profit and convince the sinner, or comfort and strengthen the saint, or promote the cause of true piety on earth. Let us pursue steadily the course we have taken, and leave the event with God. We have taken the Bible as the only rule of our faith and practice, and the name christian, as the only name we wish to have. In this we cannot be wrong. While others may be contending for their various creeds and notions—while they lose sight of religion by endeavoring to prosolyte to their faith—while they are quarreling about *Who shall be the greatest*, who shall have the greatest numbers, let us steadily follow our Leader, Jesus Christ, and keep his commandments. Let the parties deride and defame us—let them anathematize and reject us,—Let them call us heretics, arians or devils—still let us cultivate the gentle and meek spirit of Jesus. "Be wise as serpents and harmless as doves." We are advancing to the judgment where justice will be done us. There party-spirits and names, human creeds and high pretensions, shall be disregarded, unless to be divinely frowned upon, or branded with eternal infamy, and their advocates be filled with shame and confusion.

Let us not neglect to meet together every Lord's day for worship. Should you have no preacher, meet and read the scriptures, sing, pray and exhort one another. Let a part of the day be devoted to the instruction of our children in the scriptures. Choose one or more pious and intelligent men, who shall preside over the class of children; let them previously assign the portion of scripture to be read, and labor to make them understand it. This will be found profitable and pleasant.

To you, dearly beloved, are these thoughts humbly submitted by your brother and fellow laborer. EDITOR.

## TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have many letters addressed us by our patrons, requesting our correspondents to affix their proper names to their communications, and no longer conceal themselves under fictitious names. I cannot see the impropriety of the request, and therefore urge my correspondents to comply with it. EDITOR.

*Notice.*—Elder Barzillai H. Mills has lately published a Hymn-book. They can be had wholesale or retail in Zanesville, Ohio.


# THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

*BY BARTON W. STONE,*

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

*Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."*—Paul

Vol. II.] Georgetown, Ky. Feb. 1828. [No. 4.


## *REMARKS OF BRO: WILLIAM KINKADE,*

[concluded.]

Philip tries to prove that no man is called to the ministry now as they were in the apostolic age; he admits that Christ called the apostles, and then in a bantering manner asks the following question: "Are any ministers in the present day, or have they been since the days of the apostles, called in a similar way?" To this I answer, the ministers of the christian church, as far as I am acquainted, do not believe they were called exactly in the same way, *i. e.* by an audible voice, but in a *similar* way *i. e.* by the Holy Spirit, or Comforter, that Christ promised should abide with his ministers forever. Those who receive no special call to the ministry, but derive their authority from the church alone, ought to shape their doctrine to please the sovereign people, and like good republicans, obey the will of their constituents. that elected them. This appears to be in accordance with Philip's views of Government; he says, "*I believe that every member, whether preacher or not, is responsible to the church, and to the church alone.*" If we are responsible to the church *alone*, we cannot be accountable to God, nor to our brethren in the ministry. Saint Peter addressing the elders says, "Likewise ye younger submit yourselves to the elder, yea all of you be subject one to another." But Philip says we must be responsible to the church *alone*. Those who believe with Philip may do so, but we, who were called by Jesus Christ, and brought into the pastoral office, through the order of his ministry, should be careful to teach the people all things whatsoever he has commanded us, whether it please them, or not, and be in subjection to his ministers, through whom we received our commission.

If every preacher is responsible to the church *alone*, what is the use of Conference? No argument made in it can be obligatory on one of its members without the consent of his

church. If this doctrine be correct, a Conference of preachers, would resemble a convention of slaves, the property of different men, gravely arranging business, and formin extensive plans of co-operation, when at the same time not one of the poor creatures dare to do a thing without his master's leave, nor move a step off the plantation without a pass. Speaking of the elders meeting in Conference, Philip says, "*I hope never to see a meeting among us, arrogating to itself the special trust, or right of setting forth preachers, or of controling the churches in any manner whatever.*" I know Philip will never see the ministers of Christ *arrogating* this right: it is already vested in them by Jesus Christ, who in his last will, and testament directed them, whom to ordain, and how to do it; and also made them overseers over his church, putting the churches under their care, as sheep are under the control of shepherds. Peter says to the elders, "Feed the flock of God, which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lure, but of a ready mind. Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock, and when the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory."—1 Pet. v, 2, 3, 4. The phrase "Feed the flock of God, which is *among you*," proves that the elders were themselves a widely extended community. Regard them as such, and we can easily see how the flock of God could be among them. But if they had no standing, but as members of the different churches where they lived, then they were only individuals scattered among the flock. I now ask the question, is it possible to act as a shepherd without controling the flock? Again is a shepherd placed over a flock by the sheep themselves, or by their owner? If the Holy Ghost did not mean that elders should control, and rule the church, he has used language, calculated to deceive every reader. Paul says to the elders, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock of God, over the which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers."—Acts xx, 28. It was the Holy Ghost, and not the church, that made these elders overseers over the flock, and, as we are in the same dispensation they were in, may we not look for the Holy Ghost to invest men with the same authority now?

If there is no such thing as a special call to the ministry in the present day, what is the use of praying the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into his harvest? On Philip's plan



it would seem more consistent to pray to the church to elevate *suitable* men to the work. Is an overseer accountable to none but the hands under his care? Is he not responsible to their master? How is it possible to be an overseer over people, and yet control them in no respect whatever?

If the elders have no power to govern the ministry, and must be subject to the churches in all things, they cannot be rulers; they can only have a vote in common with the weakest members of the church. Liberty to exhort, and advise their brethren, and deliver speeches to them, cannot make them rulers: every member in the church has that liberty. Baptizing people, and administering the Lord's supper to them, in obedience to the church, is no more ruling them, than a slave rules the white people, when in obedience to his master, he prepares the supper, serves them while they eat, and washes their feet when they are done. On Philip's plan of Government, the elders are rulers in no sense, unless he can make it appear, that the words *ruler* and *servant*, are synonimous. The churches are commanded thus, "Remember them, which have *the rule over you*, whose faith follow." "Obey them that have *the rule over you*."—Heb. iii, 7, 17. The elders are in no part of the scripture commanded to obey the churches, but are authorized to teach, exhort, command, and rebuke them with all authority. Peter commands the elders all to be subject one to another. But if elders are responsible to the church, and to the church alone, they cannot be subject to one another; no man can serve two masters.

The very fact that they are commanded to be in subjection to each other, is a proof that they were an order of men distinct from other christians, because subjection implies government. Their experience, character and duties, are in many respects different from other christians: they have been called by the Holy Ghost to preach; they have the qualifications of a bishop, and it is their duty to administer the Gospel, and its ordinances, watch over the church, and commit the ministerial function to others. In these duties they have to work together, as labourers in harvest, or as masons at a building. Paul speaking of himself, and other preachers, says, to the Corinthians, "We are laborers together with God, ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building."—1 Cor. iii, 9. Does Philip think builders should have no control over the house they are making? Or that his

bandmen should have no control over the field they are cultivating?

It is impossible for men to be subject to each other in joint labor without agreeing on some plan of co-operation, and that minute the elders meet, and agree on any plan, they are holding a conference. And whenever they decide among themselves whether they will, or will not, ordain an elder, they act as a presbytery, or spiritual court. They cannot act in concert without counsel; they cannot co-operate in executing a plan, when no plan is laid. For one man to lay the plan, and oblige the next to execute it, would be episcopacy. For any individual church, that pleases to oblige the elders to execute her plans of ministerial operations, would be the basest of usurpation, and make the general church a monster with many heads. For the churches collectively to govern themselves by an association, in which each is represented by its delegates, would be a representative republic. But for the elders in virtue of their office to be standing members of conference, or presbytery, all on perfect equality, and always ready to act, with subjection to each other in the duties of their office, is the government of the christian ministry, laid down in the New Testament; and is as far from Episcopacy, as Democracy is from Monarcy. As it is *impossible* for preachers jointly to execute their ministerial duties in subjection to each other without some form of government among themselves, it certainly must be safest to follow that form given by Christ. The preachers in the bounds of one, or two hundred miles, are as intimately connected in their religious duties, as are private christians in a particular neighbourhood, and there is as much necessity for the former to be united in conference, as for the latter to be joined in a church. We read of two conferences in the apostolic age; one in the 2d Chapter of Gailations, in which they agreed to go, and preach, some of them to the Gentiles, and some to the Jews, and also agreed to remember the poor: the other is in the 15th of Acts. It was composed of apostles and elders, and to whom was referred the dispute relative to circumcision. In this conference there was *much disputing*, yet they continued to debate on the question till they became unanimous. From this we learn that holding conference, was an apostolical practice, therefore when we hold conference we tread on apostolic ground; if it was right for the ministers of the primitive



church, it is right for us. Speaking of the Presbytery, Paul uses the definite article, *the* Presbytery, by which he shews that it was a court well known in his day. The ministry of God under the old Testament was an order of men distinct from the rest of the Jews. And the priests were initiated into office by the priesthood. While the people continued under this ministry God blessed them. But when the ten tribes revolted, and under their leader made priests of their own choosing, that were not of the sons of Levi, they took the road to idolatry and ruin. Paul mentions this practice of the church making preachers for themselves, an act of apostacy. "For the time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears."—2 Tim. iv, 3. If it had been the order of God, for churches to choose their own teachers, Paul would not have charged them with an opposition to sound doctrine for doing so.

Conference never ought to try to impose a pastor on any church; no church ought to try to compel the preachers to ordain any man. A church has a right to choose a pastor, among the elders, that are already ordained, but has no right to decide, who shall be ordained. The sixth chapter of Acts does not prove that the people have a right to choose, who shall be ordained for preachers, because the persons there selected by the people, were not chosen to preach, but to serve tables, a business not only distinct from, but incompatible with, preaching the word. Hence the apostles said, "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God to serve tables. Wherefore brethren look ye out among you, seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.

If any person should convince me, my views are wrong, I will thank him, and he will no doubt benefit others, for I am not alone in these views. But whoever may oppose me, let him come out over his proper name. I wish to know Philip's proper name, perhaps I would rejoice to call him brother. I hope it is only modesty keeps him from telling it.

WILLIAM KINKADE.

---

*From the Christian Register.*

## A FRIENDLY INVITATION.

The writer of this has lately seen in manuscript a Dissertation on John viii. 17,—["It is written in your law, that the

testimony of two men, is true. I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me, beareth witness of me."]—which contains an argument against the doctrine that Christ is God, which I am unable to answer. The author has consented that the argument should be briefly stated in the Christian Register, with a friendly request that some believer in that doctrine, may, in the Register, candidly show how he thinks the argument can be fairly refuted.

The writer of the Dissertation says, that there was a diversity of opinion among the Jews, in regard to the character of Christ—some supposing him to be indeed the promised Messiah; others regarded him as an authorized prophet, but not the Messiah; others, and probably the majority among the leading men regarded him as an imposter, or one who assumed the office of an inspired Teacher, without being sent of God. Such being the opinions of the Jews, our Lord was induced on various occasions to affirm, that he came not of himself, as an imposter, but was sent by God. He also affirmed, that he came not to do his own will, but the will of the Father that sent him;—and in proof of these assertions, he appealed to his words or instructions and to the miracles he had wrought.

On the occasion when the words of the text were uttered, Christ had been preaching in the temple on the day of a public festival. His preaching astonished the multitude, and led some to inquire—"How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" To this inquiry, Christ answered, "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me."—Knowing that it was a disobedient temper or unreasonable prejudice, which led so many of the Jews to reject him and his instructions, he frankly told them, what temper they must possess to decide the question impartially, respecting the origin of his doctrine—whether from God or from himself.—"If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself."

It is now to be observed, that, both in this and the preceding verse, Christ made, what he obviously deemed an important distinction, between a doctrine from God, and a doctrine from himself—which seems to imply that they would have been justified in regarding him as an imposter, had he come in his own name, without being sent of God. But if Christ was himself God, what difference could there be, between a doctrine from God, and a doctrine from himself? If the



Father was the person called Christ, surely a doctrine from him might be a doctrine from God. Or if Christ was a second person equal with the Father, and the same being, still a doctrine from himself, could be no other than a doctrine from God. It hence appears to me, that Christ did not regard himself as God, or that his reasoning with the Jews was entirely destitute of force, and even of intelligible meaning.

Such is the argument in the "Dissertation;" and any one who will furnish a candid solution of the difficulty it involves, will be entitled to the thanks of

AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

---

We are pleased with the remarks in the article we have extracted from the "Christian Register," and think that the texts adduced are irrefragable evidence that the Son of God is not the only true God, but an intelligent being, distinct from him.—From the same chapter, and in the same connexion another point is as irrefragably proved, which is, that the Son of God existed in heaven before he came into the world, and consequently did not begin to exist in the reign of Augustus Cæsar. Joh. VIII. 23. "And he said unto them, ye are from beneath, I am from above; ye are of this world, I am not of this world." The expressions "I am from above—I am not of this world," evidently convey the idea that he came from heaven; as, "Who shall ascend up to heaven, that is to bring Christ down *from above*. Rom. x. 6. "Seek those things which are *above*, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God." Col. III. 1, 2. Also, Js. I. 17, and III. 15. Luk XX. 24, 25. The phrase *from above* is expressly used by our Lord to signify *heaven*. Joh. III. 31. "He that cometh *from above* is above all—he that cometh from heaven is above all." In fact there is not to us a plainer doctrine of revelation, than this that Jesus came down from heaven. "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me"—"For the bread of God is he who cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world." "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is (was) in heaven." "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father," &c. Joh. III. 13, 31. VI. 33, 38, 42. XVI. 28.

In accordance with this plain truth Jesus said to the Jews in the same connexion (Joh. VIII. 14.) "I know whence I

came and whither I go, but ye cannot tell whence I come and whither I go." It is a fact, that the Jews knew not whence our Lord came; and when he told them he came down from heaven, they were offended and murmured, and said "Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose Father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?" If he began his existence from Mary in the reign of Augustus, then the Jews did know whence he came, consequently our Lord's words were not true. Paul taught the same doctrine, 1 Cor. xv. 47. "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is *the Lord from heaven.*"

This plain truth that an intelligent being, distinct from the only true God, the Father, did exist in heaven before he came into the world, is farther evident from the declarations made in the scriptures, that he ascended up where he was before. Joh. vi. 62. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" Paul to Ephesians iv. 8–10 establishes this fact, that it was the very same person or Being who descended from, and ascended to heaven. "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." Now if we can ascertain where he did ascend, we can easily determine where he was before he did descend. Paul says, "Jesus, our great High-Priest, the Son of God, has passed into the heavens." Heb. iv. 14. Stephen saw him in heaven, standing on the right hand of God. Acts vii. 55. Paul says "After he had purged our sins, he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb. i. 3. Jesus said, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." Joh. xx. 17. From these and many similar texts, it is evident that the Son of God ascended to heaven, therefore he was in heaven before he did descend, consequently he existed before Mary, and before he was made flesh.

This intelligent Being or Spirit was the Son of the living God before he was born of Mary, and before the worlds were made. Rom. i. 1–3. "Paul—separated unto the Gospel of God,—concerning his Son, Jesus Christ, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, but declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." From this it appears that the Son of God was an intelligent Being, consisting of flesh and spirit. The flesh was produced by the power



of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, who was of the lineage of David, and therefore is Christ called the Son of David. The Spirit of holiness united with this flesh is the Son of God, who pre-existed in heaven; for "When he cometh into the world, he saith sacrifice and offerings thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me—O God." Heb. x. 5–7. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he (the Son of God) also himself likewise took part of the same—" Heb. ii. 14. The agent existed before he acted in taking flesh. "The Word was made flesh." Joh. i. 14.—He was the root and stem of Jesse—He was the root and the offspring of David—He was David's Lord and David's son—All these expressions convey the same idea, that is, He is the Stem, the offspring, the son of David with respect to the flesh; but with respect to the Spirit he was the Son of God, the Lord of David, the very root of Jesse and David; because as the root supports the tree and communicates life and sap to it, so David and Jesse and all things are supported and quickened by him. That David's Lord was the Son of God,—the pre-existent Son of God, is evident from the text; "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy foot stool." We before proved that the Son of God did ascend and sit down at the right hand of God, and that he ascended up where he was before; therefore David's Lord was the Son of God, who existed in heaven before David—before the world was.

That the Son of God existed in heaven before he came into the world, is farther evident from Heb. i. 1, 2. "God—in these last days hath spoken to us by his Son, by whom also he made the world."—Should any inquire, By whom did God make the worlds? the Apostle answers, By his Son; therefore we conclude that the Son existed before the worlds were made—The Father in verse 10 addresses the Son thus, "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands." "God created all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. iii. 9. "To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things and we by him." 1 Cor. viii, 6.—The Son also prays, John xvii. 5. "Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory I had with thee before the world was." Passages to this effect might be multiplied, but these are deemed sufficient.

These doctrines to us appear plain, and we have wondered that the christian world so generally reject them, and brand with heresy the man who believes them. It is with a pure desire, to soften their hard feelings towards us, as well as to convince them of their error, that we have been thus particular. EDITOR.

---

## OF THE KEYS.

In the Bible mention is made of several keys, conveying different ideas, the import of which may not be generally understood. We will briefly attend to this subject.

1 Rev. i. 18, Jesus says, "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death."

The word *hell* (*hades*) does not mean the place of torment; for it is said that death and hell (*hades*) were cast into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone.—Hell or *hades* represents that invisible state or place, which receives and retains the soul after its separation from the body till the resurrection—and death represents that which receives and retains the body from its dissolution from the soul till the resurrection. Hence it is said that "Death and hell (hades) delivered up the dead which were in them." Hell or *hades* delivers up the soul, and death the body. No longer forever shall they keep the souls and bodies of the world in a state of separation—those of the just shall be united in immortality to die no more forever, and those of the unjust shall be united to suffer the second death, or everlasting punishment. Paul speaking of the resurrrection, exultingly cries out "O death where is thy sting? O grave, (*hades*) where is thy victory?" 1 Cor. xv. 56. He thanks God, who gave us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. For when Jesus died his soul was in *hades*, (improperly translated *hell*) and his body was in death, or under its power. But "His soul was not left in *haeds*, nor was his body left under the power of death to see corruption. On the third day he arose from the dead, and wrested from death and *hades*, our enemies, the keys which they had, and with which they would have locked up the world in eternal night, and forever have prevented the resurrection. As a victor he triumphantly ascends to heaven, and gloriously stands in the midst of the listening multitudes there, and says "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more, Amen (loudly resounded through heaven); and have the keys of *hades* and of death"—holding them up to the view of the transported millions. With these keys he will come again, and unlock the dark prisons of *hades* and death, and deliver the countless myriads of Adam's children from their long captivity, and bring them before his judgment seat to hear and receive their final destiny.



In Rev. iii. 7, we have an account of another key in the hand of Jesus, "He that hath the key of David, he that shutteth and no man openeth, and openeth and no man shutteth."—This undoubtedly refers to Isai xxii. 22. "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open." This is a prophecy of Eliakim the son of Hilkiah. This Eliakim is recorded to have been over the household of king Hezekiah of the house of David. (Isai xxxiii. 2.) By the key of the house of David being laid upon his shoulder, we are taught, that the government of king Hezekiah's house was committed into his hand; and he should be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and a glorious throne to his father's house. Verses 21 and 23. With this key Eliakim opened the door into the presence and treasures of the king, and granted admission to such as he deemed worthy, and shut the door against the unworthy. He was doubtless a type of Jesus Christ, our great Eliakim, which name signifies *the resurrection of God*. On the shoulders of Jesus is laid the government—He presides over all the treasure of God, for all are delivered unto him—He opens the door of the kingdom with the key, which he has in his own possession, and admits into the presence of God all the unbelieving and impenitent. He opens the door into the treasures of God's grace, and gives freely to the poor that ask, but shuts it against the rich, who are sent empty away. Through Christ the door we all enter into the kingdom, presence and grace of God. The door stands open to all, but they alone enter who comply with the terms of the gospel.

Some have supposed that this was the key, which the Lord gave to Peter, when he said, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom, whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." By the kingdom of heaven they understand the church—that the keys were to open and shut the door of this church—that they were given to Peter, who

opened the door of the church to the Jews on the day of pentecost, and to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. But it is evident that no man could open or shut this door but the Lord Jesus himself. There is but one door into the church, and there was no necessity of more than one key. But Peter is said to have *keys*, in the plural number, given to him.

On the supposition that Peter did receive the key of David, by which he opened the door of entrance into the kingdom or church, and shut it against such as he judged unworthy, a few inquiries naturally arise; Who got the key after Peter's death? If Peter ever had it he never transmitted it to a mortal man; for John in vision long after saw it in the hands of Jesus. We hear nothing more about this key for several hundred years after John saw it in the hands of Jesus. Then the Bishop or Pope of Rome pretended to be the successor of Peter, and laid claim to the keys delivered him by Christ, and claimed the exclusive right of opening and shutting the door of the church—of opening it to such as he judged worthy, and of shutting it against those whom he judged unworthy. As this was a work, which required a greater degree of discernment than commonly falls to the lot of man, the pope affected infallibility.

During the reign of darkness for many centuries, his claims and pretensions were acknowledged good. At length they were doubted and ultimately rejected by the Reformers, Luther and others. For their temerity his infallibillity, the pope, hurled them out of the church, shut the door, and with his key locked it against them, and bound them on earth as incorrigible heretics; determined never to loose them till they should repent. Now were it true that the kingdom of the Pope was the true church of Christ, and if indeed he had the key or divine power to open and shut the door of this church for and against whom he pleased, and whatever he bound on earth was bound in heaven; it will follow undeniably that all the Reformers and their long train of followers to this day, are what the Catholics say they are, *accursed heretics!*

The Reformers established another kingdom and called it the church of Christ. They too had a door into their church and claimed the keys given to Peter, to open and shut to whom they pleased. Since that day they have divided and subdivided into numerous parties—each party has the kingdom or church of Christ established, and doors to open or shut with Peter's keys, for every party claims them—each claims the divine authority to open and shut the door of the Church of Christ, and that what it binds on earth is bound in heaven. Woe to the christian world if this be true! All are bound, all are excluded from heaven, except the Catholics! and indeed they also are excluded by the sectaries.



But we need not fear. The church of Christ includes the good of all the parties. The door of this church Christ himself opened, and he alone can shut it. He alone has the key—He never gave it to Peter, nor to any other man.

We will now inquire, What keys were those given to Peter? We answer. It was a custom in Israel, that when a candidate for the ministry was to be dubbed a D. D. or authorized to be a teacher, he appeared before the Doctors of the law; if they judged him qualified they gave him a key. This key unlocked a certain room in the temple, where the law and the prophets were kept: By entering into which room the young Doctor might fully learn and understand the mysteries of God, and teach them to others. According to this custom Jesus said to Peter "I will give thee the keys," &c. By these keys we understand the Holy Spirit in its various operations, which Spirit is the true key of knowledge, "which, says Jesus, shall lead you into all truth, and bring to your remembrance all things whatsoever I have spoken unto you." When Peter received this Spirit on the day of Pentecost, then he was qualified to unlock the kingdom. The mysteries of Moses and the prophets, and of Jesus Christ in the gospel were clearly revealed to him. He now saw clearly how Moses in the law and the prophets pointed to Christ and the Gospel, and how they were fulfilled in him. He opened his mouth and taught the multitudes these things to the conviction and conversion of three thousand souls by one short sermon.

Jesus farther said respecting these keys given to Peter, "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven." As if he had said, When you receive these keys you will fully understed the design of the law and the gospel. You will see that the law has its end, and is vanished away—You must loose this yoke from the necks of the disciples, and set them free from its obligation—it shall also be loosed in heaven, so that no longer shall my followers

be bound to its observance. You will find also that there are many moral and holy precepts in the law, or old dispensation, which must not be loosed, but bound on all my followers—as to love God with all the heart, &c. These you must incorporate with the gospel, and bind them with all my precepts on all my people—they shall also be bound in heaven. EDITOR.

---

We did design to address a third letter to Elder S. Clack, in reply to his, addressed to Elder A. Campbell, in order to expose his disingenuous conduct in giving a specimen of our doctrine as preached by one of our *greatest preachers*, and a *champion* in our cause. The sermon he heard not himself, but received it second-handed. If such things, stated by him, were preached, we know not; but we boldly affirm they were not preached by one, esteemed by us or the public, as the greatest or among the greatest of our preachers. The specimen is too puerile, and too high colored with absurdity to gain credit. It is truly astonishing that Elder Clack should imagine that such stuff could influence Bro. Campbell's mind against us, and prevent him from falling into our *snare*. Elder Campbell has treated it, as we anticipated, with merited contempt. Were we disposed we could give specimens of sermons preached by Baptist preachers, esteemed *great* by that sect—specimens which would astonish future generations; but such as are now so common that they would hardly be doubted by any living in our country. This is not said to disparage the preachers of that order: They in general stand as high in our esteem, as preachers of other sects; but to shew the folly of introducing such speciments for the purpose of sinking a respectable, though persecuted people. Such stuff is disgustful to the pious and intelligent, and can only please the bigot, and the ignorant. We have therefore relinquished our intention of addressing Elder Clack any farther, unless he should feel disposed to notice our letters already addressed him. We rather suspect that he will act according to the 6th rule of the Populars' logic, as mentioned by Mr. A. Campbell in these words: "When you are conscious that you cannot carry your point, represent your opponent as unworthy of your notice, give his system or his arguments the name of some obsolete heresy, and tell how it was blasted and refuted centuries ago."—Chr. Bap. vol. 5, pa. 125. EDITOR.



*From the Christian Baptist.*

*Logic of the* Ins *and Outs, or of the Polulars and Unpopulars.*

I have long since discovered that there are two systems of logic, or two modes of reasoning, that seem to be almost uniformly adopted by two classes in society, irrespective of their religious or political views. The *Ins* adopt one system, and the *Outs* another. By the *Ins* we understand those in authority with the people; and by the *Outs*, those not in authority with the people. The former are the Populars, and the latter the Unpopulars. The logic of the *Ins* has in it the following rules:—

1. Never submit any of those points essential to your good standing with the people, to the hazard of investigation. Remember you have something to lose, but nothing to gain.

2. When your system is attacked, always extol the wisdom, piety, or virtue of its founders; descant upon its antiquity, and enumerate its votaries.

3. Ridicule the pretensions and expose the arrogance of those who would dare to oppose names so reverend, usages so ancient, and authorities so numerous.

4. If possible, as far as lieth in your power, arraign the motives, and impeach the aims of your opposers.

5. Calumniate their characters, if you can, under any pretence, and defame them, but with apparent regret that you should be compelled to do so.

6. And lastly, when you are conscious that you cannot carry your point, represent your opponent as unworthy of your notice; give his system or his arguments the name of some obsolete heresy, and tell how it was blasted and refuted centuries ago.

The logic of the *Outs* is not so easily reduced to one system as that of the *Ins*. If in politics, one system is adopted: if in religion, another. But the general points of coincidence are—

1. To submit every thing to the test of reason; and if in religion, to revelation.

2. Neither to adopt nor to oppose any point because of the names of the persons who embrace or reject it.

3. Canvass the opinions and arguments of those who oppose without invading their reputation, or attempting to injure it. When the cause of the *Outs* is a good one, such is the system of logic adopted. And even when it is not so good, there must be an apparent respect to the above decisions

To make this matter more intelligible and apparent, we shall present a few remarks on

*Moral Authority.*

Political and moral authority, though different in some respects, are, in others, the same. The president of these United States is possessed of much political authority. So is the king of England. The popes of Rome have had very extensive political authority, and still have a good portion of it. They still possess a very great ecclesiastical authority; but this in church government is the same as *political* authority in the state. But besides this authority, and distinct from it, they are possessed of an authority over the minds of men affecting their understanding and consciences. This is purely what we mean by *moral* authority. The different sectarian teachers have each a certain amount of this authority over the minds of the religious community amongst whom they labor, and indirectly amongst others. Some of the sects know the value of this authority, and how to use it to the best advantage, much better than others. Convert this *moral* authority over the people into arithmetical numbers, and some of the sects possess it in the ratio of ten, twenty, thirty, and forty millions of actual stock. In managing this stock there is a great diversity of talent exhibited. Some of them manage their capital stock so wisely as to make it count twenty-five per cent. per annum; while others, not so prudent in their affairs, cannot make it tell more than eight or ten per cent. per annum. I see, or think I see, through all the machinery of the involutions and evolutions of these sects, a constant attention to increase the capital stock; and some of them have blabbed out the secret too soon in anticipation of what was to be achieved through the immensity of their resources. The Mammoth Bank of these United States is not more formidable to the little county corporations, than is the moral authority, or the capital stock of influence, of the leading sects, to the small patrimony of the Sabbatarian or the Covenanter. But there is one thing which, above every thing else, is worthy of remark while on this topic, and I have felt and seen its truth very often exhibited. It is the ease, the uncommon ease, with which a person possessed of much moral authority can support any point against a person who rests his cause upon truth and evidence alone. A single assertion of such a person is worth at least *ten good arguments* of the disciple who has nothing but reason and



the Bible to support him. A notable proof of this we gave in our last number. All the arguments in four volumes of this work in favor of the *restoration of the ancient order of things*, were set aside and proved to be erroneous by a single assertion from Mr. Spencer Clack of Kentucky, who announced that "*Semple and Campbell were at issue!*" Those, therefore, possessed of this most valuable property, are happily exempted from all the evils and hardshsps of those destitute folks who have to prove, double prove, and, sometimes, treble prove a position, before they can expect even a polite hearing.

[Mr. Campbell proceeds to state that nothing contributes so much to the increase of moral authority, as a religious revival, "It seals the mission of a man to be 'the instrument' of, or the great actor in, a *revival*, pretty much the same as miracles did the mission of the Apostles." *So* many think and judge; but he cannot by this judge of the rectitude of the cause or doctrine.] "If I did (says he) I cannot tell whether I should be a Cumberland Presbyterian, a Congregationalist, a common Presbyterian, a Baptist. of the *Gillite*, *Fullerite*—of the *creed*, or *anti-creed school:* whether I should be of the "*Christian Church*," or of the "*Church of Christ*"—a Methodist, a Calvinist, a Unitarian, or a Trinitarian; for they all, this year, have abounded in revivals. What saith the Saviour and his apostles, what saith the law and the testimony, THEREFORE, must turn the beam, or decide the point with me.

Those who consider all the revivals announced in the sectarian papers to be the work of the Holy Spirit, must either have a morbid conscience, or no conscience at all, if they refuse to unite in every act of social worship with those people amongst whom the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit vouchsafe to dwell. If God has thus gifted them all, and made no difference between the Baptist and the Paido-Baptist, the Methodist and the Calvinist, the "Christian Church" and the "Church of Christ," the old side and the new side Presbyterian; why, what are we that we should withstand God and oppose his Spirit and his work by declaring that we will commune with the Holy Spirit only when he pleases to meet us in our own quarters!!! I challenge all the believers in these revivals on this continent to present one good reason why all sects should not break down the middle walls of partition and unite in one holy communion, perfect and complete—if so be the Holy Spirit, *the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit* makes no difference amonst them all. EDITOR.

H—H

## NEWS FROM IRELAND.

*Extract from the remarks of the Rev. Mr. Montgomery, before a meeting of the Synod of Ulster, in Ireland, on the sulject of Unitarianism.*

"Mr Montgomery spoke to the following effect: Moderator, in coming forward to address you on the present occasion, I cannot avoid feeling that I do so under many disadvantages. The man who has the multitude at his back, who sails upon the full tide of popular favor, has an easy task to perform in vindicating his opinions; for there is a sympathy in the breast of his auditors which gives energy and life to all that he utters. But the individual who ventures to stem the current of public feeling, who goes forth in his frail bark against rolling waters, has only a cheerless and a hopeless prospect before him. Such is my situation at present; yet, although I may be driven back by the stream, or overwhelmed by the tempest, I cannot see the Synod of Ulster rushing forward, in the dangerous confidence of security, to what I consider destruction, without boldly pushing forth to warn her of the shoals and quicksands to which she is approaching.

"A Presbyterian by education, and feeling, and conviction; a Presbyterian, because I consider the principles of our church essentially favorable to the great cause of civil and religious liberty; I should be unworthy of the privileges which I enjoy, if any contemptible view of personal convenience or temporal interest could prevent me from expressing freely what I strongly feel. I wish, however, to approach this important subject in a serious frame of mind, and in as calm a manner as the agitation of the last four days will permit. But as I am sensible that the ardour of debate, and the very nature of an extemporaneous address may carry me beyond those mild and decorous bounds which the character and station of this assembly require to be observed, I commit myself to the judicious correction of the Moderator. I feel it the more necessary to do so, as I, and those who think with me, have had our opinions treated, by several speakers, with terms of unmeasured obloquy and reproach. The gentlest epithet applied to us has been that of *heretics*. I never expected to hear the word used in a *Protestant* assembly, but its reiterated application on the present occasion has taught me that no mode of faith can change the evil propensities of human nature, and that the hateful passions of men are never so malignant as when they put on the sacred garb of religion.



Those, however, who have adopted this vulgar system of abuse, which only reflects discredit upon themselves and the cause which they espouse, have not the merit of originality in the course which they pursue. The attaching of odious *names* to opinions and persons marked out for persecution, has always been the favorite plan of the exclusively righteous. I feel unwilling even to allude, in this heated assembly, to the most glorious Being that ever appeared upon earth; but we all know that the Redeemer of the world was brought to the cross under the accusation of *blasphemy*, and the great apostle of the Gentiles was reviled as a *heretic* for preaching the truth dictated to him by the Holy Spirit. Paul "confesssed that after the manner which they called heresy, worshipped he the Lord God of his fathers." I cheerfully make the same admission: I own, that after the manner which the majority here "call heresy," I do worship my Creator. But I am not the more in *real* error on that account, for I believe no member of the Synod will say that *numbers* prove "sound doctrine." If such a position were tenable, wo be unto Protestantism! Indeed, Moderator, except for the credit of this body, I care not by what name I may be called; neither shall I retort upon my opponents the invidious epithets which might easily be applied, being determined not to sacrifice the best part of Christianity, its spirit of infinite benignity and love, to the support of a party or the maintenance of speculative opinions.

"Mr. Cooke has been courteous enough to compliment me as possessing "talents, acquirements, and eloquence, of no ordinary kind;" and to say, "that *he* thinks more highly of *my* abilities than I do of *his*." For the first part of his eulogium, however unmerited, I feel grateful, though probably I ought to consider it only as the *tact* of an ambitious general, magnifying the power of his enemy merely to enhance the glory of certain victory. With regard to our comparative estimates of each other's talents, I hope he is correct; for, knowing how highly I appreciate *his* abilities, I should be proud to stand even *higher* in the estimation of so competent a judge. But admitting his compliments to be sincere, in how awkward a situation does it place himself in condemning my opinions! He grants me a mind *capable* of judging, and concedes that I possess literary acquirements adequate to enlighten and direct my judgment; and yet (more strange to say!) he declares that I do not understand the fundamental

doctrine of the Gospel, which he avers is clearly revealed in every page of the New Testament! How this alleged force of intellect and extent of information can be reconciled with my alleged ignorance of the plainest proposition of Revelation, it is not for me to determine; but as I feel grateful for his courtesy, I freely give him the full benefit of his argument.

"I am not, however, more surprised at Mr. Cooke's granting to me all the attributes which are usually considered necessary to enable a man to form correct opinions, and then declaring that I am in dangerous error, than I am at the humble estimate which he seems to make of his own talents, whilst he proposes to guide the opinions of others by a religious test or declaration. How a church that considered itself *infallible*, or an individual who believed himself *inspired*, could make such a proposition, I can readily conceive; but how any man, or body of men, admitting fallibility of judgment, and laying no claim to inspiration, can be guilty of such an audacious attempt "to lord it over God's heritage," (the conscience,) I do confess I have no faculties to comprehend. As there is a *possibillity* of error, wherever there is human *fallibility*, in how awful a situation must those stand who either require or give assent to that which *may* be "the commandment of men," instead of "the truth of God"! It is vain to tell me, that "this is only a declaration of opinion, not a test of belief." It is a distinction without a difference; for, what a man *declares*, at the bidding of his fellow-man, he virtually *subscribes*. Now, I do say, without fear of rational or spiritual contradiction, that any body of fallible men who demand assent or subscription to any declaration or test of faith, in *human language*, under the fear of any penalty or the hope of any reward, are trenching, not merely upon the fundamental principle of Protestantism, "the right of private judgment," but also upon the sacred prerogative of the great Head of the Church. "Who art thou," saith the Apostle, "that judgest another man's servant? To his own master let him stand or fall." And elsewhere we are instructed, "that one is our master, even Christ, and all we are brethren." How dare those very Presbyterians, that declaim most loudly against the usurpations of Popery, who call upon the Catholics to read their bibles, to despise their priests, and to extricate themselves from the trammels of their church; how dare they, in the face of common shame and



common consistency, to turn upon their brethren, and to attempt to place "the yoke of bondage" upon their necks! When I witness such an attempt, I blush for the weakness or the wickedness of man; but I will neither be a partaker in the shame nor in the crime. So truly do I detest all human interference in matters of conscience, and so awful have been its effects in the world, that were you this moment to lay before me a human creed, every word of which I believed, I would not subscribe it, least I should thereby sanction the interference of man with the sole prerogative of the Redeemer. Indeed, what are all such attempts, but a manifestation of the impious vanity of man, pretending "to be wise above what is written," and to reveal the will of God *more clearly* than it has been revealed by the spirit of truth. Sir, I will subscribe no creed but the Bible; I will account for my views of it to no human tribunal but my congregation; and when this world and its evil passions shall have passed away, I pray to Him "who alone can keep me from falling," that I may not be altogether unprepared to answer for my faith to the great Head of the Church.

"I admit that this body has the *power* to pass any declaration which it pleases, and to demand any submission of its members which it pleases; but I deny that it has any Scripture warrant for doing so. And if, Moderator, you should persevere, what will be the consequence? You may make *hypocrites* of the weak and the crafty, and the worldly; you may make *martyrs* of the firm, the upright, and the sincere; but every child who hears me must know, that you cannot change the conviction of a single mind or alter the feeling of a single heart. Suppose you pass your declaration, and I refuse my assent or signature, which as an honest man I must refuse, you will probably say unto me, "We can no longer give you the right hand of fellowship;" but, if I *subscribe* your creed, though you *know* I do not *believe* it, then you will receive me as a brother in the Lord. How revolting then is this project to every virtuous feeling of the human heart! You will spurn the hand which is pure as the mountain snow, whilst you clasp, with the grasp of friendship, that which is black with the stains of perjury! Wo be unto the Presbyterian church, if ever that day shall come, in which falsehood and dissimulation shall be bonds of union, whilst truth and sincerity shall be cast out of her counsels!

"And for what is all this tyranny to be exercised, this

disgrace to be incurred, this wound to be inflicted on religion? Why, that we may not be liable to the accusation of having a "diversity of opinions amongst us"! That is to say, we do differ and we know that we shall continue to differ, but we will hold out false colours to the world, we will cast dust into the eyes of the multitude, and try, to make them believe that "there is peace, when there is no peace." This may seem very fair in the eyes of some, but to me it appears to be rank Jesuitism and hypocrisy. Yet this alone can be the "*unity*" for which many are such strenuous advocates. I do not think so meanly of their understandings as to believe that they aim at any other kind of uniformity. *Uniformity of faith!* Oh, that such a phrase had never been heard by the ears of man, that such a vain idea had never flitted across his imagination! What dungeons has it crowded! what tortures has it inflicted! what oceans of innocent blood has it shed! what tears of widows and of orphans has it caused to ascend in sad memorial before Heaven! Leaving its mightier horrors, what havoc of integrity has it produced in the ordinary walks of life! what lips has it sealed against the utterance of truth, or opened to the utterance of falsehood! what private and political oppressions has it sanctioned! what barriers has it opposed to the progress of religion and the emancipation of a world! Uniformity of Faith! Why two of us can scarcely agree respecting the most ordinary occurrence of life. On the subjects of literature and philosophy, manufactures and commerce, government and laws, there is an endless diversity of opinions. And can we then, possibly expect to be exactly of one mind on "the high and deep things pertaining to salvation"? So long as human nature is constituted as it is, varying in dispositions and talents, subject to all the influences of education, society and interest, a vast diversity of religious tenets must necessarily prevail. Nothing less than the immediate interposition of Heaven could produce perfect uniformity. And when we consider that such uniformity never has been attained, it would be a libel on the Deity to suppose that it is essential to the salvation of his people. Such an impious supposition would imply that an all-wise and gracious Being had given a religion to his creatures inadequate to produce the effects for which it was designed. But I do not require to urge this upon Presbyterians, who spurn at the idea of "exclusive salvation," and rejoice to think, "that many shall come from the East



and from the West, from the North and from the South, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God."

---

*From the Christian Baptist.*

"Elder JOHN SECREST told me on the 23d of Nov: in my own house, that since the Mahoning association last met, he had immersed, with his own hands 190, thus lacking ten of 500 in about five months."—*Editor Chri: Bap:* for Jan'y, 1828. John Secrest is an Elder in the Christian Church.

---

Our correspondents have favored us with many communications, of which we are obliged to make selections, as we cannot find room for all. EDITOR.

---

## AGENTS

### *FOR THE "CHRISTIAN MESSENGER."*

*KENTUCKY*—Elder S. G. Marshall and Col. A. McHatton, Georgetown. Jessamine, Elder M Rice Tho: Hall, Frankfort. Elder T. M. Allen, Union. Ben: Cassell, Lexington. C. C. Moore, Winchester. Wm: McArgue, Hazlepatch. Elder Jo: H Yager, Elizabethtown. Richard Hart, Flemingsburg. John Bryan, Hopkinsville Js. Eads, Shelbyville. Elder John Jones Liberty. Elder Sam: Simpson, Columbia. Elder Js Lunsford, Monticello. And'w. Henderson, Everett's house. Andrew Moore, Cynthiana. A. Perrin, Stanford. Wm: Rule, Falmouth. Elder H. Osborne, Bethel. Js. Houston, North-Middletown. H. F. Wilson, Paris. Doc. A. W. Bills, Millersburg. Elder John Rogers, Carlisle. Doc. J. Sanders and Chas Sanford, New-Castle Elder Wm. Read, Richmond. Js. Ross, Gain's cross-roads J. G Ellis, Dry-creek. Maj. Tho: Allin, Harrodsburg Archibald Duncan, Claysville. Robt G Gorden, Canton. A. Towns. Madisonville. Elder Rowland Burns, Little Sandy Saline Samuel Brockman, Canerun.

*INDIANA.*—Thomas Parsons, Terre-Haute. Wm. Armstrong, Bloomington. Elder C Nance, Nanceville. Js. Graham, Crawfordsville. Obs: Seward, Rushville. Elder D Purviance, Richmond. Elder D. Stewart, Tuckersville. M. Morris, Indianopolis. Geo: Piercy, Greencastle Elder Lewis Bryan, Paoli. Elder Jo Wasson, Cynthiana. Henry Logan, Edinburgh. Elder Moses Condict, Boonville. John Sering, Madison. Elder Beverly Vawter, Versailles. Jesse Frazier, Syelbyville. Elder Sam: Kratzer, Dixon's mill

*OHIO.*—H. Monfort, Eaton. Elder Levi Purviance, New-Paris. Elder Isaac N Walter, Dublin. Elder Geo. Alkire, Williamsport. Elder E. Vickars, Franklin Elder Nathan Worley, Dayton. Elder Sam: Kyle, Troy. Isaac Sparks, G. Vanousdol, Js Carnahan, Cincinnati Elder Richaad Simonton, Lebanon. Elder Jo Baker, Chillicothe. Elder Robt. McCry, Hillsboro. Elder Sam: Rogers,

Wilmington Elder John Miles, Canaan Elder Matthew Gardner, Ripley. Elder Jeremiah Fuston. West-liberty Elder David Hathaway, Decatur. Elder Enoch Harvey London. Maj George Adams, Greenville. Elder Barzillai H Mills Athens Davice Crane, Bethel. Elder Jehu Chamberlane, Nelsonville.

*TENNESSEE.*—Elder W. D. Jourdan, Sparta. John Coons, Sen'r Monroe: Amos Kirkpatrick, Meigsville: Doc. J. B. Sanders and Robt. Lochridge Columbia: Js. Shelton. Round-Lick: Elder James Y Green, Hurt's cross-roads: Elder And'w. Davis and John Davis, McMinville: Wm Hill, Readyville: Js Adams Stateville: Doc L. S. Davis, Syelbyville: Wm. Bell Gallatin: Griffith Cathey, Nixon's: Js. G Wilkinson, Bolivar: Col Robt Weakley. Nashville: Elder John M. Barnet, Waynesboro: Nicholas H Davis, Dandridge: Elder Jeriel Dodge, Jonesboro.

*ALABAMA.* Elders Js. E Matthews and Eph: D. Moore, Florence; Elder Wm I. Price, Doyal's mill; John Cawart, Bellefonte; Grant Taylor, Brownsboro; Maj Tho: Brandon, Huntsville; Joseph Griffin, Meredianville.

*ILLINOIS*—John R. Adams, Lawrenceville; Wm. Wilson, Palestine; P G. Kennett, Corrolton; Elder Austin Simms, Edwardsville; Nelson W. Nunnally, Paris.

*VIRGINIA.*—Parker Lucas, Giles' Court House; Samuel Bailey, and James Fittzpatrick, Abingdon; Elder Christy Sine, Back Creek Valley; Mich: Martz, Newmarket; Elder Robert M. Shankland, Estillville.

*MARYLAND*—John Miller, Western Port.

*MISSOURI.*—Philip Love, Fulton; Elder George Simms, Farmington; Elder Wm: McMurrey, Fredericktown; Js. J Tilton, Columbia; P G Rule, Union; Waddy T Curren, Fayette; Elder Joel H Haden, Franklin.

*GEORGIA.*—Elder John A. Hurst; Elder James Bays, Kellog's; Elder George L Smith, Social circle; Elder Jacob Callahan, Watkinsville; Elder Wm. McGauhy, Monroe.

SOUTH-CAROLINA.—Elder John L: Davis, Yorkville:
NORTH CAROLINA.—Hugh Parks, Charlotte:
PENNSYLVANIA.—Elder David Wallace, Waynesburg; Mark Stackhouse, Pittsburgh; Elder Peter T: Lashley, Springhall.

---

*GENERAL AGENTS.*

*G. Vanouadal*—Cincinnati.
Elder *Wm: D: Jourdon*—Monroe, West Tenn:
*Wm Armstrong*—Bloomington, Indiana.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
AT ONE DOLLAR (SPECIE,) PER ANNUM.
Postage paid by Subscribers.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

*BY BARTON W. STONE,*
AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

*"Prove all things: hold fast that which is good."*—PAUL.

VOL. II.] GEORGETOWN, KY. MARCH 1828. [No. 5.

*From the Christian Advocate and Journal.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONNECTICUT OBSERVER:—

SIR:—You must best know the object of the inquiry, "Has *Arminianism* changed its nature since the immortal EDWARDS thought it threatened unspeakable danger to the interests of piety?" But surely it would have been more consistent to have inquired, Has *Calvinism* changed its nature? I do not insinuate that it has, yet I know of nothing in the controversy on this subject, which gives the least countenance to such an inquiry, excepting it be the practice of Calvinists with regard to their doctrines.

It is well known that the time has been, when, if a preacher proclaimed the free agency of man, the universal atonement of Christ, and the general invitations of the gospel; if he urged sinners to pray, and exhorted them to a speedy return to the Lord, by repentance and faith, he was denounced as an *Arminian.* This "strain of preaching," as one of your own writers calls it, was rejected by Calvinists, who vehemently opposed to it the doctrines of decrees, foreordination, &c. In this opposition both ministers and people were active. And that they adhered closely to the Assembly's Catechism and the Saybrook Confession, is evident from the fact that their Scripture proofs were always those which are quoted in these works in support of those doctrines.

But is it so now? And, if not, in what does the difference consist?

The first thing that will strike the mind in this inquiry, is, that the "strain of preaching" which was once considered as *Arminian*, now "almost universally prevails." I have now before me an account of a very extensive revival of religion in the State of New-York, reported by an official committee, whose names give it the highest sanction. It is designed as a particular examination into the means of promoting a work of this kind, and the causes hastening its decline. And in