

Disciples of Christ Historical Society

Digital Commons @ Disciples History

American Christian Review

Stone-Campbell Movement Periodicals

1-5-1858

American Christian Review, Volume 1, Numbers 1 - 4, January 5 - 26, 1858

Benjamin Franklin

American Christian Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/americanchristianreview>

Recommended Citation

Franklin, Benjamin, "American Christian Review, Volume 1, Numbers 1 - 4, January 5 - 26, 1858" (1858).

American Christian Review. 1.

<https://digitalcommons.discipleshistory.org/americanchristianreview/1>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Stone-Campbell Movement Periodicals at Digital Commons @ Disciples History. It has been accepted for inclusion in American Christian Review by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Disciples History. For more information, please contact jmcmillan@discipleshistory.org.

The American Christian

Devoted to the Defense, Maintenance and Propagation of Christianity, Religious News and

VOL. I.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 1858.

The American Christian Editor.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS: ELD. MOSES P. LARD, ELD. JOHN ROBERTS, ELD. F. GOODWIN, ELD. THAS. ZERTY.

Original Communications.

For the American Christian Review. CHRISTIAN UNION.

NEW SERIES.

It is this number I will commence my answer to the question, Should all the people of God be visibly united in one body?

1. My first argument in favor of such a union, is drawn from Paul's advice to the church at Corinth. From many remarks made by the Apostle in his first letter to the congregation, it appears that at the time he wrote, a spirit of dissension and division had found its way into the church. It does not seem that they had fallen out about doctrine, nor had they divided on the subject of church government, or ecclesiastical organization.

The grounds of their dissension were their peculiar attachments to different preachers. One said, I am of Paul, another, I am of Apollus, a third party said they were of Apollus, while a fourth said they were of Christ.

I think it likely the matter came up in this way: Some one in conversation, perhaps, remarked that he believed that Paul was the greatest preacher that had ever visited Corinth. No, says another, I regard Apollus as the most powerful man. O, he is so eloquent, he is also mighty in the Scriptures. Well, said a third, you are both mistaken. Cephas (Peter, perhaps, was the person meant. Cephas and Peter (Petros) both meaning a stone) is the greatest of all the Apostles. He has done more for the cause of Christ than any other preacher, and therefore, deserves more at the benches of the brotherhood than any living man; but a fourth party said, We are of Christ; we will have nothing to do with your controversies about men; we are no man's disciples; we are the disciples of Christ Jesus, the Lord, and him only will we serve. Thus the controversy went on, until the members of these parties, in all probability, declared themselves to be the disciples of these respective preachers of the word of life.

It does not appear that the church had divided into different organized bodies, but the seeds for such division were sown, and were then germinating, and would soon have produced that unhappy result. The very foundations were being laid for three or four distinct ecclesiastical organizations; and if such division had been right—it had been according to the will of God, the Apostle would surely have embraced this favorable opportunity of accomplishing the good (?) work.

Paul would doubtless have written to them in the following style: Brethren, I have heard of the dissensions and diverse views and feelings which prevail in the church at Corinth. This is all natural, and therefore, cannot be objected to. It is not to be expected that we all can see alike on these very important matters. And now, for the sake of peace, I propose that we divide. All who claim to be my disciples may organize under my name, and I will become your leader, and those who are for Apollus may do the same, and so of the Cephasites. These brethren may head their respective parties, while those who claim to be the disciples of Christ, and therefore, refuse to take sides with either of these parties, may remain where they are, selecting their own overseers to feed the flock and oversee their spiritual interests.

I say, had the division in the household of God been right, the Apostle would certainly have written in this manner. But, instead of this, he placed his apostolic veto upon the whole work of division, and raised his warning voice against the very spirit of sectarianism.

He said, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no division among you; but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment." 1. 10.

turns the argument upon himself, as if he had said, O ye Paulites, why are you claiming to be my disciples? Was I crucified for you? were you immersed into my name? If not, be ashamed of your unauthorized devotion to me. If not, give Christ all the honor. I have planted, and Apollus has watered, but God gave the increase. We are only ministers by whom you believed. All are yours; whether Paul, or Apollus, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. (iii. 21-22.)

While arguing the wickedness of their divisions, the Apostle says: "Whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and division, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? Thus showing that division was a work of the flesh, and that, in this whole matter, they were actuated by a worldly spirit, wholly incompatible with the meek and lowly spirit of the gospel of peace; that their peculiar attachments to men was of the same nature which divide men in worldly matters; that it was earthly, sensual, devilish.

Now, from this whole case, and the Apostle's reasoning upon it, and the conclusions which he draws, as well as the commands which he gives against their whole course, and especially against their divisions, we argue that division, among the people of God, is wholly wrong. That it is also wrong, and that those who take the lead in such divisions, are led by a wrong spirit; that they are generally ambitious men, fond of honor, who love to have praise of men, and to be called by men, Rabbi, Rabbi.

And these things being so, it follows that union is right—that there should be no divisions among the people of God—that they should be all perfectly joined together in the same mind—the same disposition—the mind of Christ.

I must drop the argument here for the present, and will only say that I hope the brethren will not give all the above remarks and conclusion to our religious neighbors. Let us take our own share—let us apply the whole argument of the Apostle to ourselves; and O, let us see to it, that none of us fall under the same condemnation. Let us conduct ourselves among ourselves, and towards each other, in such a manner that it may never be said of any of us, You are carnal and walk as men.

While we are contending against sectarianism abroad, let it not exist at home. I am inclined to think that the signs of the times require a revival of the old discussion of the subject of Christian Union, for our own sakes, if for no other purpose.

More anon. ELIAS GOODWIN.

For the American Christian Review.

BR. FRANKLIN—Upon the reading of Bro. A. R.'s strictures upon Mr. Stampe's article, published in the Age of September 8th, headed "The Worth of Campbellism," it has occurred to me that it would be very tiely compatible with the words of God, of Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit (for we profess to hear and heed the whole three, and not the one, the Holy Spirit) to the exclusion of the other two, as our Methodist friends feign to do in order to make common people believe that all that is done at their camp meetings, is the work of the Holy Spirit to ask you on Bro. A. R. to write some strictures on the following extracts, from the Autobiography of Peter Cartwright, a pioneer preacher of the West. The incident was so unprecedented, or unusual, that it had to be recorded in a book of 525 pages, for an everlasting reference to future posterity.

On page 400, Mr. Cartwright says: "I hastened to Winchester, where the brethren had called, and were engaged in a glorious revival of religion. They had sent off for Bro. Akers, who had been with them several days, battling successfully for the cause of true religion, and was made the honored instrument of much good to many souls. I met Bro. Akers between Jacksonville and Winchester; he was compelled to leave his regular field of labor. When I met him, he exclaimed, 'One woe is past, and behold, another cometh!' The Campbellite preachers, and many of their members, had rushed into our meeting and tried to hinder or stop the blessed work by drawing our camp into foolish controversy. Bro. Akers had used the artillery of truth very successfully against this false form of religion."

When I got to the meeting, I found a blessed work in prosperous progress. It really seemed to me that the Campbellites, and especially their preacher, were as restless as fallen demons. They tried to draw off our laboring members into vain and hurtful debates; and instead of encouraging mourners to seek out, they tried to confuse their minds, and throw doubts and difficulties in their way; and all round, and in the congregation, they were busy in this way to confuse the minds of the people, and draw them off from seeking God. At once, I saw through their plan, and the bad effect of such a course, if permitted to be carried on. When, at our first coming together after my arrival, I forbade all controversy of this kind, and told our brethren they must not indulge in it any more, and said to all that were opposed to the glorious work in progress, if they did not like it they must and should desert from entering into debates about it in the congregation.

The most of the Campbellites desisted, or slyly opposed; but their preacher continued intently to provoke debate. He readily attacked in the time of our altar exercises, one of our local preachers. When I was informed of it, I went straight to him, and told him he must not do so. He said he was a free man, and would do as he pleased. "Now," said I, "Mr. S., if you do not desert, and behave yourself like a decent man ought to do, I will have you arrested as a disturber of our religious order."

He said that all this work was wrong; that it was undue excitement, and it was his duty to oppose it; and he would do so. I said that if he would do so, he should attack it at head-quarters, and just then there to debate the question with me. "Now, sir," said I, "if you think to oppose me to our head-quarters, you had better go away and stay away; your meetings will be better than any you can have."

I compassed him considerable, and measurably silenced his batteries, but he was very reticent. At length the power of God arrested some of the members of his church. A very fine and meek woman in their church, who had been baptized for the remission of sins, but never felt any evidence of her acceptance with God, and was not satisfied with her immersion, became very much affected, and wept bitterly on account of her unconverted state. I went to her, at the request of her husband, who, though not that time a professor of religion, had been raised by Methodist parents, and was friendly. I asked her if she was happy.

She said, "No, far from it." I asked her if she was willing to go and kneel at the altar; ask God to bless her, and give her a sensible evidence of the pardon of her sins? She said, "Yes."

I started to lead her to the altar, when one of her Campbellite sisters took hold of her arm, and said, "What are you going to do?" She said, "I am going to the altar, to pray for religion."

"O," said the other, "you have religion. You were baptized, and in that act of obedience (who to your sins were all washed away; and you ought to be satisfied with your religion, and not disgrace your church by going to a man's bench, among the deluded Methodists."

She replied, "I know I was baptized for the remission of sins, and you all told me that in this act of obedience to Christ, I should be forgiven, and be made happy; but I know it is all a deception and false, for I know I have no religion, and I am determined to seek it, and if ever you assist me, if I die as I am, I must be lost forever."

"O," said the Campbellite lady, "you must not go." She interposed, and said to the lady, "Let her go, she shall go to the altar if she wants to," and I accordingly led her there. She dropped on her knees, and shortly afterwards her husband, who was kneeling up, with the great deep of his heart broken up; and they never rested till they were both soundly converted to God, and were enabled to sing,

"How happy are they, who their Savior obey!" with a joy which they had never felt or enjoyed before.

The work of God went on with great power, and the slain of the Lord were many. Presently, in going through the congregation to hunt up the wounded sinners and lead them to the altar, I found great astonishment and surprise. I found my Campbellite lady, who tried to prevent the one I had led to the altar first, sitting down with her face in her hands, and her eyes suffused in tears. She was much agitated. I laid my hand on her shoulder, and said to her, "What is the matter? Have these deluded Methodists got hold on you? or have you got a Methodist spasm?"

She screamed right out, and said, "God be merciful to me, a poor, deluded Campbellite sinner!"

"O," said I, "will not water save you?" "O, no, no," she responded. "I am a poor, deluded sinner, and have no religion; and if I die as I am, must be lost, and lost forever. Will you pray for me?"

"Yes," said I, "but now you must go to the Methodist's bench, and have no religion." "With all my heart," said she, and I partly led and partly carried her there, and if I ever heard a poor sinner plead with God for mercy, she was one.

When it was known that Mrs. Campbellite, was at the mourner's bench, it awfully shocked some of her fellow-members in that watery room. She was in such agony and such great earnest, I almost knew it would not be long till she found the blessing; and while I was leading some other convicted persons to the altar, the Lord powerfully converted this Campbellite heroine. She sprang to her feet, and shouted over the house like a top, and she fell directly to pulling and hauling her Campbellite friends to the Methodist altar, exhorting them to come and get religion, and not for a moment longer to depend on water for salvation, but come and try the Methodist sinner, and the fire of the Holy Ghost, and the way she piled up the Campbellite friends at the altar was sublimely awful. After she had got a great number there, she took after her preacher, and exhorted him to come and get religion. "For," said she, "I know you have none." But he resisted and fled. Several of his members, who had been with him, and several more were seeking it. He then started a meeting in his own church to draw off his members and others from the Methodist meeting, and if ever you saw a water divinity grow sick and pale, it was just about this time. Things were so cold at his church that the little effort soon failed. There were hundred and thirty who professed religion and joined the Methodist Church during this meeting, and, according to my best recollection, thirteen of them were Campbellites. This was during a revival of religion of five months, in 1843.

I have but a word to say about the first lady spoken of, which may be true of all the rest. She said she had no religion. Christ and the Apostles tells us that religion is something to do; but this lady, after having been baptized into Christ and his kingdom, neglected to do the religion of that kingdom. Hence her guilty conscience.

T. J. JAMES.

Newman's Mills P. O., Indiana Co., Pa.

REMARKS.

The preceding extract is about as cool and deliberate piece of frolic as my eye has met with for a long time. For a people vulnerable at every point, liable to attack on every side; the embodiment, essence and concentration—the very personification of weakness, to make such an attack as the above, to say nothing of conscience, exhibits the most lamentable want of judgment, prudence and policy. Of all points, the one at which we are here assailed is the last one at which he should have made an attack. We are the last people he should have called up, in view of his most manifest unscriptural practice. If no other consideration had suggested to him quietude, at such a point as he has introduced, that of mere policy should have kept him still here. But these are matters, in the very nature of things, that cannot stand. Besides involving the interests and happiness of all men, exciting whole communities, are not to be carried on without notice. All practices in the name of religion, especially those in the Lord's name, must pass the fiery ordeal of examination. They must

pass the scathing test of review, criticism and discussion.

Those preachers, who have made a converting institution, unknown to the New Testament, frequently are very mild exponents in the pulpit—lamb-like—as calm as doves! They do not believe in arguments, controversies and debates; no, not they; they would not ruffle the smooth surface of the water. They "dislike to hear a man speak against other denominations!" They do not love to "see a man who thinks no one right but himself," and they hold that "there are good and bad among all." These placid men preach many sermons that would not trouble the conscience of any man. In the pulpit their words are smooth as the calm breeze of summer. But the whole man is not seen in the pulpit. He has another side for pastoral duty. Go with some of these mild gentlemen and hear their conversation touching their religious neighbors, and you will hear another chapter. Go to their desks, where they write books and editorials for their brethren to read at home, and a new leaf turns over. Misrepresentation, slander and detraction there issue forth. They now pronounce their neighbors "heretics, their religion "water salvation," etc. etc. It is useless to talk of such men becoming better. They are growing worse, and we are more and more fully impressed that the love of the truth, the love of God and the spirit of God are not in them.

We are not to take the above at its face by a long ways. We know not what discount to make; but, at present, we could not afford to take one-fourth as truth. Names are carefully avoided, and everything that could give a view to detection. But, for the sake of making a strong case and meeting the whole fairly and squarely, suppose we take it at its face, admit it all true! What then? What is there in it? Nothing under the sun, only that several persons who had claimed to be disciples, under the excitement of a Methodist revival, were overpowered by the excitement, renounced their former profession and claimed to be newly converted! But not a scripture is quoted, nor an evidence given, nor a reason offered, nor that can be offered, showing that they are now converted to God, or that they are or their renouncing their former profession is any evidence that they are now right? If it is, what of the many hundreds who are renouncing methodism, confessing Christ and being immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, among the Disciples? We have hundreds among us, who have tried their excitements, their mourner's bench, class-room and band-societies, as well as infant baptism and sprinkling for baptism, and have repudiated Methodism. What of all these? Does their having tried Methodism and renounced it, prove it false? If so, it has been proved false long ago!

But let this poor, miserable creature go with us to a Methodist revival, and see what discoveries we can make! "Free grace" is preached. All are invited to come. The Scriptures are quoted: "They who seek shall find." All the terrors of hell are poured upon the impenitent, and the promises of heaven are proffered. In the course of a few days, scores come at the instance of the preachers, inquiring the way of salvation! Just here the preacher leaves the Bible, and sets the honest, sincere and penitent souls, to seeking at a human institution, not named in the Bible, and such as sinners were never invited to, for such a purpose, by any prophet, apostle or man of God from the beginning of the world till many centuries of the Christian dispensation had passed away! What success do they have? Not one half that ever come there even profess to find salvation? Why not? Because there is not a promise of God in the Bible, that says, "He that believeth and cometh to the mourner's bench, prays and is prayed for, shall be saved." Because the Lord does not say, "Repent, and come to the mourner's bench; pray, and be prayed for, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." If he had said this, every one who did as commanded would as certainly have been pardoned as he sincerely obeyed. The Scripture does not say, "Except a man come to the mourner's bench, pray and be prayed for, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," or every one who candidly complied, would be pardoned as sure as the word of God is true. The reason so many come to this appointment of men, and do not even profess to find salvation, is because there is not a promise of God there. The word of the Lord does not say that Philip and the Eunuch went to the mourner's bench, and he prayed for him; and when they were come up from the mourner's bench, the Eunuch went on his way rejoicing. The holy historian does not say, that when the Samaritans heard the preaching of Philip, they came to the mourner's bench, prayed and were prayed for. Ananias did not say to young Saul, "Why tarriest thou, arise and come to the mourner's bench; pray and be prayed for, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." If he had, all who come to this appointment would find pardon. But this whole procedure is without apostolic precedent and authority. There is not a promise of God connected with it. No one who depends upon such a procedure, knows he is pardoned, and very few, comparatively, think they are. A large majority of all who come here, no matter how honestly, seek, mourn, pray and agonize, go away without finding or professing to find. They are entreated to come again, try again and again, and told that maybe they will find pardon. They come again and again, join on trial, remain in the church, as seekers, six months, one year, two years, five years,

ten years, and some have been kept as mere seekers twenty years without finding.

All these have tried the Methodist plan, and tried it over and over again, found it a failure. They have been deceived by it, deluded and disappointed. Many of this kind have become discouraged, disheartened and fallen into doubts and cold unbelief. Who is to blame for all this? Manifestly those who have deluded them, induced them to go where there is not a promise of God, where they have been deceived and disappointed. What would these gentlemen say of us, if we would invite them to the Lord's appointment, and they would come and find it a failure, and go away dissatisfied, if we would exhort them to try it again? Suppose we had some who had come and been baptized dozens of times and were still nothing but seekers! Suppose we would exhort such to come again and again, and be baptized, telling them that maybe they would find it. They would publish all over the continent, and do right. But all who come to the Lord, sincerely believing, repenting, confessing and submitting to baptism, have the assurance of the word of the Lord that they are pardoned. These are never disappointed. They come relying upon the promise of the Lord, "If that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." The immutable promise of the Lord will give a more abiding assurance than all the excitements in the world.

We are not through with this matter. We have many things to say here, but hard to be understood, because of the dullness of hearing.

From the Gospel Advocate.

COURSE OF THE CHRISTIAN AGE AND ELDER B. FRANKLIN.

In the Christian Age, November 10, 1857, the Editor, Bro. B. Franklin, devotes a column and a half to "President Fanning's Course," the matter and spirit of which, since we regard it as a matter of public concern, we should feel under obligations to criticize with a severity that we dislike, and there fore, we will notice but a few points.

In the first place, we suggest that an interference at this late hour, in the controversy with Bro. Richardson and ourselves, is entirely out of place, unnecessary and an intermeddling that exhibits a want of common sense and a disposition to interfere in our justice. We will hear Bro. Franklin a few words. He speaks of us as wishing to make "ourself a martyr." We think we made no such effort, but thought it becoming to ask editors who, without knowing what they said, were sneering at us for being so presumptuous as to oppose what was considered sound in Prof. Richardson, if they intended to adopt the infidelity? Bro. Franklin admits that Prof. R. and ourselves "have fallen into the error of higher teaching," but for calling the teaching "infidelity," he "regrets the course pursued by us as much as the most ultra amongst them." We heard Bro. Franklin in Nashville pronounce the higher law teaching "infidelity," and he "regrets the course pursued by us as much as the most ultra amongst them." We heard Bro. Franklin in Nashville pronounce the higher law teaching "infidelity," and he "regrets the course pursued by us as much as the most ultra amongst them." We heard Bro. Franklin in Nashville pronounce the higher law teaching "infidelity," and he "regrets the course pursued by us as much as the most ultra amongst them."

Bro. Franklin says the essay in the Age from Prof. Richardson, "made no allusion to us." We are sorry that he has laid himself liable to such exposure. We simply state that a more bitter personal attack we think we never saw from any man, than I contained in the essay published in the Age against us personally, and our teaching particularly. Let the facts reveal who writes the reason.

Bro. Franklin says, "He has no sympathy for us in pressing this matter to the jury of Britain's College or its Professors, and for our 'extravagant proceedings.'" He says, "I do not believe Bro. Fanning will find a party among the brethren that will sustain him." These insinuations we regard as exceedingly degrading. The idea that one cannot expose a false system of religion without being charged by professed friends with an ambition to injure others, is too bad for men who respect each other, and the infirmation that we could be induced to operate in any way with a party, is certainly a de libelation. We wish, however, to state in much kindness, that while we earnestly desire the prosperity of all our schools, and labor parties in either Church or State, we are more than confident that every believer of the Scriptures living, who understands the controversy and is above policy, will sustain our teaching. Why has Bro. Franklin so changed his tone? In a letter written by him, to which he has already referred, Aug. 21, 1857, before us, we find these words: "I think I am fully with you in the issue with R. Richardson & Co."

"I am out in the field preaching and writing against the whole thing, showing that it is an empty, deceitful bubble, containing nothing." But in this same letter he extols the first allusion to the evil effects of colleges we have noticed. Bro. Franklin says, "I am alarmed about the effect of colleges, if our colleges are to be used as engines to pull down all that we have built, we must call them to order." This was penned with direct reference to "R. Richardson & Co.'s" teaching, yet "Bro. Fanning is the man that has made the attack on our colleges that are sound in the faith. No explanation is necessary."

Last and worst of all, Bro. Franklin tells us that "Bro. Campbell has taken his pen in hand, and this matter will be set right." We think this particularly unfortunate. We can understand them in no other sense but that of a threat. Why attempt to extol Bro. Campbell against us? He authorizes no such an expression, and we think it cruel treatment to present him in the attitude of pronouncing sentence upon the brethren. This is serious injustice to Bro. Campbell, Romanists and the degraded of earth may be whipped into traces by threats, but they are degraded by men who know and love the truth. We must repeat our regrets a Bro. Franklin's unnecessary interference the Age for some time we had regarded as very efficient in the cause of truth, and hoped under the guidance of Bro. Franklin it would occupy a high position; but such mistakes cannot be repeated with safety. We think it also due to Bro. Franklin to say, that we have considered him one of our most competent defenders of the faith, but now we confess we do not know whether he is for the truth, as it is written, or the advocate of some party with out one possible

Advertisement and notices on the left margin, including names like "J. P. Ball & Co." and "M. S. Ball & Co."

Advertisement and notices on the right margin, including names like "J. P. Ball & Co." and "M. S. Ball & Co."

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

...these were promised in testimony to do... We were invited, by the friends in and about Hallsburg, to make them a speech upon Infidelity...

Ladies' Christian Annual. We owe Bro. Challen an apology for omitting the Ladies' Christian Annual, to our list of notices of publications...

The editor was absent when he wrote the above. Our readers will notice the change in the publication of the Annual by referring to the advertisement in another column.

The Soul Requires Care as Well as the Body. BRO. FRANKLIN—I have been receiving a good many valuable lessons lately, and, as our Savior has said, "That he who makes a good use of what he receives, shall receive more, and have, what has been received, confirmed the more fully to him."

When we consider that we consist of soul and body, two distinct parts of man, this ought to teach us to take care of both. For can any man who believes he has a soul, be concerned only for his body? A compound creature cannot be happy unless both parts of him enjoy their proper pleasures. He who enjoys only the pleasures of the body, is never the happier for having a human and reasonable soul; the soul of a beast would have done as well, and it may be better; for he ceases to relish bodily pleasures as much and it may be, more than men do; and reason is very troublesome to those men who resolve to live like brutes; for it makes them ashamed and afraid, which in many cases hinders, or at least allays their pleasures. And why should not a man desire the full and entire happiness of a man? Why should he despise any part of himself, and that the best part too? and therefore, at least, we ought to take as much care of our souls as of our bodies. Do we adorn our bodies that we may be fit to be seen, and to converse with men, and may receive those respects which are due to our quality and fortune? And shall we not adorn our souls too, with those Christian graces which make us lovely in the sight of God and man? The ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is, in the sight of God, of great price, which Peter especially recommends to Christian women, as a more valuable ornament than the outward adorning of plaiting the hair, or wearing gold, or putting on apparel, (1 Pet. iii. 4.) The ornaments of wisdom, and goodness, of well-governed passions, of goodness and charity which give a grace and beauty to all our actions, and such a pleasing and charming air to our very countenance as the most natural beauty can never imitate.

Are we careful to preserve our bodies from any hurt, from pains and sickness, from burning fevers, or the racking gout, or stone? and shall we not be as careful of the case of the mind too? To quiet and calm those passions which, when they grow outrageous, are more intolerable than all natural or artificial tortures; to moderate those desires which rage like hunger and thirst; those fears which convulse the mind with trembling and paralytic motions; those furious tempers of anger, revenge and envy, which rattle our minds and fill us with vexation, restlessness and confusion of thoughts, especially those guilty reflections upon ourselves, that worm in the conscience which gnaws the soul, and torments us with shame and remorse, and dreadful expectations of an avenger.

These are the sicknesses and distempers of the soul. These are pains indeed more sharp and pungent and killing pains than our bodies are capable of. The spirit of a man can bear his infirmity; natural courage, or the powers of reason, or the comforts of religion, can support us under all sufferings, but a wounded spirit who can bear?—And, therefore, a man who loves ease, should in the first place take care of the case of his mind; for that will make all other sufferings easy. But nothing can support a man whose mind is wounded.

Are we fond of bodily pleasures? are we ready to purchase them at any rate? and if we be men, why should we desire the pleasure of the mind? If we have souls, why should we not reap the benefit and the pleasure of them? Do you think there are no pleasures proper to the soul? Have we souls that are good for nothing, or of no use to us but only to wish the pleasures of the body?—Ask those who have tried what the pleasures of wisdom and knowledge are, and you shall find them to be more excellent and glorious than any pleasures of the body.

conceive of your difficulties before you joined, and while you were in connection with the Methodist society. You were too rational to become a downright enthusiast, and not rational enough to begin at the right place in examining the evidences of the Christian religion. You were a Methodist enthusiast. But I know there are many seeking for religion "who find a sort of religion that does not wear well;" a whole suit of it will become thread-bare in a few months. I have seen the elbows looking out of some great suits in less than the regular wear of seven days. I know also that there is a possibility of keeping a suit of this sort decent for a good while; but then it must be worn only on Sundays, and only while at meeting. It must be brushed up in the wardrobe all week, and hung on Sunday morning in time for meeting.

From the Christian Baptist. Letter of a Sceptic.

To the EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.—Dear Sir—You will, no doubt, be surprised at receiving a letter from a boy; and one who is entirely unknown to you. I am, however, a young man, and my interest in myself, could have induced me to address you in this manner. I do it to obtain information from you on the subject of my soul's salvation. I anxiously hope, if time will permit you, that you will have the kindness to comply with my request. That you may understand my case rightly, I will state the facts of my history. I was born in a remote part of the State of Virginia, of a pious and respectable family. My father, a devoted man, was a member of the Methodist Church, and he had the honor of being the first to introduce the Christian religion into this remote part of the State. I was brought up in the Christian religion, and I have been a member of the Methodist Church since I was twelve years of age. I have been a diligent student of the Bible, and I have been a diligent student of the Christian religion. I have been a diligent student of the Christian religion, and I have been a diligent student of the Christian religion.

Reader, ponder these things. C. D. H.

Strange Things. The following is another extract from the same book (Autobiography of Peter Cartwright, p. 30). It will be interesting for its historical statements to those of our readers who have read the book.

Somewhere between 1800 and 1801, in the upper part of Kentucky, at a memorable place called "Cane Ridge," there was appointed a sacramental by some of the Presbyterian ministers or people; the mighty power of God was displayed in a very extraordinary manner; many were moved to tears, and bitter and loud crying for mercy. The meeting was protracted for weeks. Ministers of almost all denominations flocked in from far and near. The meeting was kept up by night and day. Thousands of people were gathered around the place, and the scene was truly wonderful. The power of God was displayed in a very extraordinary manner; many were moved to tears, and bitter and loud crying for mercy. The meeting was protracted for weeks. Ministers of almost all denominations flocked in from far and near. The meeting was kept up by night and day. Thousands of people were gathered around the place, and the scene was truly wonderful.

From this camp meeting (for so it ought to be called) the news spread through all the churches, and through all the land; and it excited great wonder and surprise; but it kindled a religious flame that spread all over Kentucky and through many other States. And I may here be permitted to say, that this was the first camp-meeting ever held in the United States, and here our camp-meetings took their rise.

As Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist ministers all united in the blessed work at this meeting, when they returned home to their different congregations, and carried the news of this mighty work, the revival spread rapidly throughout the land; but many of the ministers and members of the Synod of Kentucky thought it all disorder, and tried to stop the work. They called their preachers, who were engaged in the revival, to account, and censured and silenced them. These ministers then rose up, and unitedly renounced the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church, organized a church of their own, and dubbed it with the name Christian. There was the origin of what was called the New Lights. They renounced the Westminster Confession of Faith, and professed to take the New Testament for their church discipline. They established no standard of doctrine; every one was to take the New Testament, read it and abide his own construction of it. Marshall, McNamar, Dunlavy, Stone, Huston and others were the chief leaders in this work. Soon a diversity of opinions sprang up, and they got into a babel confusion. Some preached Arrian, some Socinian, and some Universalist doctrines; so that, in a few years, you could not tell what was harped, or what was danced.

They adopted the mode of immersion, the water-god of all exclusive errorists; and directly there was a mighty controversy about the way to heaven—whether it was by water or by dry land. In the meantime, a remnant of preachers that broke off from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1793, headed by James O'Reilly, who had formed a party because he could not be a bishop in said church, which party he called the Republican Methodist Church, came out to Kentucky, and formed a union with these New Lights. Then the Methodist Episcopal Church had war, and rumors of war, almost on every side. The dreadful diversity of opinions among these New Lights; their want of any standard of doctrine, or regular church discipline,

made them an easy prey to prowling wolves of any description. Soon the Shaker priests came along, and off went McNamar, Dunlavy and Huston, into that foolish error. Marshall and others retraced their steps. B. W. Stone, stuck to his New Lightism and fought with the Shakers, till he grew old and feeble. And the mighty Alexander Campbell, the great, arose and poured such floods of regenerating water about the old man's cranium, that he formed a union with this giant errorist, and finally died, not much lamented out of the circle of a few friends. And this is the way with all the New Lights in the government, morals and discipline of the church. T. J. JAMES.

NOTE.—Elder A. Rainey is requested to correct upon the foregoing by the writer.

But I have said that you were too rational to become an enthusiast. Weak minds, like gun-powder, are easily blown up. And like phosphorus, some of them take fire without a single spark. Animal heat alone has set a household all in a blaze; but it was an innocent sort of a flame, it did not singe a single hair. The smell of fire was not left on them. The method of teaching those who seek for religion among the Methodists is not that which is practiced by other religious sectaries. The New Testament is not, neither can it be developed on any such a system. The Divine attestations to the truth of Christianity, the miracles and the prophecies, with all the thousands of eternal evidences are not opened to the minds of the hearers. Hence there is more religion in the blood than in the heart or head of those who begin in the flesh and think to end in the spirit.

But I cannot see how your difficulties could make you a Deist. This would be a most irrational conclusion. I can easily see how you might become an Unitarian; but there is no connection between your difficulties and Deism. Do you ask us, Why? I will tell you: your difficulties never could be revealed but for the belief of the truth of the Bible. Do you say, What truths? I answer, you believe:

1st. That there is one self-existent, independent eternal God.

2d. That the world was created by him.

3d. That you have within you an immortal spirit.

4th. That there will be an end or termination of the present state of things.

5th. That there will be a future state of rewards, if not of punishments.

You admit all these things to be unquestionable truths. I ask, Upon what evidence? Not by the testimony of your five senses—for they give no revelation of this kind; all they can tell you is that all nature concurs in attesting these truths. But remember well, they do not originate in your mind these truths—else all nations, all tribes and tongues would be in possession of them, which you know, if you know any thing of history, is not all the fact. All the ideas you have by the five senses are the more images of sensible objects, or objects of sense; but on subjects that are not objects of sense they give you no information. Hence the deaf know nothing of colors—hence the blind know nothing of sounds. The reason is, the other senses give no information of any kind but what belongs to them; consequently all the senses are limited by things material and mundane; consequently can give no information of things spiritual, such as God, human spirits, heaven, etc. These truths, then, however Deists may boast, are all borrowed from the Bible. Hence there is not a rational Deist in the universe. Of this subject I am matter, if of no other. I have, therefore, found them skulking off into Egypt or Hindostan and calling upon the mountains and hills to cover them, when they have been sensibly attacked upon the principles of reason which they so unmercifully glory in. They are the poorest, drivelling philologists that ever assumed the name. And like Lord Herbert, while they declaim against Unitarianism, they are the very enthusiasts.

For they pretend to hold principles which have no foundation at all, which are subtle and insidious. They boast in the belief of one God, the immortality of the soul and a future state—but ask them how they come by it, they will tell you, by the things that are made—but who made them? Thus it goes in a circle, they prove that there is a creator, from the things created, and they prove that things are created, because there is a creator. Sagacious doctors? But pray, good doctors, where is the archetype or original of a human spirit from which you were put in possession of the ideas, where did you see any thing created by a mere exertion of Almighty power? Tell me, why cannot the dumb speak, who have tongues? because they have no articulate type of sounds? Are not all our simple ideas the result of sensation and reflection? And how is it that you can see things which are invisible, and hear sounds which are made beyond the regions of air?

But I have not to do with a sceptic in the truth of revelation; for you, my friend, do admit of many revealed truths—truths, too, which are supernatural, which are spiritual truths which no man without a revelation either oral or written, ever knew. Either Aethiopian, unqualified Aethiopian, or faith in Jesus as the Son of God are the legitimate stopping places on the principles of sound reason and good logic. All that halt between these extremes, are besotted with a brutish stupidity. The ox and the ass are their reprovers.

conceive of your difficulties before you joined, and while you were in connection with the Methodist society. You were too rational to become a downright enthusiast, and not rational enough to begin at the right place in examining the evidences of the Christian religion. You were a Methodist enthusiast. But I know there are many seeking for religion "who find a sort of religion that does not wear well;" a whole suit of it will become thread-bare in a few months. I have seen the elbows looking out of some great suits in less than the regular wear of seven days. I know also that there is a possibility of keeping a suit of this sort decent for a good while; but then it must be worn only on Sundays, and only while at meeting. It must be brushed up in the wardrobe all week, and hung on Sunday morning in time for meeting.

From the Christian Baptist. Letter of a Sceptic.

To the EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.—Dear Sir—You will, no doubt, be surprised at receiving a letter from a boy; and one who is entirely unknown to you. I am, however, a young man, and my interest in myself, could have induced me to address you in this manner. I do it to obtain information from you on the subject of my soul's salvation. I anxiously hope, if time will permit you, that you will have the kindness to comply with my request. That you may understand my case rightly, I will state the facts of my history. I was born in a remote part of the State of Virginia, of a pious and respectable family. My father, a devoted man, was a member of the Methodist Church, and he had the honor of being the first to introduce the Christian religion into this remote part of the State. I was brought up in the Christian religion, and I have been a member of the Methodist Church since I was twelve years of age. I have been a diligent student of the Bible, and I have been a diligent student of the Christian religion. I have been a diligent student of the Christian religion, and I have been a diligent student of the Christian religion.

Reader, ponder these things. C. D. H.

Strange Things. The following is another extract from the same book (Autobiography of Peter Cartwright, p. 30). It will be interesting for its historical statements to those of our readers who have read the book.

Somewhere between 1800 and 1801, in the upper part of Kentucky, at a memorable place called "Cane Ridge," there was appointed a sacramental by some of the Presbyterian ministers or people; the mighty power of God was displayed in a very extraordinary manner; many were moved to tears, and bitter and loud crying for mercy. The meeting was protracted for weeks. Ministers of almost all denominations flocked in from far and near. The meeting was kept up by night and day. Thousands of people were gathered around the place, and the scene was truly wonderful. The power of God was displayed in a very extraordinary manner; many were moved to tears, and bitter and loud crying for mercy. The meeting was protracted for weeks. Ministers of almost all denominations flocked in from far and near. The meeting was kept up by night and day. Thousands of people were gathered around the place, and the scene was truly wonderful.

From this camp meeting (for so it ought to be called) the news spread through all the churches, and through all the land; and it excited great wonder and surprise; but it kindled a religious flame that spread all over Kentucky and through many other States. And I may here be permitted to say, that this was the first camp-meeting ever held in the United States, and here our camp-meetings took their rise.

As Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist ministers all united in the blessed work at this meeting, when they returned home to their different congregations, and carried the news of this mighty work, the revival spread rapidly throughout the land; but many of the ministers and members of the Synod of Kentucky thought it all disorder, and tried to stop the work. They called their preachers, who were engaged in the revival, to account, and censured and silenced them. These ministers then rose up, and unitedly renounced the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church, organized a church of their own, and dubbed it with the name Christian. There was the origin of what was called the New Lights. They renounced the Westminster Confession of Faith, and professed to take the New Testament for their church discipline. They established no standard of doctrine; every one was to take the New Testament, read it and abide his own construction of it. Marshall, McNamar, Dunlavy, Stone, Huston and others were the chief leaders in this work. Soon a diversity of opinions sprang up, and they got into a babel confusion. Some preached Arrian, some Socinian, and some Universalist doctrines; so that, in a few years, you could not tell what was harped, or what was danced.

They adopted the mode of immersion, the water-god of all exclusive errorists; and directly there was a mighty controversy about the way to heaven—whether it was by water or by dry land. In the meantime, a remnant of preachers that broke off from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1793, headed by James O'Reilly, who had formed a party because he could not be a bishop in said church, which party he called the Republican Methodist Church, came out to Kentucky, and formed a union with these New Lights. Then the Methodist Episcopal Church had war, and rumors of war, almost on every side. The dreadful diversity of opinions among these New Lights; their want of any standard of doctrine, or regular church discipline,

a governor as well as a creator) should be considered on such principles as to meet the difficulties of those creatures lowest in intellect and immersed in crime; or the eagerness of those most exalted in capacity and of unspilled purity.

But this question is out of my way; for this is not the point to which I will refer. We all know from experience that a system of government which is based upon rewards and punishments is the most beneficial to the present state of society. It is not the present state of society, but the future state of society, which we are to consider. But if this question is to be decided by your observation and experience it is not to be decided upon mere theory, and such a decision, we know from experience, must be a guess upon what is not proved, until tested by experience, unmade. But your difficulty rests upon what is not proved, and which cannot be any mortal man's proof to be a fact, viz., that punishment will be beneficial to society in a future state. Your difficulty then is a purely theoretical one, and not one predicated upon any known fact. Consequently can you take it as a single hair, that it is of no real importance in deciding either upon the evidences of revelation nor upon its meaning.

But still I am not come to the point which I had proposed. I will now state it. For that before any creature was made, the great plan of things, was as perfectly known to the Creator as it will be in any future period. It is not possible that any other plan, was just as well known. The question then was with the Creator, if we dare suppose him either in deliberation, or in suspense on the question of creation shall I adopt, if any, the plan which was actually adopted, as the fact proved. But it might have been proposed as a difficulty, if the plan adopted, with perfect precision, was the best which possibly could be adopted, then a final question might occur, whether it was better to create or not to create, admitting the result to have been the Omnipotent One it appeared most advisable to create. Now you will observe upon the premises before us, that the Creator was the best possible state in which they could exist with a reference to all final results. It may, then, in the spirit of true devotion, and genuine humility be affirmed that God could not, with a reference to all final results, give birth to a more perfect system of things than the present.

But if God could not make an infallible rational creature. Now before your difficulty becomes too heavy for the strength of an ordinary mind, it must be proved that God could have given birth to a system in which moral evil could find no place, and in which there would be no need of a governor, and that he did not. But no living man can show that this is the fact, consequently it is solely or chiefly concerned, and not reason nor fact. It must then be conceded, that God could, in reference to all results, have given birth to a better system, or to one in which moral evil could have no place, and that he did not, before you have any grounds on which to constitute a plea against your objections. For I feel as if I should have the possibility of any creature being happy; because the knowledge of God is essential to the happiness of a rational creature, and if God had given birth to a system in which its very nature excluded the possibility of evil, it would have also excluded the possibility of his being a governor. A creator he might have been; and unless exhibited as a governor, no rational creature ever could have known him to be what essential to happiness. These principles being precluded, it follows that if God had not given birth to a system in which it was possible for some to be miserable hereafter, it would have been impossible to have given birth to a system in which any could have been eternally and perfectly happy.

I am decidedly of the opinion that there is not one rational objection can be adduced against anything in the Bible. All those objections which have a show of reason are but evidences of the weakness of the objector, and of the influence of prejudice and evil habits. It is very hard to convince a person against his will, and it requires no great ingenuity to propose such difficulties upon any subject as no wise man could answer. Yet this will not prove that the difficulties or objections are reasonable. It only shows that no man knows every thing—it may be necessary for me to state that I do not conceive that you are actuated by any other than the most sincere intentions in your communication, and that I feel a sanguine hope of being able to remove your objections. For I feel as if I should have the possibility of any creature being happy; because the knowledge of God is essential to the happiness of a rational creature, and if God had given birth to a system in which its very nature excluded the possibility of evil, it would have also excluded the possibility of his being a governor. A creator he might have been; and unless exhibited as a governor, no rational creature ever could have known him to be what essential to happiness. These principles being precluded, it follows that if God had not given birth to a system in which it was possible for some to be miserable hereafter, it would have been impossible to have given birth to a system in which any could have been eternally and perfectly happy.

I will hear any other difficulties you have to propose, when I shall have finished my reply to your communication before me, which I intend to prosecute farther in my next. Your obedient servant, EDITOR.

THE TURN OF LIFE. BETWEEN the years of forty and sixty, a man who has properly regulated himself, may be considered in the prime of life. His matured strength of constitution renders him almost impervious to the attacks of disease and judgment. His mind is resolute, firm, and equal; all his functions are in the highest order; he assumes mastery over business; builds up a competence on the foundation he has formed in early manhood, and passes through a period of life attended by many gratifications. Having gone a year or two past sixty, he arrives at a critical period in the road of existence; the river of death comes before him, and he remains at a stand-still. But the turn of life is a viaduct, called "The Turn of Life," which if crossed in safety, leads to the valley of "old age," round which the river winds, and then beyond without a boat or causeway to effect its passage. The bridge is, however, constructed of fragile materials, and it depends upon how it is trodden, whether it bead or break. Gout, apoplexy, and other bad characters, are also in the vicinity, to waylay the traveller, and thrust him from the pass, but let him guard up his loins, and provide himself with a fitter staff, and he may trudge it safely, with perfect composure. The quiet metaphor, "the turn of life," is a turn either into a prolonged walk, or into a grave. The system and powers have reached their utmost expansion, now begin to close like flowers at sunset or break down as once.

One injunctive stimulant, a single fatal excitement, may force it beyond its strength, while a careful supply of repose, and the withdrawal of all that tend to force a march, will sustain it in beauty and vigor, until night has entirely set in.—The Science of Life, by a Physician.

DO DAILY and hourly your duty; do it patiently, thoroughly; do it as it presents itself; do it at the moment, and let it be its own reward. Never mind whether it is known or acknowledged or not, but do not fail to do it. Do not think of yourself as a mortal, but as an immortal. Your nothing-but him.

Poetry.

For the American Christian Review. THE MORMON BIBLE. Song in the name of the "Old Mormon Bible."

Bro. Franklin - The following is a serious composition that I met with some years ago in Lee county, Iowa. It is said to have been composed by a Methodist preacher somewhere in that section of country...

Moral and Religious.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS

Before the I. C. State Meeting in session at Lafayette, September 24th, 1857

My friends, I do not wish to be in compliance with a popular prejudice, but to follow the lead of the noblest of men...

do good in every practicable way. It should promote the Gospel truth and reformation, by its varied influence, energy and means. It affords facilities for associating and penning acquaintance with the state of the Christian cause and reformation...

From the Banner and Epistle. UNIVERSAL GOSPEL. Mr. Editor - Some time since, I am informed, a challenge addressed to Milton B. Hopkins, to hold a public discussion in Shelbyville...

confront the thing, and to expose its nakedness and deformity. I am not disposed to suffer its escape, whether by apology for its defiant attitude or by flight to some other issue...

Advertisements. BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE, THE BRITISH REVIEWS, AND THE FARMER'S GUIDE. These Periodicals are the three great political organs of Great Britain...

THE FARMER'S GUIDE TO SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL AGRICULTURE. BY HENRY STIMPSON, Esq. of Edinburgh, and the late J. NORTON, Professor of Scientific Agriculture in the University of Edinburgh...

MATHEMATICAL, ASTRONOMICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL BOOKS. By H. M. ROBINSON, A. M. - The design of these publications is to supply the deficiencies of the American market...

The American Christian Review

Dedicated to the Defense, Maintenance and Propagation of Christianity, Religious News and General Intelligence.

VOL. I.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1857.

NO. 3.

The American Christian Advocate.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS: ELD. MOSES F. LADD, ELD. JOHN ROGERS, ELD. F. GOODWIN, ELD. ISAAC EBBETT.

Original Communications.

For the American Christian Review.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

MEMBER III.

2. My second argument in favor of the union of all Christians is drawn from the angel's song which they sang when first the news of the Redeemer's birth was announced to man.

At this time the whole world was divided on the subject of religion. The Jews, to whom had been committed the living oracles, and whose were the fathers, and the covenants, and the prophets, had become divided among themselves. There were the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes, and some minor sects, while, outside of Judaism, all was division every where. Every town and city had its guardian divinity, while almost every village and neighborhood had its own gods and altars and priests.

These humble shepherds were glorified with terror and amazement at the glorious appearance of this heavenly visitor. But the angel said, Fear not, for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

Now if the angels of heaven, those messengers of God that stand near the throne, who always do His will, and that must understand the counsel of heaven, and the good pleasure of the Heavenly Father, then we do—I say, if they thus rejoice at the prospect of Christian union, which unites the pure and honest of all the parties that then existed or should ever arise, and that God's good will and benediction purposes toward fully humanity, were this to be more fully developed, known and felt than they had ever before.

I fear this prayer is often uttered without considering its import. It is read more than any other part of the Bible, New Testament or old. The mother teaches her child, by her knee, to repeat this prayer; Sunday school teachers try to imprint it on the minds of their pupils; it forms a part of the baptismal ceremony of some churches, and makes up a part of every Lord's day performance in many congregations; but, after all, how many consider the real sentiment of this portion of the prayer? How many realize the fact, that if this prayer were granted, a death blow would be struck at once, at all the divisions known among the professed disciples of Christ. Their party walls would fall like the walls of Jericho at the blast of the trumpet of truth; then party names and creeds would be given up as incumbrances in the service of God, and all would become one visible body, enlivened by one holy spirit, and actuated by the same hope; thus they would present to the contemplation of the inhabitants of heaven, earth and hell, one holy brotherhood—one undivided phalanx—before which no enemy of God and holiness could stand. Let me ask you, my brother, who are reading these lines, Do you offer this portion to God? Do you say, with eyes and thoughts directed toward the throne of God in heaven, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven?" Then be careful; O, be careful that you do not act contrary to the sentiment of that prayer—that you do not stand in the way of its fulfillment. Let us not pray that God's people may be united on earth as angels are in heaven, and then throw our influence in the way of Christian Union. But let all our teaching, with tongue and pen, and all our actions go to promote peace on earth; in the union of all the people of God, on the holy principles which he hath revealed in the gospel.

O, God, hasten the day when thy will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven. B. J. GOODWIN.

Indianapolis, Ind., Jan., 1858.

FOR THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

WENT DEPRIVED IT WAS EASY.

This may be the proper place to state my reasons for leaving the Presbyterian Church, and why I humbly endure the contemptible language thrown upon me by Presbyterian Christians. Not long since a few of the saints were gathered together talking and lamenting over my sad condition, when one of them said: "What is the matter with Ewing?" "He has certainly gone crazy, because he has left the Presbyterian Church," was the response. I am considered, by men, to be a "traveller, a deceiver, a rascal, a thief," because they say, "He was trying to steal religious popularity," and wanting to indulge in the pleasures of this world. But, however, I must now define my position and tell my reasons for leaving that church: First, I cannot conscientiously acknowledge the whole system, because it is a system founded on human authority.

1st. External Government. 2d. Total Depravity. 3rd. Election by Adoption. 4th. Infant Baptism. 5th. The Trinity.

I will speak but little of the first, because it is not necessary; but here I will make a few assertions—1st. That Jesus Christ nor none of the Apostles never left any commands for Christians to adopt any form of external government save that of the Bible. 2d. That we are commanded to do nothing more, and if we do anything more we will violate those commands that are essential for our salvation. Do nothing more than you are commanded. Every thing is given in the Scriptures; there is nothing more needed; we are perfectly safe if we do all that therein contained. We need no Confession of Faith; it is not requisite for our salvation. I have had late thrown upon the following language, because I have reformed from Presbyterianism: "You have joined a church that is no church, because it has nothing to keep it together. It has no rules or regulations. The members are perfectly free to do as they please, and to leave at any time, without any utterance to fall from the lips of a human being. This will suffice on this topic."

Of the second, I am not limited; I am free to utterance, the omniscient and omnipotent God being my private guide. My assertions on this point are that there are no such doctrines in the Bible as "Total Depravity." But says the Confession of Faith: "Man, by a fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, so as a natural man being altogether aversive from that which is good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself or prepare himself thereunto, (pp. 47-48). The arguments which I shall use are true, being made true by experience. Besides those which will quote from the holy Law, I will give you a conversion, which was pronounced by them, when I belonged to the Presbyterian Church, to be a true one, but since I left to be a false one.

I knoeked unto the church door and it was opened unto me. I went in, believing then to be doing my duty. I was examined by the professors and Christian judges, and they unanimously said that I gave the expression of a sincere penitent of one that had passed from death unto life. I was recognized by all to be a true penitent, and promising to make a good man. But since I have abandoned the system, I have become a corruptible, defiled and polluted human being, who has never been converted or reformed. Now, according to this C. F., I was so "totally depraved," that I could do nothing toward repentance, neither could I propose myself thereunto;

but I had to wait the immediate and instantaneous spirit of Almighty God, before I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

1st. My conversion was true, or there is no such a doctrine as "Total Depravity." 2nd. If false human depravity remains good, and that session that examined me, then we must notice scriptural proofs which are irresistible and unanswerable. In the second chapter of Genesis we have the following language: "Behold man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil." What does this expression contain? The truth from Almighty God. He said that man knew good and evil. Is it possible that man can know and understand—know good from evil, and have no ability to do good? Can he know and understand that which is good, and yet not be able to do it? But let him again say, "You must stretch forth your hand and take hold of the tree of life and live forever." Does this not show that man has the power to do good? Would God command a man to do something he could not do? No, certainly not. "Come unto me all that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here Christ extends an invitation to all; but, in that invitation, he did not say, "Come unto me all that have received the ability." No; he said nothing of ability. Again: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am lowly in heart and my burden is light." Would he have commanded depraved human beings to wear his yoke? No. Again: "Ask and you shall receive; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." According to the second Bible, erected by human hand and human authority, God gives before it is asked; they find before they seek, and it is opened before they knock. This is a certainty—indisputable certainty. Again: "The Spirit and bride says come, and he that heareth says come; and every one that will." Rev. Why did Christ say, "Whosoever will let him come? Maybe he said, 'Every one that will let him come.' Now, we must make the assertion that man has the power to do good; that gift has been given him and he is held responsible for the use of his senses of it. (See Matt. xxv). You, sinners, who are outside of the church, have the Divine agency already; and if you say, if you may be cut out in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

1st. My conversion was true, or there is no such a doctrine as "Total Depravity." 2nd. If false human depravity remains good, and that session that examined me, then we must notice scriptural proofs which are irresistible and unanswerable. In the second chapter of Genesis we have the following language: "Behold man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil." What does this expression contain? The truth from Almighty God. He said that man knew good and evil. Is it possible that man can know and understand—know good from evil, and have no ability to do good? Can he know and understand that which is good, and yet not be able to do it? But let him again say, "You must stretch forth your hand and take hold of the tree of life and live forever." Does this not show that man has the power to do good? Would God command a man to do something he could not do? No, certainly not. "Come unto me all that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here Christ extends an invitation to all; but, in that invitation, he did not say, "Come unto me all that have received the ability." No; he said nothing of ability. Again: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am lowly in heart and my burden is light." Would he have commanded depraved human beings to wear his yoke? No. Again: "Ask and you shall receive; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." According to the second Bible, erected by human hand and human authority, God gives before it is asked; they find before they seek, and it is opened before they knock. This is a certainty—indisputable certainty. Again: "The Spirit and bride says come, and he that heareth says come; and every one that will." Rev. Why did Christ say, "Whosoever will let him come? Maybe he said, 'Every one that will let him come.' Now, we must make the assertion that man has the power to do good; that gift has been given him and he is held responsible for the use of his senses of it. (See Matt. xxv). You, sinners, who are outside of the church, have the Divine agency already; and if you say, if you may be cut out in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

1st. My conversion was true, or there is no such a doctrine as "Total Depravity." 2nd. If false human depravity remains good, and that session that examined me, then we must notice scriptural proofs which are irresistible and unanswerable. In the second chapter of Genesis we have the following language: "Behold man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil." What does this expression contain? The truth from Almighty God. He said that man knew good and evil. Is it possible that man can know and understand—know good from evil, and have no ability to do good? Can he know and understand that which is good, and yet not be able to do it? But let him again say, "You must stretch forth your hand and take hold of the tree of life and live forever." Does this not show that man has the power to do good? Would God command a man to do something he could not do? No, certainly not. "Come unto me all that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here Christ extends an invitation to all; but, in that invitation, he did not say, "Come unto me all that have received the ability." No; he said nothing of ability. Again: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am lowly in heart and my burden is light." Would he have commanded depraved human beings to wear his yoke? No. Again: "Ask and you shall receive; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." According to the second Bible, erected by human hand and human authority, God gives before it is asked; they find before they seek, and it is opened before they knock. This is a certainty—indisputable certainty. Again: "The Spirit and bride says come, and he that heareth says come; and every one that will." Rev. Why did Christ say, "Whosoever will let him come? Maybe he said, 'Every one that will let him come.' Now, we must make the assertion that man has the power to do good; that gift has been given him and he is held responsible for the use of his senses of it. (See Matt. xxv). You, sinners, who are outside of the church, have the Divine agency already; and if you say, if you may be cut out in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

1st. My conversion was true, or there is no such a doctrine as "Total Depravity." 2nd. If false human depravity remains good, and that session that examined me, then we must notice scriptural proofs which are irresistible and unanswerable. In the second chapter of Genesis we have the following language: "Behold man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil." What does this expression contain? The truth from Almighty God. He said that man knew good and evil. Is it possible that man can know and understand—know good from evil, and have no ability to do good? Can he know and understand that which is good, and yet not be able to do it? But let him again say, "You must stretch forth your hand and take hold of the tree of life and live forever." Does this not show that man has the power to do good? Would God command a man to do something he could not do? No, certainly not. "Come unto me all that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here Christ extends an invitation to all; but, in that invitation, he did not say, "Come unto me all that have received the ability." No; he said nothing of ability. Again: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am lowly in heart and my burden is light." Would he have commanded depraved human beings to wear his yoke? No. Again: "Ask and you shall receive; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." According to the second Bible, erected by human hand and human authority, God gives before it is asked; they find before they seek, and it is opened before they knock. This is a certainty—indisputable certainty. Again: "The Spirit and bride says come, and he that heareth says come; and every one that will." Rev. Why did Christ say, "Whosoever will let him come? Maybe he said, 'Every one that will let him come.' Now, we must make the assertion that man has the power to do good; that gift has been given him and he is held responsible for the use of his senses of it. (See Matt. xxv). You, sinners, who are outside of the church, have the Divine agency already; and if you say, if you may be cut out in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

1st. My conversion was true, or there is no such a doctrine as "Total Depravity." 2nd. If false human depravity remains good, and that session that examined me, then we must notice scriptural proofs which are irresistible and unanswerable. In the second chapter of Genesis we have the following language: "Behold man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil." What does this expression contain? The truth from Almighty God. He said that man knew good and evil. Is it possible that man can know and understand—know good from evil, and have no ability to do good? Can he know and understand that which is good, and yet not be able to do it? But let him again say, "You must stretch forth your hand and take hold of the tree of life and live forever." Does this not show that man has the power to do good? Would God command a man to do something he could not do? No, certainly not. "Come unto me all that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here Christ extends an invitation to all; but, in that invitation, he did not say, "Come unto me all that have received the ability." No; he said nothing of ability. Again: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am lowly in heart and my burden is light." Would he have commanded depraved human beings to wear his yoke? No. Again: "Ask and you shall receive; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." According to the second Bible, erected by human hand and human authority, God gives before it is asked; they find before they seek, and it is opened before they knock. This is a certainty—indisputable certainty. Again: "The Spirit and bride says come, and he that heareth says come; and every one that will." Rev. Why did Christ say, "Whosoever will let him come? Maybe he said, 'Every one that will let him come.' Now, we must make the assertion that man has the power to do good; that gift has been given him and he is held responsible for the use of his senses of it. (See Matt. xxv). You, sinners, who are outside of the church, have the Divine agency already; and if you say, if you may be cut out in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous action; 2nd, My manifestation of religious sincerity was so pure that man could not detect me, even if counterfeit; 3rd, I was able, of my own accord, to withdraw from that iam. Thus we have the following conclusions:

1st. My conversion was true, or there is no such a doctrine as "Total Depravity." 2nd. If false human depravity remains good, and that session that examined me, then we must notice scriptural proofs which are irresistible and unanswerable. In the second chapter of Genesis we have the following language: "Behold man has become as one of us, knowing good and evil." What does this expression contain? The truth from Almighty God. He said that man knew good and evil. Is it possible that man can know and understand—know good from evil, and have no ability to do good? Can he know and understand that which is good, and yet not be able to do it? But let him again say, "You must stretch forth your hand and take hold of the tree of life and live forever." Does this not show that man has the power to do good? Would God command a man to do something he could not do? No, certainly not. "Come unto me all that are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here Christ extends an invitation to all; but, in that invitation, he did not say, "Come unto me all that have received the ability." No; he said nothing of ability. Again: "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am lowly in heart and my burden is light." Would he have commanded depraved human beings to wear his yoke? No. Again: "Ask and you shall receive; seek and you shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you." According to the second Bible, erected by human hand and human authority, God gives before it is asked; they find before they seek, and it is opened before they knock. This is a certainty—indisputable certainty. Again: "The Spirit and bride says come, and he that heareth says come; and every one that will." Rev. Why did Christ say, "Whosoever will let him come? Maybe he said, 'Every one that will let him come.' Now, we must make the assertion that man has the power to do good; that gift has been given him and he is held responsible for the use of his senses of it. (See Matt. xxv). You, sinners, who are outside of the church, have the Divine agency already; and if you say, if you may be cut out in outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

From the Christian Evangelist. FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE. DEAR BRO. HENDERSON:—When at Paris I had the power to do anything toward becoming a Christian. According to the Confession of Faith, God converted me and took me into the church; therefore I had no power to leave without his assistance; therefore, God being the actor who took me into the church and took me out again, He could not have been pleased or satisfied with my mode of worshipping Him; the result of which is that He has taken unto another church (which I do sincerely hope to be the true church), where he has conscientiously satisfied me and Him according to the Bible. But if he did not have anything immediate or instantaneous to do with me, I doubt whether he had anything to do with me, for the session is an unauthorized body—is a human and totally depraved, because they cannot tell when one has received the Divine agency or not, and they are incapable of judging a convert without he is assisted or unassisted.

As to his qualification or manifestation of religious sincerity, it is to be one of two things: 1st. That I am a true convert—sincerely seeking Christ and repenting of past sins; or 2d. That that session is incapable of judging or examining the penitent's heart. If I am a true one, and God assisted in going into the church, it is a truth that God is not satisfied with the session; because he took me in and out again. If I am false, God has nothing to do with the church. The reason is this: They pray for an understanding heart to discern between good and bad; to heal backsliding; to banish hypocrisy; to not be deceived in the investigations of the penitent's heart; to be made conscientious in all their actions; and that God has answered their prayer. If they ask bread will he give them a stone? No, my friends, he will not. Now we have this conclusion: 1st. That God is dissatisfied with their session or else He has nothing to do with them no more than the infidel or Pagan. They must acknowledge me a true convert or their incapacity and ignorance as a session or immortal jury. And now, by acknowledging me a true convert, they must acknowledge that that is not the true Church of Christ; and by charging me with being a false convert, they must say that God has no more to do with it than the Pagan; and the members of the church being depraved, will show that they receive no spiritual blessings and, therefore, cannot be a church of God. Now, my Presbyterian friends, which will you acknowledge to be destroyed? Presbyterianism or human depravity. They both cannot exist in this case. Again: By charging me of being a false convert, they destroy the doctrine of human depravity. 1st. That I was able, of my own will, to come unto God without his immediate and instantaneous

The American Christian Review.

Devoted to the Defense, Maintenance and Propagation of Christianity, Religious News and General Intelligence.

VOL. I.

CINCINNATI, TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1858.

NO. 4.

The American Christian Review.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

REGULAR CONTRIBUTORS: ELD. WALTER L. LADD, ELD. JOHN ROBERTS, ELD. J. GOODWIN, ELD. ISAAC EBBETT.

Original Communications.

For the American Christian Review. CHRISTIAN UNION. NUMBER IV.

My fourth argument in favor of the visible union of all Christians is found in the language of Christ recorded in John x. 16. "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring; and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Thus the Saviour declares his own power in reference to the union of all his followers. The Jewish nation and people regarded themselves as the peculiar favorites of heaven and, therefore, were unwilling to unite in matters of religion with any other people. They judged of men's worthiness for their religious fellowship by their genealogy or fleshly descent from Abraham. But the Lord here informs them that he had sheep outside of this Jewish fold, men that he regarded as true worshippers of the heavenly Father, and, though they were then scattered and disregarded by the proud Pharisee, yet he remembered them in kindness; and he here declares his intention to bring them all into the one great shepherd, over which he himself would preside and watch, as the great shepherd of souls, at which time there should be but one fold, as there would be but one shepherd.

Now, all understand the gospel day—the day in which we live. By the fold, we understand the church to be meant. Hence it follows, as clear as daylight, to-day, that the Lord intended to have but one church, one visible religious organization, into which every Christian, every true sheep of Christ should come. Now, from this, it is clear that the division of the Lord's people into diverse parties, and separate sheepfolds, so that, in many instances, the sheep are not even permitted to eat together, is wrong—wholly wrong; being contrary to the designs and purposes of Christ Jesus our Lord, who is the great Shepherd of the sheep.

I argue, fifthly, from our Lord's prayer, recorded in the 17th chapter of John's testimony, that all Christians should be visibly one.

This is one of the most impressive and interesting prayers that was ever uttered by human lips—ah! it was dictated by the divinity within. It embraces three subjects. Himself, His apostles and all believers. For himself he prayed for the restoration of the glory he had with the Father before the world was; for His apostles, he prayed that they might be kept from *deceit*, and that they might be one even as he and the Father were one, verses 9-17. For all believers, he prayed that they may be one in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ our Lord, verses 20-26.

This holy prayer expresses the will of God on the subject referred to, namely: That all who believe on Christ, through the word of God, spoken or written by these inspired messengers of Christ, should be one.

Some have attempted to make it appear that the union here prayed for, does not exist. They speak of the visible and invisible church, and they say that, though the visible church is divided into a thousand fragments, yet the invisible church is united, and that this invisible church embraces the good of all parties, so that, in the eyes of God, all are one.

My first objection to this view is, that there is no authority in the Bible for it. But I object to it secondly, because this kind of union fails to accomplish the design of the union for which Christ prayed was designed to accomplish. He prayed that believers might be one—that the world might believe that the Father sent the Son; that is, this union was to have a good effect on the world; it was to make such a favorable impression on the public mind, that many should be thereby led to believe in Christ; this union was to be one of God's means of converting the world.

But I ask, How can an invisible union convert the world? A union that cannot be seen must fail to accomplish this end. In vain may you tell the world that all believers enjoy a secret, invisible union, while they behold division and strife everywhere. They will say, if there does exist such strong invisible ties, binding in holy fellowship, all believers, it surely would show itself more frequently in the religious organizations of the day.

But facts are stubborn things, and facts testify that this visible division among professed Christians, one of the most fruitful sources of skepticism and infidelity that ever was invented by the most virulent enemies of God and righteousness. The divisions of believers is the strong tower into which infidels always run when hotly pursued by unanswerable arguments in favor of the divinity of our holy religion. From behind this rock of defence, they hurl back into the ranks of the King's armies every shaft that from the Lord's army of truth, often piercing the cause of the blessed Jesus to the very heart.

If all true believers were visibly united in one body, harmoniously co-operating in the glorious work of enlightening the world and converting sinners to God, this fortress would be taken in an hour. The enemy, having nothing to contend against but the truth of heaven, and no weapons but those forged in the bottomless pit, would soon be conquered; and thousands, who are now standing aloof from the cause of Christ, pos-

sibly men, professing godliness, could realize the fact that, while they are building up and defending divisions among believers, they are throwing their whole influence against the fulfillment of the solemn prayer of the blessed Saviour, they surely would desert from such an unholy course; they would certainly, it appears to me, go to work, in good earnest, to heal the mangled body of Christ, that all might be one in the Lord.

Will protestant pastors and ministers, without ever seeing one word in the Bible about it, carry their infants to a preacher and allow him to baptize them in the name of the Lord, when he could not, if his life were at stake, show one word about it in all that God has said to man? If they do, the responsibility will rest upon their own souls.

Infant baptism is not mentioned in any book in the world, written in the first hundred years of the Christian era, either approving or disapproving it. This, also, has been asserted in numerous forms within the last three hundred years, both in oral debates and sundry writings, from men of the highest information, and has never been refuted by showing any mention of it made in the specified time. Now, can any man of sober judgment believe, that in the period of the church, during its greatest prosperity and most wonderful extension over the earth, infant baptism could have been universally practiced for one hundred years, and not be once mentioned in any book written during that period, that has reached our times? The practice must have been universal, or not in existence; for if it had been in existence, but only partially practiced, there would have been arguments for and against it in the writings of those times, as at the present period. We might account for there being no argument about it, during the first century, upon the ground of a perfect unanimity and oneness in the practice. But there is but one way to account for the fact, that it is not at all mentioned in any book, written during the first hundred years of the Christian era, viz: That it was not in existence. It is out of the question to suppose the practice to have prevailed universally, in all the churches, during a period of one hundred years, when Christianity produced more excitement and attention than in any other age of the world, and not be once mentioned in the New Testament, all of which was written in this period, nor any other book written during the same time, nor on earth. The practice, which is now so sacred and profane, if it finds any authority, or even a mention, it will put down the parent's faith for the child, that will not put down his unbaptized child. The same logic will make the faith of the parent secure a blessing to the child, will make his unbaptized child the opposite of a blessing. Faith and unbaptized both have their results ascribed to them in the gospel. If the faith of the parent entitles the infant to the results of his faith, by the same rule his unbaptized child will entitle him to the results of his unbaptized.

No man can show a good reason why the faith of the parent should secure baptism to the infant, and not secure every thing else to it, that it does to himself; and why all that is lost to the parent through unbaptized, should not be lost to the child. This legitimate result must inevitably follow from the doctrine that the parent believes for the child. No man living can avoid it, beyond all dispute, involves the antiquated doctrine of infant damnation. But the assumption of the parent believing for the child is not true. It can be as easily shown, that the parent can repent for the child; be baptized; belong to the church; commune; be judged in the great day, and saved or condemned for the child, as that he can believe for the child. There is not one intimation in the New Testament of one person believing for another, or of one person being baptized without faith. If then, faith is made a prerequisite to baptism in the commission, if no person is mentioned in the Scriptures who was baptized without faith; and if a person is there mentioned who believed for another, the Divine ordinance called "Baptism," does not exist without faith in the subject. Hence, for any man to lift his hand to God, with a subject before him, which he knows to be without faith, and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is making an awful and most fearful use of that most solemn and wonderful formula. The word of the living God is applied to such, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Who authorized you to utter these awful words, and administer that solemn ordinance in my name to any person without faith?

Baptism is a personal command. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 38. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—Acts x. 48. "Ariste and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts xxii. 16. These specimens are sufficient to show that baptism is a personal command. The command is to the subject, requiring him or her to be baptized, and not to some other person to have him or her baptized. A command always implies intelligent agency on the part of those commanded. A wise and just being could not command a creature to do anything, without recognizing in the creature the ability to understand and comply with the command. The infant cannot understand the command to be baptized, and has no ability to comply with the command. It, therefore, comes in the purview of that command. Infants are not subjects of commands. The commands of God are not given to a person personally. But baptism is a personal command, and, therefore, does not apply to infants. It is a command, *bonis voluntatis*, in the case of the *Infantes*, they are required to have their *Infantes* circumcised. The commandment concerning man's baptism, *bonis voluntatis*, is not applicable to infants.

There is no scriptural baptism where there is no faith. The gospel is addressed to intelligent agents, who can act for themselves. Hence, the Lord said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 15, 16. "All the world," in this passage, and "all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19, are evidently synonymous terms, and include the same persons. They both include those to whom the gospel is to be preached. The author of these words did not have in his purview unconscious infants, when he gave this commission; and did not while they were in their unconscious infancy, intend this commission for them. But he intended it for those who could be taught—to whom the gospel could be preached, and who could believe it. Hence, he says, "teach all nations—preach the gospel to every creature," and adds, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." All, to whom this commission extends, are required to believe, and those of them who do not believe, he declares, shall be damned. The legitimate result of applying this commission to infants, as the believers in that practice have almost uniformly done, is to make it appear that the Lord requires them to believe; for all to whom it extends are required to believe. But this legitimate result goes further than this, and requires them to be baptized. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." This is a commission to intelligent agents, and not to unconscious infants. Let us, then, look at the items contained in it. It contains the following items: 1, Teach or preach; 2, Believe; 3, Baptism; 4, Salvation; 5, Unbelief; 6, Damnation. Now is there any fair and honorable method of interpretation that will apply one item of these six to infants, and none of the balance? No man quotes this commission to show that an infant is entitled to faith, to pardon, or that it may be an unbeliever, or that it may be condemned. Why not? For the manifest reason, that the commission does not relate to unconscious infants. It is still insisted that the commission is, to "teach all nations"—to "every creature." Very well; what is to be done to all nations? Teach, them—preach, the gospel to them, and those of them who shall believe it and be baptized shall be saved, and those who do not believe, shall be damned. The apostolic commission connects faith and baptism; but puts faith first. It is, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16.

There, and every place mentioned in the Word of God, faith is before baptism. No person is entitled to baptism without faith. Indeed, without faith, baptism is a nullity. All admit that in regard to adults, this is true; but it must be admitted that it is true of all to whom the commission extends, and it extends to all who are gospel subjects. Infants are not gospel subjects. Gospel requirements do not extend to them. They neither believe or disbelieve; they do not obey; have gospel pardon or gospel condemnation; and, therefore, no personal accountability.

But we are told that infants are baptized upon the faith of the parents! Then, the parents believe for the children! Is that the case? What, then, if the parent does not believe? The child cannot be baptized! The argument is, that the faith of the parent stands for the child the same as if he believed itself. Then, the child is justified upon the faith of the parent; received into Christ, and saved upon the faith of the parent, just as the parent is himself! In this case, what if the parent does not believe? Then, it is not justified, not received into Christ, and not saved! Who is prepared for this? Whatever the faith of the parent secures to the infant, is certainly lost to it, if the parent does not believe. If the faith of the parent secures nothing but baptism to it; nothing else is lost if the parent does not believe. But how is it that the faith of the parent is a means of salvation to himself, and if he does not believe, he will be damned; but his faith for the child simply secures baptism to it, and nothing else? And if the parent does not believe, nothing is lost to the child but baptism. This thing of the parent believing for the child is a dangerous piece of business. Any person must see, that if the parent can believe for the child at all, the faith must stand for the same purpose for the infant it does for himself; not simply making eligible to baptism, but in everything else. Hence, if the parent fails to believe, he forfeits the same to the child as he does to himself. If he forfeits his own salvation by his unbelief, and brings the same results upon his child. There is no rule that will put down the parent's faith for the child, that will not put down his unbaptized child. The same logic will make the faith of the parent secure a blessing to the child, will make his unbaptized child the opposite of a blessing. Faith and unbaptized both have their results ascribed to them in the gospel. If the faith of the parent entitles the infant to the results of his faith, by the same rule his unbaptized child will entitle him to the results of his unbaptized.

No man can show a good reason why the faith of the parent should secure baptism to the infant, and not secure every thing else to it, that it does to himself; and why all that is lost to the parent through unbaptized, should not be lost to the child. This legitimate result must inevitably follow from the doctrine that the parent believes for the child. No man living can avoid it, beyond all dispute, involves the antiquated doctrine of infant damnation. But the assumption of the parent believing for the child is not true. It can be as easily shown, that the parent can repent for the child; be baptized; belong to the church; commune; be judged in the great day, and saved or condemned for the child, as that he can believe for the child. There is not one intimation in the New Testament of one person believing for another, or of one person being baptized without faith. If then, faith is made a prerequisite to baptism in the commission, if no person is mentioned in the Scriptures who was baptized without faith; and if a person is there mentioned who believed for another, the Divine ordinance called "Baptism," does not exist without faith in the subject. Hence, for any man to lift his hand to God, with a subject before him, which he knows to be without faith, and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is making an awful and most fearful use of that most solemn and wonderful formula. The word of the living God is applied to such, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Who authorized you to utter these awful words, and administer that solemn ordinance in my name to any person without faith?

Baptism is a personal command. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 38. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—Acts x. 48. "Ariste and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts xxii. 16. These specimens are sufficient to show that baptism is a personal command. The command is to the subject, requiring him or her to be baptized, and not to some other person to have him or her baptized. A command always implies intelligent agency on the part of those commanded. A wise and just being could not command a creature to do anything, without recognizing in the creature the ability to understand and comply with the command. The infant cannot understand the command to be baptized, and has no ability to comply with the command. It, therefore, comes in the purview of that command. Infants are not subjects of commands. The commands of God are not given to a person personally. But baptism is a personal command, and, therefore, does not apply to infants. It is a command, *bonis voluntatis*, in the case of the *Infantes*, they are required to have their *Infantes* circumcised. The commandment concerning man's baptism, *bonis voluntatis*, is not applicable to infants.

There is no scriptural baptism where there is no faith. The gospel is addressed to intelligent agents, who can act for themselves. Hence, the Lord said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 15, 16. "All the world," in this passage, and "all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19, are evidently synonymous terms, and include the same persons. They both include those to whom the gospel is to be preached. The author of these words did not have in his purview unconscious infants, when he gave this commission; and did not while they were in their unconscious infancy, intend this commission for them. But he intended it for those who could be taught—to whom the gospel could be preached, and who could believe it. Hence, he says, "teach all nations—preach the gospel to every creature," and adds, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." All, to whom this commission extends, are required to believe, and those of them who do not believe, he declares, shall be damned. The legitimate result of applying this commission to infants, as the believers in that practice have almost uniformly done, is to make it appear that the Lord requires them to believe; for all to whom it extends are required to believe. But this legitimate result goes further than this, and requires them to be baptized. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." This is a commission to intelligent agents, and not to unconscious infants. Let us, then, look at the items contained in it. It contains the following items: 1, Teach or preach; 2, Believe; 3, Baptism; 4, Salvation; 5, Unbelief; 6, Damnation. Now is there any fair and honorable method of interpretation that will apply one item of these six to infants, and none of the balance? No man quotes this commission to show that an infant is entitled to faith, to pardon, or that it may be an unbeliever, or that it may be condemned. Why not? For the manifest reason, that the commission does not relate to unconscious infants. It is still insisted that the commission is, to "teach all nations"—to "every creature." Very well; what is to be done to all nations? Teach, them—preach, the gospel to them, and those of them who shall believe it and be baptized shall be saved, and those who do not believe, shall be damned. The apostolic commission connects faith and baptism; but puts faith first. It is, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16.

There, and every place mentioned in the Word of God, faith is before baptism. No person is entitled to baptism without faith. Indeed, without faith, baptism is a nullity. All admit that in regard to adults, this is true; but it must be admitted that it is true of all to whom the commission extends, and it extends to all who are gospel subjects. Infants are not gospel subjects. Gospel requirements do not extend to them. They neither believe or disbelieve; they do not obey; have gospel pardon or gospel condemnation; and, therefore, no personal accountability.

But we are told that infants are baptized upon the faith of the parents! Then, the parents believe for the children! Is that the case? What, then, if the parent does not believe? The child cannot be baptized! The argument is, that the faith of the parent stands for the child the same as if he believed itself. Then, the child is justified upon the faith of the parent; received into Christ, and saved upon the faith of the parent, just as the parent is himself! In this case, what if the parent does not believe? Then, it is not justified, not received into Christ, and not saved! Who is prepared for this? Whatever the faith of the parent secures to the infant, is certainly lost to it, if the parent does not believe. If the faith of the parent secures nothing but baptism to it; nothing else is lost if the parent does not believe. But how is it that the faith of the parent is a means of salvation to himself, and if he does not believe, he will be damned; but his faith for the child simply secures baptism to it, and nothing else? And if the parent does not believe, nothing is lost to the child but baptism. This thing of the parent believing for the child is a dangerous piece of business. Any person must see, that if the parent can believe for the child at all, the faith must stand for the same purpose for the infant it does for himself; not simply making eligible to baptism, but in everything else. Hence, if the parent fails to believe, he forfeits the same to the child as he does to himself. If he forfeits his own salvation by his unbelief, and brings the same results upon his child. There is no rule that will put down the parent's faith for the child, that will not put down his unbaptized child. The same logic will make the faith of the parent secure a blessing to the child, will make his unbaptized child the opposite of a blessing. Faith and unbaptized both have their results ascribed to them in the gospel. If the faith of the parent entitles the infant to the results of his faith, by the same rule his unbaptized child will entitle him to the results of his unbaptized.

No man can show a good reason why the faith of the parent should secure baptism to the infant, and not secure every thing else to it, that it does to himself; and why all that is lost to the parent through unbaptized, should not be lost to the child. This legitimate result must inevitably follow from the doctrine that the parent believes for the child. No man living can avoid it, beyond all dispute, involves the antiquated doctrine of infant damnation. But the assumption of the parent believing for the child is not true. It can be as easily shown, that the parent can repent for the child; be baptized; belong to the church; commune; be judged in the great day, and saved or condemned for the child, as that he can believe for the child. There is not one intimation in the New Testament of one person believing for another, or of one person being baptized without faith. If then, faith is made a prerequisite to baptism in the commission, if no person is mentioned in the Scriptures who was baptized without faith; and if a person is there mentioned who believed for another, the Divine ordinance called "Baptism," does not exist without faith in the subject. Hence, for any man to lift his hand to God, with a subject before him, which he knows to be without faith, and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is making an awful and most fearful use of that most solemn and wonderful formula. The word of the living God is applied to such, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Who authorized you to utter these awful words, and administer that solemn ordinance in my name to any person without faith?

There, and every place mentioned in the Word of God, faith is before baptism. No person is entitled to baptism without faith. Indeed, without faith, baptism is a nullity. All admit that in regard to adults, this is true; but it must be admitted that it is true of all to whom the commission extends, and it extends to all who are gospel subjects. Infants are not gospel subjects. Gospel requirements do not extend to them. They neither believe or disbelieve; they do not obey; have gospel pardon or gospel condemnation; and, therefore, no personal accountability.

But we are told that infants are baptized upon the faith of the parents! Then, the parents believe for the children! Is that the case? What, then, if the parent does not believe? The child cannot be baptized! The argument is, that the faith of the parent stands for the child the same as if he believed itself. Then, the child is justified upon the faith of the parent; received into Christ, and saved upon the faith of the parent, just as the parent is himself! In this case, what if the parent does not believe? Then, it is not justified, not received into Christ, and not saved! Who is prepared for this? Whatever the faith of the parent secures to the infant, is certainly lost to it, if the parent does not believe. If the faith of the parent secures nothing but baptism to it; nothing else is lost if the parent does not believe. But how is it that the faith of the parent is a means of salvation to himself, and if he does not believe, he will be damned; but his faith for the child simply secures baptism to it, and nothing else? And if the parent does not believe, nothing is lost to the child but baptism. This thing of the parent believing for the child is a dangerous piece of business. Any person must see, that if the parent can believe for the child at all, the faith must stand for the same purpose for the infant it does for himself; not simply making eligible to baptism, but in everything else. Hence, if the parent fails to believe, he forfeits the same to the child as he does to himself. If he forfeits his own salvation by his unbelief, and brings the same results upon his child. There is no rule that will put down the parent's faith for the child, that will not put down his unbaptized child. The same logic will make the faith of the parent secure a blessing to the child, will make his unbaptized child the opposite of a blessing. Faith and unbaptized both have their results ascribed to them in the gospel. If the faith of the parent entitles the infant to the results of his faith, by the same rule his unbaptized child will entitle him to the results of his unbaptized.

No man can show a good reason why the faith of the parent should secure baptism to the infant, and not secure every thing else to it, that it does to himself; and why all that is lost to the parent through unbaptized, should not be lost to the child. This legitimate result must inevitably follow from the doctrine that the parent believes for the child. No man living can avoid it, beyond all dispute, involves the antiquated doctrine of infant damnation. But the assumption of the parent believing for the child is not true. It can be as easily shown, that the parent can repent for the child; be baptized; belong to the church; commune; be judged in the great day, and saved or condemned for the child, as that he can believe for the child. There is not one intimation in the New Testament of one person believing for another, or of one person being baptized without faith. If then, faith is made a prerequisite to baptism in the commission, if no person is mentioned in the Scriptures who was baptized without faith; and if a person is there mentioned who believed for another, the Divine ordinance called "Baptism," does not exist without faith in the subject. Hence, for any man to lift his hand to God, with a subject before him, which he knows to be without faith, and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is making an awful and most fearful use of that most solemn and wonderful formula. The word of the living God is applied to such, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Who authorized you to utter these awful words, and administer that solemn ordinance in my name to any person without faith?

Baptism is a personal command. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 38. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—Acts x. 48. "Ariste and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts xxii. 16. These specimens are sufficient to show that baptism is a personal command. The command is to the subject, requiring him or her to be baptized, and not to some other person to have him or her baptized. A command always implies intelligent agency on the part of those commanded. A wise and just being could not command a creature to do anything, without recognizing in the creature the ability to understand and comply with the command. The infant cannot understand the command to be baptized, and has no ability to comply with the command. It, therefore, comes in the purview of that command. Infants are not subjects of commands. The commands of God are not given to a person personally. But baptism is a personal command, and, therefore, does not apply to infants. It is a command, *bonis voluntatis*, in the case of the *Infantes*, they are required to have their *Infantes* circumcised. The commandment concerning man's baptism, *bonis voluntatis*, is not applicable to infants.

There is no scriptural baptism where there is no faith. The gospel is addressed to intelligent agents, who can act for themselves. Hence, the Lord said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 15, 16. "All the world," in this passage, and "all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19, are evidently synonymous terms, and include the same persons. They both include those to whom the gospel is to be preached. The author of these words did not have in his purview unconscious infants, when he gave this commission; and did not while they were in their unconscious infancy, intend this commission for them. But he intended it for those who could be taught—to whom the gospel could be preached, and who could believe it. Hence, he says, "teach all nations—preach the gospel to every creature," and adds, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." All, to whom this commission extends, are required to believe, and those of them who do not believe, he declares, shall be damned. The legitimate result of applying this commission to infants, as the believers in that practice have almost uniformly done, is to make it appear that the Lord requires them to believe; for all to whom it extends are required to believe. But this legitimate result goes further than this, and requires them to be baptized. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." This is a commission to intelligent agents, and not to unconscious infants. Let us, then, look at the items contained in it. It contains the following items: 1, Teach or preach; 2, Believe; 3, Baptism; 4, Salvation; 5, Unbelief; 6, Damnation. Now is there any fair and honorable method of interpretation that will apply one item of these six to infants, and none of the balance? No man quotes this commission to show that an infant is entitled to faith, to pardon, or that it may be an unbeliever, or that it may be condemned. Why not? For the manifest reason, that the commission does not relate to unconscious infants. It is still insisted that the commission is, to "teach all nations"—to "every creature." Very well; what is to be done to all nations? Teach, them—preach, the gospel to them, and those of them who shall believe it and be baptized shall be saved, and those who do not believe, shall be damned. The apostolic commission connects faith and baptism; but puts faith first. It is, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16.

There, and every place mentioned in the Word of God, faith is before baptism. No person is entitled to baptism without faith. Indeed, without faith, baptism is a nullity. All admit that in regard to adults, this is true; but it must be admitted that it is true of all to whom the commission extends, and it extends to all who are gospel subjects. Infants are not gospel subjects. Gospel requirements do not extend to them. They neither believe or disbelieve; they do not obey; have gospel pardon or gospel condemnation; and, therefore, no personal accountability.

But we are told that infants are baptized upon the faith of the parents! Then, the parents believe for the children! Is that the case? What, then, if the parent does not believe? The child cannot be baptized! The argument is, that the faith of the parent stands for the child the same as if he believed itself. Then, the child is justified upon the faith of the parent; received into Christ, and saved upon the faith of the parent, just as the parent is himself! In this case, what if the parent does not believe? Then, it is not justified, not received into Christ, and not saved! Who is prepared for this? Whatever the faith of the parent secures to the infant, is certainly lost to it, if the parent does not believe. If the faith of the parent secures nothing but baptism to it; nothing else is lost if the parent does not believe. But how is it that the faith of the parent is a means of salvation to himself, and if he does not believe, he will be damned; but his faith for the child simply secures baptism to it, and nothing else? And if the parent does not believe, nothing is lost to the child but baptism. This thing of the parent believing for the child is a dangerous piece of business. Any person must see, that if the parent can believe for the child at all, the faith must stand for the same purpose for the infant it does for himself; not simply making eligible to baptism, but in everything else. Hence, if the parent fails to believe, he forfeits the same to the child as he does to himself. If he forfeits his own salvation by his unbelief, and brings the same results upon his child. There is no rule that will put down the parent's faith for the child, that will not put down his unbaptized child. The same logic will make the faith of the parent secure a blessing to the child, will make his unbaptized child the opposite of a blessing. Faith and unbaptized both have their results ascribed to them in the gospel. If the faith of the parent entitles the infant to the results of his faith, by the same rule his unbaptized child will entitle him to the results of his unbaptized.

No man can show a good reason why the faith of the parent should secure baptism to the infant, and not secure every thing else to it, that it does to himself; and why all that is lost to the parent through unbaptized, should not be lost to the child. This legitimate result must inevitably follow from the doctrine that the parent believes for the child. No man living can avoid it, beyond all dispute, involves the antiquated doctrine of infant damnation. But the assumption of the parent believing for the child is not true. It can be as easily shown, that the parent can repent for the child; be baptized; belong to the church; commune; be judged in the great day, and saved or condemned for the child, as that he can believe for the child. There is not one intimation in the New Testament of one person believing for another, or of one person being baptized without faith. If then, faith is made a prerequisite to baptism in the commission, if no person is mentioned in the Scriptures who was baptized without faith; and if a person is there mentioned who believed for another, the Divine ordinance called "Baptism," does not exist without faith in the subject. Hence, for any man to lift his hand to God, with a subject before him, which he knows to be without faith, and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is making an awful and most fearful use of that most solemn and wonderful formula. The word of the living God is applied to such, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Who authorized you to utter these awful words, and administer that solemn ordinance in my name to any person without faith?

There, and every place mentioned in the Word of God, faith is before baptism. No person is entitled to baptism without faith. Indeed, without faith, baptism is a nullity. All admit that in regard to adults, this is true; but it must be admitted that it is true of all to whom the commission extends, and it extends to all who are gospel subjects. Infants are not gospel subjects. Gospel requirements do not extend to them. They neither believe or disbelieve; they do not obey; have gospel pardon or gospel condemnation; and, therefore, no personal accountability.

But we are told that infants are baptized upon the faith of the parents! Then, the parents believe for the children! Is that the case? What, then, if the parent does not believe? The child cannot be baptized! The argument is, that the faith of the parent stands for the child the same as if he believed itself. Then, the child is justified upon the faith of the parent; received into Christ, and saved upon the faith of the parent, just as the parent is himself! In this case, what if the parent does not believe? Then, it is not justified, not received into Christ, and not saved! Who is prepared for this? Whatever the faith of the parent secures to the infant, is certainly lost to it, if the parent does not believe. If the faith of the parent secures nothing but baptism to it; nothing else is lost if the parent does not believe. But how is it that the faith of the parent is a means of salvation to himself, and if he does not believe, he will be damned; but his faith for the child simply secures baptism to it, and nothing else? And if the parent does not believe, nothing is lost to the child but baptism. This thing of the parent believing for the child is a dangerous piece of business. Any person must see, that if the parent can believe for the child at all, the faith must stand for the same purpose for the infant it does for himself; not simply making eligible to baptism, but in everything else. Hence, if the parent fails to believe, he forfeits the same to the child as he does to himself. If he forfeits his own salvation by his unbelief, and brings the same results upon his child. There is no rule that will put down the parent's faith for the child, that will not put down his unbaptized child. The same logic will make the faith of the parent secure a blessing to the child, will make his unbaptized child the opposite of a blessing. Faith and unbaptized both have their results ascribed to them in the gospel. If the faith of the parent entitles the infant to the results of his faith, by the same rule his unbaptized child will entitle him to the results of his unbaptized.

No man can show a good reason why the faith of the parent should secure baptism to the infant, and not secure every thing else to it, that it does to himself; and why all that is lost to the parent through unbaptized, should not be lost to the child. This legitimate result must inevitably follow from the doctrine that the parent believes for the child. No man living can avoid it, beyond all dispute, involves the antiquated doctrine of infant damnation. But the assumption of the parent believing for the child is not true. It can be as easily shown, that the parent can repent for the child; be baptized; belong to the church; commune; be judged in the great day, and saved or condemned for the child, as that he can believe for the child. There is not one intimation in the New Testament of one person believing for another, or of one person being baptized without faith. If then, faith is made a prerequisite to baptism in the commission, if no person is mentioned in the Scriptures who was baptized without faith; and if a person is there mentioned who believed for another, the Divine ordinance called "Baptism," does not exist without faith in the subject. Hence, for any man to lift his hand to God, with a subject before him, which he knows to be without faith, and say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is making an awful and most fearful use of that most solemn and wonderful formula. The word of the living God is applied to such, "Who hath required this at your hand?" Who authorized you to utter these awful words, and administer that solemn ordinance in my name to any person without faith?

Baptism is a personal command. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts ii. 38. "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—Acts x. 48. "Ariste and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts xxii. 16. These specimens are sufficient to show that baptism is a personal command. The command is to the subject, requiring him or her to be baptized, and not to some other person to have him or her baptized. A command always implies intelligent agency on the part of those commanded. A wise and just being could not command a creature to do anything, without recognizing in the creature the ability to understand and comply with the command. The infant cannot understand the command to be baptized, and has no ability to comply with the command. It, therefore, comes in the purview of that command. Infants are not subjects of commands. The commands of God are not given to a person personally. But baptism is a personal command, and, therefore, does not apply to infants. It is a command, *bonis voluntatis*, in the case of the *Infantes*, they are required to have their *Infantes* circumcised. The commandment concerning man's baptism, *bonis voluntatis*, is not applicable to infants.

There is no scriptural baptism where there is no faith. The gospel is addressed to intelligent agents, who can act for themselves. Hence, the Lord said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 15, 16. "All the world," in this passage, and "all nations," Matt. xxviii. 19, are evidently synonymous terms, and include the same persons. They both include those to whom the gospel is to be preached. The author of these words did not have in his purview unconscious infants, when he gave this commission; and did not while they were in their unconscious infancy, intend this commission for them. But he intended it for those who could be taught—to whom the gospel could be preached, and who could believe it. Hence, he says, "teach all nations—preach the gospel to every creature," and adds, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." All, to whom this commission extends, are required to believe, and those of them who do not believe, he declares, shall be damned. The legitimate result of applying this commission to infants, as the believers in that practice have almost uniformly done, is to make it appear that the Lord requires them to believe; for all to whom it extends are required to believe. But this legitimate result goes further than this, and requires them to be baptized. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." This is a commission to intelligent agents, and not to unconscious infants. Let us, then, look at the items contained in it. It contains the following items: 1, Teach or preach; 2, Believe; 3, Baptism; 4, Salvation; 5, Unbelief; 6, Damnation. Now is there any fair and honorable method of interpretation that will apply one item of these six to infants, and none of the balance? No man quotes this commission to show that an infant is entitled to faith, to pardon, or that it may be an unbeliever, or that it may be condemned. Why not? For the manifest reason, that the commission does not relate to unconscious infants. It is still insisted that the commission is, to "teach all nations"—to "every creature." Very well; what is to be done to all nations? Teach, them—preach, the gospel to them, and those of them who shall believe it and be baptized shall be saved, and those who do not believe, shall be damned. The apostolic commission connects faith and baptism; but puts faith first. It is, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—Mark xvi. 16.

There, and every place mentioned in the Word of God, faith is before baptism. No person is entitled to baptism without faith. Indeed, without faith, baptism is a nullity. All admit that in regard to adults, this is true; but it must be admitted that it is true of all to whom the commission extends, and it extends to all who are gospel subjects. Infants are not gospel subjects. Gospel requirements do not extend to them. They neither believe or disbelieve; they do not obey; have gospel pardon or gospel condemnation; and

his critical notes on the Greek Testament on Acts v. 12-14. The Greek text of the Acts is not in the temple, but in the house of prayer, as their number was so great that the upper porch must have been very large. For 2000 of the hearers were converted during the delivery of one sermon in that place; see Acts iii. 11, and iv. 4. Even the learned Greek scholar, Thiersch, acknowledges that all the disciples, the church of the church, met in the portico of the temple of Jerusalem. The inspired writer informs us that they continued daily with one accord in the temple. The whole church met at the great controversy. The twelve called the multitude of the disciples to them. The church at Corinth came together to one place, and the church at Antioch came together in one assembly, to hear Paul and Silas give an account of their mission. Acts, xiv. 27.

The letters addressed by the Apostles to the churches at Rome, at Corinth, and at Ephesus, prove that the church did not meet in a presbytery, synod, general assembly, or any other assembly, but that the case would have been addressed to the body, and there is no hint given of the existence of such organizations. The ablest authorities on ecclesiastical polity confirm the view which was given, even when their testimony is contrary to their own practice. The writings of the early fathers, and the testimonies of the ablest historians, prove the correctness of our remarks. Polycarp, a pastor of the church at Smyrna, when asked by his brethren, A. D. 166, prays "for the universal church throughout the world." Irenaeus, his pupil, and a bishop of the church at Lyons, speaks of the "church dispersed throughout the whole world to the ends of the earth." Dionysius Alexandrian calls the Emperor Marcianus, a "warrior against the catholic or universal church of God, and Origin, one of the most glorious fathers of the second century, speaks of the church of God under heaven.

We find them employing the term in the second sense always. Irenaeus speaks of the "churches of Caesarea, Irenaeus speaks of the churches that were in Germany, France and Spain. Tertullian writes of the "churches of Syria and Perga," and of the "churches of Greece." When the church at Smyrna wrote an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, one of their bishops, to the church at Philomelos, they begin, "The church of God dwelling at Smyrna to the church dwelling at Philomelos." So the epistle of Clement Romanus to the church at Corinth, which Eusebius styles a great, admirable and powerful writing, is written in the name of "the church of God which dwelleth at Rome to the church of God which dwelleth at Corinth." The church of King in his "Inquiry into the constitution and discipline of the Primitive church," testifies as the result of his laborious investigation, that "the usual and common designation of the world church, is that of a society of Christians meeting together in one place, under their proper pastors, for the performance of religious worship, and the exercise of Christian discipline." Dr. Isaac Barrow, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and one of the most learned scholars of his age, says, "The church of God was settled apart under its own officers, so as independently and separately to manage its own concerns; and Dr. Kay, bishop of Bristol, in his ecclesiastical history, declares that "the passages already alleged sufficiently prove that in Tertullian's estimation, the apostolic churches were independent of each other, and equal in rank and degree."

The Karen Scriptures. Messrs. Vinton, Brayton and Beecher, Missionaries to the Karens, have issued a demand for a new edition of the Karen Scriptures. Since 1843, there have been published over ten thousand copies of the Bible and Testament in this language, and now it is believed that not over two thousand copies remain in the hands of the eight thousand Christians connected with the mission. Some have been worn out, some from the effects of the climate have been destroyed, and others are widely scattered, where it is hoped they may yet beam the light of life upon the heathen. At the present time, large numbers of the native preachers have no Bibles, and it is not possible for the mission to supply them for love or money. Should we even enough to meet the demands of the schools.

It is proposed to print an edition of from three to ten thousand copies in Burmah, according to the demand, and the supply of funds, in a convenient form, beginning with the New Testament. The missionaries have entered upon the work, in reliance upon God; for they say they have nothing in hand, and nothing pledged. Their confidence is in God alone. It is His work; and they dare not neglect the poor native Christians unsupplied with so divine a gift. God's voice seems distinctly to say to them, "Go forward." In obedience to this call, they have been diligent to see that they have no other way, and then say, we never can give ourselves rest until this great work shall be accomplished. "Undertake great things for God," is the noble motto of these self-denying laborers in a foreign land.

This subject was brought before the Board at the meeting in December, by the Rev. Dr. Brown, returned missionary from Assam, who made application for aid in the name of the missionaries. The subject, with the letters from missionaries which he furnished, was referred to the Committee on Versions, who reported at this meeting favorably to the application, and after deliberation, the Board unanimously authorized the officers to prepare a suitable statement of the facts, and solicit contributions for this object in the same way as for the German and Chinese Scriptures. The translation of the Scriptures into the Karen language was made upon the principles of the Bible Union. Should the Lord stir up the hearts of any of His dear people, to contribute to this work, every dollar will be remitted at an early day. While raising money for the accomplishment of the great work of revising the English Bible, the Union would not turn coldly away from the cry of the needy in other fields; but would encourage them till the pure word of the Lord shall be glorified in all the earth.—Bible Union Reporter.

Rev. J. O. Boardman, a Christian missionary at Kingston, Jamaica, who was present at the meeting of the Board, is about to return to his field of labor. He has been zealous in the distribution of the Scriptures in the West Indies and Central America, and will take out with him a supply of the New Testament, which has just been completely revised and published by the Bible Union.—Bible Union Reporter.

Real holiness has love for its essence, and love for its object, the good of the soul, and the honor of God for its end.

Love is a weapon that will conquer sin where all other weapons fail.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW. CINCINNATI, JANUARY 26, 1858.

TERMS FOR THE REVIEW. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS. Write the Name of the Subscriber, Post Office, County and State, both where the Paper is sent, and where it is to be sent. When you see a Red Pencil Mark on the margin of the Review, you will please understand that two more numbers should be sent, unless otherwise directed. The Paper will stop, unless ordered again.

The "Watchman" is published in the issue of January 14th of this month, and contains the "Christian Repository" for January. In nothing is its contents, the brilliant editor gives us the following: "It has our acceptance of the challenge thrown out by Benjamin Franklin, the Campbellite editor of Cincinnati, to the whole platform we agree with him [Bro. Crowell] to produce a single instance from the volume of God, of one human being loving God, or repenting, without faith, or in unbelief. The writer shows himself as one who thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, with great clearness and force." Thus depose Rev. Crowell, editor of the Watchman. But his testimony is *experte in casu*. He is the gentleman who wrote the sermon on the "Order of Conversion," in which he maintained that repentance is before faith. The more muddy, or foggy it is, the clearer it appears to him; the more weak and invalid it is, the more force it has to him. When a man's head becomes so confused that he thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, we expect dark to appear light to him, muddy to appear clear, and weakness to appear forcible.

We should like very much to see this clear and forcible document, in which our sophistry is pointed out, and we vouch to point out the sophistry of Mr. Ford and Mr. Crowell both. The Repository no more comes to our office! The last light we have had from that office, was a letter written to a Disciple to induce him to subscribe for the Repository, assigning as a reason that the editor poor and has no backer but his Master, and he wants means to aid him in his plans to kill Campbellism. Success attend the pernicious thing killed sometime, so will he and his brethren Graves and Crowell, may not any longer swindle their brethren out of money, for killing Campbellism, and then not do it! It is too hard for them to perform a miracle. He may put us down as a subscriber on condition that we pay when Campbellism is killed, dead, dead.

Evidences of Christianity. NUMBER II. PROP. VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son.

This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to deceive men. If he performed works entirely above the power of a man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou dost, except God be with him." John iii. 1. When this ruler said, "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc., he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did, that he was from God.

John ix. 16, some of the Jews inquired, saying, This man is not of God, because he does not do the signs that he does. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons, that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he did just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he is a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." John ix. 24, 25. In this passage, we have the position of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles. Mark ix. 22: His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance, they admitted "the doing of a miracle," but attributed the power to an evil agency.

To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies with reference to the apostles doing a miracle. They say, "What shall we do with these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, in manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Acts iv. 16.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW. CINCINNATI, JANUARY 26, 1858.

TERMS FOR THE REVIEW. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS. Write the Name of the Subscriber, Post Office, County and State, both where the Paper is sent, and where it is to be sent. When you see a Red Pencil Mark on the margin of the Review, you will please understand that two more numbers should be sent, unless otherwise directed. The Paper will stop, unless ordered again.

The "Watchman" is published in the issue of January 14th of this month, and contains the "Christian Repository" for January. In nothing is its contents, the brilliant editor gives us the following: "It has our acceptance of the challenge thrown out by Benjamin Franklin, the Campbellite editor of Cincinnati, to the whole platform we agree with him [Bro. Crowell] to produce a single instance from the volume of God, of one human being loving God, or repenting, without faith, or in unbelief. The writer shows himself as one who thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, with great clearness and force." Thus depose Rev. Crowell, editor of the Watchman. But his testimony is *experte in casu*. He is the gentleman who wrote the sermon on the "Order of Conversion," in which he maintained that repentance is before faith. The more muddy, or foggy it is, the clearer it appears to him; the more weak and invalid it is, the more force it has to him. When a man's head becomes so confused that he thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, we expect dark to appear light to him, muddy to appear clear, and weakness to appear forcible.

We should like very much to see this clear and forcible document, in which our sophistry is pointed out, and we vouch to point out the sophistry of Mr. Ford and Mr. Crowell both. The Repository no more comes to our office! The last light we have had from that office, was a letter written to a Disciple to induce him to subscribe for the Repository, assigning as a reason that the editor poor and has no backer but his Master, and he wants means to aid him in his plans to kill Campbellism. Success attend the pernicious thing killed sometime, so will he and his brethren Graves and Crowell, may not any longer swindle their brethren out of money, for killing Campbellism, and then not do it! It is too hard for them to perform a miracle. He may put us down as a subscriber on condition that we pay when Campbellism is killed, dead, dead.

Evidences of Christianity. NUMBER II. PROP. VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son.

This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to deceive men. If he performed works entirely above the power of a man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou dost, except God be with him." John iii. 1. When this ruler said, "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc., he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did, that he was from God.

John ix. 16, some of the Jews inquired, saying, This man is not of God, because he does not do the signs that he does. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons, that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he did just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he is a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." John ix. 24, 25. In this passage, we have the position of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles. Mark ix. 22: His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance, they admitted "the doing of a miracle," but attributed the power to an evil agency.

To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies with reference to the apostles doing a miracle. They say, "What shall we do with these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, in manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Acts iv. 16.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW. CINCINNATI, JANUARY 26, 1858.

TERMS FOR THE REVIEW. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS. Write the Name of the Subscriber, Post Office, County and State, both where the Paper is sent, and where it is to be sent. When you see a Red Pencil Mark on the margin of the Review, you will please understand that two more numbers should be sent, unless otherwise directed. The Paper will stop, unless ordered again.

The "Watchman" is published in the issue of January 14th of this month, and contains the "Christian Repository" for January. In nothing is its contents, the brilliant editor gives us the following: "It has our acceptance of the challenge thrown out by Benjamin Franklin, the Campbellite editor of Cincinnati, to the whole platform we agree with him [Bro. Crowell] to produce a single instance from the volume of God, of one human being loving God, or repenting, without faith, or in unbelief. The writer shows himself as one who thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, with great clearness and force." Thus depose Rev. Crowell, editor of the Watchman. But his testimony is *experte in casu*. He is the gentleman who wrote the sermon on the "Order of Conversion," in which he maintained that repentance is before faith. The more muddy, or foggy it is, the clearer it appears to him; the more weak and invalid it is, the more force it has to him. When a man's head becomes so confused that he thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, we expect dark to appear light to him, muddy to appear clear, and weakness to appear forcible.

We should like very much to see this clear and forcible document, in which our sophistry is pointed out, and we vouch to point out the sophistry of Mr. Ford and Mr. Crowell both. The Repository no more comes to our office! The last light we have had from that office, was a letter written to a Disciple to induce him to subscribe for the Repository, assigning as a reason that the editor poor and has no backer but his Master, and he wants means to aid him in his plans to kill Campbellism. Success attend the pernicious thing killed sometime, so will he and his brethren Graves and Crowell, may not any longer swindle their brethren out of money, for killing Campbellism, and then not do it! It is too hard for them to perform a miracle. He may put us down as a subscriber on condition that we pay when Campbellism is killed, dead, dead.

Evidences of Christianity. NUMBER II. PROP. VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son.

This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to deceive men. If he performed works entirely above the power of a man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou dost, except God be with him." John iii. 1. When this ruler said, "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc., he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did, that he was from God.

John ix. 16, some of the Jews inquired, saying, This man is not of God, because he does not do the signs that he does. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons, that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he did just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he is a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." John ix. 24, 25. In this passage, we have the position of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles. Mark ix. 22: His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance, they admitted "the doing of a miracle," but attributed the power to an evil agency.

To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies with reference to the apostles doing a miracle. They say, "What shall we do with these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, in manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Acts iv. 16.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW. CINCINNATI, JANUARY 26, 1858.

TERMS FOR THE REVIEW. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS. Write the Name of the Subscriber, Post Office, County and State, both where the Paper is sent, and where it is to be sent. When you see a Red Pencil Mark on the margin of the Review, you will please understand that two more numbers should be sent, unless otherwise directed. The Paper will stop, unless ordered again.

The "Watchman" is published in the issue of January 14th of this month, and contains the "Christian Repository" for January. In nothing is its contents, the brilliant editor gives us the following: "It has our acceptance of the challenge thrown out by Benjamin Franklin, the Campbellite editor of Cincinnati, to the whole platform we agree with him [Bro. Crowell] to produce a single instance from the volume of God, of one human being loving God, or repenting, without faith, or in unbelief. The writer shows himself as one who thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, with great clearness and force." Thus depose Rev. Crowell, editor of the Watchman. But his testimony is *experte in casu*. He is the gentleman who wrote the sermon on the "Order of Conversion," in which he maintained that repentance is before faith. The more muddy, or foggy it is, the clearer it appears to him; the more weak and invalid it is, the more force it has to him. When a man's head becomes so confused that he thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, we expect dark to appear light to him, muddy to appear clear, and weakness to appear forcible.

We should like very much to see this clear and forcible document, in which our sophistry is pointed out, and we vouch to point out the sophistry of Mr. Ford and Mr. Crowell both. The Repository no more comes to our office! The last light we have had from that office, was a letter written to a Disciple to induce him to subscribe for the Repository, assigning as a reason that the editor poor and has no backer but his Master, and he wants means to aid him in his plans to kill Campbellism. Success attend the pernicious thing killed sometime, so will he and his brethren Graves and Crowell, may not any longer swindle their brethren out of money, for killing Campbellism, and then not do it! It is too hard for them to perform a miracle. He may put us down as a subscriber on condition that we pay when Campbellism is killed, dead, dead.

Evidences of Christianity. NUMBER II. PROP. VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son.

This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to deceive men. If he performed works entirely above the power of a man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou dost, except God be with him." John iii. 1. When this ruler said, "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc., he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did, that he was from God.

John ix. 16, some of the Jews inquired, saying, This man is not of God, because he does not do the signs that he does. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons, that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he did just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he is a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." John ix. 24, 25. In this passage, we have the position of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles. Mark ix. 22: His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance, they admitted "the doing of a miracle," but attributed the power to an evil agency.

To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies with reference to the apostles doing a miracle. They say, "What shall we do with these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, in manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Acts iv. 16.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW. CINCINNATI, JANUARY 26, 1858.

TERMS FOR THE REVIEW. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS. Write the Name of the Subscriber, Post Office, County and State, both where the Paper is sent, and where it is to be sent. When you see a Red Pencil Mark on the margin of the Review, you will please understand that two more numbers should be sent, unless otherwise directed. The Paper will stop, unless ordered again.

The "Watchman" is published in the issue of January 14th of this month, and contains the "Christian Repository" for January. In nothing is its contents, the brilliant editor gives us the following: "It has our acceptance of the challenge thrown out by Benjamin Franklin, the Campbellite editor of Cincinnati, to the whole platform we agree with him [Bro. Crowell] to produce a single instance from the volume of God, of one human being loving God, or repenting, without faith, or in unbelief. The writer shows himself as one who thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, with great clearness and force." Thus depose Rev. Crowell, editor of the Watchman. But his testimony is *experte in casu*. He is the gentleman who wrote the sermon on the "Order of Conversion," in which he maintained that repentance is before faith. The more muddy, or foggy it is, the clearer it appears to him; the more weak and invalid it is, the more force it has to him. When a man's head becomes so confused that he thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, we expect dark to appear light to him, muddy to appear clear, and weakness to appear forcible.

We should like very much to see this clear and forcible document, in which our sophistry is pointed out, and we vouch to point out the sophistry of Mr. Ford and Mr. Crowell both. The Repository no more comes to our office! The last light we have had from that office, was a letter written to a Disciple to induce him to subscribe for the Repository, assigning as a reason that the editor poor and has no backer but his Master, and he wants means to aid him in his plans to kill Campbellism. Success attend the pernicious thing killed sometime, so will he and his brethren Graves and Crowell, may not any longer swindle their brethren out of money, for killing Campbellism, and then not do it! It is too hard for them to perform a miracle. He may put us down as a subscriber on condition that we pay when Campbellism is killed, dead, dead.

Evidences of Christianity. NUMBER II. PROP. VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son.

This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to deceive men. If he performed works entirely above the power of a man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou dost, except God be with him." John iii. 1. When this ruler said, "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc., he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did, that he was from God.

John ix. 16, some of the Jews inquired, saying, This man is not of God, because he does not do the signs that he does. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons, that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he did just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he is a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." John ix. 24, 25. In this passage, we have the position of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles. Mark ix. 22: His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance, they admitted "the doing of a miracle," but attributed the power to an evil agency.

To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies with reference to the apostles doing a miracle. They say, "What shall we do with these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, in manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Acts iv. 16.

THE AMERICAN CHRISTIAN REVIEW. CINCINNATI, JANUARY 26, 1858.

TERMS FOR THE REVIEW. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00. Per year, for a single copy, \$1.00.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS. Write the Name of the Subscriber, Post Office, County and State, both where the Paper is sent, and where it is to be sent. When you see a Red Pencil Mark on the margin of the Review, you will please understand that two more numbers should be sent, unless otherwise directed. The Paper will stop, unless ordered again.

The "Watchman" is published in the issue of January 14th of this month, and contains the "Christian Repository" for January. In nothing is its contents, the brilliant editor gives us the following: "It has our acceptance of the challenge thrown out by Benjamin Franklin, the Campbellite editor of Cincinnati, to the whole platform we agree with him [Bro. Crowell] to produce a single instance from the volume of God, of one human being loving God, or repenting, without faith, or in unbelief. The writer shows himself as one who thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, with great clearness and force." Thus depose Rev. Crowell, editor of the Watchman. But his testimony is *experte in casu*. He is the gentleman who wrote the sermon on the "Order of Conversion," in which he maintained that repentance is before faith. The more muddy, or foggy it is, the clearer it appears to him; the more weak and invalid it is, the more force it has to him. When a man's head becomes so confused that he thinks a man can repent or love God without faith, or in unbelief, we expect dark to appear light to him, muddy to appear clear, and weakness to appear forcible.

We should like very much to see this clear and forcible document, in which our sophistry is pointed out, and we vouch to point out the sophistry of Mr. Ford and Mr. Crowell both. The Repository no more comes to our office! The last light we have had from that office, was a letter written to a Disciple to induce him to subscribe for the Repository, assigning as a reason that the editor poor and has no backer but his Master, and he wants means to aid him in his plans to kill Campbellism. Success attend the pernicious thing killed sometime, so will he and his brethren Graves and Crowell, may not any longer swindle their brethren out of money, for killing Campbellism, and then not do it! It is too hard for them to perform a miracle. He may put us down as a subscriber on condition that we pay when Campbellism is killed, dead, dead.

Evidences of Christianity. NUMBER II. PROP. VIII. Jesus of Nazareth is God's Son.

This is proven by his performing works such as none but God could perform. An impostor could not, in his own strength, perform a miracle. God would not aid an impostor in performing a miracle to deceive men. If he performed works entirely above the power of a man, some greater power than man was with him. If he performed wonders requiring Almighty power, then Almighty power was with him.

1. But where is the evidence that he did perform wonders requiring Almighty power? The first evidence is, that impartial men admitted it. Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, said, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do these miracles which thou dost, except God be with him." John iii. 1. When this ruler said, "We know that thou art a teacher from God," etc., he evidently spoke of himself and others, who knew from the works that Christ did, that he was from God.

John ix. 16, some of the Jews inquired, saying, This man is not of God, because he does not do the signs that he does. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? Here is an acknowledgment on the part of impartial persons, that Jesus performed miracles. The miracle he did just performed was opening a blind man's eyes. Let us hear the testimony of the blind man. The Jews said to him, "Give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner. He answered and said, Whether he is a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see." John ix. 24, 25. In this passage, we have the position of the Jews and the testimony of the blind man that Jesus opened the blind man's eyes.

2. Violent opposers admit that Jesus performed miracles. Mark ix. 22: His enemies alleged that "he cast out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In this instance, they admitted "the doing of a miracle," but attributed the power to an evil agency.

To this we will add an admission of most bitter enemies with reference to the apostles doing a miracle. They say, "What shall we do with these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them, in manifest unto all them that dwell in Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Acts iv. 16.

Vertical text on the right edge of the page, likely bleed-through or marginalia.

