obeying *the least* of the commandments of Christ. "Whoever shall be ashamed of me and my word in this sinful and adulterous generation, of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Mark viii. 38. "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake, shall find it." Matt. x. 37-39.

Though I am decidedly convinced of the complete independency of the apostolic churches, and of the duty of following them, I would not be understood as placing undue importance upon this point. Christians of every denomination I love, and I will never, I hope, withhold my hand, or my countenance from any who, after impartial investigation, conscientiously differ from me. I can from my heart say, "Grace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth." Pity, indeed, while there are so few friends of Jesus, that those should harbor hard thoughts of each other for conscientious differences. But it is not to be expected from this, that I shall "know any man according to the flesh," or avoid freely censuring whatever I judge unfounded in scripture, out of compliment to any friend who may countenance it. This would be "to walk as men."

In endeavoring to overthrow the system of Presbyterianism, I have only assaulted the main pillars of the edifice; if I have succeeded, the roof and all the rubbish will fall of course. The

voluminous defences of presbytery, of former days, I consider too stale to be particularly noticed. I wait till their advocates recognize them. But though every pin of that system could be proved to be divine, it would not affect my opinion of the duty of separating from the synod. I would stand upon ground still tenable. I do not shrink from discussion. Truth will finally prevail.

* * *

THE WOOSTER LAYMAN.

HAS, by the assistance of the clergy of that vicinity, done valiantly. He, or rather they by him as an amanuensis, have bestowed four numbers on my reply to him. As the gentleman very prudently, as he supposed, declined throwing off the mask, and courageously preferred to place himself behind a tree and discharge his abuse on my defenceless head, I am terribly wounded indeed. He might, however, have saved himself of all his merited obloquy, for he might have been assured that I was not about to enter the lists with him in the use of such weapons, whether he subscribed his name in full, or assumed the garb of an honest high-churchman, lying in ambush. He smiles at my folly in standing in the open field, while he, in his entrenchment, aims the javelins of his ire at my very vitals. Unfortunate was I, indeed, by so simple a lure, to fall into the hands of such a churchman militant, panoplied by the clergy *cap-a-pie*. But as he has honestly, no doubt, and conscientiously too, declined answering any one of the seven queries proposed to him, he has honorably exempted us from the painful task of once addressing him. But for the sake of our distant readers, as we desire to acquaint them with every thing said or done by the popular clergy and their amanuenses against this paper, we shall state what this Wooster Layman has proved.

In his first number he has proved that a parson's breath is one of the most valuable commodities in the world—equal, if not superior, to all type and paper and useful arts; that William Cobbett and myself are very similar, only with one small difference, that he is man of talents and I am not. This is a misfortune which I cannot help. If the Wooster Layman is six feet high, and a perfect Newton in genius, it is hard, it is cruel in him to curse pigmies. In the same number, in the style of hieroglyphics, he has satisfactorily proved that it was right for king Henry VIII. to make himself *head* of the church for the sake of Ann Bolen.

In his second number he has satisfactorily proved that every preacher is a regular successor of Paul and Barnabas, and entitled to the same honors, rights, and immunities.

In his third number he has demonstrated that a man that "can hardly read" might read his Bible "*thirty years*" and still be as ignorant as a layman—and that science is the light of the world.

In his fourth and last number he has most convincingly proved, that when Paul commanded Timothy to give attention

to *reading*, it was modern systems of divinity, such as Calvin's Institutes or Beza's Treatise on the propriety and necessity of burning heretics, which he was to read. After we have given this summary of the rational and argumentative part of his four numbers, we shall leave him in the undisturbed possession of all the laurels which decorate his armorial, won from the general and species of anonymous abuse. EDITOR.

* * *

**A FAMILIAR DIALOGUE,
Between the Editor and a Clergyman.**

PART I.

Clergyman. WHY do you preach, seeing you decry all preaching?

Editor. I do not decry all preaching. I have said that it is the duty of every disciple to preach.

C. But how can they preach except they be *sent*?

E. I presume there are no preachers upon earth who are *sent* in the sense of those words quoted from the apostle.

C. Yes; I believe I am as much *sent* as any preacher ever was; and if I did not believe that I was *sent* I would not preach a word.

E. Well, sir, I find myself happy in meeting with a preacher sent from God. I will sit down at your feet and believe every thing you say, only remove some few doubts I have respecting your mission.

C. I do not want you to receive all that I say. Judge for yourself.

E. You do not, then, believe you are sent of God; for, assuredly, if you were sent of God, I should be a great sinner not to believe every word you say. For God would not send you to declare falsehoods, nor to deceive mankind. If you will then prove that you are *sent*, I will examine no more for myself. I will believe what you say. Who ever was sent of God with a message to men, that it is not lawful and necessary implicitly to receive upon his word? or in other words, was it not highly criminal in every instance, and at the peril of the hearer, to refuse implicit faith in the word of every heavenly messenger?

C. I do not pretend to plenary inspiration; but I contend that I am *sent*, or *called* of God, to preach.

E. To preach what?

C. The gospel.

E. What do you mean by preaching the gospel?

C. I mean to make it known.

E. You are not, then, sent unto us in this region, for the gospel has been made known to us already by such preachers as leave us without excuse; whom, if we believe not, we would not be persuaded though one rose from the dead. I mean Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul and Peter, if you please—Have you any thing *new* to add?

C. I do not mean to make it known as if it had never been read or heard before; but to make known what they have said about it.

E. You mean to explain it, I suppose.

C. Yes, and to enforce it upon the attention of mankind.

E. To make the fact known is to *preach*, and to explain the meaning of that fact is to *teach*. But on your own views I would humbly ask, Did ever the Father of our spirits send one class of preachers to *make known* his will, and afterwards *send* another class to explain their message and to enforce it?

C. Yes, he sent the Apostles to explain the Prophets.

E. And he sent you to explain the apostles; and, by and by, he will send other preachers to explain you; and so explanations will never cease, and new missions will succeed each other till time be no more. Your saying that he sent the apostles to explain the prophets, is not more ingenious than Tobiah's saying, "He sends the *event* to explain the accomplishment of prophecy."

C. And are there not many things in Paul's writings "hard to be understood, which the unlearned and ignorant wrest to their destruction?"

E. I hope you do not suppose that the explanation of these things is preaching. But as you and many of your brethren often cite these words, will you hear a remark or two upon them. It is not the *epistles* that is the antecedent to "*hois*," but "the things" mentioned by Peter. I need not tell you that *epistolais* is feminine and *hois* neuter; consequently, it is not the language or style of Paul that is referred to in this passage, but *the things* themselves of which he spoke. However, I lay no stress on this distinction, as we admit the scriptures are often wrested—but by whom? Peter says the *unteachable* (*amatheis*), not the unlearned, but, as Macknight says, "the unteachable" and the double-minded; and these are always the learned or those who think themselves wise. You know that the Romanists infer from these words the necessity of an infallible interpreter. Their words are, "The scriptures are not sufficient for deciding controversies concerning the articles of faith; and the decision of these matters is to be sought from the Catholic church." But the misfortune is, that the Catholics do not tell us "whether it is the Pope alone, or the Pope in conjunction with his own clergy, or a general council of his bishops, or any particular council, or any other body of men in their church distinguished by a particular denomination." This is good policy, for all those to whom they have attributed infallibility have erred, as they are constrained to admit. And I think you will admit that none now differ more about the meaning of scripture than the learned.

C. But do not you say it is the duty of all disciples to preach, and what are they to preach, and to whom?

E. The disciples can preach only in the same way that Moses was preached, being *read* in the synagogues. This they may and

can do, either by declaring the same things *viva voce*, or by reading the gospel and exhibiting its evidences to them who either cannot or will not read the Evangelists and Apostles.

C. But have they not all heard already, and can you, on your own principles, make known to them what they have already heard?

E. They have not all heard; for there are all the children born unto the disciples, which it becomes their duty to disciple unto Christ, and therefore christian parents stand in the relation of preachers to their own children. There are also some parents that are not disciples, and consequently their children are brought up in darkness. Now, as every disciple has access to these, it becomes his duty to instil into their minds, as far as human agency can extend, the words of eternal life.

C. Yes, and miserable preachers the mass of disciples will make—can't put three sentences together—not one in ten of them can explain one verse intelligibly. And you will set the women's tongues loose too, and they have always been too troublesome even when under every possible restraint; but you have removed all barriers and turned them loose upon us. Believe me, sir, your principles are of a disorganizing character.

E. And to what is the incapacity of the disciples to preach and speak intelligibly owing? Doubtless to their religious education—to their teachers. Every person who has ideas upon any subject can communicate them. If his ideas are indistinct, his communications will be so too; but if his perceptions are accurate and clear, his addresses will be plain and intelligible. But you who occupy the pulpit, are the very persons who are to blame for this incapacity. This useless and senseless way of talking, which you call preaching, into which the old pagans led you, is the very way to make the people ignorant, to confound, perplex, and stupify them. This everlasting sermonizing! what good is in it? It resembles nothing that is rational in all the compass of thought. A B professes to teach arithmetic; he gets a class of forty boys from 12 to 15 years old, we shall say. He tells them to meet once-a-week and he will give them a lecture or a sermon on some important point in this useful science. The first day he lectures on the cube root for an hour. They sit bookless and thoughtless, heedless, and, perhaps, often drowsy, while he harangues them. He blesses them and sends them home, to return a week hence. They meet. His text is arithmetical progression. He preaches an hour; dismisses as usual. The third day of the meeting up comes vulgar fractions; the fourth, rule of three; the fifth, addition; the sixth, notation; the seventh, cube root again, &c. &c. Now in this way, I hesitate not to say, he might proceed seven years and not finish one accountant. Whoever thought that a science or an art could be taught this way? And yet this is the only way, I may say, universally adopted of teaching the christian religion. And so it is that many men have sat under the sound of the gospel (as they call it) for forty

years, that cannot expound one chapter in the whole New Testament. And yet these same christians would think it just to prosecute by civil law that teacher who would keep their sons four or five years at English grammar or arithmetic, and receive their money, and yet not one of their sons able to expound one rule in syntax or arithmetic. They pay the parson—they are of maturer minds than their children, and they have been longer under his tuition, and yet they will excuse both the parson and themselves for knowing just as little, if not less, of the New Testament, than their striplings know of grammar or arithmetic.

C. Then you will reduce the christian doctrine to a level with common arithmetic, and you suppose that christianity can be taught just as easy as arithmetic.

E. You profess to be a Calvinist, if I mistake not; and do you not suppose that a disciple is as capable of being taught christianity as arithmetic, provided he is “a subject of divine grace,” and you know that otherwise he would not be a disciple on the Calvinistic hypothesis. But upon either the Calvinistic or Arminian hypothesis, a disciple of Christ can be taught the christian religion in a proper course of education as soon as he can be taught any human science.

C. And so you suppose there is nothing more grand, sublime, deep, or unsearchable in the christian religion, than in a human science, such as arithmetic?

E. That does not follow from my assertion. There are many things incomprehensible and sublime in various sciences; but a person is said to understand and to be able to teach them, who is not able to comprehend and to explain every topic connected therewith. Many persons can teach arithmetic very well who do not understand one proposition of Euclid’s ratios.

C. But it is only when the Spirit of God accompanies the preacher’s words that the people learn; and that Spirit is not at the command of the preachers.

E. I know of no passage in the New or Old Testament that says that the Spirit of God accompanies any of our preachers’ words. Besides, the disciples are the sons of God and have the Spirit of Christ, and are therefore every way qualified to learn, under a proper teacher, according to your own hypothesis. But, sir, they can never be taught christian religion in the way of sermonizing. Public speeches may be very useful on many occasions; but to teach a church the doctrine of Christ, and to cause them to understand the Holy Scriptures, and to enjoy them, requires a course essentially different from either hearing sermons or learning the catechism.

C. I wish to resume sundry topics in the commencement of our interview, but will have to postpone it for the present. Adieu.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

A REVIEW.

Of a Clergyman's Defence of the Annual Meeting of the General Assembly, from the Pittsburgh Recorder of June 1.

A CERTAIN "Clericus" in the Pittsburgh Recorder of June 1, discusses the following query:—

"Would it be for the interest of religion in the Presbyterian church in North America, to have said church divided into three separate sections, governed by three General Synods, and to have the General Assembly meet once in three years?"

The writer observes, "This question, or something like it, I have been informed, was laid before the last Assembly, and the consideration of it postponed to some future occasion."

He answers the question in the negative. The following reasons are assigned:—

1. "It would lead to the independent form of government." This would be an evil of no small magnitude.
2. "The course of justice would be retarded; and, in case of three general synods, the ground of review would be greatly enlarged; so that the General Assembly meeting triennially would have business sufficient to occupy it at least two or three months. Thus an aggrieved and injured appellant would at least suffer three years in many cases before he could have a final decision; and some cause might occasion the postponement of his case to another meeting of the Assembly, and thus he must suffer six years, and it might be nine before he could obtain redress."

This is passing strange! An "injured appellant," who has found no redress in a session, and thence appealed to a presbytery, remains unredressed. He appeals to a synod, but wisdom and equity are not there adequate to his relief. He appeals to a general synod, composed of provinces or states of clergy, equal to one-third of the union, and yet there is neither wisdom nor justice sufficient to relieve him!!! This "Clericus" has, indeed, a poor opinion of all inferior church judicatories. His remarks upon this question remind me of a question proposed in the book of Job, viz.—"Where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?" Every grand apartment in the universe is summoned and forced to exclaim, "*Not in me! Not in me!*" So this clergyman saith, In what church court shall wisdom and righteousness be found? The session saith, *Not in me*—and the presbytery saith, *Not in me*—and the synod saith, *Not in me*—and, lo! a general synod saith, *Neither could they be found in me*. I presume the general assembly might also say, *That which does not exist in the constituents does not exist in the constituted*, and therefore it echoes, *Not in me!*

He next exhorts the clergy to take up their cross and go to Philadelphia once-a-year. "*No cross, no crown.*" No going to Philadelphia annually, no honor nor reward to the clergy.

To lighten the cross he proposes that every member in the south and west should contribute 25 cents a-year into the commissioners' fund to help the clergy to cross the mountains and to find something to eat and drink along the road. His words are—

“Each presbytery in the west and south might be sufficiently represented annually in the General Assembly, as far as expences are concerned, by a contribution of 25 cents yearly from each member of the church, to the commissioner's fund.”

And, adds he, “Let ministers do their duty, and it would be collected.”

Supposing that the half the Presbyterian church lives in the south and west, (and we believe the larger part of it lies there,) then he would appropriate the sum of 18,700 dollars to less than 100 representatives; that is about 187 dollars to each delegate for one trip to the general assembly. That I am within the bounds, and considerably within the bounds of the generosity of this clergyman, we have only to come to particulars. It was reported a year or two ago that the number of members in the Presbyterian church amounted to about 144,000. To say that they amount at the present time to 150,000, will be moderate enough on their own documents. The average of 25 cents to the commissioners' fund from all these members amount to the handsome sum of 37,500 dollars. The one half of which for the south and west, is just 18,750 dollars, to less than, perhaps, on an average, 75 delegates—gives better than 200 dollars per head. The supreme court of the Presbyterian church is annually worth to the men, women, and children of that sect, 37,500 dollars; that is, worth 25 cents to every communicant. What a blessing! at how cheap a rate!!

This clergyman, to cap the climax, compares the toils and pains of riding or going in a chaise to Philadelphia, the metropolitan ecclesiastical city, to sit in this supreme court for the compensation of 200 dollars, to the pains and sorrows of the Saviour of the world. He thus expresses himself—

“Now, a journey of eight, nine, or ten hundred miles, once in five or six years, ought not to be considered as too great and oppressive by any, for the service of him who came the long journey from heaven to our polluted, miserable world, for their salvation. He went about in hunger and poverty, doing good, and at last died on the cross before he returned home. None of us are called to do this in going to the General Assembly. And O! it is a shame for any to complain of such a journey!”

The advantages of this “supreme court” he specifies as first conducing to make the ministers preach better for a while after they come home. Whether the improvements is in the appetite of the people, which is more easily pleased after a long fast, or whether it is owing to the notes of the new sermons taken by the preachers who have copied something from one another during their “*sederunt*,” or whether it is some special grace at-

tendant upon the meeting of the supreme court, he does not inform us.

A second great blessing resulting from this meeting, is, that—

“A similarity of feeling and of views takes place, and thence harmony of measures and united efforts for the public interests of the church. In the General Assembly the whole Presbyterian church meets by her representatives.”

These “public interests of the church” are most commonly the public misfortunes of men, and a mere pretext for the most arbitrary and oppressive decisions; and this meeting of the whole Presbyterian church, of 150,000 members, by one or two hundred *representatives*, an idea belonging to the highest order of absurdities—what! a meeting of a church for the purposes of a church by proxy! What! a man representing the conscience of a thousand members!! Yes, a thousand members praying, praising, worshipping, and voting by proxy—by a representative in the things pertaining to the moral and positive decisions of the King and Head of the church!!! We should not have noticed this singular piece were it not accordant to the “public views” of most of that sect, and had it not been highly recommended by the professed editor of the *Pittsburgh Recorder*.* There are many other things equally absurd in this piece, which our present opportunity will not permit us to notice.

EDITOR.

* * *

“NOTIFICATION.”

IT will doubtless be remembered what a terrible “*notification*” the *Pittsburgh Recorder* gave of our paper some weeks since, relative to a statement concerning a certain missionary in Pittsburgh. It will also be remembered that we paid a courtly attention to this notification, and demanded, on the footing of *justice*, yes, of *common justice*, that our notification should be published in said paper; but the worthy editor, ever true and faithful to his own interest and also to that of his sect, suppressed our notification, and to this moment permits many of his readers to believe that this notification was founded on fact. Yea, he is the cause, the sole cause, of having wounded our reputation as far as his notification is believed by that portion of his readers whose information concerning us came through his notification. I would advise the writer and publisher of that notification, as they are both preachers of the Mosaic law, to read

**There is a religious-political, or a political-religious paper of this name published in the city of Pittsburgh, under the character of a Presbyterian missionary, or a missionary Presbyterian paper—which “records” the affairs of Pittsburgh with great accuracy, and particularly the employments and residence of its patrons; for instance, it has told us twenty-two times in so many weeks, or it has recorded twenty-two times how many clergymen, tailors, barbers, &c. in Pittsburgh take it, and where they all live. These and many other great and mighty events it records, highly interesting to the christian community.*

Rabbi Brown's explanation of that precept which saith, "*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*"

It seems, however, that there is no more occasion for my "quiver full of arrows" to be called forth in this matter—those that have been discharged having reached the seat of life, the very heart itself, of those concerned in framing said notification. The framers thereof now sleep with, and are gathered unto their fathers.†

EDITOR.

* * *

TRANSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY.

IT was remarked in the 5th No. of this paper, that the Presbyterian priesthood had lost the control of this University. As a natural and necessary consequences of this fatal measure, infidelity and irreligion were said to have made some furious assaults upon the good citizen of that vicinity, and were likely to invade the very limits of the Presbyterian church. To check this daring spirit that took possession of this University, soon as these sacred guardians of religion and morality withdrew their frowns against those demons it became necessary to unite their efforts to regain its ascendancy. But unfortunately such were the measures adopted, and such has been the course pursued by that sacred triumvirate, or confederated *three*, who have commanded the ranks of the Reforming Revolutionists for the last six months of this furious war, that they have lost all hopes of gaining their glorious object, and the whole campaign has ended more fatal to the cause of those ecclesiastics, than that which General Hull commanded in the last war, did, to the United States. The reverend sages who pamphleteered, and those who appeared in the newspaper columns, instead of hurling *ex officio* the president of this institution, have hurled themselves out of the greater share of the public esteem which had yet remained to some of them, and have, by the necessary laws of action and re-action, more firmly seated the Doctor in the presidential chair, and themselves on stools "around upon the ground," and so near are they to the dust that their garments require washing. A large accession of influential and respectable friends to the institution and its faculty, has been the grand result, as we are informed, of that clerical intrigue exhibited on the occasion. It is a question of some moment and of some difficulty too, and ought to be maturely considered, whether Virgil, Horace, or Cicero can be taught by any other than a Presbyterian, and whether the daily prayers of such a teacher and a knowledge of the five Calvinistic points of discrimination, are essential to the right knowledge of the dead languages and

†The Washington Examiner, for the good and substantial reason that he is a friend to the clergy and all their measures, refused to publish my notification of that priestly notification; thus showing that he is an honest and impartial witness in all things appertaining to religious matters, and of course in things political; for he that is just in that which is little, is also just in that which is much.

the heathen mythology. And above all, it ought to be cautiously ascertained, what it is in this clerical system that possesses such a controlling power over that spirit of infidelity and impiety which always dies in the presence, and revives in the absence, of a successor of Paul or Peter.

We have understood that the Faculty of the Transylvania University is a learned and respectable one, and that they, together with the trustees of said University, have decreed that the pulpit and chapel of the University shall be open to every respectable religious teacher, of almost any sect, in due succession, or as opportunity offers, such as Methodists, Quakers, Baptists, Independants, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Romanists, &c. &c. and thus no one sect nor sectarian teacher shall have any undue influence on the minds of the numerous youth that repair thither. This is assuredly the most liberal, most equitable, and most prudent course hitherto adopted in any seminary in this country; and is precisely adapted to the genius of our country, of our government, and of the times, and puts to death every objection that could be urged either against the religious views of a principal or a subordinate teacher as being heterodox. The evidence of reason and of scripture is now, or may be fairly presumed to be, the only controlling authority in this establishment, if we except the controlling power of the prejudices of education. Until the Bible is better understood, and until the popular notions about clerical preachers are abandoned, and until it appears that there is no necessity for, nor good resulting from a chaplain in congress, in a war-ship, in an army, or in a college, the above decision will be considered both generous, and just, and polite.

EDITOR.

* * *

From the Columbian Star.

DEDICATION.

THE new Baptist meeting-house in Pomfret, Con. was solemnly dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, on Thursday, the 15th of April. The exercises on this interesting occasion were opened by singing an anthem, followed by prayer by Elder *James Grow* of Thompson; sermon by Elder *John Nichols* of Woodstock, from 1 Kings, chap. v. part of 5th verse. "And behold I propose to build a house unto the name of the Lord my God." Concluding prayer by Elder *Zena Leonard* of Sturbridge; and an anthem closed the exercises of the interesting season. The house is commodious—52 feet by 40.

["WAS SOLEMNLY DEDICATED!" as Solomon dedicated the Temple! *Queries*.—Is this a Jewish or a Christian institute! Have we *holy places* now? Who required this 52 feet by 40 to be solemnly dedicated to the Lord? Is this house or are these brick now standing in any other relation to the God of heaven than when in the mason's hands that laid, or in the moulder's hand that framed them? Will every Baptist carried captive,

after praying with his eyes directed to this *devoted place*, be rescued from his enemies. Whether was it the anthem, the prayer introductory, the sermon, or the concluding prayer that rendered this house holy or dedicated to the Lord? And would not a Baptist be better employed in reading his New Testament or in his closet, than in following up, in base imitation of Paido-Baptists, a custom that even the Jews did not practise except in the *one* instance of the Temple. No proof exists that any meeting-house amongst the Jews ever was dedicated to the Lord by the three parsons, two prayers, one anthem, and a sermon. And last of all, ought not those good people in Connecticut to have had some *holy water* applied to the burying grounds, and had the graveyard consecrated in true Popish style, and thus have prohibited the bones of any unbaptized person from reposing under the sacred turf? A little light from an Eastern Star on these grand topics would be of service to us poor creatures living in the region of darkness and error.] EDITOR.

* * *

From the Gettysburgh Compiler.

STATISTICS

Of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

FROM the Synodical and Presbyterial reports presented to the General Assembly at their present session, it appears that there are under the care of the Assembly 13 Synods, 77 Presbyteries, 1679 congregations, and 1027 ministers. The number of vacant congregations is 769; licentiates, 173; and candidates, 195. The number of communicants added during the past year is 10,431, and the whole number of communicants is 114,905.* The number of adult baptisms during the year has been 2,120, and of infant baptisms 10,642. The amount of collections for missions, \$6,795; for commissioners' fund, \$2,692; for theological seminary, \$1,465; for presbyterial fund, \$370, and for education fund, \$7,728. As the reports are made only once in four years, we shall have no further returns till the year 1828.

☞ A review of the report of the last general assembly will appear in our next.

* * *

A NEW, OR RATHER AN OLD METHOD OF CONVINCING A MAN THAT HE IS IN AN ERROR.

THE following communication is an extract from a letter written to me by a gentleman who had, some months since, read the Mount Pleasant Debate. It was not sent us for publication; but we are of opinion that it may be useful as a means of conviction, that priestcraft is a craft *per se*:—

*Whether the aggregate amount of communicants be 114,000 or 141,000, we cannot determine, as different papers give both sums.

SUMMONS FROM THE SESSION.

WHEREAS, denying the duty of infant baptism is contrary to the rules of the Secession church, and the scriptures of truth, they, who are guilty of this error, are worthy of censure; but you, Francis Chatley, a member of the Secession church, have repeatedly denied infant baptism, in the presence of John Stewart and Daniel Campbell, contrary to the Westminster Confession, Shorter Catechism, question 75, and the scriptures quoted on that question—Therefore, you, Francis Chatley, a member of the Secession church, are guilty of denying infant baptism, and ought to be censured, according to the rules of the Secession church.

Signed by order of the Session,
January 10, 1823.

DAVID IMBRIE.

Witnesses to the above charge—
JOHN STEWART,
DANIEL CAMPBELL,

* * *

A CIRCULAR LETTER

APPEARED in the "*Columbian Star*" of June 19th, addressed to every Baptist church in Massachusetts, and signed by Thomas Baldwin, Lucius Boles, N. W. Williams, Jonathan Going, F. Wayland, jun. recommending as "a good work" the formation of a state convention, to be entitled, "*The Baptist Convention of the State of Massachusetts.*" As an inducement to the churches in Massachusetts to form such a convention, they are told that similar conventions "are formed and forming" in Connecticut, Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, and New York, besides in several of the southern states.

Provided three associations concur in the constitution recommended and in the measure as a whole, the first meeting is to take place in Boston the last Wednesday in October next. It is also proposed under the 10th article of this constitution, that "whenever a general convention formed from state conventions throughout the United States shall be formed or designed, it shall be in the power of this convention to send delegates to such conventions and to instruct them to enter into any arrangements to promote the interests of religion," &c.

The Baptist churches send three or four delegates or representatives to the associations. The associations are, according to this constitution, to send one delegate for every five churches to the state convention, and the state convention is to send delegates on some ratio to the general assembly or convention.

And so we Baptists are to march forth in solid phalanx, "terrible as an army with banners" I would propose as amendment to this plan. I dislike tautology and monotony, and would, instead of so many kinds of conventions, *move* that the names of those highly useful meetings to be changed as follows—

Those councils that are sometimes called churches, let them be called *church sessions*. Let the associations be called *presbyteries*; the state conventions, *synods*; the general convention, let it be called *the general assembly of the Baptist church of the United States*. Let there be a fund attached to this establishment called the *delegates' fund*; and let it be enjoined at the first meeting of the general convention or general assembly, that every minister shall dedicate to the Lord every male and female child, born of baptized parents, at any convenient time within forty days after its birth; and let this *rite* be called *spiritual baptism adapted to infants*; provided always, that the parents are willing to bring their infants to the church to the parson to bless them; and that the parson's hand which shall be laid upon their head shall be duly *dry* at the time of imposition.

Under this arrangement and modification, I think we shall be the most popular and powerful party in the Union; and as for being orthodox, there can be no doubt upon that subject, seeing we shall have the concurrence of the Presbyterian and Congregational brethren, who will assuredly send us annually a few delegates, indicative of their great good will and high approbation of our charity, liberality, and *soundness* in the faith. I hope we Baptists in the western states will have no conscientious scruples on the propriety of this "*motion*," nor even call into question the "*scripturality*" of such a scheme, seeing the New England states and those in the south have said, "*Go forward!*" *Keep not back!*" And especially as Jethro in the wilderness advised Moses to appoint captains over tens, captains over fifties, captains over hundreds, and captains over thousands. All of which is respectfully submitted to our brethren in the East and West—by

THE EDITOR.

* * *

I HAVE acted very imprudently, say many, in the exhibition of the matter contained in this volume. If I had not been so plain and so full in opposing many popular plans, just in the commencement, I might have, say they, obtained a more extensive circulation for this paper. I confess I used none of this sort of policy. My great object was to please myself. And as to policy, I acted under the impression of the truth of that adage which saith, *Honesty is the best policy*. Whenever I cannot obtain a circulation for what I believe to be the truth, I will cease to be an editor; and while this paper will quit cost, I shall bestow all my labor rather than be a silent spectator of the proceedings and events of the times. Its circulation, however, has far surpassed my anticipations. I think I may promise that the second volume will be more interesting than the first, as my time during the past year has been chiefly devoted to objects that did not enter into my views when the prospectus was issued. We flatter ourselves that our labors have not been altogether in vain.

EDITOR.

END OF VOL. I.

THE
CHRISTIAN BAPTIST,
PUBLISHED MONTHLY;

EDITED BY
ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

Style no man on earth your Father; for he alone is your Father who is in heaven; and all ye are brethren. Assume not the title of Rabbi; for ye have only One Teacher: neither assume the title of Leader; for ye have only One Leader—The Messiah.
Matth. xxiii. 8—10.

Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.
Paul the Apostle.

What a glorious freedom of thought do the Apostles recommend! and how contemptible in their account is a blind and implicit faith! May all christians use this liberty of judging for themselves in matters of religion, and allow it to one another, and to all mankind.
Benson.

THREE VOLUMES IN TWO:
VOL. II.
SECOND EDITION

BUFFALOE, BROOKE COUNTY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL, AT THE
BUFFALOE PRINTING OFFICE.

1827.

**THE
CHRISTIAN BAPTIST**

No. 1.—Vol. II.

BUFFALOE, August 2, 1824.

Whole No. 13

PREFATORY REMARKS

THE priesthood of the East and West, or those who claim a *divine right* of teaching *authoritatively* the christian religion, have been, and now are, seduouly at work, some in their weekly harangues, and others in their parochial visitations, shewing to their good and loyal subjects the awful danger of reading the "*Christian Baptist*." They express a great concern about the souls of their hearers, and the dangerous tendency of our feeble efforts to persuade the people to read, examine, and judge for themselves. But whence this alarm—this Demetrian cry of the church in danger? Do these divines sincerely believe that it will be injurious to the souls of their worshippers to read this work? If so, then they only prove how useless they have been to their hearers. Why have they not instructed their hearers better, and thus have rendered them superior to imposition? What would we think of a teacher of grammar or arithmetic, who, after spending seven, seventeen, or twenty-seven years in teaching his pupils those sciences, should afterwards express a great fear of their reading any treatise on those same sciences, which had for its object either the approbation or reprobation of his instructions? Would he not, *ipse facto*, betray himself?

But, however uncharitable it may appear, we sincerely believe that they are unwilling to have their *authority* called in question, and fear the experiment of an effort to maintain it. The learned and the unlearned clergy have always exhibited an eager desire to pass themselves off for ambassadors for Christ, or a sort of plenipotentiaries, whose preachings, prayers, and exhortations, have a peculiar efficacy in heaven and earth, of which the prayers and exhortations of a christian cobbler or a christian maid-servant are divested. Now I am just such a simpleton as to believe that the preachings, exhortations, and prayers of sister Phebe, the maid-servant of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, are possessed of as much *authority* and *efficacy* as those of her master. By *authority*, here, I mean just every thing that the clergy claim to have peculiarly conferred on them from heaven. Such pretensions to authority, or a divine right to officiate as they do, are, no doubt, as useful to make the people fear them and pay them, as a mitre, a surplice, a cloven cap, or a sable gown is to a Popish priest, for all the wise and noble ends of his calling. But either the clergy possess an authority or a divine right to preach, pray, and exhort in public assemblies, on "the Sabbath day," which every other member of the religious community does not possess, or they do not. Now if they do, it can be proven that they do; and if they do not, it can be proven that they do not. I have already pledged myself to the public to prove that they do not, whenever any of

them attempts to prove that they do. And I will add, that if I cannot prove, and satisfactorily too, to every umpire, that their pretensions, right, and authority to act as they do, is given them, *not from heaven*, but from men; then I will say that I can prove no point whatever. But how to reconcile their conduct to any correct principles, religious or moral, I find not. If I had a piece of genuine gold, or a coin that I thought genuine, soon as its genuineness was called in question, I, being conscious that the more it was tested the brighter it would shine, would not fear to have it subjected to the severest scrutiny. But were I possessed of a base coin, or of a counterfeit bank bill, which I wished to be reputed genuine, I would endeavor (being a rogue) to pass it off amongst the ignorant and unsuspecting, and fearfully avoid examination. The Protestant clergy have, when it suited their interest, laughed at the arrogant pretensions of the Papist clergy to *infallibility*. We view their pretensions to *authority* just in the same light.

The great body of the laity are so completely preached out of their common sense, that they cannot guess or conjecture how the christian religion could exist without priests. And I believe it to be as difficult to persuade many of them that they could do much better without them, as it once was, or as it is now, to persuade the loyal subjects of an eastern monarch, that a nation could exist without a king and nobles at its head. The United States, however, has proved the fallacy of such doctrine; and the primitive church, as well as many congregations of saints in modern times, have proved to those acquainted with their history, that either a learned or an unlearned clergy are now, and ever have been the cause of all division, superstition, enthusiasm, and ignorance of the people.

These sentiments are, we know, obnoxious to the wrath and vengeance of this order; and woe awaits him that rises up against the Lord's anointed. Our remarks, puny and insignificant as the clergy view of them, are honest, well meant, and above board. Their efforts to defend themselves, strong, powerful, and valiant as they are, are in secret, by the fireside, or in the wooden box, where they think themselves protected from exposure and defeat. Two honest men, it is true, my friend Thomas G. Jones, and the reverend editor of the Pittsburgh Recorder, have *once*, but not *twice*, manfully lifted up their pen like a two-edged sword; but alas; for the honor of the cloth, it soon sought its scabbard. They cannot, either in honor to their own well meant efforts, nor to the sacredness of their calling, say I am so worthless and vile as to be unworthy of their notice. For why, then, have they noticed me at all? And were they as sacred as the Saviour of the world, and I as vile as the woman of Samaria, they would do well to remember that the former deigned to converse and reason with the latter. Or if they are ambassadors of Heaven's Almighty King, and I as common as an Epicurean, a

Stoic, or an idolatrous Lycaonian, they should remember that Paul, as great and as well an attested ambassador as they, disputed with Epicureans, Stoics, and Lycaonians. Or if they view me as an erring brother, as Paul did some in his time, they should be as open and as explicit as Paul, who, before them all, rebuked Peter to his face. It is true, indeed, that some of them have made me worse than any of these; for the president of a western college who took it into his head that he was the eloquent orator noticed in a former number, to a friend who asked him his opinion of it and me, very laconically replied, "*He is the Devil.*" Supposing this were the case, and that Satan had actually appeared in human form, his serene highness, though marked D. D should remember that the Saviour of the world rebutted the Devil with "*It is written,*" and not with saying "*You are the Devil.*"

I honestly confess that the popular clergy and their schemes appear to me fraught with mischief to the temporal and the eternal interests of men, and would anxiously wish to see them converted into useful members, or bishops, or deacons of the christian church. How has their influence spoiled the best gifts of Heaven to men! Civil liberty has always fallen beneath their sway—the inalienable rights of men have been wrested from their hands—and even the very margin of the Bible polluted with their inventions, their rabbinical dreams, and whimsical nonsense. The Bible cannot be disseminated without their appendages; and if children are taught to read in a Sunday school, their pockets must be filled with religious tracts, the object of which is either directly or indirectly to bring them under the domination of some creed or sect. Even the distribution of the Bible to the poor must be followed up with those *tracts*, as if the Bible dare not be trusted in the hands of a layman, without a priest or his representative at his elbow. It is on this account that I have, for some time, viewed both "Bible Societies" and "Sunday Schools" as a sort of recruiting establishments to fill up the ranks of those sects which take the lead in them. It is true that we rejoice to see the Bible spread, and the poor taught to read by those means; but notwithstanding this, we ought not, as we conceive, to suffer the policy of many engaged therein to pass unnoticed, or to refrain from putting those on their guard who are likely to be caught by "the sleight of men and cunning craftiness."

As we have in the first volume devoted a number of articles to the exposition of modern devices, we shall still continue true and faithful to the principles on which we have set out; and, in this volume, pay a little more attention to the primitive state of things than we have in the former. For while we would endeavor to unmask the clergy and their kingdom, we would wish to call the attention of our readers, occasionally at least, to the contemplation of that glorious superstructure built by the founder and his skillful architects, described in the New Testament.

We have only to assure every one who may read this work, that any article, written in proper style, by any person, clergyman or layman, in opposition to any sentiment we have expressed, shall be received with pleasure and correctly inserted. We will give every opportunity to our readers to judge for themselves; for we have never yet been afraid to publish the remarks of our warmest opposers; nor could we ever yet see the propriety of laying an embargo on the ears of those who hear us, lest they should be misled. We wish the exhortation of the apostle to have its fullest latitude—“*Prove all things and hold fast that which is good.*” And as both the Old and New Testament wise men teach us to answer different persons in a different style, for reasons there assigned, so we shall ever discriminate betwixt those “of whom we ought to make a difference,” the interested and the disinterested errorist. We hope ever to manifest that *good will* is our motive, and *truth* our object. EDITOR.

* * *

A REVIEW

Of the General Assembly's last Report

THIS ecclesiastical paper was published by order of the General Assembly, and signed by the stated clerk. It is therefore an authentic document. It may also be fairly presumed that it is a fair specimen of the religious feelings and literary talents of this ambitious and aspiring party. It must be as interesting to the people of that religious community, as the president's message is to the good citizens of the commonwealth.

Every religious system, like every human body, has a spirit peculiar to itself. It is also true, that there is a great similarity in human spirits, so there is a great similarity in the spirits of religious systems. This general similarity does not, however, annihilate or obscure the predominant peculiarities of each—This is as evident as that although every perfect face exhibits eyes, nose, mouth, and cheeks, yet there is such a variety in the adjustment of these, and other constituents of human countenance, as render the discrimination of face from face easy to all—The Presbyterian system exhibits a countenance specifically the same as other religious systems; yet the peculiarities in its aspect easily distinguish it from every other. One thing is certain, that the spirit of Presbyterianism is a lofty and aspiring one. It cannot, like a Roman chief, bear an equal or a superior. It aims for the chief place in the nation, and views every other system as an impudent intruder upon its rights and liberties. A full proof of this is afforded in all their plans and manoeuvres, from the kirk session to the supreme court; and more especially in their synodical reports. Let us take a specimen from the title of the last Report, the present subject of review:—

“A Narrative of the state of religion within the bounds of

the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, and its corresponding churches, in the United States of America."

"The bounds of the General Assembly;" that is, the whole United States, as would seem from the scope of the Review. The Presbyterian church is, then, bounded on the North by the British provinces, on the East by the Atlantic ocean, on the South by the gulf of Mexico, &c. and on the West, for aught I know, by the Pacific ocean. A Report of the state of religion within these bounds as a matter of no small moment. All the Arians, Socinians, Arminians, Deists, Quakers, Methodists, Episcopalians, Papists, Baptists, Shakers, New Jerusalemites, &c. &c. &c. live within the bounds of the General Assembly, and are consequently embraced in this Report. An important document truly!! But as the Report pays no very courtly attention to these residents within its bounds, it must be supposed that they do not consider these religionists at all, and observe, it is the *state of religion*, within these bounds, that is reported—This is, perhaps, the fact. This denomination, from the loftiness of its spirit, contemplates every other persuasion as irreligious and profane. Hence the editor of the Pittsburgh Recorder did positively declare, July 6, that he is the only religious editor in *nine states* and *three territories*; or, to use his own words, "the Recorder is now the only religious paper published in all the western country, including *nine states* and *three territories*, with considerable parts of other states;"—And if even a Presbyterian paper tell of marriages, battles, tariffs, dry goods, silks and fancy goods, bank note exchange, tavern keepers, and candle manufacturers, it is all religious—For this *only* religious paper occupies more than half its columns in such religious intelligence. This is a plain proof that the altar sanctifieth the gift; that the Pittsburgh Recorder, formerly of Chillicothe, is the only religious paper in *nine states* and *three territories*, and in considerable parts of other states. And so it is, that whatever a Presbyterian doth is religious, and whatsoever any other man doth is profane.—But to the report again.

The Report, perhaps, means better than it speaks—It means only a report of the state of religion amongst the communicants of the Presbyterian church—Let us try if this be its meaning. It reports that

"Within our extensive bounds, there is a vast wilderness, filled with immortal souls who are destitute of religious instruction and hope. There are regions just *beginning* to enjoy the "*day spring from on high*," still dark in error and ignorance, and cold in indifference and sin. Where the gospel is preached, it is met with powerful opposition by error of every form, and it is assailed by enemies of every name. Amid many of our churches are to be found cold and worldly professors, and many who having a name to live are dead, and the enemies of Jesus are sometimes established in the house of his friends. We do not recollect to have heard more deep and afflicting representations

from the presbyteries of the want of zeal and the life giving energies of the Spirit. On every side there are complaints of prevailing error, of licentious practice, of gross intemperance, and disregard to the Lord's day. In many parts of our widely extended and extending church, the want of ministers is still most painfully felt, and even those who can support them cannot obtain them."

"From almost every direction we learn that the Lord's day is most shamefully profaned, and that even professors sanction this destructive and most offensive sin, by the looseness of their own example, of their open conformity to the world, in some of the most popular modes by which its sanctity is invaded. Even ministers, in some instances, have been known to travel in public conveyances on this "day of rest." The Assembly have learned the fact with pain; and while they deplore, they wholly disapprove it."

"In many parts of our country the odious and destructive sin of intemperance is, we fear, increased to an alarming degree: producing blasting and destruction to individuals, families, and churches. The Assembly, while they record the fact with shame and sorrow, and real alarm, will not cease to publish it, until those who profess to love the Lord Jesus shall awake to the dangers of our country and the church. We will warn our beloved people until they shall all arouse to duty and self-denial, to watchfulness and prayer."

What a picture of communicants of this church, and that from its own supreme court!!!—If this learned and pious Assembly were to have reported the state of religion "within the bounds" of Arians, Socinians, and Papists, could its language have been more expressive of awful rottenness and corruption!!! Is this that church which is *sanctified* through the truth—"that chosen generation, that royal priesthood, that holy nation, that peculiar people," of whom the apostle spoke!!—We have never read a more lamentable account of any religious community than that under review. We have never seen any thing like it, if we except the report of a missionary, in the Recorder of July 13th, who gives an account of his tour through the New-Jersey Pines. He says—

"Had I not been an eye witness, I never could have believed such wretchedness, such *total ignorance* of Divine things, could have been permitted in the sight of a theological seminary, containing upwards of one hundred students preparing for the ministry, and of the enlightened city of Philadelphia. What will the christian public say, if told that in the state of New Jersey, a state abounding with men of science, talent and piety, there are whole neighborhoods which enjoy no preaching, no schools, no Sabbaths, and no Bibles; many precious immortals who never saw a Bible—never heard of God their creator, nor of Jesus Christ who died to open a way for the salvation of our fallen race."

Mark it well—In sight of a theological school, in the vicinity of a hundred students of divinity, in the vicinity of the annual meeting of the supreme court of the church of the United States—a tract of country “seventy miles long and forty wide,” the inhabitants are in a worse state than the Pagans in Asia!! *Query*—What has this theological school, and this general assembly been doing for years, when their nighest neighbors have been so long without every thing they call christian?

But what is still worse, the very report itself partakes of the general deterioration. It is, in a literary point of view, one of the poorest of the poor; and in a *moral* point of view, (pardon the expression) the most defective. It is self contradictory—Let us adduce the proof. The assembly saith, in one part of it, that “we do not recollect to have heard more deep (mark the expression *more deep*) and afflicting representations from the presbyteries, of the want of zeal, and of the life-giving energies of the Spirit.” Now, reader, mark what they say in another paragraph of the self-same report—“We believe that the cause of truth is advancing it, that it is gaining victories over error, that knowledge is increasing, that the church is more engaged, *steadfast*, and *prayerful*, there is *more zeal*, more liberality, and more self-denial.” Now put the two ends of the testimony together, and reconcile it, if you can. They say, “we do not recollect to have heard *more deep and afflicting representations from the presbyteries, of a want of zeal*,” and in a minute afterwards declare “*there is more zeal*” than formerly, and yet they never heard of less!!! But this is not all. They say they never heard “more deep and afflicting representations of the want of the life-giving energies of the Spirit;” and yet tell us of thirty-one revivals, of some of which they say, “One of the most extensive works of the Spirit, that has been known in our country, has occurred in Moreau, and has spread with astonishing power through the surrounding country.” And stranger still, they say, “We learn from almost *all our presbyteries* that the word of God has been faithfully preached, and the people have attended with punctuality upon the stated worship of God, and in many instances have given *earnest heed to the word spoken*”—and yet “more deep and afflicting representations of the want of the life-giving energies of the Spirit, from the presbyteries, were not recollected ever to have been heard.” Astonishing indeed!! Some of those ministers whom the Assembly deplored as Sabbath-breakers, must certainly have penned this: but then, how could the others approve it!!—This is as astonishing as the reported revival in Jefferson College, which again appears in the report of the Assembly—But tell it not in India, nor publish it in the Isles of the Pacific, that the “supreme court of the most learned (as they say) body of interpreters of scripture have, all with one consent, ascribed to the words spoken by their divines the same character and epithets which belong to the oracles of God, and have styled themselves “*the day spring from on high*.”

Once more, and we dismiss the Report *pro tem*. The Assembly saith,

“The theological seminary at Princeton is every year becoming more and more important.—Its present condition is flourishing.—The number of its pupils is greater than at any former period; and it promises to be a favored and powerful instrument of disseminating the gospel through the earth.”

Now, reader, remember that the only religious paper in *nine* states and *three* territories, did, on the 13th ult. declare, in the name of a sacred missionary, that there is a district of country, seventy miles long and forty broad, “in sight of this theological seminary, in darkness, great as any part of the Indies”—that there are “*many precious immortals who never saw a Bible, nor heard of God their creator, nor of Jesus Christ.*” How impudent is Satan thus to reign on the very borders of the camp of the Lord!!!—How much is one hundred such students of divinity worth?—One Benjamite with his sling and stone would put a thousand such to flight. EDITOR.

* * *

ESSAYS

ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MEN.

NO. I.

TO the Spirit of God we are immediately indebted for all that is known, or knowable of God, of the invisible world, and of the ultimate destinies of man. All that ancient Pagans and modern Sceptics pretend to have known of these sublime topics, was either borrowed from the oracles of the Revealer of secrets, or was mere uncertain conceits or conjectures of their own. Were it our design, we could easily prove, upon the principles of all modern Sceptics, upon their own philosophical notions, that unaided by the oracles of the Spirit, they never could have known that there is a God, that there was a creation or Creator, or that there is within them a spark of life superior to that of a brute. Indeed this has been unanswerably done already, in a work published a few years since, by James Fishback, D. D. This ingenious and profound reasoner has shewn, with demonstrative certainty, that, on the acknowledged principles of Locke, “the christian philosopher,” and of Hume, the subtle sceptic, all the boasted intelligence of the deistical world is a plagiarism from the oracles of this Divine One. Indeed it all comes to this—if there be no *innate ideas* as these philosophers teach, then the Bible is proved, from the principles of reason and from the history of the world, to be what it purports, a volume indited by the Spirit of the invisible God. To pursue this argument is, however, foreign to our present purpose. We are not now, on set purpose, addressing infidels, but those who profess to believe that the christian religion is of divine authenticity. We may, perhaps find it our duty

to drop a few hints on this subject. In the mean time, we speak to those who profess faith in the sacred scriptures .

It being granted that the Bible was dictated from Heaven, it follows that is a revealed truth that there is one God and Father of all, one only begotten Son of God who is Lord of all, and one Spirit of God, who alone revealeth to men the secrets of God. Leaving out of view all the metaphysical divinity of ancient councils, or modern theological schools on the philosophical doctrine of the Trinity, we may safely assert, upon the plainest evidence, that these **THREE** must occupy the attention of every reader of the holy oracles. Scarcely have we time to exhaust one breath in reading the history of the creation as written by Moses, until the *Spirit of God* is introduced to our view as operating in this marvellous demonstration of almighty power. And scarcely do we read a page in any one of the four Evangelists until this Divine One appears to our view as a mightly agent in some work connected with the redemption of man. Even the New Testament closes with a gracious discovery of his benevolence, and the last welcome of Heaven to the sons of misery and wretchedness is echoed by his self-same Spirit, who saith, "COME and drink of the water of life **FREELY.**"

Without presuming to roam in the regions of conjecture, or to indulge in the flights of imagination; or even to run at random through all that is recorded concerning this sacred *name*, into which we have been baptized, we shall confine our inquiries, and, if possible, the attention of our readers, to that office which the Spirit of God evidently occupies in the salvation revealed in the New Testament.

That the christian religion was to be established and consummated by the ministration of this Spirit, is one of the plainest truths in revelation. It was a subject of ancient prophecy, and the facts recorded in the New Testament concerning the gifts and operations of the Spirit, are but the accomplishment of what was long foretold and anxiously expected.

The christian religion was established by the personal labors of its founder, who appeared to be no more than a Jewish peasant, and the labors of a few illiterate fishermen. It is the most singular fact on the page of history, sacred or profane, the best established, and most universally admitted, by friends and foes, that a Jewish peasant (as his enemies called him) and a dozen of individuals, without learning, without money, without family, without name, without any kind of human influence, revolutionized, in a few years, the whole world, as the Roman empire was then called; and that, too, at a crisis the most forbidding in its aspect, the most unfavorable that ever existed. Paganism was long established and strongly guarded by the sword of the civil magistrate, and myriads of hungry, cunning, and avaricious priests. Judaism, still better confirmed, as it had truth well attested on its side, and the imposing influence of the most venerable antiquity. On the one side, prejudices,

creeds, rubrics, temples, gods in the Gentile world innumerable and indescribable—established and confirmed by many succeeding generations. On the other, the most inveterate antipathies, the most unrelenting malevolence, aggravated and embittered by a superstition that once had much to recommend it. Before their face, poverty, shame, sufferings through life, and martyrdom at last, were presented, not as matters of conjecture, but as awful certainties, to forbid their efforts and to daunt their souls. But by the energies of this Holy Spirit, its gifts and its endowments, they triumphed. Temples were vacated, altars pulled down, and idols abolished in every land, and a new religion established in Asia, Africa, and Europe. Such is the fact, the marvellous fact, recorded, recommended, and proved by a combination of evidence, the splendor of which throws into the shade all the evidence adduced in support of any other historical fact in the annals of the world.

In the contemplation of this wonderful revolution, the Holy Spirit is the most striking object presented to our view, and to it are to be ascribed all these marvellous results. And here we open the New Testament and commence our inquiries into the character of its operations.

That faith is necessary to salvation, is a proposition the truth of which we need not now attempt to prove, as all professors of christianity admit it; and that testimony is necessary to faith, is a proposition equally true, evident, and universally admitted. He that believes, believes something, and that which he believes is testified unto him by others. A man, every body who thinks, knows cannot see without light, hear without sound, nor believe without testimony. Some people, we know, say they believe what they see; but this is an abuse of language. I *know* what I see, and I *believe* what I hear—upon the evidence adduced in the first case to my eye, and in the second to my ear. It is as natural for a child to believe as it is to hear, when its capacity expands; and were it not for lying and deceit, it would continue to believe every thing testified to its understanding. Children become incredulous merely from experience. Being deceived by lies and deceit, they become incredulous. Having experienced that some things reported to their ears are false, they afterwards refuse to believe every thing which they hear. The more frequently they have been deceived, the more incredulous they become. Hence the examination of testimony becomes as natural, in a little time, as it is necessary. The first lie that was told on earth was believed to be a truth. Fatal experience has rendered the examination of testimony necessary. These observations are altogether gratuitous, as all we demand is cheerfully granted by all professors of christianity, viz. that faith is necessary to salvation; that testimony is necessary to faith; and that owing to the existence of falsehoods and deceits, the examination of testimony is necessary to full conviction. These positions being adopted as indisputable truths, we proceed

to observe that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John testify that there was a woman named Mary who brought forth a son supernaturally, who was called Jesus; that the child was announced by John the Baptist as the Redeemer, or Lamb of God, that was to take away the sin of the world, who had been foretold and expected for many generations; that he was distinguished above all that was born of woman, in the circumstances of his nativity, childhood, baptism, and in every personal accomplishment; that he spake and taught truths, and performed actions peculiar to himself; that he was maliciously put to death in Judea in the reign of Tiberius Caesar, under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate, by the Jewish sanhedrim; that he rose from the dead the third day, and after appearing alive for forty days on the earth, he afterwards ascended into heaven, and was placed upon the throne of the universe, and appointed Judge of the living and the dead; and that until his second coming to judge the world, he is exalted to bestow repentance and remission of sins unto all that call upon him. These things and many others of the same character the Evangelists and Apostles *una voce*, declare. Now their testimony is either true or false. If false, then all christians are deceived, and all the religion in christendom and in the world is delusion; for if christianity is not true, it will be readily admitted by my readers that neither is Mahometanism, Judaism, nor Paganism. If true, then all the christian religion depends upon their testimony. Their testimony, on either hypothesis, is worthy of the most impartial and patient investigation. But such a testimony required supernatural attestations. For although there is nothing in this astonishing narrative impossible in the nature of things, nor indeed improbable on the acknowledged principles of human reason itself; yet the marvellous character of the facts testified, the frequent impositions practised, and, above all, the momentous stress laid upon them, required that they should be authenticated from heaven. In the attestation of this testimony, and in the proof of these facts, the office of the Holy Spirit first presents itself to our notice.

It was not enough that the apostles were qualified by the Spirit to deliver a correct, intelligible, and consistent testimony, but for the reasons above specified, that this testimony be attested by such accompaniments as would render the rejector of it damnably criminal, as well as afford the fullest ground of certainty and joy to all that received their testimony. Nor are we in this inquiry so much called to consider the import of their testimony or their qualifications to deliver it, as we are to exhibit the attestations afforded by the Holy Spirit.

Miracles were wrought by the influence of the Holy Spirit in confirmation of their testimony—that is, signs or proofs of a supernatural character followed their testimony. The very circumstance of miracles being added, proved their necessity; for all declare that God doeth nothing in vain. If miracles were

wrought by the Saviour and his Apostles, those miracles were necessary appendages to their testimony. For if faith, which we have agreed is necessary to salvation, and if testimony is necessary to faith, as also admitted, then, in the case before us, miracles were necessary in order to the confirmation of this testimony, or to its credibility; for this is apparent from the fact that they were exhibited, and from the acknowledged principle that God doeth nothing in vain. But our remarks upon miracles must be postponed to the next number.

Two conclusions are fairly deducible from the preceding observations. The first is that the truth to be believed could never have been known but by the revelation of the Spirit; and secondly, that though it had been pronounced in the most explicit language, yet it could not have been believed with certainty but by the miracles which were offered in attestation of it. It may then be safely affirmed that no man could believe the gospel facts without this work of the Holy Spirit in attestation thereof; for the Spirit of God would not have empowered those witnesses to have wrought those miracles if their mere testimony without them was sufficient to produce faith. For let it be remembered, that it is universally granted that God's works are all perfect, and that he doeth nothing superfluous or in vain.

EDITOR.

* * *

A FAMILIAR DIALOGUE,
Between The Editor And a Clergyman.
PART II.

Clergyman. I TOLD you at our last interview that I wished to resume the passage in the Romans which saith, "*how shall they preach except they be sent?*" This I suppose to be applicable to all preachers authorized according to the law of God.

Editor. I presume it is. But I think it is by no means applicable to those licensed by a presbytery, except you can prove that a presbytery is authorized of God to send, in his name, whom it pleases. And for my part, I have long thought that those sent to preach by a presbytery are not sent of God; and amongst many other reasons I have for so thinking, this is one, that the presbytery has authorized itself so to act, and consequently its authority being self-bestowed, its acts and deeds are altogether human. Those whom it commissions are sent of men, as much so as a physician, who is authorized by the medical board under the recent law in Ohio, is sent of men to practise.

C. But is not a physician licensed by the board, authorized by the state, seeing the state constituted the medical board? Every licensed physician in Ohio is really sent or commissioned by the governor or the highest authority in the state, to act as a physician; and consequently the board is but a *mean* appointed to convey the authority of the state to the individual. Just in this sense I argue that a person licensed to preach by a presbytery

is licensed of God, inasmuch as the presbytery is a *mean* appointed of God to convey his authority to the individual. Now that a presbytery is a divine institution, and that it did in the age of the apostles convey such a right as I contend for, I will explicitly prove. Read with me, if you please, 1 Tim. iv. 14. Paul says to Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."

E. I confess you have found the word *presbytery* once in the New Testament, and in connexion with the imposition of hands too; but really I had thought that none but those sometimes called the ignorant laity, who are wont to be carried more by sound than sense, would appeal to this passage in proof that a presbytery, in modern style, is a *mean* appointed by God to *license, commission, or send* forth preachers in the name and by the authority of God. Before you can bring this passage into your service, three things must be done—First, shew that the word *presbytery* meant in that age what you mean by it in your church style. In the second place, prove that the gift here said to be conferred on Timothy, was a license to preach, or to exercise his ministry in one congregation. In the third place, that the laying on of the hands of the presbytery conferred this gift. I should be glad to hear you attempt these things, because, I think, that there lives not the man who can do any one of the three, and because I think that these three things must be explicitly proved before you can at all quote the passage in your favor. You yourself, in arguing with a Romanist, would adopt this same method. Suppose your controversy was about the church, or the church of Rome, and he should say that the "church of Rome" was actually once mentioned in the New Testament, therefore of divine authority; but as the church of Scotland was never mentioned, therefore it is an imposition. You would immediately say that he was now using the words *church, or church of Rome*, in a sense of his own, and not in the New Testament sense. So I say of your presbytery. You may call your son Paul or Peter, if you please; but your son and the Paul and Peter of the New Testament are very different characters. Six men may meet in an inn and form a constitution for themselves and call themselves a *presbytery*, but you would dispute their right to the name. Now every argument you would bring against their assumption I would turn against your canonized presbytery. It is to me all one and the same whether your system of presbytery be five or five hundred years old, I pay it no more deference than I do the modern discoveries and improvements of the most modern errorists.

Your laying hold of the word "*presbytery*" in Paul's Epistle to Timothy, reminds me on an anecdote I read somewhere a few years ago, perhaps in Hunter's Sacred Biography. Some Jew, I think it was, in his researches in Asia, found, in some mound or other singular place, a tomb at some distance from the surface

of the ground. On examination of the inscription it was found that, in ancient style, there was written upon it these words, "*Here lies the body of Moses, the servant of God.*" Great speculations were afloat, and in a little time it was agreed that this was actually the tomb of that Moses who brought Israel out of Egypt. The discoverer was just upon the eve of making his fortune by his discovery, when it unfortunately was found out that this was the tomb of a Moses who had died a century or two before, who was *reputed* a servant of God. So ensnaring and dangerous is it to appropriate names of great antiquity or of sacred import to things which are every way incongruous. Believe me, sir, that they who thought they had got the *body of Moses, the servant of God*, were not more cheated than they who think they have found the presbytery of Lystra or of Ephesus in one of your church courts.

C. And do tell me what ideas you attach to the word *presbytery*? You admit that it is a Bible term. Now it must have a Bible signification.

E. This I have no objections to do, provided you first give me a definition of what you call a *presbytery*.

C. I will. "A presbytery consists of the ministers and representative lay elders of the congregations of a certain district."

E. Now let me ask, Did you ever read in the scriptures of "representative lay elders" or ministers of a certain district meeting for any purpose? or rather, Was there ever such a being as a lay elder in the primitive church?

C. You promised me a definition of the word *presbytery* in its Bible import. I am waiting to hear it. Those questions you ask will lead us off from the subject altogether. Let them be reserved till another time.

E. In doing this, then, I will read you a Presbyterian Doctor's translation of this verse. Your brother Macknight thus translated it: "Neglect not the *spiritual gift which is in thee*, which was given thee according to prophecy, *together with the imposition of the hands of the eldership.*"

C. But what was this *eldership*?

E. I will let Macknight explain it. His comment on the verse reads thus: "That thou mayest understand the scriptures, neglect not to exercise the spiritual gift which is in thee, which was given thee by *the imposition of my hands* according to a prophetic impulse, together with the imposition of the hands of the eldership at Lystra, who thereby testified their approbation of thy ordination as an evangelist." It seems, then, that the Greek word *presbytery*, according to the most learned of your own fraternity, implied no more than the eldership of one congregation. And so we read that the apostles ordained them elders in every city or church. As for your "*lay elders*," they were not yet got into fashion. If you cannot bring some other scripture to countenance your presbytery, it must appear altogether destitute of scripture warrant. Again, Paul, in the next

epistle to Timothy, declares that this gift was given by the imposition of his own hands; and in no instance on record does it appear that spiritual gifts of any kind were bestowed by the imposition of any hands save those of the apostles. But, as you have already said, this may lead us into another discussion. I would then, in the mean time, propose that we would confine our attention to the passage in Romans until its meaning is ascertained; as you see nothing can be obtained in support of your views from 1 Tim. iv. 14.

C. And what do you say of the passage in the Romans?

E. I appeal to the context for its meaning—to the design of the apostle in the passage. If this does not determine the meaning, it must be indeterminate, as you will readily admit.

C. And was not the apostle speaking of the ordinary preachers of the gospel—of those we now call ministers of the gospel?

E. Those you call the ordinary ministers of the gospel are very ill defined in the popular creeds, and not at all defined in the New Testament. But I will say without hesitation, that the passage in dispute exclusively appertains to those who received a commission from Jesus Christ to announce or to publish the gospel to all nations, and that the prophetic allusion in the prophecy of Isaiah, which, in the style of the Easterns, and, indeed, in the style of Sophocles, the Grecian poet, is descriptive of the feet of those who publish good news, is wholly applicable to the apostles and their associates, and to none else.

C. And have the apostles no successors in this commission; or are there none now divinely commissioned to do the things enjoined in that commission?

E. I know of none. If you and your brethren in office conceive yourselves acting under this commission, your conduct is altogether unjustifiable. You should be always employed in announcing the gospel to all nations, and not stationed in a parish.

C. Strange and singular as your views are on many topics, I did not think that you were so extravagantly wild as to say or to think that the commission given in Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, had ceased to be a commission authorizing a regular ministry, seeing it expressly says, "I will be with you always to the end of the world." Did the apostles live to the end of the world, or are they yet alive?

E. Novel and extravagant as you view the sentiment offered, and ancient and sacred as you view that opposed to it, I confidently assert that yours is unfounded and novel, and that mine is capable of the clearest proof, and that the very words you quote to prove its perpetuity prove that it was but temporary.

C. What! the promise, "I will be with you always to the end of the world," you say will prove that it was only of limited duration!!!

E. Yes, and with confidence of making it evident too. Let me read the commission, and, as I read, propose a few queries: "And

he said unto the eleven, [what eleven?] Go ye, [who?] therefore, and teach or disciple all nations, baptizing them, &c. teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, [who?] and, lo! I am with you [who?] always—even unto the end of the world! What is meant by "*the end of the world?*" There is one question yet of great consequence which I have intentionally omitted to the last, merely to give it a marked emphasis. It is this: What does he mean by the promise, "I AM WITH YOU?" Now I conceive the very promise, "*I am with you,*" determines the whole matter.

C. I will hear your exposition of it before I offer any remark.

E. You shall have an infallible exposition of it from the pen of an infallible writer. John Mark gives the promise "*I am with you,*" in the following words. See his statement of the commission, xvi. 15-17. Campbell's translation. It reads thus: "And these miraculous powers shall attend the believers—(I am with you.) In my name they shall expel demons—they shall speak languages unknown to them before—they shall handle serpents with safety, and if they drink poison it shall not hurt them. They shall cure the sick by laying hands upon them." Thus the Lord was WITH them. Hear John Mark once more, and more explicit still, 20th verse: "They went out and proclaimed the tidings every where, the Lord co-operating WITH THEM, and confirming their doctrine by the miracles wherewith it was accompanied."

The promise, "*I am with you,*" then, is infallibly explained to denote that Christ would, upon the invocation of his name, be present with all his power, to confirm their testimony by open and visible miracles, performed not only by the apostles themselves, but also by their immediate converts. So saith Paul in his exposition of it, (Heb.) "God also bearing them witness, with signs and wonders, with diverse gifts and miracles." If such be the meaning of the promise, "*I am with you,*" as it doubtless is, then where are the pretensions of those who suppose themselves authorized by this commission? Let any one of them prove that *Christ is with them* in the common sense of the words, and I will sit down at their feet and open my mouth only to echo their oracles. And in fact there is no other way it can be understood that will help your views. For if Christ be not with the clergy in some peculiar sense in which he is not with other men, then all their pretensions are vain. That this is the very sense in which it was necessary for him to be with the commissioned preachers, the very sense in which he was with them, and the only sense in which he was understood by them, I presume no man of common (I mean ordinary) sense can or will controvert. If so, then the commission is not to be extended to any in our time, nor is it given to any in our time.

C. Until I hear you define the last clause, "*always, unto the end of the world,*" I will make no remarks.

E. Your Presbyterian brother, Dr. George Campbell, offers a

very handsome criticism, and a very correct one too, on this passage, and shews that it ought to have been translated "*to the conclusion of this state.*" I have some remarks to offer upon the Greek phrase, "*sunteleia tou aionos,*" which the present moment will not permit.

C. I will make only one objection, which I think is enough to destroy your whole theory, viz. On your speculations on the commission Paul was not included, for he was not one of the *eleven*, and so you have reasoned away Paul's apostolic character—so dangerous it is to follow seemingly ingenious speculations without adverting to facts.

E. My dear sir, I am often confirmed in the truth by the puny efforts of those who dislike it to overthrow it. Some, however, thought with you in ancient times on this subject; for they would make Paul some kind of a little apostle, or a second-hand one, because he was called after the others were commissioned; and, indeed, both your objection and theirs to Paul would have been well founded, had it not been that he received a peculiar commission of his own, which I need not tell you is often referred to in the New Testament. But you may consult Acts xxvi. 16-18. where the items of his commission are specified: so true it is that Paul's commission differed from the others, that he was not sent to baptize, but to evangelize the heathen.

But as the evening is far advanced, I will leave you with these views of the commission till our next interview, hoping then to find you reconciled to them, or to hear a more vigorous defence of your own. I understand the commission as follows: 'Go ye, Peter and Andrew, James and John, Zebedee, Philip and Bartholemew, Thomas and Matthew Levi, James Alpheus and Lebbeus Thadeus, with Simon the Canaanite, and disciple all nations, immersing the believers of all nations into the faith of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching the baptized disciples to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, either before or since my resurrection from the dead—and take notice that I shall be ever present, with signs and wonders, to confirm your testimony, to the end of this state; for before this generation shall have passed away, the gospel shall be preached to all nations for a testimony unto them.'

C. If such be the meaning of the commission, I have yet to learn the meaning of all the New Testament.

E. And if this be not the meaning of the commission, pray inform me what it is?

C. Adieu for the present.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

* * *

LAY PREACHING.

MR. CHURCH, of the city of Pittsburgh, at his baptism on the 11th ult, delivered a discourse of three hours and one quarter in length, in the presence of a very numerous congregation, assembled on the banks of the Allegany. Having myself been

one of his hearers, I can give my readers a brief outline of his object and method. Mr. Church had been a member of different religious communities, and once a ruling elder of a congregation of Covenanters. He is well versed in all the systems of presbyterianism, and has, for a number of years, been a diligent searcher after truth. He brought with him to the water the creeds, testimonies, and formulas of those churches, as well as the holy scriptures. After having vindicated himself from the foul aspersions of some of his quondam brethren and friends, which are the usual lot of those who presume to judge and act for themselves in religious matters, he informed his audience that he would.

1st. Prove from the holy scriptures and the standards of the different churches his right to search, judge, and act for himself, and especially that he had an inalienable right, as well as the most justifiable reasons, to separate from every branch of the presbyterian church—

2d. Demonstrate from the scriptures the true nature and character of the church of Jesus Christ, her members, ministers, modes of worship, discipline; and contrast these with the genius of those societies that had assumed the title of christian churches, their members, ministers, modes of worship, and government—

3d. Exhibit the sacred import of christian baptism; its various corruptions and abuses in the Presbyterian churches, and others, as well as the character of those who were admitted to this ordinance in primitive times.

It would be altogether out of our power, in the size of this number, even to give any thing like a fair miniature of this discourse. Suffice it to say, that Mr. Church redeemed the pledge he had given in his method; and did, at least to my satisfaction, as well as, no doubt, that of many of his auditors, fully prove his right of search from all the documents mentioned, and exhibit the corruptions of the systems proposed. He stripped the clergy of all their exorbitant claims and pretensions, and fully expatiated on the vices and deformities of the clerical system. He read many extracts from the popular creeds and testimonies, the national covenant and solemn league, on which he presented many appropriate remarks. And such was the efficacy of his remarks, that they produced, in some instances, the same effect on some of the sons of the national convention and solemn league which the discourse of Stephen produced on the Jews, such as a literal gnashing of the teeth, and an equivalent to stopping of the ears. He was, however, patiently heard by a respectable congregation to the close, although it rained for more than an hour of the time, and the people were by no means comfortably circumstanced. This discourse has, we have since understood, caused a great "shaking among the dry bones." Indeed, he sometimes appeared to me like Sampson amongst the Philistines, at least likely to kill more by his emblematical death, and in his emblematical burial, than during his former life. Very few of the

regular clergy could have made so lengthy and so appropriate a discourse, and have assembled such a congregation, as this erudite layman.

EDITOR.

* * *

A DROPPED LETTER.

A REVEREND gentleman in the Western Reserve, who is in the habit of obtaining a regular supply of orthodox sermons, manufactured in New England, writes as follows to his merchant in holy orders. The letter was dropped in the house of one of his parishioners.

“Reverend Sir,

“I wrote you some weeks since for a few sermons. They have not yet been received. I am really disappointed in not obtaining them, as all those you sent me by the Rev.—are become too stale. I have altered them considerably; yet, without traveling out of my proper bounds, and making some exchanges with some remote members of presbytery, there is not one of them I can honorably deliver in either of my congregations. Our friend, the Rev. Mr.—, has ten sermons which he obtained from New York, which he will exchange with any of our friends in the presbytery of —, provided he receives an equal number, equally well written. These are well composed, easy memorized, and remarkably pathetic, they have been heard with great interest, and often with many tears. Dear sir, forward me a few dozens per mail if no other opportunity offers. Put them in packages of half dozens, well enclosed, and addressed to me at this place—and accept the assurance of my brotherly esteem.

_____”

“May, 1824.”

This divine appears to be in as great a strait as the Rev. Mr. H—, of Pittsburgh was, when a puff of wind unluckily penetrated into his bible and gave wings to his sermon, which actually flew to one of his hearers, whom the Genius of the place supposed had more need of it than the parson. The embarrassment of these two orators brings to my mind an incident which unfortunately happened in a town of Pennsylvania some years since. A young divine, now of the state of Ohio, and once a teacher in a college, in his precipitation to get into the pulpit, the congregation having been long assembled, forgot that his sermon that morning had been thrust into his saddlebags, and had actually read out his text before he discovered that it was not, as usual, in his pocket. After reading his text a second time, and making several fruitless efforts to get into the train, he was obliged to send for his saddlebags to the no little amazement of his hearers—to whom he apologized with all the ingenuity the nature of the case would admit.

These facts, which I can vouch for, go some length to show with what kind of materials the pulpits are filled in this latter

day, and especially amongst those who have spent some years at college learning the art and mystery of making orthodox sermons.

EDITOR.

* * *

RELIGIOUS HONORS.

THE Rev. Samuel Ralston was, some months since, constituted a Doctor of Divinity by the Board of Washington College, Pa. and the Rev. Matthew Brown, Principal of Jefferson College, received the same "good degree and great boldness in the faith," from the honorable Board of Princeton College. In these distinguished honors to which these divines have obtained, there are some things hard to be understood, which I, for one, cannot, owing, no doubt, to my natural stupidity, understand. The members of the Board, in the first instance, are not *ex officio* ecclesiastical characters; some of them of no party in religious matters, some of them are of different religious creeds and sects. In Washington, for instance, Baptists, Presbyterians, and, I believe, those of no religious party, concurred in making Mr. Ralston a Doctor of Divinity, and yet they were not Doctors of Divinity themselves. And how Baptists can make a Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity is to me a most perplexing problem. It is about as difficult as how Presbyterians can make a Baptist Doctor of Divinity. Perhaps the common principle of "*Help me to day, and I will help thee to-morrow,*" might go some length to remove the difficulty. And, again, how the Board of Princeton could bestow the honor on Mr. Brown, without insulting the good understanding of the Board at Washington, is to me another perplexing point. Were not the people at Washington better acquainted with the merits of Mr. Brown than they at Princeton? And we have never seen any public writing of Mr. Brown's, except his inaugural speech at Canonsburgh, that could have warranted the Princeton Board to have prejudged and condemned the Washington Board. Besides all this, the President of Washington College is, in my opinion, and, I believe, in public opinion, as well, if not a great deal better entitled to this honor, than either his neighbor of Canonsburgh, or his senior brother of Mingo Creek. It is true his senior brother has fought hard in some instances; and in the military department, I believe, it is not uncommon to distinguish those who are covered with wounds in their country's cause, with appropriate honors. But until I hear that the President of Washington College has obtained this honor, (and I honestly believe that if either his talents, or his acquisitions, or his writings are to be taken into consideration, he deserves it better than either of the two who have obtained it; and, no doubt, they will pardon me for saying so, as they think so themselves,) I must think that there is some strange manoeuvring behind the curtain. As I have forfeited all right, and renounced all pretensions to this high honor, and am therefore perfectly disinterested, I

doubt not but my hints on this topic will be well received by all concerned. I shall dismiss this topic with a query to those who are acquainted with *alligation*—What kind of a composition of different sectaries, and how many of each, say Presbyterians, Seceders, and Baptists, are necessary to *create* one Presbyterian D. D.?

EDITOR.

* * *

THE following QUERIES came from the pen of a diligent student of the Bible. We have not room to attend to them in the present number. We wish our readers to attempt, each, to answer them for himself. We shall attend to them hereafter.

1st. The order of the first churches when supernatural gifts were abundant, being discovered; what, if any example, will it form to us who live in these last days when supernatural gifts have ceased?

2d. What duty or duties are *peculiar* to the Bishop and not *common* to the brethren?

3d. Was it the Bishops who chiefly spoke in the first churches where they presided, or did they commonly sit as judges (1 Cor. xiv 29.) to correct, &c. while the brethren edified the body in love? Eph. iv. 16.

4th. What are the peculiar duties of a Deacon?

5th. Was it to the deaconship that those *seven* mentioned in Acts, 6th chap. were appointed, or what were they?

* * *

No. 2.

MONDAY, SEPT. 6, 1824.

VOL. II.

PRIMITIVE AND MODERN CHRISTIANITY.

A SERIES of almost 2000 years has now fled away since the gospel announced light and religious liberty to the enslaved world; since Messiah, emerging from the rocky sepulchre, destroyed Death, and delivered those who, through fear of his merciless domination, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. Strong and implacable were the enemies of Jesus; many were the foes with which the Captain of our Salvation had to contend, and for a moment they seemed to prevail. They crucified him, and thought themselves secure; they entombed his murdered body, and vainly imagined the conquest was complete. Unhappy men! how blind to the future! Scarce was the palm of victory lifted to their brows, when it withered; scarce did the dawn of conquest rise upon their marshalled efforts, when it set in the midnight of everlasting dismay. They succeeded in depriving the Champion of Israel of the light of life; but in the awful moment he only groped for those pillars on which the whole temple of Jewish and heathen superstition stood. Then, indeed, he bowed himself. The grave could not retain him who made the world. The Shepherd of Israel descended into the pit, but it was only to destroy the enemy of the flock, and having

seized him he slew him. When the Son of God rose from the dead, and thereby brought life (eternal life) and immortality to light, ignorance, the cause of all Jewish, heathen, and anti-christian superstition fled before him; and seeing that the world were in great bondage through fear of death, and especially through their ignorance of that life which lay beyond death, it was necessary that he who gave his life for the world should deliver his children from the bondage of this fear. Having risen from the dead, and removed the cause of all uncertainty respecting a resurrection and eternal life, nothing remained but to let the children know it. To effect this, to remove all fear, to inform the body of the resurrection of its head, to let all flesh see the salvation of our God—the Lord Jesus called the twelve, and, *viva voce*, commissioned them to go into all the world and to preach the gospel (*i. e.* his death and resurrection) to every creature: “He that believeth shall be saved—he that believeth not shall be damned.” This, by the way, is the only constitution of a christian assembly, in opposition to all written instruments. Having received this gospel in charge, the apostles went forth every where preaching it, God bearing them also witness in signs and wonders, and diverse miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his will. Having made disciples in Jerusalem and every where among the gentiles, it became necessary to assemble the brethren on that fact which they had believed, in order that they might edify one another, grow in grace and knowledge, increase in every good word and work, and finally show forth the death of Jesus in the eating of the supper.

To manage the business of the church in all ages, it pleased the Head of the Church to appoint bishops and deacons. The apostles were chiefly employed in ordaining elders “in every church” on their return from their first tour through the Lesser Asia. Titus was left in Crete for the express purpose to “ordain elders in every church,” and Timothy had this business in charge in the church at Ephesus. And in all those appointments the bishops and deacons were chosen from among those who believed; and they had previously assembled themselves, like others, to eat the supper. Besides this, they were numerous in every church.

Of the elders or bishops at Ephesus, it is said that they “all fell upon Paul’s neck,” &c. but the word “all” is never used of one or two, but of a considerable number of persons. The epistle to the Philippians is addressed to the church there with the bishops and deacons. Two things, then, are remarkable in the choice of the primitive bishops: 1st. They were selected from among the brethren—2dly. they were numerous in every church. Two things are remarkable of modern teachers also: 1st. That they are not chosen from among the brethren—2dly. that there is uniformly but one in every church. The order established by the apostles was the same in every church, and was very simple; but the world, which perverteth all things, soon began to make

inroads into the beautiful and simple institution of the Lord Jesus, and from the most instructive and pure society, it has become the nest of every unclean bird. Evil men did not wait until the apostles were *dead*, but even while they were alive commenced their antichristian labors, which caused the apostle to say that even now, *i. e.* while the all-authoritative apostles and chief servants of the Lord Jesus were present, the mystery of iniquity was a-working; yes, even then there were evil men and seducers, who were to wax worse and worse; and those men were not without, but within the church, like Diotrepes, who loved to have the pre-eminence, who received not even the apostles, but prated against them with malicious words. So says John. Peter tells us that these false teachers were to be remarkable for false doctrine, for covetousness, for their contempt of the magistrates, for their corruption, for loving the wages of unrighteousness, for speaking great swelling words, &c. &c. They even dared, under the name of christians, to call in question the authority of the apostle, which occasioned him to speak as follows to the Corinthians: "Am I not an apostle?" and to say of those pretended servants of Christ, that seeing Satan himself was transformed into an angel of light, it was no wonder therefore, if his ministers were transformed into the ministers of righteousness. This is a singular incident, that the sons of God, the disciples of our Lord Jesus, should really be subject to the impositions of the servants of the Devil, transformed in appearance into servants of Christ. What is the christian to do after being told so by the Spirit of his Father? Where is he to look for these transformed ministers? How is he to detect the cloven foot?

This difficulty is greatly increased in the present age. Teachers are so numerous and so contradictory, so learned and yet so ignorant of the scripture, so covetous and yet so lofty in their requirements, that even the well meaning are at a loss sometimes how to act in regard to their claims. Is the disciple to look for these transformed ministers among those who have thrown off not only the power, but the form, of religion? Surely not! The apostle says they assume the colour of servants of Christ, and therefore must be looked for among christians. When any truth in the New Testament is contended for by any number of combatants, it is possible for all to be wrong, but they never all can be right. If one man call himself a servant of Christ because he holds a license of the Pope; another, because he holds it of an Episcopalian bishop; a third, of a classical presbytery; a fourth, of an association; and a fifth, of any body that has plenty of influence with the public—surely they cannot all be right when they come to contend with each other about the *jus divinum* of their respective ordinations. The first of these tells the world he can make his God! and the disciples eat him! The second half denies this, and the rest deny it altogether. This, one would suppose, is a very delicate point to be

divided upon—yet so it is; and the Lord pity the poor disciple who has to confide in any of them, for they are very wolves! O! reader! is it not a desideratum then to have a rule by which the disciple may distinguish the ministers of Christ from the ministers of Satan transformed. Surely it is; and the Bible is that rule—the Bible, declared to be profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, and is given by inspiration, that the man of God may be perfect, fully furnished, says the apostle. I shall suppose myself a christian greatly embarrassed by the above saying of the apostle, viz. that the ministers of Satan are transformed into the ministers of righteousness, and feel anxiously desirous to be able to distinguish them from those who are the true shepherds or bishops of Christ's flock.

I have no guide under heaven but the Bible. This is either allowed, or ought to be, by all. There is no legitimate authority in religion that is not derived immediately from the scriptures; they are God's umpire in all christian questions; and to them, and them alone, in the dernier resort, must we appeal; so that the only question remaining is, Whether the Bible contains descriptions of the real and transformed ministers, particular enough to enable me to distinguish them from each other. I can know this only by opening the Bible and reading it. I proceed, with respect to both, by induction of particulars, thus:—First, all the bishops and deacons in the churches of Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, Ephesus, Greece, Crete, &c. &c. were uniformly, without a single exception, selected from among the brethren of the particular churches in which they were to officiate; and this particular I hold to be a *sine qua non* in the electing or ordaining of a bishop of Christ. He must be chosen from among the flock. Step aside from this, and the hireling system at once enters with all its train of religious spouting, preaching, &c. If the brethren, therefore, *require* or *desire* to have bishops and deacons, it is indispensable that they look out from among themselves holy men, answering to the description of such persons, in Timothy, Titus, and elsewhere. Now in selecting bishops and deacons, a church, or a number of people calling themselves a church, may choose to depart from this uniform practice of the apostolic churches, *i. e.* they may hire a school or college man, who, allowing the assembly so hiring him to be what they profess to be, a church of Christ, can never, in any sense, be said to be selected from among the brethren of said church; and for their practice in so doing it is certain that they can plead neither scripture precedent nor precept. In such a case, then, we have great and manifold reasons to suspect the character of the church, as well as that of the minister. The first may be, and I only say it *may* be a synagogue of Satan, and the preacher his minister transformed into a minister of righteousness. However, it would be premature in me to say that every minister so appointed is a minister of Satan, because this would,

even in my own opinion, be deducing the general conclusion for which I am searching, from too limited a number of experiments. I only say then that such a person and such a church are wrong, *i. e.* astray from scripture authority in the very first step, and therefore I must proceed with the induction. But here I shall turn a leaf, and look through the medium of the scriptures at the hireling or transformed minister. We have seen how any number of individuals in the apostolic churches arrived at the episcopal office, *i. e.* through a choice from among the members of the church where said bishops were to officiate. We are sure, then, that one so appointed "cometh in by the door," *i. e.* in the only manner authorized by scripture precept and example. But for the hireling—how comes he in? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, is a thief and a robber." It would appear from this declaration, then, that the step which a man makes at the threshold, may finally determine his character as a minister. The reader may, perhaps, be afraid to look at things in this frightful point of view, seeing he may never have heard or seen of ministers being got by selecting them from the christians in the church where they are to officiate. We grant that this manner of viewing things bears wonderfully on the preachers of the present day, notwithstanding all their pretensions. But to go on: It may be objected that the Saviour used the above language (John x.) in reference to the Pharisees with whom he was speaking. It will be granted; but let us try to discover the meaning of the Saviour's account of the hireling in John x. First, then, he spoke this address to the Pharisees, as appears from the latter end of the preceding chapter; and when he had done so, the Apostle John makes this observation on the matter, (verse 6.) "*This parable Jesus spake unto them, but they understood not what things they were which he spake unto them.*" A second matter worthy of observation then is, that those same Pharisees, whom he plainly indicated to be thieves and robbers, did not understand what he meant in this speech. In short, it would appear that those ministers were not aware of their own origin—were not aware that they had no right to labor among the flock of God, and had no authority from him. Let us see, then, how these men climbed up to the office of *teachers in Israel!*—how they came by the name Reverend or Rabbi.

All the world knows that there was no foundation in the law of God for the sectarian distinctions of Pharisee and Sadducee. These sectaries, therefore, owe their origin to some heresiarch, who lived either at or before the return from Babylon. Well, therefore, might the Saviour style them an offspring of vipers, *i. e.* the followers of unauthorized, heretical assemblies, who, instead of adhering to the law of God, and that alone, would wickedly frame their own religious course, and even set aside the law of God by their traditions. But if they had no liberty from

the law to assume these names, they had far less for assuming to themselves the office of teachers. It was declared of God in Deuteronomy, that the house of Levi should teach Jacob his judgments, and Israel his law; that they should put incense before him and whole-burnt sacrifice upon his altar. And on this account the lands of the house of Levi, which amounted to the one-twelfth of all Canaan, was divided among the other tribes, who returned one-tenth of their annual increase for the service appointed them of God, viz. for teaching his judgments and law, waiting on the service of the tabernacle. And here it must be remarked, to the confusion of those who plead for the tenth, that the lands of the tribe of Levi being taken into account the priests received only one-tenth of the produce for one-twelfth of the soil, which is about one-sixtieth of the whole, besides what in reality was their own; so that Israel paid to the priests, in fact, a very poor stipend, considering the business and important service appointed them of God. The house of Levi, then, were the true teachers in the church of Moses. And now conceive for a moment the fatal effects which the violation of the law would have upon the condition of the Levites; conceive how easily this paltry return might be diminished, and how quickly the ministers of God might be deprived of their due and necessary means of subsistence. If a host of individuals from the other tribes should arrogate to themselves the office of teachers and expounders of the law, the Pharisees, then, who were chief teachers, and compounded of individuals from every tribe, are therefore, by our blessed Saviour, declared to be a plantation which his heavenly Father had not planted, and were to be rooted out. Josephus, as quoted by Whitby, says that many of the priests were starved to death in consequence of the people not bringing in their tithes. It appears to me that the Pharisees had got up an order of things very much resembling our theological institutions, where all comers indiscriminately were instructed in the divinity of the day, without the least respect to the law of God on this point, without the least regard to the rights dues of the Levitical ministers; and who does not see that the young Pharisee, Paul, who was no Levite, but the tribe of Benjamin, was one of the young divines at the moment of his conversion? What right had Paul to teach the judgments and law of God to the Jews? He was a Benjamite, concerning which tribe God said nothing about teaching. Yet was this young gentleman sent to college—school in the traditions of his sect—distinguished for his zeal, and for his progress in the study of self-deception, as well as for being the student of the famous Gamaliel. Now, then, we can easily perceive, I hope, what the Saviour meant by the Pharisees' climbing up into the sheepfold another way, and being thieves and robbers. First, they had no authority for teaching from God. Secondly, they robbed both the priests and the people; as the Lord Jesus said, "Ye rob widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers." The

priest's lips were to keep knowledge, and the people should seek the law at his mouth; for, says Jehovah, "He is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." The Pharisees and others then had come in between the people and the teachers whom God had appointed, and thus threw the nation into sects, as the schoolmen have done in the christian church; for, whereas our blessed Saviour has ordered us to look out for the officers from among ourselves, and has given us examples of it in all primitive churches of his apostles' planting, these learned divines have come in between the holy brethren and the law of Christ, and have not only done away the ancient custom of selecting bishops from among the brethren, but even succeeded almost generally in foisting their own young men on the sons of God for teachers. When I look, therefore, through the medium of scripture at the christian bishops, I see that they are distinguished for being selected from among the disciples, and this I call the door into the sheepfold, because if it is the way authorized of Christ. When I look through the scriptures at the transformed minister of Satan, I behold him coming into the fold by another way, *i. e.* in a way not authorized of Christ, not chosen from among the brethren, but foisted over the heads of the most aged and experienced into an office which is duly only to one of themselves. "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." Now, then, in searching the scriptures, I have discovered one difference between the bishop and transformed minister—they do not come in alike—the manner of their induction is absolutely diverse—the one by the door, the other by the wall—the one by an authorized method, the other by an unauthorized method. But this induction may be pursued to greater length in some future paper.

PHILIP.

* * *

ESSAYS

ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MEN.

NO. II.

IN our last essay it was, we hope, fully proved, that with regard to the truth to be believed and the evidences of it, we owe every thing to the gracious ministrations of the Holy Spirit. The matter of faith preached is, that "Christ died for our Sins, was buried, and is risen from the dead;" but even this fact is attributed to the immediate agency of this Glorious One. He, therefore, may be said to *have made the truth*, as well as by the most illustrious displays of his power in its behalf, to render it credible to men. His testimony in its behalf consists of miracles and prophecy, but it is with the first of these only we have to do in our present essay. The term *miracle* is general and comprehends not only those displays of power whose legitimate and single purpose was to establish the fact that *Jesus*

was risen from the dead, but the gifts also which were vouchsafed to those who believed, and whose primary intent was to fill with light and wisdom and the new converts to our holy religion.

It has often been asked, What necessary connexion is there between a miracle and a revelation from Heaven? If the term *miracle* is properly defined to be "the suspension of some known law of nature," the connexion will be as follows:—The suspension intimates the certain presence of a power superior to the law, and this is all it proves. The miracle, I say, only proves that a power superior to the law operates in its suspension; but the moral character of the agent is to be deduced from the nature of the miracle combined with the end for which it is said to be performed.

The Miracles of our Saviour are chiefly of a beneficent kind, and the declared end of them is to establish a mission the most salutary. From a consideration of the character of his miracles and the salutary end for which they were wrought, we are constrained by the rules of right reason to believe that they were effected by the Spirit of God, and not by Beelzebub, as the infidel Jews evilly suggested. The moral character of the power is to be known by its effects; and so the Saviour, as a key to guide us in this difficult step, tells us that we are in this case to judge as in the case of trees bearing fruit. If the fruit is good, the tree is good—if bad, the tree is bad. If the miracle is of a beneficent character and its declared end good, the agent by whom it is effected is good. It was not our Saviour's finger that performed the miracles—his touching the cured was only to connect the miracle with the end for which it was wrought, viz. to show that he was the *Messenger of the Most High*, that this display of power was in behalf of his pretensions, and not of others who might be present. The work of the Holy Spirit in this respect, then, is most glorious, and becoming Heaven in the highest degree.

The Jewish religion and the Christian are the only two religions that ever were received by men, purporting to be confirmed by miracles. Neither the Mahometan religion nor any system of Pagan superstition at its first publication claimed the evidence of miracles. On this topic we shall present an extract from Doctor Campbell's "Essay on Miracles," in reply to Mr. Hume. He says,

"Can the Pagan religion—can, I should rather say, any of the numberless religions (for they are totally distinct) known by the common name of *Pagan*, produce any claim of this kind that will merit our attention? If the author knows of any, I wish he had mentioned it; for an all antiquity, as far as my acquaintance with it reaches, I can recollect to such claim. However, that I may not, on the one hand, appear to pass the matter too slightly; or on the other, lose myself, as Mr. Hume expresses it, in too wide a field, I shall briefly consider whether the ancient

religions of *Greece or Rome* (which of all the species of heathenish superstition are on many accounts the most remarkable) can present a claim of this nature. Will it be said, that monstrous heap of fables we find in ancient bards, relating to the genealogy, productions, amours, and achievements of the gods, are the miracles on which Greek and Roman Paganism claims to be founded?

If one should talk in this manner, I must remind him, *first*, that these are by no means exhibited as *evidences*, but as the *theology* itself; the poets always using the same affirmative style concerning what passed in heaven, in hell, and in the ocean, where men could not be spectators, as concerning what passed upon the earth. *Secondly*, that all those mythological tales are confessedly recorded many centuries after they are supposed to have happened; no voucher, no testimony, nothing that can deserve the name of evidence having been produced, or even alleged, in proof of them. *Thirdly*, that the intention of the writers seems to be solely the amusement, not the conviction of their readers; that accordingly no writer scruples to model the mythology to his particular taste, or rather caprice; but considering this as a province subject to the laws of Parnassus, all agree in arrogating here the immemorial privilege of poets, to say and feign, unquestioned, what they please. And *fourthly*, that at least several of their narrations are allegorical, and as plainly intended to convey some physical or moral instruction, as any of the apologues of Æsop. But to have said even thus much in refutation of so absurd a plea, will perhaps to many readers appear superfluous.

Leaving, therefore, the endless absurdities and incoherent fiction of idolators, I shall inquire, in the next place, whether the Mahometan worship (which in its speculative principles appears more rational) pretends to have been built on the evidence of miracles.

Mahomet, the founder of this profession, openly and frequently, as all the world knows disclaimed evidence. He frankly owned that he had no commission nor power to work miracles, being sent of God to the people as a preacher. Not, indeed, but that there are things mentioned in the revelation he pretended to give them, which, if true, would have been miraculous; such are the nocturnal visits of the Angel Gabriel, (not unlike those secret interviews, which Numa, the institutor of the Roman rites, affirmed that he had with the goddess Egeria) his getting from time to time parcels of the uncreated book transmitted to him from heaven, and his most amazing night journey. But these miracles could be no evidences of his mission. Why? Because no person was witness to them. On the contrary, it was because his adherents had previously and implicitly believed his apostleship, that they admitted things so incredible, on his bare declaration. There is indeed one miracle, and but one, which he urges against the infidels, as the main support of his cause;

a miracle for which even we, in this distant region and period, have not only the evidence of testimony, but, if we please to use it, all the evidence which the contemporaries and countrymen of this military apostle ever enjoyed. The miracle I mean is the manifest divinity, or supernatural excellence, of the scriptures which he gave them; a miracle, concerning which I shall only say, that as it falls not under the cognizance of the senses, but of a much more fallible tribunal, taste in composition, and critical discernment, so a principle of less efficacy than enthusiasm, even the slightest partiality, may make a man, in this particular, imagine he perceives what has no reality. Certain it is, that notwithstanding the many defiances which the prophet gave his enemies, sometimes to produce ten chapters, sometimes one, that could bear to be compared with an equal portion of the perspicuous book, they seem not in the least to have been convinced, that there was any thing miraculous in the matter. Nay, this sublime performance, so highly venerated by every Mussulman, they were not afraid to blaspheme as contemptible, calling it "*a confused heap of dreams,*" and "*the silly fables of ancient times.*"

While modern sceptics would tell us of miracles wrought in support of Paganism, and of the Roman priesthood, they have not as yet attempted to say that either the "lying wonders" of the "mother kirk," or the false miracles of the Pagan temples, were exhibited in the first exhibition of a religion, or for the establishment of it. Mr. Hume, indeed, would compare the miracles of Christ and his apostles to some things he calls Pagan and Popish miracles,—but there is not, in fact, one point of coincidence or resemblance between them. What were the tales of Alexander of Pontus, the celebrated Pagan fortune-teller, or of Vespasius the Roman emperor, in common with the miracles of Christ and his apostles? What was the miracle reported in the memoirs of the Cardinal De Retz, or those said to have been performed in the churchyard of Saint Medard, at the tomb of Abbe Paris, to do with the christian miracles? Is there one point of coincidence in the alleged design of these miracles, or in their character and use? Not one. Mr. Hume himself was constrained to yield the point. And those miracles mentioned by Mr. Hume were the best suited to his design of any "lying wonders" in the annals of the world. Those Pagan and Popish miracles, as far as the sceptic has introduced them, were not wrought in confirmation of any new religion as proofs of its Divine origin. The cures said to have been performed, were, even by their own testimony, *few* in comparison of the number of applicants who received no cures, and *few* in comparison of the number who were thrown into diseases in seeking remedies. In these false miracles *impostures* were often detected and proved, and as Dr. C. has shewn that all the cures said to have been effected were such as could have been effected by *natural* means.

Again, *none* of those cures were *instantaneous*; many of them were the effects of medicine before use, and in many instances the maladies had evidently abated before application for remedies were made. Many of those miraculous cures *incomplete*, and the relief afforded as in many instances *temporary*. Now if all the false miracles which one of the most ingenious and the most learned of believers was able to assemble from history and from fable, were liable to all the above imputations; and if the gentlemen himself who advanced them was put to silence on the grounds, how transcendent this species of evidence afforded our holy religion. The miracles wrought by the Holy Spirit in attestation of the preaching of the apostles, were *numerous, public, beneficent*; no imposture was ever detected, the adversaries of the christian faith themselves being judges; the cures were *always instantaneous, always complete, and always permanent*. To this Holy and Eternal Spirit, then, is every christian indebted for that most splendid and powerful of all evidence, which puts out of countenance all opposition, which covers with shame and confusion the subtle and presumptuous infidel, and which, in fact, presents the whole phalanx of opposers to the christian faith in the same ridiculous and absurd attitude as the dogs in the fable, which conspired to bark down the moon walking in brightness.

We must reserve our remarks on *spiritual gifts* to the next essay, which, in the department of miraculous evidence, are the most triumphant and glorious of all.

EDITOR.

* * *

ADDRESS TO THE PUBLIC.

IT is no doubt known to some of you that a pamphlet, titled, "*Letters to Alexander Campbell, by a Regular Baptist*," has been published at Pittsburgh a few days ago. It will, doubtless, be expected that I would pay some attention to this work. The spirit and style of this "Regular Baptist" forbids my addressing one word to him. I will, therefore, without prepossessing my readers by expressing any opinion of the motives and object of this letter-writer, proceed to review his performance.

This "Regular Baptist" informs me that my character is of two kinds—*extrinsic* and *intrinsic*. My "*intrinsic character*" is that which he investigates and on which he pronounces judgment. In coming at my *intrinsic character*, or the character of my heart, he has, he says, adopted, "as a standard of judgment" principles admitted by "the christian and the philosopher." These principles, he adds, "direct to a general investigation of life, the whole area of action." But he regrets that the whole area of my action is unknown to him, every thing previous to my arrival in these United States being with him "something of conjecture." But although my "*intrinsic character*" is the subject of investigation, and the principles of the christian and the phi-

losopher require that the "whole area of action" should be examined, yet the ingenious author views "*the area of my action*" only since I joined the Baptists—and, in fact, while he professes to do this much, he only fixes his eyes upon me since the year 1820. And of all the area of my action from which my intrinsic character is to be ascertained, only four years come in review,—and of these four years but my "two debates and the Christian Baptist" are particularly noticed. To what a span is the whole area of my action reduced! And from how few documents does he undertake to prove that I am unregenerated. Let not the reader be startled at the word *unregenerated*; for this is the point of investigation, and the whole area of this Regular Baptist's letters is filled with mighty and convincing proofs, he alleges, that I am an unregenerated man. But the strangest point of all remains to be noticed, and that is, that of all the actions of my life, and of all the words I have spoken or written, *not one* is adduced as proof of his favorite position, but only his *conjectures* with a reference to the Debates on Baptism and the Christian Baptist. Of all that I have written not one word is cited. These letters then are, if any thing can be so named, "a new thing under the sun." For I am tried and condemned upon mere conjecture, and worse than all, these conjectures are predicated either upon the most evident falsehoods, or upon a false view of facts. So much by way of introduction to my review.

A few remarks upon the writer of these letters are also necessary to their easy comprehension. They are anonymous, and necessarily to be ranked under the very common and general head of anonymous abuse. As such I was not bound to notice them; for who knows not that the ebullitions of anonymous foes carry their own condemnation in their preface? But, believing that medicine may be deduced even from the carcase of a serpent that has poisoned itself, I am induced to notice them under the conviction that good may result therefrom. The writer of these letters is the Reverend Mr. GREATRAKE, from the city of Baltimore, or somewhere thereabouts. He is now located in the city of Pittsburgh, and calls himself a "Regular Baptist." It is true that he either promised or prophesied in the conclusion of his address to the Baptist churches in the West, that while on earth he would "be known to them *only* by the name of a Regular Baptist," In his last letter to me he was kind enough to *appear* willing to give me his *real* name on presenting to the publisher a "fair reason" for demanding it. But when I called on the publisher he presented me with *written* conditions which the "Regular Baptist" had given him, which precluded him from giving up his name except upon such conditions as the civil law would oblige him to give it up, or suffer prosecution. This gentleman is at present *hired* by a party, who were excluded from a regular Baptist church, at least by a church which, at the time of their exclusion, was recognized as such. He seems to

glory in the name of "*a Regular Baptist*," yet with what propriety I cannot see, as he is ordained over a party that cannot be called regular Baptists. It is a truth that the last Redstone Association recommended the calling of a committee to endeavor to promote a re-union of those excommunicated ones; or, as they express it, "to compromise their difficulties"—and that a committee was called by the excluded party, which leaving undone what was the only thing recommended by the association to be done; they proceeded to do that which they were not commanded to do, and *did, without any authority from the association*, call or denominate the excommunicated ones a church; and thus, as far as in them lay, prevented their re-union on such grounds as could, on regular Baptist principles, constitute them a regular Baptist church. Although, then, Mr. Greatrake glories in the name of a Regular Baptist, as though the very name should "*cover a multitude of sins*" he is not at present acting as such in the instances specified. This, with me, is, however, a very small matter, as I lay no stress on such names, whether assumed or bestowed. There is a church in Pittsburg that would rejoice much more in being a regular church of Christ than a regular Baptist church, which church has two bishops, who, while they watch over and labor among the saints, labor working with their own hands according to the apostolic command; and not only minister to their own wants, but are examples to the flock in beneficence and hospitality. This church, by walking in the fear of God and in the comfort of the Holy Spirit, is edified and enlarged by regular accession—and their example in that city is a dangerous one to those who would maintain themselves by maintaining such opinions as will maintain them. The object of the letter-writer evidently being to defame this church as well as myself, it was necessary to present the reader with this brief notice of things in relation to the Rev. Mr. Greatrake. Now to the letters.

There are *four conjectures*, in some respects different, and in some respects not very distinct, by which Mr. Greatrake demonstrates that I am unregenerated. The first is, that I "must have received some personal pique or experienced some severe disappointment, if not both, from the denomination or church to which I formerly belonged." The second is that I must be stimulated by an "*insatiate vanity*." The third, that I am actuated by *avarice*, or, as he expresses it, by my "*pecuniary interest*." The fourth is, that I am aiming at being the head of a party. Into one or more or all of these evil motives, he resolves my two Debates on Baptism and the "*Christian Baptist*," and thence concludes that I am a very bad man—although my *extrinsic* character he acknowledges is good.

I could have wished that my biographer had taken a little more time, and a little more of the advice of his friends, in waiting to get acquainted with my history and myself, and have left it to some more skilful, though less benevolent hand, to write

memoirs of my life. I have only to make a statement of a few facts and occurrences of general notoriety, and I think his efforts will require no comment nor praise.

I sailed from the city of Londonderry on the 3d day of October, 1808, destined for the city of Philadelphia; but being shipwrecked on the coast of the island of Ila on the night of the 9th of the same month, I was detained until the 3d day of August, 1809, on which day I sailed from the city of Greenock for New York. On the 27th of which month I and the whole ship's company had almost perished in the Atlantic; but through the watchful care and tender mercy of our Heavenly Father, we were brought to the harbor which we desired to see, and safely landed in New York on the 29th of September, 1809. On the 28th of the next month arrived in Washington, Pennsylvania, to which place I have been known ever since. I arrived in this country with credentials in my pocket from that sect of Presbyterians known by the name of *Seceders*. These credentials certified that I had been both in Ireland in the presbytery of Market Hill, and in Scotland in the presbytery of Glasgow a member of the Secession church, in good standing. My faith in creeds and confessions of human device was considerably shaken while in Scotland, and I commenced my career in this country under the conviction that nothing that was not as old as the New Testament should be made an article of faith, a rule of practice, or a term of communion amongst christians. In a word, that the whole of the christian religion exhibited in prophecy and type in the Old Testament, was presented in the fullest, clearest, and most perfect manner in the New Testament by the Spirit of wisdom and revelation.

This has been the pole-star of my course ever since, and I thank God that he has enabled me so far to prosecute it, and to make all my prejudices and ambition bow to this emancipating principle. I continued in the examination of the scriptures, ecclesiastical history, and systems of divinity, ancient and modern, until July 15th, 1810, on which day I publicly avowed my convictions of the independency of the church of Christ and the excellency and authority of the scriptures, in a discourse from the last section of what is commonly called "Christ's Sermon on the Mount." During this year I pronounced one hundred and six orations on sixty-one primary topics of the christian religion in the western part of Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the neighboring part of Ohio. On the 12th day of March, 1811, I took unto myself a wife of the Presbyterian connexion, and on the 25th of the same month became a resident in Virginia. I became a citizen of Virginia as soon as the laws of the state permitted, and have continued such until this day. In conformity to the grand principle which I have called the pole-star of my course of religious inquiry, I was led to question the claims of infant sprinkling to divine authority, and was, after a long, serious, and prayerful examination of all means of information, led to

solicit immersion on a profession of my faith, when as yet I scarce knew a Baptist from Washington to the Ohio, in the immediate region of my labors, and when I did not know that any friend or relation on earth would concur with me. I was accordingly baptized by Elder *Matthias Luse*, who was accompanied by Elder *Henry Spears*, on the 12th day of June, 1812. In the mean time I pursued the avocations of a husbandman as the means of my subsistence; and while I discharged, as far as in me lay, the duties of a bishop (having been regularly ordained one of the Elders of the Church of Christ at Brush Run) and itinerated frequently through the circumjacent country, I did it without any earthy remuneration. I did not at first contemplate forming any connexion with the Regular Baptist Association called "*the Redstone*," as the perfect independency of the church and the pernicious tendency of human creeds and terms of communion were subjects to me of great concern. As a mere spectator, I did, however, visit the Redstone Association in the fall of 1812. After a more particular acquaintance with some of the members and ministers of that connexion, the church of Brush Run did finally agree to unite with that Association on the ground that no terms of union or communion other than the Holy Scriptures should be required. On this ground, after presenting a written declaration of our belief (always distinguishing betwixt making a declaration of our faith for the satisfaction of others, and *binding* that declaration on others as a term of communion) we united with the Redstone Association in the fall of 1813; in which connexion the church of Brush Run yet continues. In the close of 1814 and beginning of 1815 I made an extensive tour through a part of the eastern region, visiting the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, and did, to my present shame, by milking both the sheep and the goats, obtain about 1000 dollars for the building of a meeting-house in Wellsburgh, a place then destitute of any house for religious meetings. In 1816 I delivered a discourse on *the law* before the Redstone Association, which being published by request, gave rise to some discussion, which resulted, we believe, in some benefit to the searchers after truth. January, 1818, I undertook the care of a classical and mercantile academy, known by the name of the "Buffaloe Seminary." I continued the principal of this seminary for five and a half years. In 1820, after being *thrice* solicited by the Baptists, I did consent to debate with Mr. Walker on the subject of baptism. Of this debate two editions have been published—one by myself, of 1000 copies, and one by Messrs. Eichbaum & Johnson, of 3000. In 1823 I commenced editing the *Christian Baptist*, and in the fall of 1823 held a public debate with Mr. MacCalla, which grew out of the former with Mr. Walker. These outlines bring me up till the present year, and render a further detail unnecessary. I should have observed that a church was organized in the town of Wellsburgh in 1823, which was composed for the most part of

members dismissed from the church at Brush Run, of which church I was appointed a bishop.

The reader will agree with me in the result that it was expedient for me to give the above abstract with circumstantial accuracy, and we can, not only solemnly testify the above statement to be correct and strictly true, but we are able to prove every item of it of any importance before any tribunal, civil or ecclesiastical. With this document before us, let us now attend to the first *conjecture*. It is founded on a falsehood. I never received any personal pique or experienced any disappointment from any Presbyterian Sect, Seceder or other. I never asked one favor from any Paido-Baptist sect, and therefore never received any disappointment. Nay, so far from this, favors were offered and not accepted. Immediately after my arrival in this country the Academy at Pittsburgh was offered me, and invitations to union with the Paido-Baptist sects presented to me. Every thing is just the reverse of Mr. Greatrake's conjecture. Time after time favors, ecclesiastical favors, were offered me, and no consideration under heaven but conscience forbade their acceptance. Indeed I am bound gratefully to remember the kind offers and offices of many Paido-Baptists; and a better return I cannot (as I think) make, than to admonish them of their errors.* But this gentleman, to destroy my influence and my power to do them good, would persuade them that I am an enemy because I tell them the truth, and would conjecture that I was avenging an affront or an injury, which I never received. Insults and injuries I have received from some Baptists, but until my appearance on the stage in defence of the truths I had espoused in common with them, no insults or injuries are recollected ever to have been received from any body of Paido-Baptists.

But there is another falsehood in Mr. Greatrake's first conjecture. He represents me as peculiarly bitter against the Seceders. Now it is a fact which he cannot disprove, that in all my remarks, both oral and written, there is less said about them than other Presbyterian Paido-Baptists.

His second conjecture, that I am actuated by an "*insatiate vanity*," is capable of being proved to be a falsehood. By vanity he seems to mean, in his subsequent remarks, a *love of fame*. How a person, whose ruling passion is a love of fame, should, in that period of life when this passion is supposed to be strongest, retire from every theatre on which he might exhibit to advantage, is a point which deserves some consideration, and which my biographer should have explained. A person that refused, as I have done, offers of connexion with popular sects, and of places of public and conspicuous eminence in the cities of Philadelphia and New York, who could take his Bible

*The first night that I spent in Washington county, Pa. I enjoyed the hospitalities of Doctor Samuel Ralston.

and the plough and sit down among the hills of Western Virginia, and, from the age of 21 to 31, move in the quiet vale of retirement, without seeking in one instance to make himself more conspicuous than his immediate duties and business required, affords, we conceive, but few evidences that his ruling passion is the love of fame. But that I would not desire the fame of doing good and of being useful to my fellow-men, is what I do not affirm. From a boy I have admired the sentiment of the following lines:—

“All fame is foreign, but of true desert;
 “Plays round the head, but comes not to the heart.
 “One self-approving hour whole years outweighs
 “Of stupid starers, and of loud huzzas;
 “And more true joy Marcellus exil’d feels,
 “Than Cesar with a senate at his heels;”

But this third conjecture will throw some light upon the former two. And behold he says, “Your vanity is gratified and your pecuniary interest advanced by the whole circle of your doings; and these combined are the grand controlling principles from which you act.” And so this reverend gentleman begins by conjecture, and ends by asserting that *avarice* and ambition are the two “grand controlling principles” from which I act. Yes, “Caesar aut nihil is my motto.” And, adds he, “While men of sense will readily discern the ambition of your projects, those of the most common-place ability in business calculation will be enabled to furnish themselves with conclusive testimony, that by the publication of your debates on Baptism, and your *mere sounding Christian Baptist*, you wheedle the Baptists and others of the community out of as much money as would cover the salary of nine out of ten at least of the Baptist ministers.” Then to prove the point, he gives the following exhibit:—

* * *

“Dr.	“PUBLICATION OF DEBATE ON BAPTISM.	
	“To 2000 copies of Debate with Mr. Walker, at 37½	
	cents per copy,	750 00
	“To 6500 copies of Debate with Mr, M’Calla, at 50	
	cents per copy,	3250 00
	To incidental expences of distributing said Debate,	
	including contingent losses, say 12½ cents per volume,	1062 50
	“To balance,	4862 50
“Cr.		\$9925 00
	“By 2000 copies of Debate with Mr. Walker, at 75	
	cents per copy,	1500 00
	“By sales of 6500 copies of Debate with M’Calla, at	
	\$1 25 per copy,	8125 00
	“By sale of copy right of Debate with Mr. Walker,	300 00
		9925 00
	“By balance,	\$4862 50”

By giving a little more latitude to the powerful results of figures, he might, by the same spirit of falsehood, have made me a quite handsome speculator, and have given me 20,000 dollars instead of almost 5000. Now let us coolly examine this forgery. In the first place, it is a positive falsehood that I published 2000 copies of the Debate with Walker. I published but *one thousand*. In the next place, I paid more for the binding and printing, independent of paper and all other expences, than $37\frac{1}{2}$ cents per volume. In the third place, it is a positive falsehood that I published six thousand five hundred copies of the Debate with M'Calla. But six thousand copies were published in all, and of these I published but fifteen hundred. The truth is as follows: Mr. Sala and I, in joint partnership, published three thousand copies, of which fifteen hundred copies were his and fifteen hundred mine. I also agreed to print, bind, and deliver two thousand copies for Mr. Joseph Freeman, and one thousand copies for Mr. Jacob Osbourne, as any person having a printing establishment would do. These three thousand copies were their property and not mine. But the greatness of my speculation will appear when it is understood that I am legally bound, and my property *alone* responsible for all the expences incurred in printing and binding six thousand copies, and that I am legally entitled to the profits resulting from the sale of fifteen hundred copies for the whole risk; having no security but the integrity of the young men for whom I finished three thousand copies, and all the materials for the fifteen hundreds copies of Mr. Sala were obtained also on my responsibility. Besides all this, Mr. Sala and myself, out of our joint three thousand copies, have instead of $12\frac{1}{2}$ per volume, given 40 cents per volume to Mr. Heyworth for the sale of five hundred copies that were not subscribed for. These are all facts, in proof of which written contracts and arrangements can be produced. We shall leave this exhibit before the reader without further comment, knowing that friend or foe will be able to appreciate the moral character of the mind of the letter-writer, who, either intentionally or unintentionally, could descend to such a statement. But what means all this false representation? It is intended to prove a conjecture—that is, Mr. Greatrake conjectures that avarice is one of my two controlling principles of action, and to prove his conjecture, he deliberately writes down falsehoods. But Mr. Greatrake is a *regenerated* man, and *says* he was converted in a *special* manner; and if the righteous sin their iniquities shall be pardoned, and especially when they sin in defence of the orthodox faith. But again I ask, What means all this falsehood

and calumny? Why, courteous reader, I will conjecture too: I have, you know, declaimed, and reasoned, and argued too, against the hireling clergy, and if one of them could make it appear that while I have labored more abundantly than any of the hirelings and taken nothing for it, yet I too was actuated by avarice and ambition; then I must fall into the same ranks and my influence be destroyed. And although but few of my brethren, the Baptist, are in danger of getting rich by the office of an Elder, yet there is now and then such a "Regular Baptist" as Mr. Greatrake, who looks, or seems to look, a little too much to his office for something that comes from the mines of Potosi. But conjectures avaunt!

I am only yet nibbling at a few of the falsehoods in this reverend gentleman's letters. Concerning the baptism of Mr. Church, in one half page Mr. Church himself did, in my presence and in the presence of Mr. Walter Scott, convict him of no less than the round number of one dozen. On which I observed to Mr. Greatrake—"Sir, if, in describing an incident which occurred a few weeks since, in your own city, at your own door, you could, from any cause, make so many false statements, how could you, a perfect stranger in this western country, be supposed or suppose yourself able to give any thing like a fair statement of my history for almost 15 years in this country?" Nay, this is the least outrage committed against Mr. Church; for although Mr. Church had been a citizen of Pittsburgh for 17 years, and has supported an unblemished character, and had been an Elder in a congregation of Covenanters, because (as conjecture would say) Mr. Greatrake was not called to baptize him, he deliberately tells this aged and respectable professor that he holds or is "confirmed in a delusion perhaps that shall only be dissipated in hell—I mean by delusion, that *baptism is salvation*." Mr. Church declared that he never held such a sentiment; but the word "*perhaps*" Mr. G. made emphatic. But, indeed, Mr. Greatrake has gone beyond all bounds in the assertion of falsehoods. He has, too, in things of the greatest notoriety, been quite as unguarded as in things of a more private nature. For instance, he says that I debated a week with Mr. Walker. His words are, "Having for the space of a week, on *two different occasions*, contended earnestly, *viva voce*, for baptism by immersion." Now, did this man ever read this debate? Instead of a week, it was only a part of two days!! Again, he represents me, as with a design of taking vengeance on the Seceders for some conjectured injury, or from ambition or avarice, got up this debate with Mr. Walker, whereas it has been already proved to the public, and to the silencing of the Paido-Baptists, and can be proved again and again, that I was written to *three* times before I accepted of Mr. Walker's challenge. To Mr. Walker I am, then, indebted for so much fame and money—for every one knows that the second debate grew out of the former.

But this "Regular Baptist" tells us a part of his object very

plainly. He says—"Confident that you have an undue and deleterious influence in the Baptist church, I would wish to see it destroyed." And yet he acknowledges that a part of that influence is good. He says,—“Now it is not my wish to be understood as disapproving of all possible devotedness to the perusal of the Scriptures—on the contrary, I think your fraternity worthy of imitation in this particular.” Let this “Regular Baptist” destroy my influence by truth and righteousness, and not by iniquity and falsehood, and then I will rejoice with him. But I have transgressed too far on the patience of my readers. I will only notice his fourth conjecture at present—“that I wish to place myself at the head of a new party.” He appealed to the history of the world if such would not be the result, and I, in an interview with him, appealed to the history of the world that such could not be the result—that the very motto of the Christian Baptist forbade the idea, and that the world did afford an instance of any individual advocating such principles placing himself at the head of a party—my grand object being to destroy all sectarianism, and to see all christians united on the one approved and tried foundation.

A more edifying use of this pamphlet will, we hope, be made in the next number. We have been obliged from our regard to the truths we advocate, to make this defence of our character from the attacks of an imprudent, and, to say the best, prejudiced foe. I asked him to make a recantation of the whole pamphlet, and I should publish his recantation. He agreed to make a partial one, and, as respected Mr. Church, a full one; but I told him, in the presence of Messrs. Scott and Church, that no other than a full and unequivocal one would, on my part, be accepted. There is no course, as we once hinted, which we can take, against which carping envy and prating maliciousness will not object. John the Baptist came neither eating nor drinking, and they said, He hath a Devil;* and the Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they said, Behold a lover of banquets and wine. But “wisdom is justified of her children.”

EDITOR.

* * *

Mr. Editor,

BEING some time ago very much harassed in my mind on various topics of the christian religion, the Rev. S. F——y came to give me relief. One of the points, and the principal one, for which he laboured to convince me, was the importance of infant baptism. I had heard him preach on the subject, and in his conversation with me he said the same—That there was no command nor precedent for it in all the word of God. “But,” said he, “the Most High, in the dispensations of his providence, so ordered it, that the church of Rome had left this ordinance pure and uncorrupt from the apostles down to the Reformation, and the worthies of the Reformation handed it down to us.”

**Mr. Greatrake has positively said that the Devil is my master.*

This gentleman has been a long time an opposed of thine; but in this agreed exactly with thyself; for in your catechism you ask, "*Who instituted infant baptism?*" The answer is, "*The clergy.*" Now the Rev. S. F——y perfectly agreed with thee, and gives the clergy the whole honor of handing it down to us. I see then, sir, that your friend of West Middletown, while he differs with you in some respects, agrees with you in the main. The above you may rest assured is fact.

No more, at present, from your friend,

JOHN.

* * *

REMARKS ON CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

MR. GREATRAKE, in his letters, says—"Again, we know that you propagate the doctrine of the church's independency, so far as to exclude all reference to articles of faith, and principles of order upon which they have been founded, (I am now speaking of the Baptist church) this your writings are uniformly understood to aim at. And really, sir, your attempt to disseminate this sort of sentiment, in the Baptist church in particular, demonstrates your very great attainment in impudence, or that you are extremely ignorant of the constituents of social unity and order, as I shall hereafter endeavor to exhibit. Can you suppose that any reflecting, intelligent member of the Baptist church, will ever conceive favorably of that man, or have confidence in the purity of his motives, who attempts to destroy the very foundation upon which the denomination has risen to such imposing magnitude, in such fair proportions, and with such solidity? Indeed, sir, the attempt on your part, or that of any other person, bears testimony of a radical defect in understanding, and can only leave you, in the exercise of all possible charity, the character of the Knight of La Ma cha, or the phrenzied Swede."*

I had thought that the Baptist denomination gloried not in the Westminster creed, but in the New Testament. I think Mr. Benedict, in his history of the Baptists, more than once represents this as a fact, that the Bible without comment is the creed and confession of the Baptists. I know that he declares of the first Baptists in the United States, (vol. 1. p. 487,) in giving the history of the oldest church in the union, that, "from first to last, the Bible without comment has been their confession of faith." And I am very sure that it is only in so far as they have adopted and acted on this principle, that their progress is estimated in heaven. If they should, on any other principle, proselyte the whole world, they might become famous and respectable on earth, but all in heaven would frown upon them. And there is one fact which all my Baptist friends in this country know,

*We never descend to reply to such composition. We think the mere citation of it a sufficient act of humiliation, and a sufficient refutation of it in the estimation of all sober christians.

that when the church to which I belonged associated with them, we protested against all creeds of human composition as terms of communion; at the same time declaring what we believed to be christian truth in opposition to reigning errors. And although some seem to think there is no difference between a verbal or written declaration of faith recognizing a human creed as a term of communion, we see a very great difference, so much at least as to forbid an effort on our part to make our own declaration of faith a term of communion to others. The New Testament, as respects christian faith and practice, is our only creed, form of discipline, and the avowal of the *One Foundation*, our only bond of union. I object to all human creeds as terms of communion from the following consideration:—

1. They are predicated upon a gross insult to the wisdom and benevolence of the Founder of christianity. They, in effect, say, that "*the form of sound words*" which he has communicated in writing is not so well adapted to the exigencies of christians as some other form into which human wisdom and benevolence can place them. For if the New Testament is not so sufficient and suitable as a creed of human contrivance or arrangement, this creed exhibits greater wisdom and benevolence than the New Testament.

2. All creeds as terms of communion, being designed to exclude the evil and receive the good, are the most foolish of all expedients which human folly has adopted. For who that will see, does not see, that good men, that is men of christian integrity, will never subscribe or swear to believe that which they do not believe, for the sake of a name, a place, or an office in any church; whereas evil men who want a name, or a place, or an office in any church; will subscribe whether they believe or not.

3. They are the sources of division. They make an assent to philosophical views of revelation a bond of union, and consequently every new discovery, or dissent from an ancient one, occasions a new heresy and a new sect. Exclude him; for "how can two walk together unless they are agreed," says the orthodox.

4. They are, in one word, every way wicked—Inasmuch as they have always led to persecution, and have produced enmity, variance, and strife as their legitimate results. For these and a hundred other reasons, which time may specify and illustrate, I will never subscribe, nor swear to any other confession of my christian faith, than the New Testament.

EDITOR.

ADDRESS TO THE PUBLIC

*“There is one spirit in all the clergy, whether they be Romanist
“or Protestant, Baptist or Paido-Baptist, learned or unlearned,
“their own workmanship or the workmanship of others.”*

AMONGST the Baptists it is to be hoped there are but few clergy; and would to God there were none! The grand and distinguishing views of the Baptists must be grossly perverted before they could tolerate one such creature. The Baptist views of a congregation of saints, if I understand them correctly, are such as the following:—

1. A congregation or church of Jesus Christ is an assembly of intelligent individuals, who, “by the washing of regeneration, and renewal of the Holy Spirit,” voluntarily associate to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord Jesus Christ, declaring allegiance to the King Eternal, Immortal, and Invisible; and renouncing every other authority in heaven, on the earth, or under the earth.

2. Such a society having pledged themselves to one another, by the profession of the faith, and by the baptism ordained by Jesus Christ, have all power, liberty, and right to administer all the ordinances of Christ; and to do every act and thing that appertains to the order, discipline, and worship of the christian church; to choose out from among themselves bishops and deacons, that is, overseers and servants, to ordain or appoint such; and then to submit themselves to such, as to them that watch for their souls, and must give account, and all this without the interference of any ecclesiastical authority on earth.

A pretty good illustration of this principle we find in the first Baptist church in the United States, A. D. 1636, a little over a hundred years after the Reformation. Twelve persons, amongst whom was the famous Roger Williams, the first settler and founder of Rhode Island, desirous of forming a church, and first of being immersed in the primitive style—did meet together to deliberate on these topics. How to obtain a suitable administrator was a point of some difficulty. “At length,” as Benedict says, when they understood the scriptures, the “candidates for communion nominated and appointed Mr. Ezekiel Holliman, a man of gifts and piety, to baptize Mr. Williams; *and who, in return*, baptized Mr. Holliman and the other ten.” Although the circumstances of the case compelled this measure, yet if it were not essentially right, that is, scriptural, it never could be justified; and I think that man is very inadequate to teach the christian religion, who is not able to justify this procedure upon the grand principles of revelation, and of reason. This first church in the union also appointed its own Bishops and Deacons according to the primitive style.*

See Benedict's History, vol. 1, p. 475.

Every person possessed in a good degree of the qualifications laid down by the apostle Paul as essential to the christian bishop, and who, after having been first *well proved by a congregation of disciples*, is ordained or appointed by the congregation to the overseer's office, in which he is to exercise the functions of a bishop; every such person, I say, is to be esteemed and valued as a bishop, and by no means to be ranked amongst the clergy. But some few Baptists, tickled by the love of novelty, and lured by the false majesty of Presbyterianism, exhibited in a classical priesthood, or ordinaries, co-ordinates, subordinates, priests, and Levites; ruling elders, licentiates, reverends, and Doctors of Divinity, have compromised the distinguishing features of their own grand peculiarities, and palmed upon themselves a species of demagogues, who, while they have all the airs, haunter, and arrogance of some Paido-Baptist priests, have neither their erudition, nor their talents, nor their policy. They can neither wear the gown decently, nor conceal the cloven foot.

To do this in such a way as not to give umbrage to the pious members of this community, it is necessary to mock the ancient principles of this once humble and unassuming people. And so it comes to pass that a number of pious young men, of poor circumstances, but of virtuous habits, are *taken out of the churches* to be made bishops of other churches, and after taught to conjugate *amo and tupto*, are sent to a theological school, now called a *school of the prophets*, and being drilled in the art and mystery of making a sermon, set out to find a church which wants a young foppish gentleman, who says to the old bishops, "Stand by—I have seen, and sure I ought to know." But how will he get *into the church* so as to be chosen *from among the brethren* is the point! The teachers of the schools of the prophets have settled this point. He gives in his letter, becomes a member a week or two, and is then *chosen from among themselves*; and so the Baptist principles are compromised. Thus a young gentleman filled with the vast ideas of his own *little though noble* self, mounts the rostrum and is called ELDER, *though the term is a lie when applied to him*, and obliges all the old and experienced saints to be silent, who are a thousand times better qualified than he to be overseers. Thus I have known a young Baptist priest *made and finished* in Philadelphia, go to the state of New York, preach a few times to a rich congregation, give in his letter, and in two or three weeks be called out from among the brethren to become their bishop; and that too, before he has got a wife, or a house, or a family to rule well.* Such teachers I

*Let not the reader suppose when I speak of young priests made such by grammar, English, Greek, or Latin, I have in my view the Rev. Mr. GREAT-LAKE. For although he tells the citizens of the West that they are in a deplorable state of ignorance, as devoid of all the means of intelligence he had in the East, and although he quotes two or three scripts of Latin in his pamphlet, yet he affords infallible evidence that he never learned a grammar in his life, English, Greek, or Latin. And, indeed, although we are very ignorant in the West, and have much to learn, I must say that the priests coming

must rank among the clergy, and, indeed, they soon prove themselves to have a full portion, and sometimes a double portion, of the spirit of the priesthood. I hope, however, the number of such amongst the Baptists is small. Perhaps the whole aggregate number is not greater than the aggregate of *good well meaning men* amongst the Paido-Baptist clergy. They are not *all* Israel, which are of Israel, is proverbially true, of Baptists and Paido-Baptists; though in different acceptations of the word *Israel*.

There is one vast difference, one essential and all-important difference betwixt the Baptists and Paido-Baptist views and societies. The Baptist views of the church of Jesus Christ are constitutionally correct; the Paido-Baptist views are unconstitutional. To make myself more intelligible—there are to be found in the Baptist system such views of the christian church, as, if carried out to their legitimate issue, will place them on apostolic grounds; but the Paido-Baptists would, if carried out, place them in the bosom of the Roman pontiff. Yes, the one system would place the church upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief cornerstone. The other system would place it upon St. Peter as the rock. The Baptist system is capable of being reformed or brought back again to the constitution of the kingdom of heaven; the Paido-Baptist cannot. It must be destroyed. The one system carries in its bosom the means of its purification; the other, the fire that must consume it. The foundation of the former needs but to have the rubbish cleared away; the foundation of the latter must be totally razed. The constitution of the one is essentially of Divine construction; the constitution of the other is altogether human. The good confession of the King of Martyrs before Pontius Pilate, is received by the Baptist and rejected by the Paido-Baptist system.

Mr. Greatrake speaks in a very flattering style to the Paido-Baptists—“For with all their *spots and imperfections*, they approach the nearest to what is your glory—I mean *experimental religion and solid piety*.” To say nothing of the *near*, I do not know who are the *nearer*, if the Paido-Baptists are the *nearest*. And as the Paido-Baptists are Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and Catholics, I think Mr. Greatrake was, surely, sufficiently altitudinarian to avoid the imputation of being uncharitable. But this will be well received by the Herodians, and king Herod and the procurator Pontius Pilate will feast together.*

over the mountains generally are little better. I suppose, however, the learned ones all abide there; for, of those I have been acquainted with, in the character of emigrants, they are mostly inferior to the western clergy in general information, and always inferior in biblical knowledge. And if Mr. Greatrake is one of their regenerated ones, I sincerely say, “from all such may we be delivered.”

*I think it unnecessary to notice the calumnies and slanders of the author of the letters bestowed on the church of Christ in Pittsburgh. I have said bestowed, and, indeed, they are perfectly gratuitous, inasmuch as they

This gentleman is very much concerned for the peace of his Paido-Baptist brethren, and is very much displeased with me for having disturbed their tranquility. He says the sum of your debates—give just as much information as two apostles* give us in less than so many verses, when *they* say [Paul one of them] “We are buried with Christ by baptism,” and [the other apostle apostle Philip!] “If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest be baptized.” But, reader, mark well the conclusion: “Hence, had your object been simply to establish the mind of the Baptist in the validity of baptism by immersion, or to make proselytes to that *mode*, nothing more was necessary than reference to the passages of scripture we have quoted, or some other similar ones; for, if men will not hear Christ and his apostles respecting the truth, neither will they hear you.” Let us now turn this powerful argument to the interest of Mr. Greatrake (for every one sees that, in it, I am not only condemned, but every living soul that has either spoken or written one word of this subject)—“Hence, if Mr. Greatrake’s object was simply to edify a church or convert sinners, he would just read a few verses to each, and not receive a salary for preaching, when he declares that he knows that if they hear not Christ and his apostles, neither will they hear him.” Where, then, is the value received?

But to resume the letters of the Rev. Mr. Greatrake once more, and to make some improvement thereof, I will, in the first place, pay myself a compliment, or rather I will let Mr. Greatrake do it. There is no one, I presume, who reads these letters, will hesitate in saying, that Mr. Greatrake has exhibited the greatest good will to blast my character (for his letters are solely an attack on my character.) If, then, a Rev. “Regular Baptist,” with this manifest intention, was not able to produce one word

are notoriously unmerited on the part of the slandered. But to vindicate this church, with its bishops, from aspersions so evidently false and malicious, would be an insult to the good sense of the citizens of that city who are acquainted with them either as citizens or christians. I have only to say that this pamphleteer has honored me too much in representing them as my disciples. In this acceptation of the term disciple, I am as much their disciple as any of them is mine. I hope we are both disciples of a more exalted teacher and of a more infallible guide. If It were consistent with my views of the christian religion to have disciples, I would ardently pray to God that I might have myriads of such disciples.. But our motto is, Call no man Master or Teacher on earth; and the fact is that I have been profited as much from my acquaintance with some of the members of that church, as I believe any of them has been profited by me.

*This reverend teacher exhibits all through the grossest ignorance of the scriptures. Here he calls Philip, the deacon, an apostle. Who does not know that Philip said to the eunuch, “If thou believest?” &c. Again, he calls Peter, the apostle, a false teacher; and speaks of Barnabas being led away by “false teachers,” whereas it was by the dissimulation of the apostle Peter, that the Jewish brethren (not teachers) were led away, and by them jointly, Barnabas. At another time he represents baptism and the washing of regeneration as if contradistinguished by the apostle; whereas every intelligent christian knows that baptism is called by the apostle the washing of regeneration. These are but a few of the glaring proofs of his biblical knowledge!!

I had said or written, or one action of my life, for 15 years, the period he embraces in his area of defamation, I *conjecture* that I must have been peculiarly fortunate in having given no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. While I feel, and now acknowledge this handsome compliment, I have only to add my regret that the gentleman has not left it in my power to thank him for it. We shall now let him exhibit his plan of attack. In his address to the unconverted whom he wishes to rouse with indignation against me, he says—"If [remember if] you have ever *understood* him to say, [whether he said so or not] either in his preaching or writings, *that the ordinance of baptism has any tendency to wash away sins, or to infuse holiness into the soul of man*, he has said that which is at direct variance with the Baptist faith; and if he has said it as a Baptist, it is a foul slander upon them; or if he has said, under the name of a Baptist, that there is no Holy Ghost to operate especially and essentially upon the souls of sinners in conversion, he has denied the faith of the Baptist church—of if you have understood him [whether he has or has not said so] as saying that the moral law of God is not a rule of conduct for the believer in Christ; that also is contrary to the Baptist faith. If he has said that prayer, after a man has believed, or professed to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, is not a duty and *a mark of saving faith*, that also is in opposition to the sentiments of the Baptists. If he has said, that the preaching of the gospel since the apostolic days is gratuitous, and unauthorized by the Lord Jesus Christ, that is likewise foreign to the faith of the Baptist church. And if he has advanced such doctrines as the foregoing, while professedly a Baptist, what confidence can be placed in his honesty or veracity?" The reader will recollect that he arranged my *motives* before the awful *tribunal of conjecture*, relative to what he calls the prominent incidents of my life; and also, he will remember, that, in my former notice of this work, I afforded evidence that his conjectures were every one false, and that he appeared to have deliberately fabricated falsehoods to help out with his conjectures. The reader will now see that my *sentiments* are attacked in the same manner as my *motives*, and although they are before the public in a tangible and precise form, yet Mr. Greatrake would rather conjecture that they are what they are not, than quote my words and shew what they are. This is quite consistent, however, with the spirit of Mr. Greatrake. In the above extract there are *seven* IFS, from which positive conclusions are drawn; for although he begins with *ifs*, he ends by *assertions*. It is true these *seven ifs* are to be found in the 28th page, near the close of his pamphlet, but I cited them from this page because of their being recapitulated and placed together in one view. They are his *only premises*. Now take one assertion, amongst many, for a specimen of his conclusions: "Saul was quite as great, scholastic, and intellectual a man as you, and yet he was subject to this awful delusion, that is, he denied Jesus

Christ of Nazareth!—You, the Holy Ghost from Heaven!” *Par nobile fratrum!* The celebrated Horne Tooke represents himself as having suffered much from the improper application of *two prepositions*; but had he been tortured by *four conjectures* and *seven ifs*, he would not have complained of the potency of two *particles*. We despatched the four conjectures of the reverend Mr. Greatrake in our last. I would not even have demurred so much at the introduction of *seven ifs*, if he had not deduced from such premises positive and bold assertions. What logical or rational connexion is there between saying *if* a man denies the Holy Spirit, and in the next breath affirming from his *if* that he does. His doing so must either be owing to the weakness of his intellect or the perversity of his heart. One of the two must be assigned: if the former, it calls for pity—if the latter, for contempt. But in either case I am slandered. It was just every way as true that Paul said “*let us do evil that good may come,*” as that I have denied the Holy Spirit. It was just as true that the Messiah cast out demons by Beelzebub, as that I have said, or thought, or taught, that believers ought not to pray. It is just as true that the Saviour of the world was a Samaritan and had a demon, and that I have said, or thought, or taught that the gospel ought not now to be preached. It was just as true that Paul was beside himself and mad, as that I have said or taught any one of the *seven ifs* in the sense which he insinuates. What I have said on the law, on baptism, and on preaching, is already before the public, in what I conceive definite and intelligible language; as also on all the topics embraced in his *seven ifs*. To these I refer the inquisitive. I would also add, that I am prepared to defend every position advanced on these topics, against intellects, and pens, and tongues, guided by truth and virtue, more puissant than a council of three-score-and-six Mr. Greatrakes.

But, indeed, I have good reason to fear the talents of this “Regular Baptist;” for when I asked him, in the presence of the two gentlemen mentioned in my last, on what grounds, and from which of my publications he affirmed that I denied the operations of the Holy Spirit, he referred to my Essay on the Work of the Holy Spirit, in the 1st No. of 2d. vol. of the Christian Baptist, saying, “that I there taught that all its operations were confined to the apostolic age.” I answered, that no such an idea was either expressed or implied. He then excused himself by saying “he had not the number by him, but had so *understood* it.”

But why should I deign to disprove conjectures and suppositions by argument, and especially when there cannot be found an individual in the whole community to which I am known, that can, and I think I may add, that *would* concur with Mr. Greatrake in making such statements. I fearlessly assert that he cannot find a second, friend or foe of mine, of any standing in society that will affix his name in full to such accusations; and we have

already seen that the gentleman himself feared to put his own name to it.

I will not condescend to present *four conjectures* and *seven ifs* respecting this anonymous scribe, though I know that by the cogency of *four conjectures* and *seven ifs* I could present him in awful caricature. I will leave him to the reflections of his own mind and to the suggestions of his own conscience, well knowing that if he is one "born from above," he will come forward, and as openly and unequivocally confess his faults as he has calumniated me; and until then, though he would tell the people that he was caught up unto the third heaven, and "heard things unutterable," I will consider him, and for my life I could not consider him otherwise, than as "a heathen man, and a publican."

Before dismissing this subject, may we not deduce some instructions of importance. The Saviour of the world and his holy apostles, as well as the ancient prophets, often inveighed against the doctors and false teachers of their times; but never did they support their reproofs or predicate their remonstrances upon any other grounds than evident and irrefragable argument and fact. The consequence was, their *benevolent* efforts were ascribed to evil motives, and the most foul and base slanders were the returns they received from such as were not benefited by their kind and suitable endeavors. How excellent their example in those instances, as well as in all others! When the Jews took up stones to kill the Saviour, how admirable his conduct! He said, "Many good works have I shewn you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?" When they cavilled at his language as too vague and ambiguous, he asked, "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." And when they yet believed not, he asked, "Which of you convicteth me of a crime? Now if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" When they told him he had a devil, he replied, "I have not a devil; but I honor my Father, and ye dishonor me." And when they treated him with every contumely as an impostor, even to suspension on the accursed tree, he said, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do!" His martyr Stephen, while he faithfully called his countrymen "stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, a race of persecutors," exclaimed, amidst the bruises they inflicted on him, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." While the history of their lives affords us a thousand lessons on a thousand topics, their example in these instances should be ever present in the remembrance of those who may be honored with suffering shame for his name. Christians, however, should take heed that they suffer not as evil doers, or busy-bodies in other men's matters; but if they suffer as christians, let them not be ashamed, but let them glorify God on this account.

There is one thought, and O! how grand and solemn a thought! which, methinks, should annihilate every envious, malicious, and revengeful feeling—WE MUST ALL STAND TOGETHER BEFORE THE

JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST!! Yes, the accuser and the accused, the slanderer and the slandered must meet there. To be then saluted with "Well done, good and faithful servant!" will be more desirable than all the honors, and wealth, and fame, that all the sons of Adam could bestow.

We may also see that the spirit of the world and of the clergy of this world is always one and the same. The history of the world does not afford one instance where the popular clergy, those of influence and popularity amongst the people, ever espoused the cause of reformation. All the famed reformations that ever have been canonized, were effected, to speak in common style, in spite of the reigning clergy. Many of the temporizers, it is true, came up in the rear, when they saw it to be their interest. Even in the history of the progress of christianity in Jerusalem, given us by Luke, to the eternal honor of the priesthood, we are informed, that after immense multitudes were converted, "and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly—a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith."

There is one thing to me most obvious, that in proportion as the scriptures are understood and the genius of christianity apprehended, there will appear less necessity for priests; and some of the clergy seem to know it so well, that they fear the experiment of putting their admirers upon the search after the character of primitive christianity. They would rather extol their present creed, and flatter their people with the idea that every thing is about what it ought to be amongst them, than to hazard a doubt that they have departed from the faith and order of the primitive church.

Let then all those who are looking for a place in the new heavens and in the new earth, be diligent in exhibiting the excellency of christianity in their own lives; and while they meet with opposition, let them be encouraged, that this has been the peculiar honor of the virtuous in every age—"for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." EDITOR.

* * *

ESSAYS

ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MEN.

NO. III.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

DAVID the king and prophet, foretold that when Messiah the Lord would ascend to his throne, he would bestow *gifts* upon men. This passage of Psalms lviii. 18. Paul (Eph. iv. 8.) applies to our Lord. When he ascended he saith, "he gave," and by spiritual gifts qualified "some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." Peter also, on the day of Pentecost, ascribed all the stupendous gifts vouch-

safed on that day to the Lord Jesus. "Therefore," says he, (Acts ii. 33) "being exalted at the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, HE hath poured out that which you now see and hear." These "*distributions of the Holy Spirit*," as Macknight renders Heb. ii. 4. issued in the perfect qualification of *apostles* with "*the word of wisdom*;" *prophets* with "*the word of knowledge*;" *evangelists* with *tongues*, and *miracles*;" *pastors* with an immediate possession of all the requisites to feeding the flock, and *teachers* with the means necessary to instructing the noviciates in all the christian doctrine. It may be necessary to remark, that the *pastors* and *teachers* mentioned in this passage are to be distinguished from the ordinary bishops or elders of a christian church, inasmuch as the elders or bishops are to be qualified by ordinary means and to be selected by their brethren for the possession of those ordinary attainments mentioned by Paul in his epistles; whereas those *pastors* and *teachers* given on the ascension of the Lord, were as *instantaneously* prepared for their offices as Paul was made an apostle: they were not only converted to the christian faith, but, in an instant, by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, qualified to teach the whole religion. That this is no conjecture, but matter of fact, will appear from Eph. iv. 8-13. *Three* things are distinctly stated in this context to which we refer the reader, and these *three* must be distinctly noticed to understand the passage. The *first* is, that these apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, were *gifts* bestowed by Jesus the Lord on his receiving the throne of the universe. The *second* is, that they were given for an immediate exigency, or for a purpose which the infant state of the church required, that is, saith the apostle Paul, (v. 12.) "for the sake of *fitting* the saints for the work of the ministry, in order to the building of the body of Christ"—(Macknight)—for fitting the converted Jews and Gentiles for the ordinary work of the ministry or service requisite to the building of the church. The *third* is, that these supernaturally endowed apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, were to continue only for a limited time, marked by an adverb in Greek and English which always denotes *the time how long*—*mechri*, "*until* we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, even to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, that we, the church, be not always composed of *nepioi*, babes."—Dr. Macknight in the following words: "These supernaturally endowed teachers are to continue in the church *until*, being fully instructed by their discourses and writings, *we all* who compose the church, *come through one faith and knowledge of the Son of God, to perfect manhood* as a church, *even to the measure of the stature which when full grown it ought to have*: So that the church thus instructed and enlarged, is able to direct and defend itself without supernatural aid."

These *three* things being noticed, it is evident that these apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, were all supernatural characters, for a precise object, and for a limited time; that this object was answered by their discourses and writings, and, that this limited time has expired. For the benefit of those of weak understanding it may be observed that although *apostles* were appointed before Pentecost, even from the commencement of the Lord's ministry, yet they were not qualified fully for this peculiar work, until endowed with those supernatural gifts bestowed on Messiah's sitting down on the throne of his Father, after his ascension into heaven; and consequently, it might be said, most justly, that on his ascension, "he gave apostles," as well as "prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers." It may also be noticed for the benefit of the same class of readers, that while *the word of wisdom* was given to one—*the word of knowledge* to another—*faith to work miracles* to a third; to another the *gifts of healing*; to another *the inworkings of powers*, that is ability to produce or work in others the ability of working miracles; to another *prophecy*; to another *discerning of spirits*; to another *diverse kinds of foreign tongues*; by one and the same Spirit; yet some individuals possessed more than one of those gifts, and the apostles many, if not all of them; and one in particular, which distinguished them from, and elevated them above all others, viz. the ability of conferring some particular gift by the imposition of their hands.

These gifts differed both in their nature and dignity, and some envied those possessed of the more splendid gifts, which gave rise to the apostle Paul's illustration of these gifts, in the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of his 1st epistle to the Corinthians, where he shows that although there was a great diversity of gifts, yet the *matter* of those gifts, if I may so speak, was the same; for they were all *distributions of the same Spirit*; their *object* was the same, for they were ministries of the *same Lord*; and their *origin* or *authority* was the same, for *the same God* in-worked them in all the spiritual men. And while some were eminent for the *word of wisdom*, which appears to have been the doctrine of the gospel communicated by inspiration; others for the *word of knowledge*, or an inspired knowledge of the types and prophecies in the ancient revelations; others for faith which, as a *spiritual gift*, "led the spiritual men, without hesitation, to attempt the working of miracles;"* others for the gifts

*This faith, which the apostle calls a *spiritual gift*, he contradistinguishes from the common faith of christians in this discourse. "A faith that removes mountains" he shews to be different from the faith of christians, in this grand respect, that the *spiritual gift* called *faith* was to pass away—was but for a time; but the faith that saves the soul was to abide always. The scope and spirit of his argument in the 13th chapter of this epistle, taken into view with the context, is, "Ye Corinthians are coveting the best gifts, but come, now, and I will show you a better way;" for, says he, all these gifts shall cease, tongues, &c. shall vanish away. And when all these gifts shall have ceased, faith, hope, and love, these *three* abide co-existent

of healing, &c. &c. it was to be remembered that these distributions or these manifestations of the Spirit were given to every member of the church of Corinth; or a manifestation of the Spirit was given to every spiritual man to profit withal, not for his own honor or benefit, but for the good of the brotherhood; which the apostle in the subsequent context compares to a human body composed of many members—no member created for itself, or for its own benefit, but for the service of the whole.

To shew more fully the nature and use of those gifts, it may be necessary to take a view of the church of Corinth, of which church the apostle says, "*It came behind in no gift.*" "You," says he, speaking to the Corinthians, "are enriched with every gift by him, even with all speech and knowledge." "When the testimony of Christ was confirmed among you by the *miracles* which I wrought and the spiritual gifts I conferred on you, so that ye come behind in *no gift.*" In the history of this church, then, we may expect to learn the nature and use of those gifts, to as much advantage as from the history of any other.

Corinth at this time was the metropolis of the province of Achaia, and was as famous as Athens itself for the Grecian arts and sciences, Cicero calls it "*totius Graeciae lumen,*" the light of all Greece; and Florus calls it "*Graeciae decus,*" the ornament of Greece. Refined and intelligent as Corinth was by Grecian sciences and arts, it was, through its luxuries and wealth, the most dissolute, lascivious, and debauched city in its day. Here Paul preached and taught for 18 months the doctrine of Christ, and converted a very numerous church, composed of some distinguished Jews, but chiefly of the idolatrous and profligate Pagans. Luke tells us, "Many of the Corinthians, hearing, be-

with the present world; but the greatest of these *three* graces is love, which will continue forever, not only co-existent with the present state, but when this state shall be consummated. Now the *better way* is to cultivate *love*, than to be coveting spiritual gifts, though of the most splendid rank. To see that this faith, hope, and love, and even *love* which is the greatest and best of all, is emphatically contradistinguished from *spiritual gifts*, we have only to read the close of the 13th and the commencement of the 14th chapter. It reads thus: And now abideth faith, hope, love, these three, but the greatest of these is love. Follow after love, therefore, and desire *spiritual gifts*, but of these the chief is prophecy. The faith that was always to abide is not once classed amongst spiritual gifts. The only passage in our translation that might, by common readers, be so understood, is Eph. ii. 8. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." Leaving system out of view and following the scriptures, we find the sentiment to be as Macknight has rendered it. "For by grace ye are saved through faith, and *this affair* is not of yourselves; it is the gift of God"—not *charisma*, a spiritual gift, but *doron*, a favor or common bounty. Indeed, the antecedent to *that*, every linguist knows is not *faith*; for *pistis*, *faith*, is feminine, and *touto*, *that*, is neuter. Let not, however, any systematic conscience be alarmed at this translation of the celebrated Calvinist. It is unanswerably correct. Nor does it at all interfere with the idea of salvation being of grace, of free grace; for if salvation, as a whole, is through the grace of God, faith, a part of that salvation, is of grace also; but here we are speaking of spiritual gifts, amongst which this faith is not one.

lieved and were baptized." From the history of this church, gathered from the Acts of the Apostles and these Epistles, it appears that there was a schism in it, envying, strife, and many irregularities; so that the presence of those gifts did not place the church out of the reach of those human corruptions, but were necessary to the illumination and confirmation of the disciples in the faith which purified the heart by its intrinsic character. Indeed, we find that even the spiritual men themselves needed the word of exhortation and admonition for their imprudence in the management of those gifts; which at once teaches us that those gifts had no general influence, and were not necessarily productive of the appropriate effects of the saving and sanctifying truth in the minds of the subjects of them. No wonder, then, that the Apostle Paul commended the cultivation of brotherly love as a "more excellent way" than the coveting of the most splendid gifts. It is evident from the face of the first Epistle, that even among the spiritual men there were blemishes and imprudences that required the castigation of the apostle. The apostle, indeed, settles the contest about the *precedency* of those gifts, and places them in due subordination to one another. A free and full translation of the 28th verse represents the matter thus: "The chief members of the church are thus to be ranked as God has distinguished them by gifts. *First*, apostles, who being endowed with *the word of wisdom*, from them all must receive the knowledge of the gospel. *Secondly*, the *superior prophets*, who, possessing the *word of knowledge*, are qualified to interpret the ancient revelations. *Thirdly*, *teachers*, embracing all who boldly declare the doctrine of Christ, illustrate it, and confirm it by miracles. *Next*, those who communicate to others the spiritual powers. *Then*, those who possess the *gifts of healing diseases*. *Helpers*, who, speaking by inspiration to the edification of the church, are fitted to assist the superior teachers, and to help the faith and joy of others. *Directors*, who, by the gift of discerning spirits, are fitted to direct the church. *Lastly*, persons who, having the gift of speaking *different kinds of foreign languages*, can preach to every nation in its own language." But yet the church can never be composed of all such, no more than the body can be all eye or all ear; for, saith the apostle, "Are all apostles? Are all prophets?" No, indeed. The *nature* of those gifts, however splendid, was evidently only adapted, and their *use* merely designed, to illustrate and confirm that doctrine, which in its primary and essential results, when received and understood, purges, purifies, elevates, and ennobles the mind of the recipient. Hence the Holy One prayed, "*Sanctify them through thy truth.*"

Again, when the Lord spake of the Holy Spirit, (which was to proceed from his Father and himself, when he should be glorified), he assured his disciples that this Monitor would testify of him, and would not only conduct them into all truth, but when he is come, "he will convince the world concerning sin, and con-

cerning righteousness, and concerning judgment: concerning sin, because they believe not on me; concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye see me no longer; concerning judgment, because the Prince of this World is judged. He will glorify me.”* The signs and wonders, and distributions of this Holy Spirit, the Apostle Paul declared were the confirmations by which Jesus was glorified in the world, and the testimony of the witnesses rendered credible and omnipotent. So, on Pentecost, the unbelieving Jews were convinced of their sin in not believing that Jesus was Lord Messiah, by the Holy Spirit confirming their word by signs following or accompanying. They were convinced of his righteousness, or of his being the righteous Messenger of Jehovah, by the proofs the Spirit gave of his having been well received in heaven by his Father; and they were convinced of judgment, because it was evident from the testimony of the apostles, confirmed by those splendid signs of the Holy Spirit, that, by his cross, Jesus had triumphed over principalities and powers, and had vanquished him that had the power of death. Thus the Saviour promised and thus it was performed, and thus the world, infidel Jews and infidel Gentiles, were convinced of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. The Apostle Paul also declares in that same epistle, chapter xiv. that “foreign languages are for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers.” Now the signs by which the Holy Spirit glorified Jesus on the day of Pentecost, was that of foreign tongues, diverse, or separated tongues of fire, appeared on the heads of the witnesses, and they spake in foreign tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. This, then, was such a sign to the unbelieving Jews as to convince three thousand of them of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; and hence they gladly received the word that announced to them the remission of their sins and the promise of the Holy Spirit. Thus the word came in “demonstration of the Spirit and with power,” and their faith rested not on the wisdom of human reason, but on the power of God, thus exhibited with the word.

In our next essay this same topic will be further illustrated. As we promised to investigate this important subject with some degree of attention, we must request the patience of our readers to be put into requisition; and we must also remind them, that our object is to present just what the scriptures teach on this subject, not attempting to support any system of divinity, however canonized or extolled. But in these things every disciple of Christ will suffer no man to judge for him while he is able to read the revelation of God in his own tongue—at least such ought to be his determination.

EDITOR.

*Campbell's translation of John xvi. 8—14.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

Dear Sir,

AS you are decidedly opposed to all intrigue, corruption, and tyranny of those courts called ecclesiastical, in whatever denomination they exist, I have concluded to make a statement to you for the benefit of the whole religious community at large, and of the Baptist community in particular, of some recent occurrences in an association with which you are well acquainted. You not being present at that association, but as I understood the church of Wellsburgh being now a member of the Mahoning Association, Ohio, it was supposed you had been there; and therefore I suppose that you will be yourself, as much as others, much interested in hearing of this matter.

You need not be informed that there have been, for seven years, two or three choice spirits of the old hierarchal system in that association, who have been, for some time, in the spirit of Diotrophes, seeking for the pre-eminence. Baffled in every attempt for a long time, their zeal, like a concealed fire, only waited for a fair opportunity of bursting forth with destructive fury. By a concurrence of fortuitous incidents, as we sometimes say, they conceived a favorable opportunity had occurred, which gave them some hopes of realizing their darling project. There were a few churches, and one in particular, whose messengers some way or other stood in the way of their gaining the ascendant. How to get *these* out of the way was the difficult point. And how these gentlemen could acquire the eminence which they courted, without getting them out of the way, was a point still more difficult. There was one scheme, which, of all others, seemed to favor their project. It was known that some of the churches, in their annual letters, simply appealed to the scriptures, and gave from them a statement of their faith; and that some clause or article in the archives of the constitution of this association required an acknowledgement of the Philadelphia Confession of Faith. The junto, before the meeting of the association, began to intrigue in this way: They, as far as possible, obtained an appointment of such messengers as would favor their project, and I can assure you that I know of one church whose appointment of messengers was set aside by the parson, a member of the junto, and two of them removed because they were supposed to be men of an independent mind.

As soon as the association met, all the letters that did not appeal to the aforesaid confession, were ordered by the head of the party to be "*marked* for further investigation." When the letters were all read, it appeared that but *nine* had appealed, and *thirteen* had not. After the reading of the letters a committee was appointed to arrange the business, and chiefly of the leading members of the junto. They agreed that the *nine* churches *only* should be the association, and therefore made out a list of the messengers of the *nine* churches—and at once proscribed the *thirteen*. But, on a number of the messengers from

the proscribed churches declaring that they would leave the house instantly if not permitted to take their seat, it was agreed to give them a seat while they investigated their claims. Then came on the investigation of their claims.

Various reasons were assigned for not appealing to the Confession by the messengers, as severally interrogated by the court. Some of the churches had *not seen* the little book called the "Confession of Faith," and knew nothing about it but from report. This was a fact true of the most of them, and not all the members of any one church in the association had ever read it. Some of those who had seen, did not understand it, but said that as far as they understood it, they made no objections to it. Some alleged that there was so great a diversity of opinions about the lawfulness, propriety, and utility of such confessions, that they could not decide the point. Others affirmed that the scriptures were sufficient, and that stating their faith in them in direct terms, which they understood, appeared more consistent and satisfactory, than a mere appeal to any creed made ready to their hand. Two only of the churches, in their letters, utterly refused to adopt it as an expression of their faith; not, however, as opposing its doctrines, but on principles of pure scriptural independency. These things were all known to the junto, as well before as after the investigation; and therefore the long investigation of these letters was but a mere covering for their plot. One of the two churches was the one for which the whole plot was laid, and nothing now remained but to reject the one and to retain the other by an arbitrary usurpation of power. Several things were alleged in order to make a difference to cover the design, but nothing could be proved, or even investigated. The measure was carried amidst the frowns and marked contempt of every umpire in the assembly. Thus churches have been distracted into schisms, and an association, in fact, rent in twain by the *unhallowed ambition* and *manifest envy* of three or four leaders, at the expense of their own disgrace and public reprobation. Other acts of injustice and wanton tyranny were perpetrated by these individuals, under the pretence of being an ecclesiastical court, which I will not at present trouble you with. I am resolved, however, with your permission, to exhibit, if the case may require, some of the most flagrant violations of right which the ecclesiastical history of this century affords. In the mean time I cannot conclude this communication without declaring the striking resemblance which appeared to me between this *would be* ecclesiastical court and an ecclesiastical court of courtiers, that procured the signature of a Median prince to their decrees. This council sat 2361 years ago. Daniel, a prophet of the God of heaven, had been elevated to very high honors by the king, and was extolled above all the nobles of the land. "Then the presidents and princes sought to find occasion against Daniel concerning the kingdom or church; but they could find no occasion nor fault, forasmuch as he was faithful;

neither was there any error or fault found in him." So far the cases are exactly similar. "Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning THE LAW of his God." So far the coincidence is striking. "Then these presidents and princes assembled together," that is, the ministers and messengers associated; "and they said, O king! live forever!" So said these—O constitution! live forever! Again, "all the presidents of the kingdom and counsellors have consulted together to establish and make a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man, for thirty days, save of thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions." The resemblance is still apparent by substituting the words "whosoever shall acknowledge the Bible as the confession of their faith, or any other confession of faith, save the Philadelphia one, shall be cast into purgatory." These pious divines well knew they had got Daniel now, provided they could establish the decree. Daniel, as soon as the decree was established, invoked the God of heaven as before. The consequence was, *might gave right*, and into the den of lions he was cast. The only essential difference between these two courts is, that the former was the most impartial and consistent of the two, because it cast all who departed from the decree into the den of lions; but in the latter, of *thirteen* which did not comply with the decree, but one suffered the vengeance of the law.

These late events have contributed more to demonstrate the correctness of the principles delineated in your paper, than any thing I have witnessed; for, to use an ancient proverb, "If these things be done in a green tree, what shall be done in a dry?" If, amongst a people who advocate the independency of the church of Christ, and who, in their meetings, say they are no more than an advisory council, such flagrant assumptions of power and violations of right can take place, what may not be expected from those who declare that all the congregations in the land are under the control of inferior and superior church judicatures? I know that such occurrences are extremely rare in our connexion; but although I am a Baptist, and the son of a Baptist, I would not conceal these flagrant abuses of principle amongst Baptists more than had they happened amongst Paidobaptists. I send you a number of new subscribers which grew out of the late scenes of ecclesiastical despotism. I have only to add, that I was an impartial contemplator of these occurrences, and neither a minister nor a messenger at this meeting, and that I can vouch for the truth of all that I have stated. Your friend,

TITUS.

☞ I have omitted all the names mentioned in this letter, and altered a few phrases which I thought too personal for mere edification—*Ed.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.

Sir—IN the numbers of this work already published, we meet with several essays upon the christian religion, all justly tending to enhance its value by pointing out its consummate excellence, and peculiar adaptation to ameliorate, as far as possible in this life, the wretched condition of a guilty, ruined, perishing world; not only by bringing into view the consoling prospect of a blissful and glorious issue to all our toils and sorrows, by a revelation of good things to come; but, more immediately, by inspiring us with principles, and leading to practices, which have a direct tendency to strengthen our minds against the pressure of worldly calamities and guilty fears; filling our hearts with joy and gladness in the apprehended favor and fellowship of God through the Spirit, by the mediation of Jesus Christ. See Hebs. xii. 22-24. I could wish, however, to see those things more distinctly developed, not only by pointing out, as above, the high and distinguishing peculiarities of the christian religion; and, by an upright endeavor, to extricate and defend it from the innumerable perversions and abuses, with which it is, and has been, corrupted and subverted; as you evidently have been in the habits of doing from the commencement of this work; and which, indeed, appears to be the very design of it: but also by pointing out, and defending as clearly as possible, *the religion of christianity*, (pardon the expression;) for in this, if I mistake not, the christian religion has suffered most. For what does the Spirit predict, as the combined issue of the evil and perilous times that should come in those last days of the Gospel Dispensation, when the great body of professors should be such as are described in 2d Timothy, 3d and 4th chapters—“lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;—after their own lusts heaping up to themselves teachers, having itching ears;—turning away their ears from the truth, and being turned unto fables;—not” so much as “enduring sound doctrine;—having a *form of godliness*, but denying the power thereof.” Mark this—these professors of the christian religion would have a *mere form of godliness*, instead of *the religion—the pure, blissful, and substantial religion of christianity*. If you think, sir, the following essay any way conducive to answer the above purposes, and you approve of the sentiments it contains, as I believe you do, please give it an insertion in your useful paper.

I remain, sir, yours, very respectfully,

T. W.

* * *

ESSAY ON THE RELIGION OF CHRISTIANITY.

WHILE many writers and teachers, some of them too of high repute in the christian world, so called, compliment christianity, I mean the New Testament exhibition of it, upon the super-excellency of its moral dictates, who, at the same time, are ignorant of, and even averse to, the religion it inculcates; and whilst others profess to embrace it as a system of religion, without imbibing the spirit, realizing the truth, and experiencing the power

of its religious institutions; but merely superstruct to themselves, rest in, and are satisfied with, a form of godliness; and that, very often, a deficient, imperfect form, or such as their own imagination has devised; let us, with an open Bible before us, distinguish and contemplate *that religion* which it enjoins and exhibits—I mean the religion of Christianity, for it also exhibits the religion of Judaism; but with this, in the mean time, we christians have nothing *directly* to do—we derive our religion *immediately* from the New Testament.

The author and ultimate object of our holy religion, is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, by his Spirit speaking in Christ and his holy apostles. The principle of this holy religion *within us*, is faith, a correspondent faith; that is, a belief, or inwrought persuasion by, and according to, the word of truth, in all points corresponding to the revelation which God has made of himself through Jesus Christ by the Spirit. Hence, being rooted and grounded in the truth of this revelation, by faith in the divine testimony, we contemplate and worship God inwardly; that is, adore and reverence him in our souls, according to the characters and attributes under which he has revealed himself to us. Thus we worship the Father, through the Son, by the Spirit, relying upon his teachings in and by the word, to lead us into all the truth which he has testified for our edification and salvation; and also upon his internal influence to excite, instruct, and comfort us, by the truth; to help our infirmities, and to enable us to think and pray as we ought, both as to the matter and manner of our prayers. See Rom. viii. 26. and Jude 22. 21. with a multitude of other scriptures. Thus we have the internal religion, the habitual worship of the real believer, the sincere Bible-taught christian, with its principle; which is the faith above described. See Rom. x. 12-15.

Now this internal religion, externally manifested by certain acts and exercises of divine appointment, is what is commonly called worship, and rightly too. See the whole Bible upon this word. The first instituted act of christian worship is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Why is it translated "*in the name*," &c. contrary to the literal and almost universal translation of the particle *eis*? In the name of any dignified character, universally imports, *by the authority* of such a person. Whereas, this is not the proper and obvious meaning of the baptismal institution. For although it is done by virtue of the divine authority enjoining it, that is, by the authority of Christ; yet its proper and primary import is not a mere exhibition of authority on the part of the institutor, and of submission on the part of the baptized, though this is certainly implied in every act of worship; but it is of a much more consolatory and blissful import, being an expression of faith and obedience on the part of the baptized; nay, the very first instituted act of the obedience of faith, in and by which the believing worshipper is openly declared to be of the household of faith and of

the family of God, being baptized into "the name of the Father," of whom the whole redeemed family in heaven and earth is named; and into the name of the Redeemer, the Son, and heir of all things, who makes his people free; and into the name of the Holy Spirit, the sanctifier, the comforter, and perfecter of the saints; that by virtue of his indwelling and sanctifying presence, he, the baptized believer, may be separated unto God, with all the redeemed, for a habitation of God through the Spirit. Thus a new and blissful relation to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, is publicly recognized towards the believer, by an ordinance divinely and graciously instituted for this purpose. Being thus openly and explicitly declared to be of the family of God, through Jesus Christ, by the Spirit, he is declared free—justified from the guilt, and washed from the pollution of sin, by this washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which is the privilege of all them that believe and thus obey the gospel, by a worshipful and obediencial compliance with this divine appointment. His faith corresponding with every item of the divine testimony, thus exhibited, he joyfully recognizes his new, justified, sanctified, and filial relation to God; and, realizing this, is filled with peace and joy in believing; and so goes on his way rejoicing, as well he may. See Acts viii. 39. So much for the first divinely instituted act of the worshipful obedience of faith.

The next, in the immediate order of connexion is prayer. See Acts xxii. 16. with Luke iii. 21. With what a beautiful and holy consistency is the religion of christianity ordained and exhibited! First, "Be baptized and wash away thy sins;" then, "Call upon the name of the Lord." The heart first sprinkled from an evil conscience by faith in the blood of atonement; and next, the body washed with pure water, declarative of the universal sanctification of the whole man, body, soul, and spirit. Then, and not till then, can the believing subject draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, and worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness, first having believed and obeyed the gospel. For "it is not by works of righteousness that we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit. iii. 5-7. Now, and not till now, can the believing sinner, first sprinkled at the altar, and then washed in the laver, enter into the holy place without fear, as a qualified and acceptable worshipper. For as it was in the *typical*, so it behoved to be in the *antitypical worship*; the laver still keeps its appointed place; still stands between the altar and the tabernacle. Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest of all, by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and a high priest over the house of God: having our

hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith. Compare Exod. xl. 30, with the above quotation from Heb. x. 19-22. The christian's faith, duly realizing those things, and observing the appointed way, he can draw near with confidence to his Heavenly Father, under the gracious and powerful protection of his Great High Priest, who ever liveth to make intercession for him. Let him now pray, with all manner of prayer and supplication, and intercessions for all saints, and for all ranks and degrees of men; let him also abound in praise and thanksgiving; offering up the sacrifice of praise to God by Jesus Christ continually; for this is he graciously instructed and authorized to do in his religious directory; with the goodly assurance that he is heard and accepted in all his addresses, according to the word of God; and that even when through ignorance he asks amiss, the Lord will graciously pardon. Hence praise and prayer become the christian's delightful exercise, because he realizes the greatness of the privilege; not only of being thus permitted to address the Glorious Fountain of being and blessedness without servile fear, in confidence of being always graciously heard and accepted; but more especially because it gives vent to the grateful and dutiful feelings of his heart, both towards God and man, and always increases them; and thus constantly furnishes him with the happy opportunity of growing in every grace, of subduing every vice, and of promoting and strengthening every virtue; also, of alleviating every woe, of mitigating every affliction. In a word, of bringing down upon himself all the blessings of Heaven that can be enjoyed upon earth—as well as of doing much good, both spiritual and temporal, to others. Where is the genuine Bible-taught christian, then, that does not delight to abound in the exercise of praise and prayer—to embrace and improve every favorable opportunity for those goodly purposes.

But, that this may be the case, the next immediate ordinance of the christian religion, namely, the reading, I mean the *musings* upon, or *studying* the Holy Scriptures; taking them up in their connexion, and meditating upon the subjects they propose to our consideration, with a fixed contemplation of the various and important objects which they present. This dutiful and religious use of the Bible, (that most precious, sacred record of the wonderful works of God, the only authentic source of all religious information,) is inseparably connected with, and indispensably necessary to, the blissful and all-important exercises of prayer and praise. Without this, those exercises must dwindle away to a trite form—must degenerate into a lifeless formality. It is from this dutiful and religious use of the Divine Word, that we derive the proper materials for those holy exercises. Hence says the apostle, "let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord. And whatsoever ye do (of a religious nature) in

word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." Col. iii 16. 17. And again, "Be ye filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; giving thanks always to God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." Eph. v. 18-20. Hence it is evident, that if we would be spiritually minded, spiritually exercised in this delightful and heavenly employment, we must be filled with the Spirit; and if we would be filled with the Spirit, we must be filled with the Word; the word of Christ must dwell in us richly; for we have no access to the Spirit but in and by the Word. Therefore, "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." To take up the Word, then, in this manner, that we may thus come to God by it, learn his glorious character, be taught by him, enjoy the blissful communications of his Spirit, be made wise unto salvation, thoroughly furnished unto all good works, is to make the proper and religious use of it; is to worship God by it; and to enrich our souls with all spiritual and heavenly blessings that can be enjoyed in this life. Thus saith the Lord, "Hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. Incline your ear, and come unto me; hear, and your soul shall live." Isaiah lv. 2. 3. Again, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." Rev. i. 3. "Moreover, we have more sure the prophetic word, to which ye do well to take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts; for the holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2d Peter i. 19-21. "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you, that ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us, the apostles of the Lord and Saviour." 2d Peter iii. 1. 2. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope." Rom. xv. 4.

So much for the three primary, comprehensive, and all-important ordinances of the christian religion; the particular and individual observance of which, constitute the religion of every real christian. Here let us pause a little, reflect, and compare these ordinances, in their proper and primitive import, order, and connexion, as above deduced from the Holy Scriptures, and contrast them with the present views and practice—with the dull, listless, formal, ceremonious—nay, even superstitious and absurd formalities, which have, almost every where, taken place of these.

T. W.

[TO BE CONTINUED]

RELIGIOUS HONORS.

The Rev. Messrs. *Heron* and *Bruce*, of the city of Pittsburgh, were promoted, some time since, by the Board of Jefferson College to the high and distinguished honor of *Doctors of Divinity*. There is no country in christendom, with which we are acquainted, which is more congenial to the growth of distinguished Divines, than the regions round about Canonsburgh and Washington. It is apprehended that, owing to the peculiar influence of this climate, in a short time all our Divines will grow up into Doctors of Divinity. It is fairly presumable that the Doctors themselves will take a second growth, and shoot up into Metropolitans and Cardinals. But as it has been said, every new Baronet, Earl, and Duke, under a monarchy, makes a few scores of paupers—so it may be said, that every new Doctor makes a few scores of ignorant dupes, who admire and fawn upon these Doctors proportionally to their ignorance and credulity. We propose some questions on the curious process of making a Doctor of Divinity, which have not yet been solved. To these we will add another, viz. What is it that qualifies a man for this honor? for, indeed, these recent appointments have so astonished us, that we are not able to know what is the qualification which entitles a teacher of religion to *double D*. I understand that it is about to be resolved that no quorum of a Collegiate Board is ever to sit down, or rather to rise up, without *creating* two or twenty Doctors of Divinity. It is an honorable army where there are no privates or subalterns, but in which every man is a Captain, or a Colonel, or a General—And how will Satan tremble when attacked by a whole army of Doctors of Divinity!!!

EDITOR.

* * *

No. 4

MONDAY, NOV. 1, 1824.

VOL. II.

ESSAYS**ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SALVATION OF MEN.****NO. IV.**

HOW transcendantly kind and excellent is the work of the Holy Spirit in glorifying Christ, in advocating his cause, and in affording to men such a gracious confirmation of that testimony, which, when believed, puts them in possession of the most certain, cheering, and animating hope—the hope of immortality and eternal life. How diverse its gifts and operations! This persecuting Jew, in a moment, is converted, not only to the christian faith, but becomes himself the subject of its powers, the temple of its residence. The converted Jew, by its influence, is filled with *the word of wisdom*, and, while his tongue pronounces divine oracles, his finger communicates health to the incurable, and life to the dead. Another, who yesterday could not read an ancient prophecy or explain a Jewish emblem, to-day, filled with *the word of knowledge*, infallibly expounds all the secrets concealed

in dark oracles, in obscure allegories, and in mysterious types of the oldest times. Another, who a moment before had no confidence in the crucified Nazarene, has that peculiar faith which impels and emboldens him to bid a demon depart, or a leprosy withdraw, in the assurance of seeing his command obeyed. Another, who, just now, ignorant of the past, and even of the present times, can, by the gift of prophecy, foretell infallibly what will happen next week, next year, or a century to come. Another, who, till now, knew not what manner of spirit was in himself, can, by the gift of discerning spirits, detect the inmost thoughts of a stranger who has put on the christian name. Another, who never knew a letter, an obscure and idolatrous Pagan, who never learned the grammar of his vernacular tongue, can speak foreign tongues with all the precision and fluency of an orator. And another, in the twinkling of an eye, becomes an able and accurate expositor and interpreter of languages, a letter of which he never learned. Yes, all these gifts, and many more, did one and the self-same Spirit distribute to every individual, respectively, as he pleased. These glorious, inimitable, and triumphant attestations to the truth concerning Messiah, did the Spirit of God vouchsafe, as well as reveal the truth itself. And, although these gifts were not bestowed on every first convert; yet, in some instances, whole congregations, without an exception, became the temple of these gifts; and, for the encouragement of the Gentiles, who, for ages, seemed to be proscribed from the favors of Heaven, the first Gentile congregation to which the glad tidings were announced, was filled with these gifts, and they all, in a moment, spake *foreign tongues*, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

Let it, then, be distinctly noticed, from all these premises, that these gifts had for their object, first, the *revelation* of the whole christian doctrine; and, secondly, the *confirmation* of it; and without them, no man could either have known the truth, or believed it. To this effect does the apostle reason, 1 Cor. ii. 9-16. He shews that none of the princes, the legislators, or wise men of Judea, Greece, or Rome, ever could, by all their faculties, have discovered the *hidden wisdom*, "which God had determined before the Mosaic dispensation began, should be spoken to the honor of those apostles, gifted by the Holy Spirit." For so it was written, "Eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, and into the heart of man (before us apostles) those things have not entered, which God hath prepared for them who love him. But God hath revealed *them* (those unseen, unheard, and unknown things) to us (the apostles) by his Spirit"—"Which things (before unknown, unheard, and unseen,) also we (apostles) speak (to you Gentiles and Jews, that ye may know them) not in words taught by human wisdom, (in Judea, Greece, or Rome,) but in words taught by the Holy Spirit, explaining spiritual things in spiritual words." "Now, an animal man, (whether a prince, a philosopher, a legislator, or a rhetorician, in Judea, Greece, or

Rome, by means of all arts and sciences,) receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, (by all his faculties and attainments,) because they are spiritually examined" (by the light which *revelation*, and not *reason*, affords.) "But the spiritual man (the man possessed of a supernatural gift) examineth, indeed, all things; yet he cannot be examined by any animal man (because such cannot judge of the principles suggested to him by the Spirit;) for what man (who is merely animal) hath known the mind of the Lord, (his deep designs respecting Jews and Gentiles, now made known to us apostles,) who will (or can) instruct him (the spiritual man.) But we (apostles) have the mind of Christ," and are able to instruct your spiritual men, with all their gifts, O! ye Corinthians! How has this beautiful passage been perverted by system into a meaning the most remote from the mind of the Spirit! The translation above given is most consistent with the original, and, indeed, is the translation of Dr. Macknight, who seems to have rendered all those passages that speak of spiritual gifts, in all the epistles, much more accurately and intelligibly than any other translator we have seen. The *animal* man, or what our translators call a *natural* man, spoken of by the apostle, is quite another sort of a man than the Calvinistic or Arminian *natural* man. The apostle's natural man, or his *animal* man, was a man who judged of things by his animal senses, or reason, without any revelation of the Spirit; but the *natural* man, of modern systems, is a man who possesses the revelation of the Spirit, and is in the "state of nature," as it is called. The apostle's natural man's eye had never seen, his ear had never heard, his heart never conceived any of those things written in the New Testament—our natural man's ear has heard, and it has entered into his mind to conceive, in some way or other, the things which were revealed by the Holy Spirit unto the apostles. To argue from what is said of the one by the apostle, to the other, is a gross sophism, though a very common one; and by many such sophisms is the word of God wrested to the destruction of thousands.

While we are upon this subject, we conceive we cannot render a more essential service to our readers than to detect and expose a few such sophisms connected with the work of the Holy Spirit; in doing which we will still farther illustrate the topic under investigation.

Before coming to specifications, we shall make but one preliminary observation, viz. that, in the fixed style of the New Testament, there are certain terms and phrases which have but one meaning attached to them; and when we use those phrases or terms in any other meaning than that attached to them in the sacred style, we as infallibly err, as if, in using the term *Jupiter*, I should always attach to it the idea of a *planet*, whereas the author, whose work I read, always attaches the idea of a *god* to it.

In such a case, I must, in every instance, misunderstand him and pervert his meaning.

The first specimen (and we can only give a few specimens) we shall give is from 1 Cor. xii. "But the manifestations of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." A thousand times is this sentence quoted to prove, and many a sermon is preached from it to shew, that there is some kind of a communication, afflation, or gift of the Holy Spirit given to every man to improve, or profit withal, to his own salvation. *Three* notable mistakes are obvious in such a perversion of the text:—First, the *manifestation* of the Spirit denotes, in this context, some spiritual gift, by which the Spirit is visible, or, at least, evidently manifested to be in or with the person. Secondly, the *every man* denotes the spiritual men only, or every one that possessed a spiritual gift; for of these only the apostle here speaks. Thirdly, *to profit withal* denotes that the spiritual man did not receive this gift for his own benefit especially, but for the profit of the other members of the body; as the ear or eye does not receive impressions for its own benefit merely or primarily, but for the benefit of the whole body. This is just the design of the apostle in the whole passage.

We shall find another specimen or example of this same sophism in the 2d chapter, 4th verse: "And my speech, (or discourse) and my preaching was not with persuasive words of man's wisdom, but with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power." How often do we hear the modern sermonizers praying that their preaching may come with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, meaning thereby some internal operation of the Spirit;* whereas, the apostles uses these words to remind the Corinthians that his preaching was not successful among them by means of his eloquence, but because of the demonstration of the Holy Spirit; or that his mission was established by the gifts of the Spirit imparted to them, and by miracles wrought in their presence. The next verse makes this evident; for the design of this was, he adds, "that your faith might not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the *power* of God." in the miracles which God empowered me to perform, for such is the fixed meaning of the term *power* in this connexion. "God anointed Jesus

*We are not calling in question, nor purposely disproving any of the popular theories of the operations of the Spirit, in these examples of sophisms which we now adduce. We are merely exhibiting the way in which scriptural phrases are perverted, or wrested from their fixed meaning in the New Testament. And here it may be observed, that not unfrequently the scriptures are wrested to prove what is scriptural truth. For instance, it is a scriptural truth that there is but one God; yet admitting 1 John, v. 7, to be a genuine reading, it is perverted when it is quoted to prove that there is but one God; For John's argument is not, that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one God; but that the witness, or record given from heaven, is one and the same. "There are three that bear witness in heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one" in respect of the unity of their testimony. I am happy in having the concurrence of Calvin, Beza, and Macknight, in this instance, for so they declare.

of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with *power*." "You shall be endued with a *power* from on high." Those who were converted by seeing, and those who are converted by hearing of the miracles which God vouchsafed to the witnesses, their faith rests or stands upon *the power of God*. I know that some, to countenance the above mentioned perversion, are wont to cite the 19th verse of the 1st chapter of the Ephesians, which reads thus: "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward, who believe according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead." Here, say the populars, is a plain proof "that the power that produces faith in us is equal to the power that raised Jesus from the dead." This will serve as a *third* example of this species of sophistry. Without either denying or affirming the truth of the popular sentiment, as an abstract speculation, let us see whether this was the meaning of the apostle. The apostle, from the 17th verse, is declaring his prayer to God for the Ephesians, and, in the 18th verse, mentions one item of his request, viz. "that the eyes of their understanding being enlightened, they might know what is the *hope of their calling*, and what the *riches of the glory of his inheritance* prepared for the saints; and that they might know what the exceeding greatness of his power *will be* (in the resurrection and glorification of their bodies) with relation to us who believe (which will be similar in glorifying the bodies of the saints to what it was in raising and glorifying Christ's body)—according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and exalted him," &c. So that the power here spoken of is a power to be exhibited in raising the bodies of the saints, and not a power to be exhibited in producing faith; for the Ephesians had already believed.

Another example of the same sophism we often observe in the citation of Acts vii. 51. "O! stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears! Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye." Hence it is argued that there is some kind of operations of the Holy Spirit which are called *common*, and which are equally enjoyed by all men, the saved and the damned; and on this, and another saying or two, is the whole doctrine of *common operations* predicated. But that Stephen, who was full of the Holy Spirit and of wisdom, had no reference to any internal or external operations upon the unbelieving Jews, is most evident from the context. He shewed that his audience, as did their fathers, persecuted the prophets who spake by the Spirit, and in resisting his word delivered by the prophets, they resisted the Spirit of God: for to resist a person's word and to resist himself, is, in all idioms of speech, the same thing. The unbelieving Jews, in resisting the testimony of Stephen and of the apostles, resisted the Holy Spirit; and many in our time, who resist the testimony of the apostles, dictated and confirmed by the Holy Spirit, do, in fact, resist the Holy Spirit. And, as in the

days of Noah, the Spirit of God, by the preaching of Noah, strove with the antediluvians; so the Spirit of God, by the preaching of the apostles, committed to writing, does strive with all those to whom the word of this salvation is sent; and yet many still resist the cogency and power of the truth, and the arguments that confirm it. They did not all believe who saw the miracles, and such of the spiritual gifts as were visible; neither do all, who read or hear the apostolic testimony and its confirmation, believe it. It has, however, been shown in the first volume of this work, that the miracles and signs were *written* for the same purpose that they were *wrought*. This, indeed, needs no other proof than the testimony of John the apostle. He says, chap. xx. 30, 31. "Many other miracles Jesus likewise performed in the presence of his disciples, which are not recorded in this book. But these are recorded that ye may believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God; and that believing (*this*) you may have life through his name."

Curiosity inquires, How long did this age of miracles and spiritual gifts continue? It would be no matter of great consequence to settle this point, and, therefore, it cannot be precisely determined. A few hints, however, on this subject may be useful, in connexion with the design of these essays. It must be remarked, that when Peter first opened the reign of heaven to the Jews, these gifts were showered down in a more copious manner, than at any one period afterwards among the Jews. The proof of this fact will presently appear. When the same apostle Peter, who was exclusively honored with the keys, opened the reign of Messiah the King to the Gentiles, in the house of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit fell on all the congregation, as it did on the Jews "*at the beginning*." This phrase, "*at the beginning*," denotes that the Spirit of God had not fallen on the Jewish congregation, as it did on Pentecost; and from Pentecost, till the conversion of the Gentiles, such a scene was never witnessed, even by the apostle; for he could find no parallel case, to which he could refer in giving a description of it, save that which happened in Jerusalem on Pentecost. The Samaritans did not receive it in the same manner as the Jews and Gentiles received it—Until Peter and John went down from Jerusalem, after many of the Samaritans had believed and were baptized, the Holy Spirit had *fallen on none of them*; but Peter and John imparted it to them by laying on their hands.* In almost every other instance, if not in all other instances, the Holy Spirit was communicated by the apostles hands; consequently, when the apostles all died, these gifts were no longer conferred; and gradually all the converts who had those gifts died also; and, therefore, these gifts did not long survive the apostles. A reason for

*Some sophistically talk of outpourings of the Holy Spirit now-a-days; yet, in the apostolic age, when the phrases poured out and shed forth were fixed in their meaning, there were but two outpourings of any note of which we read; in other cases it was given in another manner.

their ceasing to be conferred will appear in our next essay, which will be devoted chiefly to the third species of evidence, which the Holy Spirit vouchsafed to the testimony concerning Christ. Correct views of the office of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men, are essential to our knowledge of the christian religion, as also to our enjoyment of it. On mistaken views of it are engrafted most of the extravagant systems, as well as the cold and lifeless systems of our times. EDITOR.

* * *

ESSAY ON THE RELIGION OF CHRISTIANITY.

[CONCLUDED.]

WHAT is the sprinkling of a few drops of water upon the face of a thoughtless, unconscious infant, when contrasted with the all-important significancy, and blissful effects of that first great ordinance of christian worship—that first constitutional act of the obedience of faith. Courteous reader, do but reflect, compare, and consider.

Laying aside all popular prejudice, say which *you* would choose—the joyous, blissful baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, or the unauthorized sprinkling of a poor unconscious babe; never to be *so much* as remembered; and, in consequence of which, it is never after allowed to enjoy this blissful privilege; for which, through the grace of God, it might be duly qualified in due time. Again, consider the principle upon which this baptism is to be enjoyed; the inward preparation essential to its profitable reception, and then say what a sorry substitute is even the scriptural administration of this ordinance, (I mean as to the external form of it,) for the most part, in our day, when, instead of the *demand* of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, in consequence of correct views of the gospel, rightly taught, understood, and believed; *the demand is* concerning inward impressions, exercises, and feelings; predicated upon some peculiar inward work of the Spirit, in order to ascertain the regeneration of the subject; which, if approved, the person is then admitted to baptism; not, indeed, as the first instituted act of christian worship; as a Divine appointment, declarative of the justification, adoption, and entire sanctification of the believing worshipper; but, *merely*, as an act of obedience to a positive command, and in imitation of Jesus Christ; having, thus, no farther tendency to produce a good conscience, than merely the pleasing sense of having performed a duty—of having obeyed a divine command. Thus, this great gospel ordinance is sunk to the dead level of a mere moral duty; an ordinance *great indeed* in its import, and corresponding privilege, to the intelligent, believing worshipper; who, in the faith of its declarative and real import, receives it; and therein, and thereby, yields and presents himself, soul and body, a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. See Rom. 6th chapter, upon the doctrine of

baptism, with the consequent exhortations tendered thereon, chap. xii. 1-&c.

But herein is that old saying verified, "*There shall be like people, like priest.*" "For the leaders of this people cause them to err, and destroy the way of their paths." Therefore, "have they turned away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables;" for "they have heaped to themselves teachers, having itching ears." Again, to what a lifeless formality—nay, even disgusting drudgery, is that next, immediate, and delightful ordinance, prayer, reduced under the present corruptions of christianity! Formerly it was from the *altar* to the *laver*, from the *laver* into the holy place. Ex. xl. 30. Jesus being baptized, and praying, the heavens were opened unto him; and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape, like a dove, upon him. Compare Matthew iii. 16. with Luke iii. 21. &c. Paul, also, having washed away his sins, calls upon the name of the Lord, (Acts xxii. 16.) and so of all the rest. The uniform doctrine was, First believe the gospel—next be baptized—and then pray. Look back, courteous reader, to the doctrinal exhibition of this article, and you will not only see the propriety, but also the indispensable necessity of this order of proceeding, God having so ordered his worship; and, in this order and connexion, made ample provision for the comfortable and profitable access of his people. But how is it now? Some are taught forms of prayer from their infancy; others are taught to pray by set forms all their days. Prayer, or rather *saying* of prayers, is taught and considered by many merely as a duty, the *neglect* of which brings guilt upon their conscience; and the *performance*, no other comfort but merely a sense of having done their duty. Men are indiscriminately urged to pray, as a means of salvation, that they may escape hell, without any immediate respect either to the altar or the laver. Hence the great majority pray in their sins all their days, and, for aught that appears, die so. Do you not hear those men-taught, formal people confessing always, from day to day, the same sins; the sins of their nature and practice; of omission and commission; of thought, word, and deed; of childhood and youth, &c. or under whatever terms they are accustomed to make their confessions; withal, praying continually for pardon of the *same sins*; thus daily confessing their unbelief, their unpardoned, guilty condition. Not so the apostolic christians. These primitive worshipers, once purged, had no more conscience of sins. Heb. x. 3. For Jesus, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. (xiii. 12.) and by one offering perfected forever them that are sanctified. x. 14. Whereas the ancient sacrifices could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience, (ix. 9.) for in those sacrifices there was a remembrance again made of sins every year, x. 3. Hence those poor, men-taught, formal people, are in a much worse state than the ancient Jews, whose sacrifices, &c. being a shadow of good things to come, though they could

not perfect them as pertaining to the conscience, yet afforded them some relief against despondency, in hope of the good things that were to come: but now the good things prefigured being come, and, after all, those formal worshippers not being perfected, not being purged from the guilt of dead works, to serve the living God with a true heart, in full assurance of the faith of the remission of their sins, through the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ once—there remaineth for *them* no farther hope, no other sacrifice to be hereafter offered for sins: so they must either receive and enjoy pardon through faith in *his blood*, or live and die with a guilty conscience. Alas! for the present corruptions of christianity! Alas! alas! for its corrupters!!! Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you: they make you vain. They speak a vision of their own heart, not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despise me, The Lord hath said ye shall have peace: and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come unto you. For who hath stood in the counsel of the Lord, and hath perceived and heard his word? Who hath marked his word and heard it?—I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in *my counsel*, and caused my people to hear *my words*, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings. Therefore, behold I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words every one from his neighbor. Behold I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use *their* tongues, and say, *He* saith. Behold I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness. The prophet that hath a *dream*, let him *tell* a dream; and he that hath *my word*, let him *speak my word faithfully*; what is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like as a fire, saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces? Jer. xxiii. 16-32. In consequence of such teaching as this, how is the third great and fundamental ordinance of our holy religion, the religious use of the Divine Word, obscured and perverted. With what uninteresting formality, and coldrife indifference, do many read it; even of those who place some part of their religious worship in daily reading a portion of Holy Scripture, as if the mere reading of it were to save them. Under what a cloud of errors and prejudices are the generality introduced to this sacred book! Some calling it a sealed book; others, a book hard to be understood, nay, almost unintelligible, except to the learned or inspired; and others again, a dead letter. The great majority of our modern teachers, like the false prophets of old, countenance and promote these errors and prejudices by their pretendedly learned or whimsical interpretations, spinning out lengthy discourses from a single sentence or clause of a sentence, thus teaching the hearers to believe that nobody can understand it

but themselves. In this manner they steal the word from the people, feeding them with their own dreams and notions, instead of causing them to hear, and attend to the word of the Lord.

From this brief scriptural view of the private and personal religion of every intelligent Bible-taught christian, both internally and externally considered; and *this* briefly contrasted with the popular religion of our day, we may clearly perceive an essential difference, and be hereby enabled both to examine ourselves, and admonish others. T. W.

* * *

From the "Witness," for June, 1809.

KING JAMES' INSTRUCTIONS.

TO THE TRANSLATORS OF THE BIBLE—WITH EXTRACTS AND REMARKS.

[The following copy of instructions, with the extracts, are taken from Lewis' History of the English Translations of the Bible. They are here inserted, not to introduce the controversy about baptism, but to shew (what is little known) that king James actually forbade the translators of the Bible to translate the words baptism and baptize, and that these words accordingly are not translated by them. If any of our readers should doubt of the correctness of the extracts made, we refer them to the above work, that they may read for themselves.]

“FOR the better ordering of the proceedings of the translators, his Majesty recommended the following rules to them, to be very carefully observed:—

1. The ordinary Bible, read in the church, commonly called the Bishop's Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit.

2. The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names in the text, to be retained, as near as may be, according as they are vulgarly used.

3. The old ecclesiastical words to be kept; as the word *church*, not to be translated *congregation*, &c.

4. When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which has been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place, and the analogy of faith.

5. The division of the chapters to be altered, either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require.

6. No marginal notes at all to be affixed, but only for the explanation of the Hebrew or Greek words, which cannot, without some circumlocution, so briefly and fitly be expressed in the text.

7. Such quotations of places to be marginally set down, as shall serve for the fit references of one scripture to another.

8. Every particular man of each company to take the same chapter of chapters; and having translated or amended them severally by himself, where he thinks good, all to meet together, to confer what they have done, and agree for their part what shall stand.

9. As any one company hath despatched any one book in this manner, they shall send it to the rest to be considered of seriously and judiciously: for his Majesty is very careful in this point.

10. If any company, upon the review of the book so sent, shall doubt or differ upon any places, to send them word thereof to note the places, and therewithal to send their reasons; to which if they consent not, the difference to be compounded at the general meeting, which is to be of the chief persons of each company, at the end of the work.

11. When any place of special obscurity is doubted of, letters to be directed by authority to send to any learned in the land for his judgment in such a place.

12. Letters to be sent from every bishop to the rest of the clergy, admonishing them of this translation in hand, and to move and charge as many as being skillful in the tongues, have taken pains in that kind, to send their particular observations to the company, either at Westminster, Cambridge, or Oxford, according as it was directed before in the king's letter to the archbishop.

13. The directors in each company to be deans of Westminster and Chester, and the king's professors in Hebrew and Greek in the two universities.

14. These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishop's Bible, viz. Tyndal's Coverdale's, Matthews',* Wilchurch's, Geneva."

"A copy of these orders or instructions being sent to Mr. Lively at Cambridge, and other copies to Dr. Harding, the king's reader of Hebrew at Oxford, and Dr. Andrews, dean of Westminster; it seems as if some other doubts arising concerning them, application was made by the vice-chancellor to the bishop of London for the resolution of them. To which his lordship replied that, "to be sure, if he had not signified so much unto them already, it was *his Majesty's* pleasure that, besides the learned persons employed with them for the Hebrew and Greek, there should be three or four of the most eminent and grave divines of their university assigned by the vice-chancellor, upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be the overseers of the translations, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the rules appointed by his Highness, and especially concerning the *third* and *fourth* rule; and that when they had agreed upon the persons for this purpose, he prayed them to send him word thereof."

The author from which the above is extracted, observes, that the translators, in their preface to the reader, affixed to their translation, declare as follows: "They had," they said, "on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who left the old ecclesiastical words and betook them to others, as when they put *washing* for *baptism*, and *congregation* for *church*: and on

*This seems to intend the great Bible printed 1539-40, by Edward Wilchurch, one of king Henry VIII's printers, and Grafton.

the other hand had shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their *Azymes, Tunike, Rational, Holocausts, Prepuce, Pasche*, and a number of such like, whereof their late translation (at Doway and Rhemes) was full, and that of purpose to darken the sense; that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet, by the language thereof, it might be kept from being understood." The same author says, "Of this translation the learned Mr. Matthew Poole has given the following character. In this royal version, says he, occur a good many specimens of great learning and skill in the original tongues, and of an acumen and judgment more than common. By others it has been censured as too literal, or following the original *Hebrew* and *Greek* too closely and exactly, and leaving too many of the words in the original untranslated, which makes it not so intelligible to a mere *English* reader. This last was perhaps in some measure owing to the king's instructions, the 3d of which was, that the old ecclesiastical words *should be kept*. However it be, we see many of the words in the original retained, as, *Hosannah, Hallelujah, Amen, Raka, Mammon, Manna, Maranatha, Phylactery, &c.* for which no reason can be given but that they are left untranslated in the vulgar Latin." This author further declares, that Nary, in his preface to the Bible, (printed in 1719,) remarks, there were certain words in the scripture, which use and custom had in a manner consecrated, as, *Sabbath, Rabbi, Baptize, Scandalize, Synagogue, &c.* which, he said, he had every where retained, though they were neither *Latin* nor *English*, but *Hebrew* and *Greek*, because they are as well understood, even by men of the meanest capacity, as if they had been *English*." Speaking of Wickliffe's translation, he adds, "In Dr. Wickliffe's translation of the Bible, we may observe that those words of the original which have since been termed sacred words, were not always thus superstitiously regarded: thus, for instance, Matt. iii. 6. is rendered *weren waschen*, instead of *were baptized*, though, for the most part, they are here left untranslated, or are not rendered into *English* so frequently as they are in the Anglo-Saxonic translation."

From the above instructions given by king James to the translators, and the subjoined extracts, the following observations are obvious, and are submitted to the consideration of the disciples of Jesus Christ.

1. It is evident from rule *third* of the king's instructions to the translators, that he forbade them to translate the *old ecclesiastical words*; and in rule *fourth* he commands, that when any word hath divers significations, they should retain that in their translation which has been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith.

From the first extract subjoined to the above instructions of the king, it appears that his Majesty was careful that his instructions should be observed by the translators, and *especially* the *third* and *fourth* rules. "It was his Majesty's pleasure, that

besides the learned persons employed with them for the Hebrew and Greek, there should be three or four of the most eminent and grave divines of their university assigned by the vice-chancellor, upon conference with the rest of the heads, to be overseers of the translations, as well Hebrew as Greek, for the better observation of the rules appointed by his Highness, and especially concerning the *third* and *fourth* rules." In the second extract, the translators, in their preface to the reader, declare that they had observed at least his Majesty's *third* rule respecting the old ecclesiastical words. They say, they had "on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who left the *old ecclesiastical words* and betook them to others, as when they put *washing* for *baptism*," &c. In the third extract, though highly commended (and we believe justly) by Mr. Poole, their translation was censured by some others. The grounds of this censure are, that their translation is "too literal, or following the original Hebrew and Greek too closely and exactly, and leaving too many of the words in the original untranslated, which makes it not so intelligible to a mere English reader." It is said by the author from whom the instructions and extracts were taken, that "this was perhaps in some measure owing to the king's instructions, the *third* of which was, that the *old ecclesiastical words should be kept*." He adds, that "however it be, we see many of the words in the original retained, as, *hosanna*, &c. for which no reason can be given but that they are left untranslated in the vulgar Latin." This author also informs us that Nary, in his preface to the Bible, printed 1719, says, that "he had every where retained these *consecrated* words, though they were neither Latin nor English, but Hebrew and Greek." And he adds in the last extract, that Dr. Wickliffe, in his translation, though he has in Matt. iii. 6. rendered the word *baptized* by *washed*, yet these words termed *sacred words*, are, *for the most part*, left untranslated by him, or are not so frequently translated into English as in the Anglo-Saxonic translation.

2. Let it be particularly noticed, that among those words called *consecrated ecclesiastical words*, and which were forbidden by the king to be translated into English, are the words *baptism* and *baptize*. This must be obvious to any person who will compare the king's instructions with the extracts made above. The king, in his instructions to the translators, rule *third*, commands "*the old ecclesiastical words to be kept*," and gives the word *church* not to be translated *congregation*, with an &c. as a specimen of these words. The translators, in their preface quoted above, declare that *they*, in order to avoid being puritanical in their translation, had put *baptism* where the Puritans had put *washing*. They also say that the Puritans, by so doing, "left the *old ecclesiastical words*," which clearly demonstrate that the word *baptism* was one of those words reckoned both by the king and the translators, to be an *old*, a *consecrated*, and an *ecclesiastical* word. This, the translators

add, was one of the Puritan scrupulosities, and that they had, in their translation, avoided it. This is also proved from what was said by Nary in his preface to the Bible, printed 1719. He declares, in the extract made above, that *baptize* was one of the *consecrated words* which he had every where retained in his translation, and which he allows are neither Latin nor English, but Greek. If more evidence of this fact was necessary, we might add that the author of the work from which the extracts above are made, declares that these words called *sacred words* (of which *baptism* and *baptize* are two) were not always thus superstitiously regarded. As evidence of this, he remarks that Dr. Wickliffe, in his translation of Matthew iii. 6. rendered the phrase *were baptized* by *weren waschen*, though, in his translation, the old ecclesiastical words are, for the most part, left untranslated, or are not rendered into English so frequently as they are in the Anglo Saxon translation.

3. From the above instructions and extracts, it is very evident that whatever the words *baptism* and *baptize* may signify in the Greek language, they are words which are not translated in our version of the Bible. The king virtually prohibited their being translated, the translators declare they left them untranslated, and others allow that they are neither "*Latin nor English*," but Greek. This surely should rouse the attention of every one who has any regard to the authority of the Divine Saviour, to inquire what do these words mean when correctly translated into English. If they signify *sprinkling* or *pouring* let them be so translated. Had the king and the translators been Baptists, and believed that these words signified *immersion* or *dipping*, would it not have been singular that they should agree to conceal their meaning by giving us only the Greek words anglicised? If they did mean sprinkling, as is generally asserted, there surely could have been no harm in translating them accordingly, when it was both the duty and interest of those who superintended the translation to do it. Why, then, all this concealment of their signification? It is said that they were *old, ecclesiastical*, and even *consecrated* words. It is believed that, *consecrated* and *ecclesiastical* as the king and translators esteemed them, had they meant any thing but immersion, these qualities would not have saved them from being rendered into English. But who said these words were consecrated and ecclesiastical words, which should not be translated? The king and ecclesiastics, whose practice required this *pious fraud* to justify their kind of baptism, or at least to conceal that their practice was unscriptural. In no place of the Bible, that I remember, does God say that there are certain *old, consecrated*, and *ecclesiastical* words, which must not be translated into the English language. The translators themselves only thought that these words were *consecrated* and *ecclesiastical*, when they occurred in certain places, and when used to express the mode of christian baptism. Thus, in the following passages, where the same Greek words occur, they disregard their *age*,

their *consecration*, and the *ecclesiastical* nature. "He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped* it. And when he had *dipped* the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." "And he was clothed with a vesture *dipped* in blood, and his name was called the Word of God." John xiii. 26. Rev. xix. 13. See also Matt. xxvi. 23. in the Greek. The translators in these, and in other instances, have inadvertently, or rather unavoidably, to make sense of these passages, shewn us that they believed the Greek word *baptisma* means *dipping*. It may be presumed that there were particular reasons for leaving these words untranslated where christian baptism is spoken of, unless we can make ourselves believe that in those days king James and the translators in this acted without any reasons at all. But it is not easily believed that they acted without these reasons, when it is remembered that they had every inducement to translate the words if they meant nothing contrary to their practice. It was with these *old ecclesiastical* words that the *clergy* succeeded in preserving the fascination of priestcraft. When Tyndal issued his translation of the Bible, because he had in it disregarded the words which the clergy esteemed *sacred*, they condemned it. He had, for instance, changed *charity* into *love*; *church* into *congregation*; *priest* into *senior*; *grace* into *favor*; *confession* into *knowledge*; *penance* into *repentance*; and a *contrite heart* into a *troubled heart*. Sir Thomas Moore, who warmly espoused the cause of the clergy against Tyndal's translation, wrote a dialogue, with a view to bring it into contempt among the people. Tyndal, in answer to it, (as quoted by the author from whom we have taken our extracts) thus speaks: "What made *them* whose cause Sir Thomas espoused, so uneasy and impatient, was, they had lost their *juggling terms* wherewith they imposed on and misled the people. For instance, the word *church*, he said, was, by the popish clergy, appropriated to themselves; whereas, of right, it was common to all the whole *congregation* of them that believe in Christ. So, he said, the school-doctors and preachers were wont to make many divisions, distinctions, and sorts of *grace*; with *confession*, they juggled and made the people, as oft as they spake of it, to understand it by *shrift* in the ear. So by the word *penance*, they made the people understand holy deeds of their enjoining, with which they must make satisfaction for their sins to Godward." The Bible is not yet free from these juggling terms, when words are left untranslated and another meaning is affixed to them than what they originally signify, and that meaning sanctioned by very extensive practice. Whether this has originated in kingcraft or priestcraft, or in both, justice demands that it should be detected. A sacred regard to the authority of God ought to lead us to reject an error, however old, sanctioned by whatever authority, or however generally practised.

EXTRACT FROM LETTERS.

Addressed to Elder HENRY TOLLER, by JAMES FISHBACK, Pastor of the First Baptist Church of Lexington, Ky.

IN order to show that faith is more than a belief, a number of absurd distinctions have been made use of upon this subject. Many distinguish the belief of the head from the belief the heart, as if a man could perceive a thing to be true with his head whilst in his heart he perceived it to be false. If they mean by this, to distinguish faith from love, the terms are proper; for love is not belief, but an affection of the heart. They both unite in saving faith. The Spirit of God harmonizes the head and the heart, by imparting right apprehensions to them, and suitable impressions upon them, through and by the gospel of God's grace. It is common to distinguish true faith from a historical faith, as if there could be any true faith, without believing the gospel history! The Gospels written by the four evangelists, contain the history of Christ's incarnation, life, doctrine, miracles, death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession, and one of the evangelists tells us the design of this history:—"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." John xx. 31. Surely that belief, which has life eternal connected with it, must be true faith. A distinction is also made between believing the doctrine of the gospel, and receiving the person of Christ; as if Christ's person was not the object of the gospel doctrine, or as if we could receive Christ in any other way, than by believing that doctrine! John says "as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God" which receiving, he explains the following words, "even to them that *believe* on his name." John i. 12. for another apostle says, "ye are the children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii. 26. And it is plain, to receive him, or believe on his name, is to believe the doctrine of the gospel concerning him; for "he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." 2 John, ver. 9.

Some describe faith to be an inward principle of grace, implanted in the heart by the operation of the Spirit, separate from, and previous to the knowledge of the word of God. But it is impossible to conceive what is meant by such a principle of grace as this. It cannot be any sentiment respecting Christ or his salvation, since it is supposed to be previous to the knowledge of the word of God, wherein alone he is revealed. Nor can it be any disposition or affection of mind towards Christ; for the mind cannot be affected with any object of which it has no knowledge, and our confession of faith makes the principal acts of saving faith to have immediate relation to Christ, trusting on him for justification, &c. But the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of *truth*, and operates upon the mind not abstracted from the word, which is *truth*, or without it, but by means of it, enlightening the understanding in its doctrines, and influencing the will by its motives: so that the

word itself, is the very principle established in the heart of the Spirit. Men are *born of the spirit*; but it is *by the incorruptible seed of the word*, 1 Pet. i. 23. It is *of his own will* that God begets men of the faith; but it is *with the word of truth*, James i. 18. *for faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God*, Rom. x. 17. To suppose, therefore, that the Spirit implants *faith*, as a principle of grace in the heart, without the word, or previous to any knowledge of it, is unintelligible, and unscriptural, and contrary to the word of God, and the Confession of Faith,—it makes the word of God of little consequence—supercedes the necessity of preaching it to sinners, or of its being read by them in order to faith; and the Spirit does not glorify the Lord Jesus Christ in his operations as he was promised to do, in imparting it. It opens a flood-gate of wild enthusiasm, and sets aside the scripture rule for distinguishing the Spirit of truth from the spirit of error. Isa. viii. 20. 1 John v. 1—6.

When men conceive faith to be a principle wrought in the heart by the Spirit, abstract from the word, it will lead them to look within themselves, for the operation of some spirit, very different from the Spirit of truth, who speaks in the scripture, whose work it is to guide into all truth, to testify of Christ, and take of his and show it unto us. John xvi. 13, 14. It will make them seek after this inward principle, in the first instance, as the main hinge of their hope; and prevent them taking any comfort from the word, till they find, or rather they fancy they find, this mysterious principle wrought in them; which, after all, seems to be only a principle of blind enthusiasm or self-conceit.

On the other hand, when faith is confounded with its effects, and made to consist of a number of good dispositions and vigorous exertions of the mind, it limits the *extent*, and clouds the *immediate freeness*, of divine grace to the chief of sinners, by confirming it to such as are supposed to be *better qualified* than others.

It sets the gospel ground of hope at a distance from the self-condemned, who cannot find such good dispositions in themselves, and puts them upon striving to attain them, or to exert some act in order to be justified. The consequence is that they either, discouraged, sink into despondency, or fall into despair after much fruitless labor; or, if they obtain some fluctuating peace in this way, it is not founded on what they believe concerning Christ, but upon a better opinion of themselves, or of the dispositions and actings of their minds towards him; and in this case, it signifies little whether they call these things acts of faith' or works of the law; or whether they thank God or themselves that they are not as other men are. There is surely a wide difference between believing "that God will justify only such as are well disposed and properly qualified," and believing "that he justifies the ungodly freely, by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. iii. 24, ch. v. 5. and the effects of these two faiths are equally different. The former leads a man to seek relief to

his guilty conscience, and peace with God from something to be wrought in him or done by him. The latter leads a man directly to the character and work of Christ, as the sole foundation of his justification, and of his hope and peace with God.

Saving faith is distinguished from every other, by its object and effects. Faith cannot so much as exist without an object; for, when nothing is believed, there can be no belief. It saves in no other way than that it has a saving object; and all its influence upon the heart and life, is, properly speaking, the influence of truth believed.

Though there can be no true faith without knowledge, yet there may be a kind of speculative knowledge without true faith. There is a wide difference between understanding the terms of a proposition, and believing the truth of it.

Whatever men may think of their knowledge and belief of the gospel, yet if they do not in some measure perceive its excellence, suitableness, and importance to their lost condition as sinners, they do not in reality know, and believe it—it is the operation of God's Spirit that produces this.

Christ told his disciples that the Spirit of truth, the Holy Ghost, when he came, would not speak of himself—but would glorify him. Accordingly, his operations, during the age of miracles, were all performed in *glorifying Jesus Christ*, and in *his name*. The gospel of Christ, since the days of the apostles, has been the theme he has blessed, in convincing the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and through which he has imparted saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It was in the name of Jesus, all the miracles were wrought; and by the preaching of Christ, and him crucified, as he is exhibited in the record God hath given of his Son, the same Spirit has exerted his power, through this preaching, in regenerating the hearts of men. Hence it is by preaching *Christ* to sinners, and *not the Spirit*, that the Spirit operates in glorifying Jesus in their conversion. If I preach to sinners *less* about the Spirit, it is that they may experience the operation of the Spirit *more*, by preaching Christ and him crucified, which is the sum and substance of the gospel. On *believers* I urge the necessity of praying the Father, through the Son, for the Spirit, that he may enlighten and sanctify *them*, &c.

* * *

FROM "THE REFORMER," OF SEPTEMBER 1.

[Communicated from Providence, Rhode Island.]

MESSRS. EDITORS—IT affords me much pleasure to think that there is in existence such a publication as the *Reformer*. Ever since I have become acquainted with spiritual things, I have held sentiments similar to many of those advanced in this publication, and this I believe to be the case with very many sober, humble christians, scattered throughout christendom. I cannot say that I approve of every thing which I have seen in the *Reformer*; nor do I know of any publication or book, excepting the Bible, of which

I could fully approve. Still, I like the general tenor of the work, and believe it will be productive of much good: and if a publication somewhat like it could be established in every principal place in the Union, incalculable good would, I think, be the result.

That christianity is, at present, most grossly corrupted, many sincere and spiritual christians see and deplore. In this town we have our share in this soul-sickening state of things. One church (one of the orthodox ones too) has in its bosom men who are notorious for profanity! This is one of that vast combination of churches which is now so active in the promotion of the modern plans of christianizing the world. If they would christianize themselves, and get rid of their abominable pride of life, and pompous religious parade, they would remove a great cause of grief from the minds of all meek and lowly christians acquainted with them; and the more especially, seeing they pass in the christian world for orthodox and evangelical.

It was formerly a saving among the Baptists, "Reading, no preaching;" but they have got so now, in this place, that they can read their prayers! Yes, the *Baptists in Providence, R. I.* do not scruple to read their prayers! At the celebration of Independence, this novel spectacle was exhibited, for the first time there, by a Baptist minister of this town, who was selected to pray on the occasion by the *Military Committee of Arrangements!* This same Baptist minister wears a gown in his pulpit, and, for preaching, *pronounces* a very flowery oration, written at full length. He is, therefore, a tolerable Episcopalian. But if he should take a little trip among country brethren, he would find disapproving countenances there. But who would have imagined, a few years ago, that the Baptists would ever have come to this? Where is the remnant of camel's hair, and leathern girdle of John the Baptist? *Ichabod* may with propriety be written upon the walls of their temple.

In one of our heterodox societies, people are taught a new birth of this nature; when the drunkard leaves off drinking, he is, in that, regenerated—and so of every thing else. Now every one that has been born of the Spirit, knows that this is not what is meant by being born again; and yet this doctrine is publicly held forth, and many embrace it. O! in what a lamentable case are blind people, when led by such blind guides!

Our singing here, as in other places, is performed by professors and non-professors all together, headlong; and thus people are made to utter solemn lies, singing of their heavenly birth when they never experienced any; and of their love to God when they are at enmity with him. This public sham is a public shame; and why it is suffered to go on in quiet as it does, is inconceivable. It is not my place to judge; but I should dread to be in the place of that minister who should promote or consent to this abominable outrage upon common sense and the worship of God. And yet this is the universal custom among us—orthodox and heterodox; and it is enough to make the heart of a servant of God ache.

The abomination of having men of the world meddle with the religious affairs of meetings, is here common. O! christianity! O! abused gospel! thou needest not the hateful, polluted embraces of thy enemies. If they withhold their hearts from thee, their money is thy affliction when proffered to thee.

As to the numerous societies of the day, things are here as in other places. Characters of the worst sort and church members mingle together, and talk of restoring the Jews, and of bringing about the Millennium, &c.—and the reverends, and honorables, and rabbies, and lawyers, and scribes, (I go no further,) trumpet their wonderful doings in the papers, and get their names upon these rolls of immortality. I see not how these people can teach the world christianity, seeing they do not appear to understand it themselves. And I should suppose that the members of those societies who are not christians, would be more consistently employed in healing themselves before undertaking to heal others.—It is truly ridiculous that men, who know nothing about religion, should be zealously engaged in missionary matters. It seems to me this is the most foolish age that has ever yet been.

So much for the fountain. The streams which flow from it may be expected to be like it. Worldly policy, ambition, and vanity, seem to be the governing principles throughout. Young men are sent to college to get qualified to preach? One way to learn to preach with a witness. How edifying must it be to the mind of the young *theologian* to read the obscene and idolatrous Pagan tales of antiquity! How favourable an influence must the wanton legends of yore have upon him! And to see the vanity, lightness, self-importance, and apparent want of devotion of great numbers of those designed for the ministry, is enough to sicken and sadden the heart of every serious, humble christian.

The foregoing is but a glance at a few things—but it is enough to show us that the christian world is in a wretched, wretched state. O! for the Spirit to come and make searching work among christians! Instead of being in a prosperous condition, the christian world is daily getting worse; and there is, at present, scarcely any pure christianity on the earth; and yet, our *college divines* will come in with their sophistry, and try to make us believe that things are going on finely! Out upon such nonsense, I say. I do not believe that a brown loaf is a leg of mutton.

ORION.

* * *

FROM THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

INTERESTING FACTS

IT appears, from the best information which we can obtain on the subject, that some new scheme must be devised for propagating christianity in India, or the exertions of both Catholics and Protestants will prove ineffectual.

1. "The Rev. Mr. Adams, a Baptist missionary in Calcutta gives it as his opinion, that the number of native converts, now living

and in full communion with one or other of the Protestant missionary societies, does not exceed *three hundred*.”

2. “The young Baptist missionaries in Calcutti, not inferior to any in India in abilities and acquirements, or in christian zeal and exertions, are sincere enough to confess openly that the number of their converts, after the hard labor of *six years*, does not exceed **FOUR**—and in like manner ,the independent missionaries of the city, whose resources are much greater than those of the Baptists, candidly acknowledge that their missionary exertions for *seven years*, have been productive of only **ONE** convert.”

INDEX TO VOLUME I.

Page.

A.

ACADEMICS, views of	167
Act of Synod of Philadelphia	143
Address to the Readers of the C. B. on reading the Scriptures	93
on moral law	115
On Sabbath day and Lord's day	127
on Experimental Religion	144
to the prejudiced	115
to Christian Mothers	211
to the Public	277-289
Ambassadors of Jesus Christ, character of	13
American Indians, deterioration of	163
Ammonius Saccas, views of	183
Anecdotes	104-163-181
Apostolic art of preaching	137
Aristotle, era and views of	165
Assemblies, ancient order of	14
Association Redstone	303
Authority clerical, cause of	248
Awful calculation	202

B.

Baptism before prayer, necessity of	306
Baptist Convention	242
Baptist church, the first one in America	124
Beattie's opinion of the christian religion	26
Bible, a text book	18
Bible Societies, good and evil of	102
Bishops, support of	140
called the Holy Spirit	55
Blue laws of Connecticut	123
Body of Christ, increase of	69
Boston Recorder, notice of	47
Bounds of the Synod of Kentucky	88
Brown loaf not a leg of mutton	329

C.

Campbell George Dr. extract from	9
Carson's Reasons, Preface to	228
extracts from	222
Case of conscience	141
Cautious Robert, letters from	100-156
replies to	101-157
Christian Almanac	24
assemblies, order of	14
religion, essay on	11
abuses of	75
established by Constantine	22
Christian charity	142
Christianity, modern	16
primitive and modern	267
infallible rule of teaching	30-66-110-133
religion of	285
ditto	317
Chatley Francis, exclusion of	242
Church, Wm. baptism of	263
Clergy, training of	105
special call of	51-54-232-258
how possessed of power	51

	Page.
Modern, remarks on	59
on the wheel	103
origin of	20
support of	28
association of	71
essays on No. I.	49
No. II.	71
No. III.	85
No. IV.	105
No. V.	124
invitation to	160
Clergymen who differed from the twelve apostles	104
Clerical councils not founded on Acts xv.	75
Clerical arrogance	143
Clericus	236
Convention of Baptists	243
Conditions of this work	4
Conversion of the world	119
Controversy religious, benefit of	198
Corner stone, laying of	176
Covenanting	144
Croisades, account of	37
Commission apostolic, limits of	262
Confessions of faith	291-303

D.

Debate on Baptism	105-197
Dedication of this work	2
of a meeting house	240
Dialogue familiar	232-258
Dropped letter	265

E.

Early instruction, benefit of	202
Ecclesiastics, character of	167
Enthusiasm, definition of	8
Epicurus, era and views of	166
Episcopalian Baptists	328
Essays on ecclesiastical characters, No. I.	164
No. II.	183
No. III.	223
Essays on the work of the Holy Spirit, No. I.	254
No. II.	273
No. III.	296
No. IV.	310
Essenes, views of	169
Events distinguishing the First day	132
Experimental religion, essays on	144-195-203
Extracts from Dr. Fishback's letters	325

F.

Faith, the nature and power of	170
Ferdinand king, a decree of	141
Foundation of hope and christian union	176

G.

Greatrake Lawrence Rev.	278
Gospel ancient, rapid spread of	162
primary intention of	33
means of universal spread of	43
Governess of the Netherlands, an advice of	163

J.

	Page.
Jesus Christ, style of	68
Jesus is the Christ, import of	174
Jesus, law of, a rule of life to christians	116
Jones Thomas Rev.	100
John, communication from	286

L

Incredulity, definition of	8
Invoking the name of Jesus, the grand peculiarity of the first christians	155
Infants unbaptized, future state of, hopeless	181
Incidents in the biography of the editor	216

K.

King James' instructions to the translators	319
Kingdom of the clergy, varieties of	50

L.

Lay preaching	263
Law of Moses, not a christian's rule of life	117
Letters from T. W.	33-203-305
Letter from Robert Cautious,	100
to Robert Cautious	100
from the same	156
to the same	157
extracts of	138
from a Layman	188
to a Layman	189
from an Ohio Baptist	178
from Pittsburg	199
to the editor	215
reply	216
Titus	302
Lyman Beecher's appeal	24

M.

Mahomet disclaims miraculous powers	257
Miracles, necessity of	257
of Jesus	275
false	276
Methodists English	143
Missions, views of	215
Missionaries, remarks on	37
capital mistake of	40
in Burmah	45
in Madagaskar	83
domestic	158
sent	166
Missionary wheel	63
stalls	64
report	81
societies	158
speculator	180
Meeting houses first	23
Money, the rock	126
Mosheim, extracts from	183
Mother church	103

	Page.
N.	
Narratives of religion	88
Nebuchadnezzar's plan of converting	76
Notices of a tour	90
Notification from Pittsburg Recorder	191
Refutation of	238
Novel advertisement	249
O.	
Opinions different, of Christian Baptist	138
Origen, some accounts of	186
P.	
Pews, sale of	26
Persecution first, cause of	153
Pharisees, views of	169
Philip, essays of	29-66-110-133
Philosophical opinions	164
Plato, era and views of	165
Platonics	184
Preface	5
Prefatory remarks	247
Primitive and modern christianity	267
Prospectus	4
Prayers, complimentary	208
reading of	328
Preached gospel	215
Pulpit honesty	201
oratory	222
Pythagoras, era and views of	164
Q.	
Quakers persecuted	124
Queries	133-163-267
R.	
Reading the scriptures, plan of	95
Regular Baptist examined	276
Reign of Messiah, remarks on	11
Resurrection of Jesus, a new argument for	60
Religions of the world, a miniature view of	120
Religious sects, their rise and fall	122
Religious honors	266-310
Review of Kentucky Synod's report	88
of Pittsburgh ditto	91
of Clericus	236
of General Assembly's report	250
Revival	202
Rule of life, definition of	139
S.	
Sadducees, views of	169
Sabbath day	127-130
Saulus Paulus, consecration of	46
Science, oriental	167
Sentimental Journal, extracts from	170-207
Sermon of William Guthry, extracts from	222
on goats	19
to fish	96
Socinians, argument against	150

	Page.
Socrates, era and views of	165
Statistics of Presbyterian church	241
Stoic philosophy	166
Spiritual gifts	296
Summons of a church session	242
Superstition in Pittsburg, anecdote of	100
Scriptures wrested	311-312-313

T.

Teaching christianity, essays on	No. I.	29
	No. II.	66
	No. III.	110
	No. IV.	133
Texts illustrated		26
Theological Seminary, the oldest		184
Transformed ministers		272
Transylvania University		239
Tythes		145

W.

Wade Jonathan, consecration of		45
Ward Mr. death of		66
Word of God, influence of		206
Wooster Layman		231

Z.

Zeno, era and views of		166
Zeal, modern		16

