cannot now walk on the same side of the street. Yes, they will feast at the same table who could not break bread together on earth. There sits John Calvin and John Wesley side by side in a close *tete-a-tete*, not far from where Michael and Gabriel are conversing, & their followers on earth biting & devouring one another! 'Tis a dream; but perhaps a true one—and for my part I am got so sick of all this partyism that henceforth, and forever, if the Lord will, I will never conduct myself towards any professor who walks piously, in such a way that I should feel ashamed to sit at his side, or at his feet in the King's own country.

OBITUARY.

DIED at Indianapolis, Ia. Sept. 16th, MRS. NANCY MITCHELL, wife of DR. S. G. MITCHELL, aged 46 years. It is due to the memory of that intelligent lady to state, that as a wife, a mother and citizen, she sustained an unblemished reputation. In her intercourse with society, and at all times she was governed by the principles of our holy religion. For some months previous to her death, her health was bad; but the sudden death of her only child, MRS. ELIZABETH PORTER, hurried her down to the grave. She lived a christian, suffered patiently as a christian; and with unexampled composure left the world.

TO POSTMASTERS.

☞SOME Postmasters have been in the practice of charging double postage for this work. This is improper—the "*Christian Messenger*," is printed on a single sheet, of duodecimo form, (24 pages to a sheet,) and is consequently only subject to a postage of 1 1-2 cents a number, when not sent over 100 miles, and 2 1-2 cents over 100 miles. Post Masters are referred to the following letter from the Post Master General to the Editor of the "*Christian Baptist*."

General Post-Office Department, August 2, 1827.

SIR—Every 24 duodecimo pages of a pamphlet shall be considered a sheet. See the 15th section of the Post-Office Law. The cover is not rated The "*Christian Baptist*" of November 6, 1826, published at Buffalo, Va. contains 24 duodecimo pages, and is therefore one sheet and no more, and must be rated with postage accordingly, viz: for any distance not exceeding 100 miles, 1 1-2 cents, and for any greater distance 2 1-2 cents.

Yours respectfully, JOHN M'LEAN.

REV. A. CAMPBELL, *Bethany, Va.*

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. II.] GEORGETOWN, KY. DEC 1827. [NO. 2.

AN HUMBLE ADDRESS TO THE VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTIANS IN AMERICA.

NO. II.

From the last No. our design may be seen, which is a plea for the religion of Heaven—the religion of love, peace and union of God's family on earth. That this is the religion of the Bible no Christian doubts; and none can doubt that this is not the religion of the present day, nor of centuries past. We are glad that the attention of the christian world is turned to this subject, and the inquiry now is, what shall we do that we may regain the pure religion of the Bible? To this inquiry we have answered,—

1st. That we must cease to judge each other according to our peculiar faith or opinions of truth, and learn the long neglected precept of Jesus, to judge according to our works. We proceed to answer the inquiry more fully.

2d. It is absolutely necessary, in order that Christians may be united, that they know their real situation. This is a subject of delicacy, from which many, for various reasons, have turned their eyes. We feel it a heavy cross; but the love of truth, the glory of the church, and the salvation of souls, overbalance, in our mind, every other consideration. Did we consult our honor, or profit, or worldly pleasure and ease, we should also be silent. But these are transient trifles in comparison with truth and its everlasting blessings.

We are fully convinced that for many centuries the christian world have been, and yet are in Babylon, MYSTERY-BABYLON; and while they are there, the union of christians on Bible principles, can never be effected. Old Jerusalem, called the City of God, was called by the prophet, Sodom, because she resembled Sodom by her wickedness. So the New Jerusalem, or Church of God, is called Babylon, because she resembled that city in her spirit and conduct. The resemblance is very striking to every honest ob-

server." The first account we have of Babylon, or Babe (which literally signifies confusion) is to be found in Gen. xi. Pride and vain glory were then the spirit of Babylon.—"And they said, go to, let us build us a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto Heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." The spirit of mystery-Babylon is the same. The builders of this city, or as it is called, the church, are determined to make it great, not for the Lord, but for themselves, in order to make them *a name*, or that they may become famous in the world. Before the old Babylonians began their city, it is said, "The whole earth was of one language and of one speech," Gen. xi. 1. So before the builders of Spiritual Babylon began their work, the whole church of God was of one speech and of one language—the language of the New Testament. God, for the pride of old Babylon confounded their language. They no longer could understand one another; they could not build together, nor enjoy each others society. They were consequently divided into parties, and separated one from another in different directiogs. All was now confusion; each party vieing with the other, who shall be the greatest. Has not the same confusion existed even since the day of Constantine; when spiritual Babylon took its rise? Then their language was confounded. Bible language and terms would no longer do. If any should doubt, let him read the Athanasian Creed—let him read the jargon of the schools—let him read the controversies, carried on between the different sects from that to the present day, and his doubts will be removed.

The spirit of Babylon was more clearly manifested in the time of her king, Nebuchadnezzar. He must have an established religion in all his vast empire. He set up a monstrous image, and commanded all to worship it according to the modes and ceremonies prescribed by himself; and if any refused he must suffer a painful death. Persecution to death was a short but powerful argument. Look at mystery Babylon ever since her rise, the same spirit for an established religion, and the same spirit of persecuting them who will not submit to it, has appeared. A religion established by law is by our happy constitution forbidden; but the spirit of it is apparent in every party establishment throughout America. Persecution to death for religion is also forbidden; but the very spirit of it is seen in the bitterness, clamor and strife of the parties against each other.

We speak facts. Let a member of any of our petty establishments dare to think for himself, and should see an error in the creed of his party; let him but dare to publish it; how soon is he denounced, excluded from society, and his name cast out as evil! This is persecution for not submitting to the established religion of the party. It is impossible that every party can defend and establish itself by scripture-arguments; for this would make the scriptures clash as much as their clashing systems. Arguments similar to Nebuchadnezzar's can only support them.

Old Babylon was ultimately destroyed by the righteous judgment of God. Mystery-Babylon too is to be destroyed by the judgment of the Almighty. The desolation of old Babylon was so entire, that its ruins cannot be found. The desolation of Mystery-Babylon shall be so complete, that its place shall not be found on earth forever. O! let us hear the warning voice of heaven, "COME OUT OF HER MY PEOPLE, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."—Rev. xviii. 4. Too long have our eyes been directed to Rome when we have read of Babylon. Thus have we deceived ourselves. As the spiritual Jerusalem is only known by the character she bears; so spiritual Babylon is to be known in the same way.

You may be ready to say that we are reproaching christians of all sects in the world by representing them as in Babylon. If it be a reproach, the scriptures, not we, have given it. For the very language, "*Come out of her* (Babylon) *my people*," implies that his people are in her. They must come out, they will come out, before the glorious millenium, so earnestly looked for by the pious, shall commence. It is not in our heart to offend nor wound one christian on earth, unless the truth should have that effect. The fear of offending has kept the world in ignorance on this and other subjects of importance. Be convinced of the lamentable fact, and obey the voice of God by coming out of Babylon. You are well convinced that the 1260 years are not expired—you are convinced that the woman has not yet come up out of the wilderness—you are convinced that the *man of sin* is not yet revealed and destroyed—that the reign of Antichrist is not abolished—that Antichrist is not confined to Rome; for if Rome be Antichrist, so are the *orthodox* in the whole world. Antichrist is thus defined by the inspired John, "He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the

Son.—I John II. 22. But the church of Rome believes in the Father and in the Son, as the orthodox do. Their faith on this doctrine is the same. The reign of Antichrist is very extensive. O that Christians would lay these things to heart! But the question recurs, What shall we do?

EDITOR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

From the Baptist Recorder.

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO A. CAMPBELL.

LETTER V.

Brother Campbell.—It would afford me greater pleasure to correspond with you, had I more leisure to read and meditate. The whole of every day in the week, together with four nights, is occupied in my various round of duties. But not to detain you with apologies, permit me to notice a sentence in your reply; it is this: "I," say you, "attribute to *Creeds*, in the proper acceptation of the term, ALL the divisions and strifes, partyism and sectarian feeling of the present day; ALL the havoc of human life, and ALL the horrors of the inquisition in the cause of religion, during many centuries before we were born."

Sweeping declaration; and fraught with self condemnation. Can it in truth be said, that your writings have never produced "strifes and divisions?" If not, does it not follow from your own deduction, that your writings are *de facto*, really and truly a creed, in the proper acceptation of the term? A word to the wise is sufficient.

The creed question has long been agitated in Kentucky—the subject has been worn thread bare by Barton W. Stone, and his disciples, the Arians of the West. They preached and prayed against creeds and confessions; taught the all sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the only rule of faith and conduct: attempted the establishment of churches according to the ancient order of things. But what is the History of these reformers? Did they content themselves with the pure unadulterated word of God? By no means; Mr. Stone, Kincade and others, manifested the real grounds of their hostility to creeds: they did not believe the sentiments contained in them. The doctrine of the Trinity they abhorred; the divinity of Jesus Christ was denied; the atonement was rejected; the operations of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration of the human heart were deemed useless; and in fine, after having attempted a refutation of the *fundamental truths* of the gospel, the creed of the party was developed. I call them a party; for such they are, notwithstanding their imposing name; a sect, they are, influenced by sectarian views and feelings, as much as any other sect in this western country. I did hope brother Campbell, that in your reply to Mr. Stone's letter, you would have contended earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. You cannot conceive how much I felt myself disappointed. Surely you have lost the sword of the Spirit, or have not courage to wield it. You saw that in defending the doctrine of Christ's divinity, you would of necessity fall into the creed making plan; You well knew the history of Arius and his adversaries in the field of disputation. You shrunk; I feel sorry; not that I wished to make a boast of the accession which might be made to the creed cause, but because my soul desired to see truth triumphant over error. Is it a matter of small importance, whether Jesus Christ be the God whom we worship, in whom we trust, or that he be a created being? Stone and all his party, deny that Jesus Christ is God—whole sermons of several hours length have been delivered to disprove the divinity of the Saviour. I am grieved brother Campbell, that you did not reply to Mr. Stone in full—what will be their exultations when they see, that you have abandoned the field to Mr. Stone—that you did not take even one fire before you fled.—Beware, my brother, lest you be ensnared, lest you be caught in the net of Mr. Stone.

SPENCER CLACK.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

REPLY:

TO ELDER SPENCER CLACK, EDITOR OF THE BAPTIST RECORDER.

SIR:—In your No. of October 13, 1827, we have read a letter over your signature, addressed to A. CAMPBELL, in which you manifest a great degree of anxiety and fear lest he be ensnared by us, and you lose one of the brightest ornaments of your connexion. In order effectually to deter him from adventuring too near this vortex of destruction, you pourtray us in the blackest colors, and, over his shoulders, attempt to stab and destroy our influence in society.—Brother Campbell, no doubt, smiles at your fears, and wonders why you should wish to retain him among you—a man

whom your paper has represented as unregenerated, and a promoter of strife and discord—a man, who is exerting his mighty powers to destroy the constitution or foundation of your churches—a man, whose view of gospel truth in general, differs as widely from yours, as the east is from the west—a man in fine, who professes "to be most sincerely attached to every one, who loves his Lord and Master, whether Baptist or Pœido-Baptist, New Light, or Old Light; and firmly determined to advocate the *restoration of the ancient order of things* to his last breath."

We feel bound to defend ourselves from your aspersions, in a plain style. To wound your feelings is not our object; but to defend what we deem the precious truth of the Bible.

You say, "The creed question has long been agitated in Kentucky—the subject has been worn thread-bare by Barton W. Stone, and his disciples, the Arians of the West."—We acknowledge that the question whether *human authoritative* creeds are not in opposition to the will of God, and the peace of the church, has been agitated for more than twenty years; and we rejoice that many advocates for such creeds (among whom you are considered one) are fairly beaten from their long establishments, and in fact, have yielded the point at issue. Your creeds are truly worn *thread-bare*, and are so pervious to divine light, that they will soon be rent and torn away as veils from all faces. You are pleased to call us "the Arians of the West." With respect to this name, we refer you to our last No. If we are Arians, so were the Fathers of the three first centuries.—This we have proved in our letters to Doct. Blythe; and if farther proof be necessary we are prepared to give it. We can prove, if proof be required, that Arius and his followers apostatized from the Apostolic faith, as believed and taught by the most influential Fathers of the first centuries. The Fathers believed that the Son of God, or Logos, derived his being immediately from the Father, and is therefore of the same specific divine nature. Arius believed that the Son was created out of nothing, and therefore is not the *only begotten son* of God, God's *own* son. You will find, Sir, by examination, that this is true, and the best and most patristical investigators have confirmed it. Does it not argue something worse than ignorance, to apply this name to us, to to whom, of all others, it least applies? We remember that the disciples of our Lord were butchered in multitudes because they were called *Christians*. We remember that Doct. Fishback and his church in Lexington were very recently rejected by the Elkhorn Association of Baptists, because they choosed to be called by no other name than the Church of *Christ*. We remember, also, when the Baptists in their days of humble piety and success in winning souls to the Lord, were called *New-lights*—So were the Methodists, and so were the zealous part of Presbyterians. You being now *unhappyily* freed from this reproach, cast it upon us, calling us *New-lights*. Indeed, sir, by calling us *New-lights* you confer on us an honor of which we feel unworthy—the honor of being ranked among the pious, despised and persecuted Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in their best days. We have taken the despised and rejected name of our Lord and Master; but men will call us by what names they please, but we hope to own none other than *Christian*.

You proceed to give bro: Campbell our history. No doubt he is as well acquainted with it as you are; for we shall make it evident that you are partially ignorant of it.

1st. You say in reference to us, "That they preached and prayed against creeds and confessions. This is true with regard to *man-made, authoritative* creeds; nor have we preached, nor prayed in vain, you being judge.

2dly. "They have taught (say you) the all sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the only rule of faith and conduct." And will you, Mr. Editor, presume to teach otherwise? Does not your Confession of faith teach this? Does not the Apostle Paul teach it, 1 Tim. iii, 16, 17.? Does not the great Head of his church teach it in Matt vii, 24, 25. We thank you, sir, for this honorable testimony in our favor.

3dly. "They have attempted the establishment of churches according to the ancient order of things." This is certainly a praiseworthy attempt; nor have our attempts been in vain; for some hundreds of churches within a few years have been thus established, which are living in peace and in the comforts of the Holy Ghost, and multitudes are daily added to them. We pity the confusion, which we see among the sects of the day, caused in a great measures by their man-made creeds.

4.th You say, "Did they content themselves with the pure unadulterated word of God? By no means." Pray, Mr. Editor, how do you know this? Have we made or received any other book, or any other form of doctrine than the Bi-

bl , as authoritative? Answer, if you please. If you deem us unworthy of a reply, do, sir, let us also be considered as unworthy of your notice in charging us wrongfully.

5th. You proceed; "Mr. Stone, Kincade, and others manifested the real grounds of their hostility to Creeds; they did not believe the sentiments contained in them." This we think a very good reason for renouncing a creed; to act otherwise, that is, to hold to a confession, and yet to disbelieve some of the sentiments contained in it, is a species of hypocrisy too base for an honest man to practise. Do not you, sir, reject the Methodist creed for the same reason we reject yours? But is this the only and real ground of your hostility to creeds? Where have we once expressed this? Do sir, inform us, and we will honestly acknowledge our error. If you do not, we shall cast your assertion into the sink of fabrications. Brother Campbell, in his reply to you, has spoken our mind on this subject, we shall add no more at present.

6th. You add, "The doctrine of trinity they abhorred." Pray, Mr. Editor, which theory of the doctrine of trinity have we abhorred? For you well know that the theories are various, discordant, and opposite, some of which, you, no doubt, reject with equal abhorrence with ourselves. But, sir, we ask again what is the doctrine of trinity we abhor? You will probably say, in accordance with your Confession, it is that there are three persons in one God, and one God in three persons. You know the modern and prevailing theory of trinity rejects the term *persons*, and has substituted *distinctions*. We acknowledge it a mere subterfuge, whither men of information have fled to avoid the absurdity of saying, there are *three persons* in one God. For they have clearly seen that the term *person* must be taken in the proper sense, as meaning an intelligent being; or in the improper sense, as meaning an unintelligent being. One or the other it must mean. The first leads to tritheism, or to the belief of three distinct independent Gods; the latter to atheism, or the denial of an intelligent God; for three non-intelligents, nor three thousand, can ever make one intelligent being. The term *distinctions* can never answer for a covering of the doctrine. For should we ask, are the three distinctions, Father; Word and Holy Spirit, each an intelligent being, or non-intelligent being? The answer will involve the same absurdities, as the term *persons* do.

This you may call speculation; and what else is your doc-

trine of three persons in one God, and one God in three persons? Cease from your speculations, and use Bible terms, and then we shall cease from ours, having no necessity for them. But when you hold up your doctrine, as the doctrine of revelation, and unchristianize all who reject it, we feel bound to expose it in its nakedness, and destitution of all claims to Bible truth. We do most firmly believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that these three are *one* in the very sense the great Teacher designed and explained in his prayer for believers, *that they all might be one, even as we* (the Father and the Son) *are one*. Now, Sir, tell us the passage in the Bible, where the Father and the Son are said to be one in any other sense. If not, you should confess you have wronged us, when you said we abhorred the doctrine of trinity. The fact is simply this, we have rejected the doctrines of men on this article. Indeed, Sir, it is time for us all to cease from *teaching for doctrine the commandments of men*, and more diligently read and cleave to the word of God.

7th. "The divinity of Jesus," you say, "was denied" by them. This charge is reiterated from Dan to Beersheba against us without proof, though again and again, from the pulpit and from the press, we have denied it and proved the contrary. Had you designed to do us justice, and to give correct information respecting our views of this subject, you would have stated them as we have done; or at least, you would have said that they denied that the *Son of the living God*, was the living God himself, or the only true God, which is the Father. John, xvii. 3. This we have denied, and some of our reasons you have seen in our letter to the Christian Baptist. You express great chagrin and disappointment that Brother Campbell did not come out and boldly refute them. Do, Sir, refute them yourself. We seriously invite you to the work. If we are wrong, we shall rejoice to be corrected. Your reward shall be sure, if you turn a brother from the error of his ways. Answer the queries proposed to Brother Campbell—answer them in the power and spirit of truth. We assure you, Sir, if our views are wrong here, they cannot be confuted too soon, for they are spreading like fire in dry stubble. Declamation and detraction—misrepresentation and innendoes—have ceased to have any weight with the intelligent; fair statements and scriotural arguments are expected. Remember that we im-

derstand the divinity of Jesus to be this, that he was God's OWN son, his ONLY begotten, and that in him, (the son) dwelt all the fulness of Godhead bodily.

8th. You go on—"The atonement was rejected" by them. We wonder, my dear Sir, at your temerity in making such assertions in a country, where our writings and preaching are so well known. Had you stated that we denied your notions of atonement, you had spoken correctly. You doubtless, with the orthodox, define atonement to be "a satisfaction, made by the death of Christ to law and justice in the stead of sinners." We define it to be a reconciliation effected in the sinner to his God, by the death of Christ: and the death or blood of Christ may be called the *atonement* or *reconciliation*, because it is the means by which reconciliation to God is effected by faith in his blood. Let us try our views by the only passage in the New Testament where the word *atonement* occurs. "And not only so, but we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the *atonement*."—Rom. v. 10. According to your views, it would read, By whom we have now received the *satisfaction* to law and justice. Quere:—Do *we* receive the satisfaction, or does God? Or, is the debt, which is demanded *from* us by law and justice, paid to *us*, and received by *us*; or is it paid to God and received by him? Your doctrine affirms the latter. Hence you may see how widely you and the Apostle differ. We say that *atonement* means reconciliation; and so the word, translated *atonement* in the passage just quoted, literally signifies, and is so translated in v. 10. To this no man of learning dare object. The New Testament every where represents us as reconciled or atoned to God by the death of his Son; but no where represents God as reconciled or atoned to us by the death of Jesus. Strange! that your doctrine, if true, has never been taught by Christ nor his Apostles! Passing strange! that you have ranked it among the fundamentals of the Gospel—a doctrine, says Dr. Murdock, unknown in the world till the eleventh century. We refer you to our "Address," 2 Edition, and Letters to Dr. Blythe for correct information of our views on this subject. Do, Sir, make yourself acquainted with them before you publish such groundless assertions, lest some may think that the article you have published on slander on the same page with your letter to Bro. Campbell, may too justly apply to yourself.

9th. "The operations of the spirit in the regeneration of the human heart were deemed useless" (by them.) Is it possible that a Minister of Righteousness, acquainted with our views on this subject, can make this barefaced assertion?—If unacquainted with them, how can he presume to do it?—The people who hear us and read our writings know better. Do, Sir, read the 4th and 5th sections of our Address, 2 Edition, on this subject, and you will confess you have wronged us. If any among us hold the doctrine with which you charge us, we know them not. If we knew them, we should as sincerely oppose them as you do. We believe that sinners are dead in trespasses and in sins; but not so dead but that they can hear and believe the gospel, and through faith, receive the Spirit, by which they are regenerated and saved. If this be not the truth, as stated in the Bible, we have yet to learn the meaning of language.

You are pleased to call us a "party, or sect, influenced by sectarian views and feelings, as much as any other sect in the Western country." If we are such, we are as blameworthy as any other sect in the Western country, yours not excepted. A man gives a poor excuse for drunkenness by saying another gets drunk. If partyism or sectarianism be a crime, do, sir, purge yourself from it before you object it as a reproach to another. The Christians of old were called a sect, while they were laboring to teach and live the religion of their Lord, and to discountenance and oppose every thing contrary to his revealed will. But a true church of Christ never was, and never can be, *voluntarily* a sect from the body of Christ; for this is contrary to the nature and laws of his kingdom. Had we voluntarily separated from the body of Christ, and formed ourselves into a distinct church, governed by laws of our own making; and should we reject a Christian, because he could not receive and be governed by our laws, then might we be called a sect in the worst sense of the word. All such churches are sectarian, and apostate from the true Church of Christ. By this we do not mean that there are no Christians in these sectarian Churches. No: for even in *Mystery-Babylon* the Lord's people are found; for says he "Come out of her my people."

For a while we bid you adieu. You shall hear from us again in our next number; in which we shall say something respecting the worship of the Son of God, and prove from the scriptures that to worship him as a distinct Being from

the Father, is not idolatry, but a duty enjoined by the Father; and which duty, rightly performed, is to the glory of God the Father. We may notice several other particulars in your letter to Brother Campbell. We are yours to love and serve in the gospel of our Lord.

EDITOR.

QUERIES PROPOSED FOR INVESTIGATION BY A WORTHY BROTHER:

1. Is war right or wrong in the kingdom of Christ?
2. Is slavery right or wrong according to the New Testament?
3. Did Christ forbid swearing, or taking an oath in every sense?
4. Is the washing of feet an ordinance of God; to be observed in his church?

These are queries of importance, to which the attention of the great and good has long been turned. Nothing new can now be advanced. War and slavery have been reckoned among the greatest evils in the world. We believe that nothing pure can proceed from an impare fountain. James says, "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" Jas. iv.—We read "that wars shall cease to the ends of the earth" in the reign of Christ. Now if war was a moral good, the gospel would not put an end to it. The gospel is the ministration of peace, its author is the God of peace, Christ is the prince of peace, the Church of Christ is the kingdom of peace, and its subjects are the children of peace, the fruits of the spirit are love, joy, &c. If all the world were real christians, wars would of course cease, and peace universally reign. The gospel aims a death blow at the very root and principle of war, as all must agree, yet if an assassin were to enter our houses to kill us, our wives or children, should we not act right in endeavoring to defend ourselves and families? If this be justifiable in a family, it would be equally so in a neighborhood attacked by a band of assassins; and if this be justifiable in a neighborhood, a nation would be justified in repeling by force the aggressions. This is war; and this is the point which has divided the opinions of men. We have stated this purposely to elicit information from intelligent brethren. We wish such to communicate to us their ideas briefly, as we wish all communications to be as concise as possible.

Query 2nd. Is slavery right or wrong according to the New Testament?

Ans. Slavery as punishment for crimes; such as is practised in the penitentiary of our State, we think justifiable and right. But African slavery as practised in America, we with all Christians, are assured is wrong, according to the New Testament. To attempt to prove this position in this enlightened day, we think would be an imposition on the judgment of our countrymen. To find a remedy for the evil, now employs the attention of our nation. To emancipate the slaves among us would be to open the flood gates of incalculable evils both to the emancipated and the emancipators. Though we have evinced our hostility to slavery by emancipating those under our power; yet we should be the first to leave the land, in which this should become universal. The only effective remedy for the evil is the colonizing plan. To this the attention of our country is now turned, and colonization societies are formed and yet forming throughout the nation. It is believed that our Congress can, and will aid in the laudable work, and that this evil of our land will be removed; and will become a blessing to Africa, where the light of heaven shall be carried by those, transported thither, and settled in a fertile land. The experiment is made, and hundreds have been taken there, and are happy in the enjoyment of liberty. Their children are all at school, and peace, health and plenty smile upon the colony. Let all christians aid in this work—let every church become a colonization society—Heaven will bless them more abundantly—Africa will bless them—and what has been the greatest evil, will be the cause of eternal thanksgiving and praise. The conscientious christian will give up his slaves to the colonization society, who will have sufficient funds to send them to the mother society to be taken to the land of their forefathers. May the merciful God of heaven make the plan successful in removing the evil from our nation! Amen.

Query 3d. Did Christ forbid swearing, or taking an oath in every sense?

Ans. Profane and false swearing, and swearing when there is no necessity for an oath, is certainly condemned by the Scriptures. But in certain cases it appears to be proper and right. God cannot do wrong; yet he is frequently represented as swearing by himself in order to confirm the faith of his people. Gen: 24, 7. Jer: 22, 5. Exod: 24. 7, 9. 13, 5.

33, 1. Num: 14, 16. 32, 11. Deut: 1, 8. 6, 10. 7, 13. 8, 1, 18. 9, 5. 11, 9. 26, 3. 28, 11. 30. 20. 31, 21. 34. 4. Josh: 1. 6. 21, 43. Luk 1, 73 Heb: 3, 18. 6, 13. 7, 21. &c. Angels swear by his name. Dan: 12. 7. Rev: 10. 6.—God's people are very often presented as swearing by the name of the Lord and that according to his will and command. Deut: 6. 13. 1 Sam: 20. 3. Ps: 132. 2. Heb: 6. 16. &c.—The popish custom of kissing the Bible in swearing, and the light and irreverend manner in which oaths are administered and taken in our courts on trifling matters, we disapprove, believing that by this the very design of swearing is lost.

Query 4th. Is the washing of feet an ordinance of God to be observed in his church?

Ans. On this subject but little is said in the New Testament. In John 13, it is recorded, that Jesus washed the disciples' feet, and said, "Know ye what I have done unto you? Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well; for so I am. If I then your Lord and Master have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done unto you."—Here is certainly a precept and an example given by the great Teacher of the world to his disciples.—That this was observed and practised in the Church afterwards appears from 1 Tim: 5, 10, where it is ranked among good works. "Let not a widow be taken into the number under three score years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet—" &c. Hence it appears that women as well as men practised the washing of feet in the days of the Apostles. How long it continued afterwards we know not; nor should we be careful to know. If it be found in the New Testament, it is enough for us, without farther inquiry.

But how and when shall it be performed? On this question there is a diversity of opinion. We know a very conscientious Christian preacher, who believes this to be a divine ordinance. He has long practised it in the following mode. If a christian brother calls to tarry with him for a night, after family prayer, he girds himself with a towel, and in a bason of water washes the brother or brethren's feet, before they retire to rest. This surely fulfils the precept. Others practise it in a different mode. On the night after the Lord's supper, they meet. The preacher girds himself with a towel, and having water prepared, proceeds to wash the feet of some brother—the sisters at the same time washing the feet of sisters. The exercise is mingled with songs of praise.—How often and when, and where it should be practised by the brethren is not declared.

We are not certain that it is an ordinance imposed on the Church. It is evident that the washing of feet has been practised from the days of Abraham to the time of our Savior. Gen: 18, 4. 19, 2. 1 Sam: 25, 41. compared with Luk 7, 44. The latter verse reads thus; "And he turned to the woman, and said unto Simon, seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet; but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head. Thou gavest me no kiss, but this woman since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint, but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment." From these passages and that in 1 Tim: 5, 10, it is evident that entertaining strangers, kissing them, and washing their feet with water, were reckoned then among the common acts of hospitality, salutation and friendship. These the Savior wished forever to be observed by his disciples, and therefore gave them an example in Joh: 13.—In this nothing uncommon was done.—The washing of the feet was considered a great comfort to those who travelled over the burning regions of the east, with sandals instead of shoes. We think that the mode, practised by the brother mentioned above, as nearly fills the design as we can conceive. EDITOR.

Cabbin Creek, Nov. 13th, 1827.

Bro: Stone—I want your opinion on Rev. 19, 15. I have heard it expressed that our Savior trod the wine-press of the fierceness of the wrath of the Almighty God alone, when he hung on the cross. This I do not understand. I want you to send it in our Christian Messenger. MARY MAPLE.

—

Dear Sister—With your wishes we shall endeavor to comply. The passage to which you refer, is—"And he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." In reading the Revelation to John in Patmos, three grand enemies of the Church of Christ are described—the Red-dragon—the Beast—and mystery Babylon. The Dragon supports the Beast, and the Beast supports mystery-

Babylon. In chapters 17 and 18 the fall of Babylon is described. On her God first pours his indignation. In chapter 19 the judgment and fall of the beast are described; against which the Son of God, called the Word of God, with his armies, is represented as engaging in battle and overcoming. In the 20th chap. the conquest of the Dragon is described.—By the Wine-press is figuratively expressed the dreadful judgment of God upon his enemies, under the beast. As grapes in the wine-press are trodden and pressed, so that the red liquor flows in streams and stains the garments of the vintners; so shall the enemies of God be trodden and pressed, and their blood is represented as flowing in streams and staining the garments of the conqueror. Thus is the Son of God represented in Isai 63, 1—6. This event in the Revelation is certainly yet to be accomplished, and therefore could not have taken place at the crucifixion of Christ.

Your brother and servant for Jesus' sake, EDITOR.

REVIVALS.

Extract of a letter from Elder David H. Hathaway to the Editor.

NOVEMBER 6, 1827.

BRO: STONE—On Cabin Creek since the third Lord's day in August, 10 or 12 have been added to the church, and the work still increases. On Stout's run in Adams co. Ohio, we have received 10 and immersed 9. The work is glorious. In short, within three months I think I have seen near 100 souls profess the religion of Jesus Christ. Lord! increase the work!

BROTHER STONE,

As it is encouraging to the friends of the Redeemer to hear of the influence of truth, upon the hearts and lives of men, I send you a few lines upon this subject, to be inserted in the Messenger.

Upon my return in September, from a long preaching tour to the East, I found the Church, at Concord, pretty much as I left it, and as it had been for some time before, making no advances in numbers or holiness. There were individuals, it is true, who were growing in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth, but as a Church, we were not prospering. The consequence of which was, that iniquity greatly abounded in our borders, and as a mighty torrent bore off the multitude

with it, and the Church possessed but little moral energy or influence, to withstand its desolating tide.

But, thanks be to the Author of all good, times took a happy turn in our favor, at our three day's meeting, which commenced on the Saturday before the third Lord's day of September. On Saturday and Lord's day, large congregations collected, and listened with great attention and seriousness, to the exhibitions of the Gospel. The brethren, many of them, seemed unusually affected, with a sense of the languishing condition of Zion, as well as the dangerous state of their neighbors, and neighbors' children, who were without God, and without hope in the world. None, however, professed the faith of the Son of God, till Monday; during which day, about seven or eight were brought to embrace the Lord Jesus as their Saviour, and were united to the Church. Since that time the good work has been progressing, and I have had the pleasure of burying about fifty-two men and women with Christ in Baptism; all of whom, save two, have been added to the Church of Christ, at Concord. Unusual seriousness pervades the neighborhood generally, and many are enquiring, "What must we do to be saved?" I indulge the pleasing hope, therefore, that in a short time, I shall see many more of my neighbors taking upon them the yoke of Jesus, and rejoicing in hope of immortality.

As a Church, we can truly say, "The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad." May the Lord carry on his good work here, and elsewhere, till sin and partyism, and superstition, and every thing which exalteth itself against God, may be driven from the earth; and all the followers of the Lamb, be united in *the one body, the one spirit, the one hope, the one Lord, the one faith, the one Baptism, the one God and Father of all, who is above all, and with all, and through all.*

Wishing you grace, mercy, and peace, from God, the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, I subscribe myself your brother, in the faith and hope of the Gospel,

JOHN ROGERS.

A LETTER TO PROCHORUS.

DEAR BROTHER—I have lately read your inquiries and remarks, directed to PHILIP, and the Editor of the Chr: Messenger, on the subject of Conference, Preaching, and Church Government. As you seem willing, not only to make, but also to answer inquiries, I wish to propose a few for your

consideration, with a hope of eliciting information. In reading your communication, which is now before me, I gather the following as your sentiments on the subjects above named:

1. That men are now specially called of God, by the immediate suggestions of his Spirit, to the Gospel Ministry:

2. That persons thus called, act under the commission given to the Apostles; and

3. That a conference or convention of Elders is necessary, and authorized by the Head of the Church, to settle question of particular importance, to induct men into the Gospel Ministry, and to depose them from it.

I am well aware that these propositions, which I am about to call in question, are venerable by reason of their age and popularity; and that to support them, the learning, the talents, the eloquence, the interests, the feelings and prejudices, of the popular sects of the day, are all arrayed.

I approach them, therefore, with some degree of fear, as to the result. Not that I fear the result of a candid investigation, whether it be against or in favor of my sentiments: for truth is my object; and neither truth nor its votaries have any thing to fear from investigation. I fear the result only where partyism, with its unhallowed train, is up in arms, to condemn every thing, without any trial, merely because it may be conceived to be in opposition to its interests. But, Sir, so far as this investigation shall be confined to you and me, I have nothing to fear, but something to expect. For you, Sir, have long since called in question your infallibility. You will therefore weigh what I shall present, in the scales of the sanctuary, before you will either give your approbation of, or put your veto upon it. I will come immediately to the subject of this communication.

1. In the first place, we will make some inquiries and remarks in relation to the proposition that men are specially called of God to the Gospel ministry. I will premise, however, before I proceed farther, that the idea attached to the proposition just stated, in popular use is about this: that God directly, by the immediate suggestions of his Spirit, convinces the man, whom he has set apart for himself, that he is a chosen vessel to preach the Gospel. Now I would enquire, Does the New-Testament afford an instance of any man being specially, or directly called of God to preach the Gospel, or for any other purpose, who had not evidence of his call, which addressed his outward senses? If there be such instances, I have overlooked them.

The Apostles were called by the Saviour while in the flesh, and so were the Seventy. "Follow me," (was his language to the fishermen,) "and I will make you fishers of men."—He appeared to Saul, and said, "Arise, stand upon thy feet, for I have appeared unto thee, to make thee minister," &c. But, have the preachers of the present day, ever heard a voice saying, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men?" Has the Saviour ever said to them, I have appeared to you, to make you ministers? Certainly not.

If we have no evidence then, that any were ever directly called to the ministry, by the Saviour, of whom we have any account in the New Testament, who had not evidence of their calling, which addressed their outward senses, how can we claim to be specially called to preach the Gospel? We have heard no voice—we have seen no miracle. In a certain sense, it may be said, that we are called by God to perform every religious duty, because our duty is pointed out to us in the Gospel, which is the voice of God, or of his Spirit. But something very different from this, I apprehend, is meant by a special call to the ministry.

2. I would enquire, Does the New Testament, afford an instance of any who were called to the Gospel ministry, who were not enabled by the Spirit, by which they were called, to teach infallibly? We think not. Hence there is no discrepancy in their teachings; and if we reject their instructions, it is at our peril. But, do Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist preachers, who all claim to be called of God, teach infallibly? And are we bound to receive their instructions, as those of an Apostle? Most assuredly we are not: And thanks to heaven for it; for if we were, who then could be saved?

3. Were not those, who were called by the Saviour to the ministry, furnished with power to work miracles, and to confirm their mission? The Apostles and the Seventy were thus furnished. But have modern preachers such power? No: for we cannot heal the sick, nor raise the dead. How then can we expect to be credited when we say we are moved directly by the Holy Spirit to preach the Gospel?

4. If men are now, specially called of God to the ministry, why was Paul so particular in his Epistles to Titus and Timothy, in pointing out the qualifications of a Bishop?—You will probably answer, to direct the Church and the Elders, in choosing, or setting apart men to the work of a Bish-

op. Very well. But is not this in effect giving up the point, that God specially calls? For in such cases, recorded in the New Testament, *the called* never conferred with flesh and blood; they never were brought before an ecclesiastical court to have their claims to a special call investigated.—Indeed, such an act, on their part, in going before a spiritual court, would be to cast contempt on the Spirit of God; and on the part of the court to require it, would be presumption. But enough at present, upon this point. We will now consider—

2. The proposition, that preachers, in the present day, act under the commission given to the Apostles.

That this is your opinion is clear from the remark, "Their (the preachers') commission is, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."

1. In the first place, I would inquire, if modern preachers act under the commission given to the Apostles, with what propriety are they called Bishops or Overseers?—There were Bishops, or Overseers ordained in every Church, by the Apostles, or others by their directions Now, does not this imply that the labors of those Overseers, were chiefly confined to the respective Churches, in which they were ordained? But had the Apostles any particular charge?—Did not the care of all the Churches come equally upon them? And did they not travel through them all, and thro' the whole world? Yes, verily (says Paul) their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world. But, what would you think of an overseer who would leave his charge and travel through the world?

2. To be a little more particular, the commission given to the Apostles, may be divided into two parts, viz: *mandatory* and *promisory*. The former in these words: "Go ye, therefore, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you"—And the latter in these: "And Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world." The first points out the duties, which the Apostles were to perform.—The latter, the aid which they were to expect, in the performance of those duties.—Now in tracing them, in the prosecution of their commission, we readily see what is implied in the promise, "Lo! I am with you," &c. For it is said in the last verse of Mark's Gospel, "And they went forth, and preached every where, the

Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following—Amen."

Here then, sir, we have a view of the commission given to the Apostles, and consequently of that also (if you be correct) under which modern preachers act.

3. Then should not modern preachers go into all the world, literally, and preach the Gospel to every creature, as did the Apostles? Should they not also expect the same divine aid, and be enabled to perform the same divine works, of their predecessors, the Apostles? And as the Apostles were law-givers in the Church, have not Ministers now, acting under the same commission, the same right of law-making?

4. If so, does it not come to pass that the Roman Catholic Church, is the only true Church, and that the Pope has assumed nothing? For, if any can claim to act under the commission of Peter, or to be his legitimate successor, the Pope has greater pretensions; and as such, he only claims the right which was given to Peter, of opening and shutting the Kingdom of Heaven—of giving laws to the Church, which Peter did also.

But having covered so much paper with my inquiries concerning the two first propositions, I will pass over the third for the present. I will close this letter by observing, that however Prochorus may view the sentiments it contains, he will, I doubt not, receive it and attend to it, in the same spirit of christian friendship which dictated it.

Your brother, in search of truth, and in hope of immortality,

TIMOTHY.

From the Gospel Banner.

In a former communication, I promised to show in a future number, that honest differences of opinion were not the principal cause of the divisions and dissensions in the Christian Church; but that evil is to be traced to some other source. There is no doubt, but, in the present divided state of Christians, many come to a determination with what society they will associate, from conscientious motives; after a careful inquiry to know the truth. Having satisfied themselves upon this subject, they join in church fellowship with those whose spirit and practice they judge most conformable to the law of Christ. But how many there are who make the inquiries, which society is the most popular; what church stands highest in the estimation of the world; which course will best

comport with the respectability of my character; how shall I be most likely to forward my views of worldly interest; what church adopts those ordinances and forms of worship, that will be least crossing to the feelings of my mind? More inquiries, of this description, than we could name, present themselves to the mind; and they have, in many cases, more influence than the subject of them, is himself aware of. Thus in the very outset, many individuals espouse the interest of a party, from motives widely different from an honest conviction of truth.

It has frequently been witnessed, that members of one society have anathematized the sentiments, which are embraced generally, by another body of christians; and yet retain, in their fellowship and communion, individuals, who embrace the very same sentiments which are deemed heretical. The church whose opinions are denounced are excluded from all christian connection and fellowship; the individual is embraced, as a good christian, and a brother in the church. In this case it cannot be an honest difference of opinion, that occasions the division and strife; for the individual must be denounced, as well as the *deemed heretical church*. But this we do not often find to be the case. But if it be urged that they have acceded to the confession of faith, adopted by the church to which they belong, though in some things they think differently; this only makes the matter worse, for they have added to the evil of their heresy, a species of hypocrisy.

We find this difference in opinion existing not only in the case of individuals in a particular assembly; but in large bodies of christians. We find in the same body of christians, all the shades of difference in opinion, from the highest toned Calvinist to the lowest Arminian, or the mere moralist. But difference arising from this variance of sentiment, are easily obviated, where no views of personal ambition interfere, to cause contention. The extremes of those different sentiments, place those who embrace them, perhaps, as far from each other, as almost any sentiments that we could name. The strife has been as severe and hard contested upon this subject, as any subject in the christian's faith.

Thus, when I discover a portion of the professors of christianity, who have associated themselves with a particular denomination of christians; from motives entirely different from a conscientious agreement in particular doctrinal points; I think I discover evidence that honest difference of opinion does not furnish the ground for their separation from, and contention with others.

When I hear preachers crying "*go not after them nor follow them*," "they are heterodox in sentiment, they are wolves in sheep's clothing; and at the same time seek to proselyte those who are converted through the instrumentality of those very wolves in sheep's clothing; and retain in their communion individuals who embrace the doctrines denounced; I think it is not honest difference of opinion that occasions the division, and engenders the strife; it must be derived from some other source.

When I see an extensive body of christians acting in concert, who in their particular views depart from each other as far as the rankest Calvinism and the rankest Arminianism are apart; I think they furnish evidence that some more powerfully operating cause exists, for inducing division and strife among the followers of Christ.

This other powerfully operating cause, I will, if permitted, consider hereafter. O.

OBITUARY.

Elder James Dickinson, an able minister of the New-Testament, has gone from labor to reward. He died Oct. 31st, 1827, at the house of bro: Joel Ellis on Cape Caphon, Hampshire county, Virginia. He was a native of Ohio—he became a member of the church of Christ in that state in the 21st year of his age, and commenced preaching two years afterwards. He travelled to the east—was ordained in Virginia—took charge of a church in Philadelphia, and labored much in Baltimore. Borne down by labor in the gospel, his weakness becoming so great, he was obliged to desist from preaching, and practised medicine in Shenandoah county, Va. His disease, the consumption, increased on him till he was unable to attend to his business in that line; and after a short time he with perfect composure of mind, sunk under the hand of death. His companion has lost an affectionate husband—society a worthy citizen—the public a skillful physician—and the Christian Church, a faithful member, and an able minister of the New-Testament. His life was active, and filled up with usefulness, and his death was happy and triumphant.

The communication of Elder Wm. Kincade was received too late for a place in this No. It shall appear in our next.

NOTICE.

All letter communications to W. D. Jourdan must be sent to Locust-shade, Overton co. Tenn.

PROSPECTUS

OF

THE GOSPEL LUMINARY,

VOL. I.—NEW SERIES.

To be devoted to subjects Experimental, Doctrinal, Historical, Biographical, Miscellaneous and Political,

BY DAVID MILLARD & SIMON CLOUGH.

CONDITIONS.

THE GOSPEL LUMINARY, in the proposed form, if suitable encouragement be given, will be published once in two weeks, on a half sheet of imperial size, folded in quarto form, the first number to be issued in January, 1828.

2. It will be afforded to subscribers at one dollar a year, payable on the receipt of the first number, or one dollar and twenty-five cents, if not paid within six months from the time of its commencement.

3. To be fowarded to any part of our country where conveyance is practicable by mail; postage paid by subscribers.

4. Agents who obtain ten subscribers, and become responsible for the pay, will be entited to the *eleventh* and *twelfth* for their trouble, and for all above that number, every sixth.

5. Every preacher in standing with the people known by the name of *Christians*, is an authorized agent for this work; and any person wishing to obtain it, may apply to any of them.

6. Returns should be made to Simon Clough, city of New-York, No. 206 Cherry street, by the middle of December next.

ERRATA IN VOL. 2, No. 1.

P. 18, line 9 from bottom, read *of* instead of *or*.
P. 21, lines 22 and 23, blot out *as*.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. II.] GEORGETOWN, KY. JAN. 1828 [No 3.

AN HUMBLE ADDRESS TO THE VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF CHRISTIANS IN AMERICA.

No. III.

IT is hoped that some impression is made on the minds of our serious readers from attention to our last number, with respect to the lamentable situation of the people of God; and that they seeing the evil, are disposed to reform, and unite according to the will of God. The inquiry now is—on what ground shall we unite? Or, in what creed shall we agree? It is evident that the Presbyterians cannot receive the Creed of the Methodists, nor can the Methodists receive that of the Presbyterians; nor can the Baptists receive the Creed of either of the other sects, nor either of these sects receive that of the Baptists. So of every other sect established on a creed. On any of these grounds or creeds, it is impossible for the various sects to unite. To us it appears equally impossible for them to form a creed to which every sect would cordially subscribe, and on which they could unite. The history of the church from the commencement of creeds proves this fact. For 300 years after Christ the church had but one authoritative creed, which was the Bible. Though they had different opinions of some truths, yet in the spirit of forbearance, they generally lived together in love and worshipped together in peace. But since the council of Nice in 325, when the first authoritative creed was formed, peace and union have forsaken the church, and war, strife, division and confusion, have succeeded to the disgrace of chrstianity, and to the shame of its humble professors.—Creeds and parties increase with time, and yet new parties rise and new creeds are formed.

But we will suppose that all the various sects should harmoniously agree to unite on the Creed or Confession of the Presbyterians; will this creed keep them in union. No. Witness the various parties of Presbyterians who are as far from union and communion, as any other sects on earth, and yet they all hold to the same Confession, but form different