REPRINT OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER

PUBLISHER'S STATEMENT

It is our conviction that the writings of such men as Barton W. Stone and others who contributed from the fields of labor into the pages of *The Christian Messenger,* constitute some of the richest and most significant material this side of the New Testament.

The Christian Messenger reprint represents the combined efforts of hundreds of people. First, locating a complete set to photograph was a long search—a job we *never* attained! So far as our several months' research revealed, there is no extant complete set of these books in any one collection. Our work of photo reproduction was accomplished through "a little here, a little there," working from the basic set graciously made available by Roscoe Pierson, Librarian, Lexington Theological Seminary, Lexington, Kentucky. Among others helping in tracing down and supplying original copies were Enos Dowling (Lincoln Bible College), Lester Galbraith (Christian Theological Seminary), R. L. Roberts (Abilene Christian University), and Don DeWelt (Ozark Bible College), Wm. B. Miller (Presbyterian Historical Society), and David McWhirter, (Disciples of Christ Historical Society).

Especially grateful are we to R. L. Roberts, first for his urging that we coordinate the reprinting of the set, and second for producing a general index to the entire series. This required long hours of reviewing articles on his microfilm copy and assigning appropriate titles. The original indices at the end of each volume, as the reader will observe, were vague and inadequate. The general index is at the end of volume 14.

Sincere appreciation is expressed also to the hundreds who have entrusted us at Star Bible with their orders, a vote of confidence that gave us renewed courage and strength. We pray that these men of the early Restoration Movement will be duly honored, that many wise men will be led to their Savior, and that Jehovah's Name may be glorified through His Church now and evermore.

Alvin Jennings
Star Bible Publications
Fort Worth, Texas 76118

Dec., 1978

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: 3.] GEO: TOWN, K. NOV. 1828. [No. 1.

TERMS OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

1. ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 Nos
2. All communications, except from agents, to be post-paid.
3. For every ten subscribers obtained by any one, who will as agent collect the money he shall have one for his services

INTRODUCTION.

We have closed the second volume, and have commenced the third. We shall pursue the same course in this as in the former volumes, only we shall not dwell so lengthily on doctrinal points of controversy, as we were compelled to do in the last volume. Yet similar circumstances may dictate to us a similar course. The difficulties of an editor are greater and more numerous than were anticipated by us before we commenced the CHRISTIAN MESSENGER. Many pieces are sent us for publication, which we cannot view so worthy of notice as their authors do, and therefore do not give them a place in our columns. For this neglect we incur the displeasure of our best friends, and lose their patronage. We find it impossible to please all our readers, so various are their tastes and notions. Our agents, (some of them) cannot feel our interest; therefore neglect to make collections; to advise us of such of our subscribers as have discontinued; and to obtain new subscribers. By not advising us of such as have discontinued we have sent hundreds of Nos. abroad, which are entirely lost to us. Many subscribe, but never take the Nos. when sent them. We seriously thought of giving up the publishing of the MESSENGER at the close of the 2d vol: but our friends have prevailed with us to continue it. Our thanks to the majority of our agents and patrons are due, and to them they are cordially tendered. Were they to fill up with other subscribers the place of those who discontinue.

they would lay us under additional obligations, and enable us to prosecute the work. Those of our agents and patrons who have hitherto neglected us will please to attend to us in future. If not, our loss must be serious and oppressive. We have received but little more than half for the first vol. yet, and not near the half for the 2d. Preachers and others, who feel any interest in the work, are requested to get good subscribers in different neighborhoods. They are entitled for every ten subscribers, to one vol. gratis. The terms are the same as before, one dollar for twelve numbers, the money paid at the delivery of the 6th No. Postage paid by the subscribers. The postage is 1 1-2 cts. each No. in the state, and in any other state under 100 miles; but over 100 miles 2 1-2 cts. a No.

We will endeavor to render the MESSENGER as profitable as in our power. No pains shall be spared. We hope after the timely notice given in the Messenger that none of our subscribers will subject us to farther loss by refusing to take the present volume. EDITOR.

The following Address was delivered before the SYNOD OF ULSTER, at their late session, on the subject of the introduction of a TEST:

Mr. *Fletcher Blakely*, (of Moneyrea,) spoke to the following effect: I rise to oppose the amended overture with the best of my ability; and, in doing so, while it is well known that I am no Trinitarian, I wish it to be understood that I am not a disciple of Arius or Socinus. As gross misrepresentations, however, of the sentiments of these persons have been made in this assembly, I may, before I conclude, claim your indulgence in stating them from some authorities that cannot fairly be disputed. This may be deemed a departure from the question: but I do, notwithstanding, pledge myself to keep closer to it than any speaker that has gone before me. And, in pursuing this course, I must forget all popular feelings which have been so frequently and so shamefully appealed to, and speak as if in the hearing of God alone, whose all-seeing eye is every where present. I have heard, Sir, much pompous declamation concerning religious liberty, and the right of private judgment; but as nothing definite has been said, I am at a loss to know whether the gentlemen who have supported the amendment, mean their own religious liberty and right of private judgment, or those of their

brethren. In either case, I would humbly recommend them to remember one beautiful passage of Scripture; "If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's." Notwithstanding the high sounding phrases which have been used in connexion with religious liberty, I am surprised that this liberty is so badly understood and so sadly abused. In the exercise of the right of private judgment, I have taken Christ for my Master; and, however much some may be alarmed, I tell you candidly and boldly, that I have *now no liberty to serve other masters:* and I trust, that neither the fear of persecution nor of death shall influence me to break my engagement, and choose Synods or Councils in his stead. "One is my Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren; "No man can serve two masters;" Even the Apostles, who were divinely inspired, said to the early disciples, "not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy."

I have heard long and loud speeches respecting the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as a perfect rule of faith and practice; and, if I be not much misinformed, there have been long and loud lectures delivered, by some of my orthodox brethren now present, to convince the Roman Catholics of the perfection of the Sacred Scriptures for these purposes. But how unaccountably strange is it, that these very gentlemen are attempting to establish, in this place, the very things which they wished to free the Roman Catholics of in another place. It would be a most glorious boast, if their conduct were in unison with their profession; but the gentlemen who are one moment strenuous in urging the importance and sufficiency of the Scripture in all matters of religion, are, the next, noisy in advocating the necessity of human creeds and confessions. Be it remembered, that Jesus Christ is, to every humble disciple, not only "the *author*, but the *finisher* of his faith." "All Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works:" not merely furnished, but *thoroughly* furnished. Besides, if this amended overture contains nothing but what is in the Scriptures, it is superfluous; and, if it contain any thing contrary to the Scriptures, it should be rejected. If any suppose the Scriptures not plain enough to be a rule and

centre of union, how shall we mend the matter? Can we express the ideas of Jesus Christ in clearer and better terms than himself? Can we express the ideas of his Apostles, who wrote and preached under the inspiration of God in plainer and better words than they? Can we put our ideas on an equal footing with any of these? Can we improve that which we declare to be perfect? If all the Synods and Councils in the world should make this presumptuous attempt, that cannot have any concurrence. For there can be no medium between an earthly fallible head of the Church, and the sufficiency of the word of God: if any such medium can be found, let it be pointed out. No individual in this large assembly dare assume the right of dictating to me in matters of faith; and if no individual will attempt it, how can numbers create the right? You might as well, Sir, think to make an arithmetical sum out of noughts. We must understand the Scriptures before we can make a *rule* by which the Scriptures are to be understood; and yet, according to the views of my brethren on the other side, we must apply that rule for understanding the Scriptures, which we must have understood before it was made! This is evidently most strange and preposterous. If we cannot bind a man's conscience by the divine word of God, no human composition, however excellent, can bind him: and, in proportion as we fix our affections on human and fallible creeds, and tests, and articles, in the same proportion must we forget the divine and infallible creed contained in the Holy Bible. And it is absolute mockery to grant the right of private judgment in the examination of the Bible, and then reproach and injure a man, because he cannot see every passage in the same light as his neighbor, who is as liable to err as himself.

It has been said, that the object of human creeds is to establish *uniformity*. When and where, Sir—in what church or country, or kingdom, has this uniformity been established? Attempts without number, have been made: and they have failed. The celebrated Lord Chatham, when speaking in his capacity as a senator, said, of one of the most learned churches in the world, "we have a calvinistic creed, a Popish Liturgy, and an Arminian clergy." There may be a pretended uniformity, there may be an usurped authority, which may injure the best feelings of our nature, and hurt the best charities of life. But what want of uniformity has been exemplified in the supporters of human tests and standards, and of this strange and unexpected overture, may be seen before we conclude, by appeals to the living and the dead. Before I proceed to notice this pretended uniformity, I beg leave to notice the singular sentiments of my friend, Mr. Barnett; for whose head and heart I have a high regard. He has urged the great dangers of Arianism, and the great advantage of a church being of the same faith,—of one mind. How strange is it, that Mr. Barnett left a church, professing to be of one mind, and volunteered in uniting to one, where there is such a variety of opinion, and in which there are so many dangers! [Hear, hear, from all quarters.] I say to him if he be so much alarmed, repent and return to that church pretending to uniformity. I am utterly astonished at the expressions of Mr. Francis Dill, in referring to the Confession of Faith as the ancient standard of this Church. He has pleased his youth in asking information; but I must tell him, and, in doing so, I do not wish to wound his feelings, nor those of any other individual in this large assembly, that, on account of his age, I wonder at his ignorance. This Church, I tell him, was long established before the Confession of Faith was compiled, and even before the present translation of the scripture was made. I might have referred him to the sexton of my congregation for information on these particulars. I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence and I shall now proceed, under your protection, to give some authorities to prove the shamefulness of the attacks that have been made upon me and my friends, and how fruitless have been the attempts at uniformity among Trinitarians themselves. I am asked to name my authorities, and I reply, that I shall be happy to lend the original works to any gentleman who call the authorities in question.

Can any one really believe that the Unitarians are to be classed with infidels? Is a man, who believes that Jesus was a teacher sent from God, that he taught the words of eternal life, that he wrought miracles, that he was raised from the dead, that he ascended into heaven, and that in due time he will return to raise the dead and judge the world, and who governs his conduct by the faith and hope of the gospel, is this man no christian? is he to be regarded as a blasphemer and an infidel? Lardner, whom all parties agree to praise, has done more to establish the truth and to exemplify the spirit of Christianity, than almost any

writer since the age of the apostles: Yet, Lardner was an Unitarian; he believed no Trinity. And if Lardner, and they who think with Lardner, are to be excluded from the pale of Christian communion, who is entitled to admission? In a dark and barbarous age, when ignorance and bigotry were universal, and a degraded laity were the abject slaves of a miserable and unlettered priesthood, nothing was too absurd for an arrogant priest to teach, or an ignorant and priest-ridden layman to believe. But that hour is passed. And it is rather too much for a man of sense and learning, who knows any thing of the world, in the present liberal and inquisitive age, to affect to thunder out anathemas upon those who hold different opinions from his own, and to consign to everlasting torments men whose characters are unimpeached, merely because they cannot subscribe to his metapysical creed, because they prefer the doctrine of Dr. Wallis to that of Bishop Gastrell, the doctrine which was formerly approved by the University of Oxford, to that which has lately been sanctioned by the University press.

Let every man, according to the Apostolic rule, "freely enjoy his own opinion." Let Unitarians believe with Dr. Wallis, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are no more three distinct intelligent persons than that the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, are three Gods: and let Dr. Sherlock and his partisans believe, if they like, that the three persons of the Trinity are as much three distinct infinite minds, as Peter, James, and John are three men. Let the Athanasian believe that the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty, and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty; while Dr. Burnet and his followers maintain that the Son and the Holy Ghost are created beings, and are Gods, only by the indwelling of the Father's Godhead. Let Bishop Horsley and his admirers contend that the Father produced the Son by contemplating his own perfections, and refuse to assign a reason why he produced no more than one. Let Bishop Gastrell and Dr. Moysey believe, *if they can*, that the *Father* 'includes the whole idea of God, and *something more;*' that the *Son* 'includes the whole idea of God, and *something more;*' and that the *Holy Ghost* 'includes the whole idea of God, and *something more;*' while altogether, they make up one complete God, and *nothing more*. And let Bishop Burgess, on the contrary, believe, *if it be possible*, that the *Father* is a

person, but '*not a being*,' the *Son* is a *person*, but '*not a being;*' and the *Holy Ghost* is a *person*, but '*not a being;*' and that these personal non-entities make *one perfect being*. Let Mr. Heber maintain, if he pleases, the extraordinary position, that the Father is the first person in the Trinity, the Archangel Michael the second, and the Angel Gabriel the third: let all these gentlemen, and their numerous adherents, enjoy their respective opinions with the most unrestrained freedom: let them profess their principles as publicly as they please, and let them propagate these doctrines with zeal proportioned to their apprehended importance; but let them, at the same time, beware not to exceed their just limits; let them not invade the rights of their neighbour; let them not set themselves up as lords over other men's consciences; let them not presume to erect the little shiboleth of their own party as the test of evangelical truth; let them not usurp the authority of Christ, and reject those who acknowledge him as their master and head, and who yield ready and unfeigned assent to whatever doctrine it is proved that he has taught, but who assume to themselves that liberty of judgment which they concede to others, and who cannot see the evidence of many opinions, which pass currently for the peculiarities of the Gospel, and upon which many are disposed to lay the greatest stress.

Besides the authorities which I have now quoted, to prove the *want of uniformity* of faith among those who have subscribed the same human tests, I must acknowledge, Sir, that I am ashamed to notice the strange, paradoxical, and contradictory arguments that have been advanced, by different orthodox members, against Arians, Socinians, and Unitarians. I must assert, and I do it with humility and charity, that they are utterly unacquainted with the systems to which they have referred. In Dr. Evans' well known sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, under the article on Arianism, it is stated "Arius owned Christ to be God in a subordinate sense, and considered his death to be a propitiation for sin. The Arians acknowledge that the Son was the *Word*, though they deny its being eternal; contending, that it had only been created prior to all other beings. Christ, say they, had nothing of man in him, except the flesh, with which the Logos, or word, spoken of by the Apostle John, was united, which supplied the rest. The Arians, though they deny that Christ is the *eternal God*, yet they contend

against others for his *pre-existence*. His pre-existence they found on the two following passages, among many others:—'*Before* Abraham was, I am:' and the prayer of Jesus—'Glorify me with the glory, which I had with thee *before* the world began.' These, and other texts of a similar kind are, in their opinion, irrefragable proofs that Christ did actually exist in another state before he was born of the Virgin Mary, in the land of Judea." But, without longer detaining you on this point, one of our brethren, notwithstanding their boasted uniformity, says, we are Atheists, that is having no God; another says, we are Deists, that is having a God; and, however unaccountable it may be, Mr. Elder whose age obliges me to respect him, has said, we are both Deists and Atheists, that is having at the same time, a God, and no God. One orthodox member says, we deny Christ: another says, we believe in Christ: the former says, that we rest for salvation upon the merit of our own good works, though he should know that, without exception, we trust for salvation to the free, unpurchased mercy of God, as revealed in his word. The latter charges us with denying good works, though he should remember that disgraces and degradations have been confined to his orthodox brethren. (Order, order.) Yes, confined to his Trinitarian friends. To crown the uniformity, an aged member has, in his own peculiar manner, called us Infidels, though he expects to meet us in heaven.

I must again, Sir mourn, and lament, and deplore, that men, professing Christianity; that Ministers of the Gospel, and who have had opportunities for obtaining information, should expose themselves by making such rash and erroneous statements. This moment, one judging by the inhabitants of our bleak mountains and sequestered glens, tells us, that we are decreasing. The next, another, judging by the 500 Unitarian Congregations of England, and the 1000 of America, and which have been erected in less than 50 years, talks of danger with alarm; I tell these gentlemen, that, were all the Arians and Unitarians of this island flung to the north-star, they cannot prevent men from judging for themselves. Mr. John Brown has had recourse to arithmetic, as an argument in favour of his cause; and, if he wish, according to his own observations, to be influenced by numbers, he should pass from Presbyterianism into the Church of England, and from that into the Church of Rome, where he may add the Virgin Mary to the number of his Gods. It is more

than marvellous, that he should have recourse to the arguments of numbers being on his side, when he must be aware, that the history of science, and the history of religion, puts this claim of the majority to the blush, and shows that the propagation of Christianity was the work of *individual minds*, in opposition to the will and wishes of the *multitude*; that Copernicus and Gallileo advanced philosophy under a persecution which was popular; and that Luther and Calvin, and Zuinglius, brought on the Reformation, when opposed by the great mass of the people. Even the hatred of one the Trinitarian Church to another has been pressed forward, as an evidence and a zeal, to prove the truth of the Trinity: and, I must say, if railing will pass for criticism, reproach for argument, and contradiction for proof, that to these gentlemen I freely yield the victory. *They* may appeal to the public feeling; *we* appeal not from Festus to Cæsar; but from man to God. And, I add, that I have, in some measure, been confined in my present views, by the immortalities of Trinitarians, and rejoice in having brought persons to the table of Christ, who were driven almost into unbelief, by the crimes and creeds of the Orthodox. What now, Sir, shall be said of this boasted uniformity! On my right hand, I see Calvinists with their five points; on my left, I see Arminians with their opposite five points, and claiming on both sides, the names Orthodox and Evangelical. Nay, more—much more; they all lay claim to the influence of the Holy Spirit. Were not this a mere pretence, we should have a sure and safe guide to uniformity. But one orthodox spirit is frequently at variance with another orthodox spirit, though both the spirits pretend to be of God. They may pretend what they please; but as for us, we must return to Moses in the Law, and to Christ in the Gospel. Personal piety is mentioned in the amended overture, and is, undoubtedly, of great moment. But to those who wish to encourage it in others, I would respectfully remark, that humility is the first lesson which we learn from diligent reflection, and self-distrust the first proof we give of having obtained a knowledge of ourselves. I could speak many hours on the question before the house, but am aware that your time is too precious to claim such indulgence. I invite, however, any of my orthodox brethren to meet me with his bible in his hand, and discuss with me the important points at issue.

From the Gospel Luminary.

It will be recollected by our friends, who have been made acquainted with the proceedings of the *synod of Ulster*, at their session in 1827, that the subject of introducing a religious test into the association, for the purpose of preserving Calvinism, which for some time past has been in a declining state, was refered to the next year. At their late session the subject was called up, and gave rise to a long and spirited debate. It was finally decided in favor of introducing the test.

Thus we perceive that while all Christian nations are abolishing the laws against dissenters, the sticklers for orthodoxy, are endeavouring to support a falling doctrine, by resorting to the old expedient, of introducing a confession of faith. The consequence of this is, to unchristian all who do not subscribe to it, in the estimation of the creed supporters, by which means brethren are separated, divided, and set at variance the one with the other. The following are the principle articles, of this *abominable document:*

3. "That before any person be recognized as a candidate for the Ministry, he shall, previously to entering a theological class, be enjoined to present himself at our annual meeting, to be examined by a Committee of this Synod, respecting his personal religion, his knowledge of the scriptures, his views of the Trinity, Original Sin, Justification by Faith, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit; and likewise as to his motives, for offering himself as a candidate for the sacred office of the Ministry; and that should any such examinant be found opposed to those doctrines, or appear to be destitute of vital Godliness, he shall, in no case, be recognised as a candidate for the Ministry in this Synod.

4. "That students, after having finished their theological course, and their trial in the Presbytery, shall again present themselves for a similar examination before the same Committee; and it shall be the duty of that Committee to ascertain their soundness in the Faith, by requiring of them a statement of their views of the doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

5. "That if any person thus licensed be afterwards found not to preach the doctrines of the Trinity, Original Sin, and Justification by Faith, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, or to avow any principles in opposition to these doctrines, he shall not be continued in fellowship with this body.

6. "Persons who are already Preachers in this body, but have not been licensed according to these regulations, shall, previously to ordination, be required to undergo a similar examination.

7. "Should any person be licensed or ordained in opposition to these regulations, such licese or ordination shall not be deemed valid by this body."

For the Christian Messenger.

THE COMMUNION OF CHRISTIANS AT THE LORD'S TABLE—*NO. II.*

Having already given my reasons why I cannot go with the Pædo-Baptists in their plan of Communion, I shall proceed to present my objections to the Baptists' plan.

1. I object to the Baptists in their plan of communion, because, I conceive they are inconsistent with themselves. To make this manifest, it is only necessary to state the following plain facts, viz: That while the Baptists contend, that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and immersion into his name, are the only prerequisites or qualifications in order to the breaking of bread, they do, nevertheless, exclude from their communion table many Baptists, who have embraced the very same faith in the Lord Jesus, and received the very same immersion into his name with themselves!

For, it is well known that there are many Baptist churches in Kentucky, (and probably in other states also) which, although they do not belong to the "United Baptists," are, notwithstanding, of the same faith in almost every particular. Now how the Baptists can maintain their reputation for consistency, under these circumstances, I cannot imagine. For, if faith and immersion entitle the "United Baptists" to a place at the Lord's table, then most certainly, according to all just principles, the Separate Baptists, who have received the same faith and immersion with themselves, must have the same right at the Lord's table, though they have no connexion with them as a sect. But I look upon the Baptists as inconsistent with themselves in another respect.—This will appear evident from the mere presentation of the plain facts which follow: They tell us that faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world, and immersion into his name, only are necessary to church-membership, on "the breaking of bread;" yet they exclude a large body of christians from the Lord's table, who do most

conscientiously believe, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and Saviour of the world, who have been immersed into his name, and whose lives are holy and harmless! This to me is an irreconcilable inconsistency. It will not do for them to say, they have a right to require us to receive their explanation of the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God: For this were to say they were infallible, and had a divine right to dictate to the Universe in matters of religion. This is a right which all the different sects claim, but which belongs to none, thank Heaven, but Jehovah: And the fact that all sects have equal authority to claim this right of dictating to others, is a demonstration that none of them have it. The Baptists, therefore, who claim it, or any other people, give up, in effect the protestant cause as untenable, fall in ranks with the papists, and justify all their cruel persecutions of the people of God!! Such, before my God, I do believe are the legitimate consequences of this horrid doctrine, though innocently embraced by thousands of pious christians.

2. I object to the Baptists' plan of communion, in the second place, because it supports partyism. That the "United Baptists" are a sect is a fact which needs no proof; it is too plain to be denied by any, but those whose eyes are closed, by sectarianism to the plainest truths.

It being admitted then, that they are a sect, it follows of course, that as such, they cannot claim to be the Church of Christ, unless indeed, all the sects be churches of Christ, which we know cannot be.

To invite the Baptists, therefore, of any one congregation, and others from sister churches as Baptists, to come to the Lord's table, and partake of the emblems of the broken body and shed blood of the Son of God, is sectarian and anti-christian. For, when a Baptist church is invited to the Lord's table, a description of church is invited, about which the scriptures know nothing, and the existence of which they do not recognize. But what makes it still more manifest, that the Baptists' plan of communion supports sectarianism, is, that they invite their United Baptist brethren to commune with them, notwithstanding all their differences of sentiment, while they exclude other Baptists who do not differ from them as much as many of their own sect!

Now, in my view, this kind of procedure cannot be accounted for, upon any other than sectarian principles. The plain meaning of their course seems to be this: "They who

belong to our sect are worthy of a place at the Lord's table, because they are called United Baptists, but all other Baptists, whatever may be their sentiments and conduct, are utterly unworthy of a seat among us, because they are not called United Baptists—because they do not belong to our sect!!".

They exclude from their communion, the Pædo-Baptists, because they say, they never have entered the Kingdom of God, or the Church; but when they exclude Baptists from the table of the Lord, they are obliged to change their ground, and act upon perfectly sectarian principles. They cannot exclude the Baptists because they never have entered the church through immersion, they, therefore, have to do it because they do not belong to their sect!

3. But, in the third and last place, I object to the Baptists' plan, because, in effect, they deny that any are christians but the "United Baptists." They must either take this ground, or else maintain that they have a right to exclude christians from the Lord's table. One, or the other of the horns of this dilemma, they must choose. Should they choose the first, then they deny, or come in contact with their own acknowledged principles. For, it is well known by all, that *faith in the Lord Jesus, immersion into his name, and a life of holiness*, are, with them, *the characteristics of a christian, and entitle him to all the privileges of the house of God.* To say then, that none are christians but the "United Baptists" is to commence hostilities against their own principles, as well as against one of the plainest truths.

But should they choose the second horn of the dilemma, which is, that they have a right to exclude christians from the Lord's table, then we ask them to show this right. Here they will be more at a loss than ever. For, most assuredly, the scriptures give them no such right. But by every argument, by which they prove their privilege, as christians to eat bread and drink wine, in commemoration of the dying love of the Saviour, they establish the privilege of all other christians to do likewise. And, on the other hand, by every argument, by which they prove, that other christians have no right to take the supper, they prove, that they themselves have no such right. In this branch of the argument then, it all comes to this point: either *all christians* have a right to this ordinance, or *none*. But we know some christians have a right to this ordinance: Therefore all christians have it.

Here then, we have the Baptists, self-placed between the horns of this dilemma, from which, it is believed, they never can escape, till they abandon the ground they occupy.

TIMOTHY.

A FEW REMARKS ON A SERMON PREACHED BY MR. SAMUEL STEELE, ON BAPTISM.

NO. IV.—CONCLUDED.

Mr. S. (pa: 30) proceeds to speak of the design and mode of baptism. From the design he infers the mode. He thinks that baptism by water is a sign of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; or that it is an "*outward sign of inward purification* by the Spirit of the living God."

That baptism by water is a sign of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, or regeneration, has been long asserted, but, we think, without proof. That it is a sign of the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, is plain, as before shewn; and that it is the means through which God bestows pardon and salvation, is clearly shewn in the scriptures.—"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."—"Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."—"Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins."—"The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," &c. From these and similar texts it is abundantly plain that baptism is the appointed means of salvation, forgiveness, or the washing away of sin. Mr. S. "has heard of some teachers, who affirm that water baptism washes away sin." Yes; Ananias was one—and no doubt he has heard from a greater teacher that "thy faith hath saved thee."—Does Mr. S. think that the woman's faith saved her? or that it was the virtue which proceeded from Jesus through faith? Can he think that Ananias taught Saul that the water of baptism would wash away his sins? or that it was God's appointed means through which God would do it by the Holy Spirit? Did the waters of Jordan wash away Naaman's leprosy? or was it through this means that the power of God effected the cure? Many, like Naaman, object to the simplicity of the means, by which so great a work as regeneration can be effected. I ask in the language of scripture, "Can faith save us?" No: but "the grace of God through faith."—Can baptism save us? No; but the grace of God through obedience to this ordinance. God has bound himself by

promise that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he has not bound himself that every unbaptized person shall be damned, for "he that believeth not shall be damned;" it is not added, *he that is not baptized also shall be damned.* If he had thus decreed, there could be no hope for the penitent thief on the cross, nor for myriads of others.

Mr. S. having assumed the position, (I say *assumed*, not proved) that water baptism signifies the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, thinks that the mode of baptism is very plain, and that it is rightly defined by *pouring* or *sprinkling*.

1. Because, he asserts that the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is described by *pouring out the Spirit* upon the people.—Hence he infers that water baptism is done by pouring. If indeed Mr. S. in baptizing would pour on the person to be baptized such a quantity of water as literally to surround and cover him, this would fitly represent the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; for it is expressly recorded of this baptism that "it filled all the house where they were sitting."—Hence it is plain that those baptized with this Baptism were literally *immersed*.—"Water being merely the *sign* (says Mr. S.) it should be applied in such way, as to bear as close a resemblance as possible *to* the thing signified." p. 34. We think then that the closest resemblance possible, is not to pour a few drops of water on the person, but literally cover him over with it, as they were on the day of Pentecost with the Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

2. Mr. Steele has discovered that the commission given to the apostles to baptize all nations, was the fulfilment of a prophecy, (Isai 52. 15.). "*So shall he sprinkle many nations;*" and therefore, "that to sprinkle the water on the person is the scriptural mode of performing this ordinance. Now *pouring* and *sprinkling* convey two very distinct ideas; both cannot bear *as close a resemblance as possible to the thing signified.* We never read of the Holy Ghost being *sprinkled* on any; therefore sprinkling cannot resemble it. Had Mr. S. read this text (Isai 52. 15.) in the Hebrew, or even in the Septuagint translation of it, he would never have drawn such conclusions as he has done. The Hebrew word *nezе* in Hiphil (as in Isai 52. 15.) signifies *to cause to leap* or *exult*. It should be read, "*So shall he cause many nations to leap*—('1st. for joy and alacrity; 2dly. for desire and inclination towards; 3dly. for admiration and holy astonishment; all which views are clearly authorized by the use of the Arabic

dialect,' says Schultens)—*and kings shall shut their mouths at him* through wonder and veneration." See Park: Heb: Lex: on the word *neze*. The Septuagint translate the beginning of 15th thus: "*Houto thaumazontai ethnee polla ep' auto*"—"So shall many nations admire at him." See Parkhurst, and Bishop Lowth *in loco*. Parkhurst also quotes Coverdale's English Bible of the year 1535, thus: "*Even so shall the multitude of the Gentiles* loke unto *him*." To the same point Mr. S. introduces Ezek: 36. 24-26. "*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness*," &c. Mr. S. "has heard of some teachers, who affirm that water baptism washes away sin." I ask, if he himself has not plainly taught this doctrine in the application of the last mentioned text to baptism?

From the application of these two texts in the prophecies to the baptism ordained by Jesus Christ, Mr. S. concludes that the proper mode of administering this ordinance is by *sprinkling* or *pouring*, and not by immersion! p. 36.

We promised only a few remarks on this subject, nor do the limits of our work justify many. Yet we are forced to confess that, when the mode of christian Baptism is founded upon figurative expressions of old prophecies, to which no reference is made by Christ nor his Apostles, that foundation is built upon the sand. As well might we argue from the frequent bathings under the law, that if they did not refer to water baptism under the gospel, then one point of the law remains unfulfilled; as to argue that if the pouring on and sprinkling of the nations do not signify baptizing the nations that the prophecy remains unfilled. Mr. Steele's exposition of 1. John 5. 8. may pass for its value. To us it is without any degree of plausibility.

Mr. S next introduces the principle arguments of his opponents, for immersing only.

1. That the word *baptize* signifies primarily to *immerse*. This he denies in the face of a host of the greatest and most learned critics the world ever bore, and these too professed Presbyterians, Episcopalians and Catholics.—Doc: G. Campbell of Edinburgh, a pædo-baptist, whom none surpassed in biblical criticism, says, "that the word *baptizein* sometimes, and *baptein*, which is synonimous, often occurs in the Septuagint and Apocriphal writings, and is always rendered in the common version by one or other of these words, *to dip, to wash, to plunge*." Had the translators rendered the word

in the New Testament by the same version, much confusion had been avoided. His notes on this word we think are sufficient to convince any, that both in sacred and in classical authors, it signifies *to dip, to plunge, to immerse*. This is also the sentiment of the most learned pædo-baptists, as Doc's: McKnight, Whitley, Doddridge, Taylor, Beza, Luther, Calvin, and a host of others might be added.

But Mr. S. prefers a "thus saith the Lord" to all such authority. For this we give him our cordial approbation. Let us see his divine warrant for his practice. "a thus saith the Lord."—1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. "Moreover brethren I would not that you should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—Exod: 14 22. "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left."—"And the children of Israel *walked on dry land* in the midst of the sea." Mr. S. thinks this *a thus saith the Lord* that the Israelites were baptized by pouring or sprinkling! especially when the Psalmist describes the passage through the sea, that "*the clouds poured out water*, the skies sent out a sound; thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven," &c.—77. 16–20. Had Mr. S. proved that this dreadful storm was upon the poor Israelites, *walking on dry land*, it would have appeared a little more plausible and would have accorded better with his opinion; but it is evident that the storm was upon the Egyptians. Is this *a thus saith the Lord*, that pouring or sprinkling is baptism! We confess we cannot see it; but the contrary is plain that they were immersed in a watery grave. The waters stood on both sides and the cloud immediately over them. To a person above the cloud, they would have appeared literally immersed.

Another *Thus saith the Lord* that baptism does not signify immersion, produced by Mr. S. is Dan: 14. 24, 25. Here we are told that "Nebuchadnezzar was *wet with the dew of heaven*;"—the word wet is *bapto*. Now we appeal to common sense, whether the wetting of Nebuchadnezzar more resembled an immersion, or a pouring or sprinkling a few drops of water on his forehead. Nebuchadnezzar in lying on the ground at night when the dews so copiously fell in that country, was wet all over, covered with dew-drops lite-

rally. Were pædo-baptists to wet the person to be baptized all over by pouring or sprinkling water on him, they might then plead the case of Nebuchadnezzar for authority; but his case can never justify their practice of pouring or sprinkling a few drops on the forehead.

But Mr. S. by turning up his Hebrew Bible to Dan: 4. 25, will find that Nebuchadnezzar was *baptized* with the *snows of heaven.* He will find that the word *sheleg* translated dews, is by the same stranslators, rendered snow. See Exod: 4. 6. Num: 12. 10. Psal: 51. 9. Isai 1. 18. Sam: 4. 7. Ps: 147. 16. "He giveth his snow, like wool." "Sir John Chardin tells us, that towards the Black sea, in Iberia, and Armenia, and in some other countries, the snow falls in flakes as big as walnuts, but not being hard or very compact, it does no other hurt than presently covering and overwhelming a person." See Parkhurst Heb: Lex: on the word *sheleg.*—This account literally shows how Nebuchadnezzar was baptized, overwhelmed or immersed in or with snow. Mr. S. when bringing forward a thus saith the Lord, should remember that a translation, even the Septuagint, is not properly his word. To be immersed or baptized with snow is natural and easy.

Mr. S. gives us another thus saith the Lord that baptism does not always signify immersion. Mark 7. 4. "And when the Pharisees come from the market, except they wash they eat not, And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the *washing* (in the Greek, *baptizing*) of cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables." He thinks though cups might be immersed, yet not tables or couches. Is this a thus saith the Lord that baptism does not signify immersion! Had he attended to the word of the Lord, he would have found that every unclean vessel of wood must be rinsed *in* water. Lev: 15. 12. The Hebrew word *sheteph* translated *rinsed*, signifies *to cover with water, to immerge, to wash by immersion; to overflow, to overwhelm, to rush upon*, as waters. Ps: 69. 2, 15. "I am come into deep waters, where the floods *overflow* me."—"Let not the water-flood *overflow* me." Also Ps: 78. 20. 124. 4. Jer: 47. 2. &c: in all which places the word translated overflow, and *overwhelm*, is the same as that used in Lev: 15. 12. "Every (*unclean*) vessel of wood must be *rinsed in water*—or must be immersed or overwhelmed in water." See Park: Heb: Lex: on the word *sheteph.* The baptism or immersion of

tables then was in accordance with the law of Moses, however improbable it may appear to us.

Mr. S. adduces another thus saith the Lord to establish his position. It is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. This we have already considered, and we think have sufficiently confuted. We have also considered the text "*Buried with him in or by baptism,*" and have, we think, clearly shewn that neither Mr. S. nor the pædo-baptists have understood the text. It demonstrably proves that baptism is immersion.

The cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament, and referred to by Mr. S. as irrelevant to prove immersion, are certainly not in opposition to this mode, and are very far from proving the doctrine of *pouring* or *sprinkling.* This has been made manifest by an host of writers.

Let us try also a few cases. "And they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."—According to Mr. Steele it would read, "They were *poured* of him in Jordan—or they were *sprinkled* of him in Jordan." How unnatural such expressions! But how plain and easy is it to say, they were immersed of him in Jordan. Again, "Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—i. e. *sprinkling*, or *pouring* them into the name of the Father, &c. Again, Repent and be sprinkled or poured in the name of Jesus Christ, &c. To substitute *pouring* for *baptism* is a perversion of language and meaning. To immerse a person is proper language; but to *pour* a person is not; it is an absurdity.

These few thoughts are humbly submitted to the public. May the Lord lead us all into all truth. EDITOR.

REVIVALS.

Extract of a letter from Elder J. McDANIEL, *dated "Winchester, (Tenn.) Aug. 11th, 1828.*

"But in the midst of all the persecution, opposition and difficulties with which I have met, I have abundant reason to thank God for the effect which his word appears to have on the hearts of some of the fallen sons and daughters of men. I have had three two-day's meetings on my circuit this season, one in May, one in June, and one in July. Brothers Matthews and Anderson attended with me. We had glorious times; while the servants of God were exhibiting the truths of the gospel, and while the believers in Jesus were rejoicing and shouting forth the praises of the God of

heaven, mourners were comforted, sinners were alarmed at their undone situation, and were made to cry out, as they did on the day of Pentecost, *what shall we do?* I must confess we know no better way to give them instruction, than to tell them in the language of Peter,—Repent and be baptised, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of their sins, and they should receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Thus many were comforted."

Extract of a letter from Elder J. P. ANDREW, *dated*
"*Warren co.* (*Ohio,*) *Sept. 26th*, 1828.

After having mentioned the happy death of his pious mother, he proceeds.—"Last Saturday and Sabbath there were twenty-four baptized in the neighborhood of New Burlington (by Bro: R. Simonton.) The work of the Lord is going on in power there. Bro: E. Harvey lately told me that at a communion meeting a few miles above Urbanna, about forty embraced religion. Last Tuesday six were baptized at Franklin. There is at present the greatest prospect of religion generally I ever saw in this state.

Extract of a letter from Elder DAVID STEWART, *dated*
"*Tuckersville*, (*Va.*) *Oct. 6th*, 1828.

"BRO: STONE,—I send you this note that you and your readers may be gratified at hearing good tidings. The Lord has visited us with a refreshing season. Upwards of one hundred of my neighbors have professed faith in the Lord Jesus within two months past. The work is progressing gloriously."

Grassy-Point, (*Ohio,*) *Oct. 2d*, 1828.

DEAR BRO: STONE,—I was appointed by the Mad River Conference, at its session at Franklin-Union, 22d ultimo, to address you in behalf of the Conference on the subject of the *Christian Hymn Book.*

The Conference believing the book ought to undergo a revision, by having some of its words and phrases altered, and perhaps some of its hymns excluded and others inserted, have selected and unanimously chosen Elder Barton W. Stone and Elder Thomas Adams for the purpose of examining the book, and to make what amendments and improvement, they in their judgment, may deem necessary. The Conference pretend, as a body, to lay no claim to the profits

arising from the sales of said book, and give it as their opinion that the privilege of publishing should not be arrogated by, nor restricted to any one individual. They therefore recommend Bro: Stone and Bro: T. Adams, to publish an edition of the book revised, on their own expense, and for their own profits; and they pledge their services in the sale and circulation of such an edition. Hoping this intention may be prosecuted with dispatch, and that it may meet the better success, the Conference advise this to be published in the Christian Messenger that the brethren and public in general may be timely apprised of the same.

I remain, dear brother, yours, in the gospel.

[By order of the Conference.] JOSEPH THOMAS.

OBITUARY.

I suppose you have heard of the death of Elder GEORGE SHIELDS, but probably you have not heard the particulars concerning it. I will give you a short sketch of the few last days of his life and death. On the 3d Lords day of August, was our communion meeting at Eaton. Brother Shields was with us from the commencement; and on the Lords day delivered an interesting and energetic discourse from Isa. 28, 16., but was not able to go through his subject, on account of a weakness in his breast. That night, after a sermon had been delivered, he took his stand on the floor, gave a warm exhortation, invited those in distress to come forward and join us in prayer; a number came, some pleading for pardon, while others wept bitterly. The next day we met again with a large congregation; after some preaching, and other solemn exercises, Brother Shields stepped forward into the public field, for the last time; he began as if filled with a care for souls; urged the necessity of preparing for death; hoisted *the ensign of the people*, and beat up for volunteers. A crowd gathered round him and sunk on their knees, begging for mercy through the Lord Jesus; a number of them rose happy, and went away comforted, taking their leave of their spiritual father, to meet no more in this world. On the next Friday he was returning home from Hamilton, and was attacked violently with a fever; he called in at a brother Pottengers, about thirteen miles from his own house; sent for his wife and children, who came speedily to see him. Medical aid was tried in vain; he was sensible of his approaching dissolution, but that hand which had

borne him through various trials in health, supported him in sickness. He manifested an unshaken confidence in God, and died without a murmur on the next Wednesday evening after he was taken ill, being the 27th of August, 1823. He was intered on the next day; a large concourse of people witnessed the scene; they appeared like a large family mourning for an affectionate father. He has left a wife and two daughters, with a numerous acquaintance, to lament the loss, (but not his state.) Several congregations were almost entirely dependent on him for the dispensing of the word, and are now quite destitute. The harvest is truly great and the laborers few in this country. It is a time of reviving among us present. Farewell.

B. W. Stone. LEVI PURVIANCE.

For the Christian Messenger.

BRO: STONE,—On the 19th of September last, our annual meeting commenced at Antioch, Bourbon county. It was numerously attended by brethren from different portions of the country. The following Elders were present, viz: B. W. Stone, Thos. Smith, Francis R. Palmer, John Rogers, John Roberts, Leonard J. Fleming, William Parker, Stephen G. Marshall, Michael Rice, Peter Cox, Harrison Osborne, and Thos. M. Allen; also Jos. Marsh from N. York, Matthew Gardner from Ohio, and Jas. H. Evans from the South East Conference in Kentucky.

Bro: THOMAS SMITH was called to the Chair, and THOMAS M. ALLEN appointed Sec'y.

A communication was received by Bro: Evans from the South East Conference informing us of the rapid speed of gospel liberty among them, the increase of churches, and considerable additions made to those that have long since been planted in that country. Brothers Stone and Fleming were requested to write a letter in reply.

A letter was also received from the "*Baptized Church*" at Cooper's run in Bourbon county, soliciting a friendly intercourse, informing us that their only rule of faith and practice was the Bible—that their pulpits, meeting houses and tables, were open for our reception and comfort, and that they were free and happy at all times to co-operate with all the lovers of the Lord Jesus in advancing his cause, and promoting the great cause of religious liberty. Brothers Rogers and Allen were requested to write and bear a letter in reply, assuring

them of our willingness to mingle with them in social worship, of our pleasure in hearing from them as brethren, who stand upon the Bible alone, and that we acknowledge all our brethren who love the Lord, take his word for their guide, and yield obedience to the same.

Communications were then read and received, from thirty churches, viz: Republican, Bethel, Union, Mt. Tabor, Berea and Lexington, in Fayette county; Georgetown, Bethlehem and Turkey-foot, in Scott; Antioch, Paris, Millersburg, Cane-ridge, Flat-run & Mt. Carmel, in Bourbon; Kentontown, Cynthiana, Indian Creek, Beaver Creek and Leesburg, in Harrison; Hillsboro' and Republican in Washington; Cave Spring in Jessamine, near New Castle in Henry; Concord in Nicholas; Cabin Creek in Lewis; Mud meeting house in Mercer; Minerva in Mason; Mt. Pleasant in Franklin; and Union in Fleming county—which embraces nothing like the number of churches in the limits of what has hitherto been considered the North Conference of Kentucky. The accounts from those churches were truly refreshing and encouraging, and furnish the most conclusive evidence of the rapid and increasing advance of the free principles of the gospel. Of the churches above named seven or eight have been planted within the last year, and are in a flourishing condition; large additions have been made to many, and are yet making. Not two thirds of the churches above named, state specifically their increase, but the additions made to such as did state, i. e. eleven, is upwards of eight hundred since our last meeting—and the glorious work of reformation is yet progressing in our country. Never had the friends of christian liberty greater cause to rejoice than at the present moment—large additions are making to the churches, new churches are forming, revivals are progressing, truth is advancing, and the demand for the labors of the preachers far exceed their ability to meet them.

The meeting continued until Monday, the 22d. Crowds attended every day to hear the word of life, which was ably and faithfully dispensed among them. On Lord's day, the Lord's Supper was attended to, and between six and eight hundred united in commemorating the dying sufferings of their exalted Saviour. A great many weeping mourners came forward on Lord's day and Monday to unite with God's people in prayer; an evidence that *truth* is powerful.

I have no doubt but many of the letters from the churches

would be highly interesting to your readers, and I would cheerfully make extracts from some of them, if I thought you had room in your paper. They contend for the independency of the church, maintain that it is the highest religious tribunal on earth—but while they thus believe, they are however willing to co-operate with their brethren in periodical meetings, the object of which is to obtain religious information, learn of each other their prosperity and situation, and worship together. Meetings of this description generally prove a blessing to those who attend, and the neighborhoods in which they are held. It is humbly hoped that our brethren will act with union and concert, and that harmony and steadfastness will prevail among all who earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Sept. 30, 1823. THOMAS M. ALLEN.

The next annual meeting will be held at Berea, on Cane Run, in Fayette county, on the Friday before the 3d Lord's day of Sept. next, to continue until the Monday following.

T. M. ALLEN.

SUPPORT OF RELIGION IN FRANCE.—From the discussions in the Chambor of Deputies, it appears that for the year 1828, the sum of eight millions of dollars is granted by the government to the priesthood of France. This enormous sum is independent of all monies for building and repairs of churches, &c. and is also independent of the sum of nearly two millions of dollars, which was left in legacies, bequests, &c. during the year 1827, and which it was stated, would be still more considerable during the present year. M. Dupin protested vehemently against the legacy system, and predicted that unless immediate steps were taken, the time was not far distant, when all France would be held by the clergy. To those who have opportunity and leisure, we would recommend to examine how much is paid in this country for similar purposes.

NOTICE.

☞Elder BARZILLAI H. MILES has returned to his former residence, in Rutland, Meigs county, Ohio, where he has received the appointment of Post Master, and wishes all communications designed for him to be directed to that place accordingly.

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: 3.] GEO: TOWN, K. DEC. 1828. [No. 2

From the Christian Register.

SYNOD OF ULSTER.

There is no spot, perhaps, on the face of the globe, more interesting at this time to the friends of Christian truth and religious liberty than the country of Ulster in Ireland. A desperate attempt is there making by the advocates of a corrupt theology and of an Exclusive system to check free inquiry by the imposition of creeds and confessions of faith. This attempt has been nobly though unsuccessfully resisted by the high-minded members of the Synod.

Mr. Montgomery, whose eloquent and noble speech last year is well known, and whose defence of liberty of conscience on that occasion has been rewarded by the presentation to him of a splendid service of plate by the liberals of the North of Ireland, again grappled with bigotry, in a speech which would have stopped any men in the course of intolerance who were not absolutely delirious. He and twenty-two other ministers, and seventeen elders, (the Synod appears to have consisted of one hundred and thirty-nine ministers and fifty-seven elders,) signed a manly Protest, which we shall insert below. It is expected that next year the liberal party will have matured a plan of separation, and will form themselves into another Synod, which shall recognize and provide for the great principles of religious liberty.

PROTEST.

"We, the undersigned Ministers and Elders, protest against the decision of Synod, in this case, for the following, amongst other reasons:

"1. Because the Overture contains several statements respecting the opinions and characters of the Ministers of the Church, which we consider to be unfounded and injurious.

"2. Because, subjecting our Students and Licentiates to