She then resigned to God her husband and little son, in hopes of meeting them in a better world. She soon after, about 11 o'clock, fell asleep in Jesus.

PROSPECTUS OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

MANY religious newspapers and pamphlets are regularly issued in our country, a leading object of which is to strengthen and perpetuate the sectarian interests of the religious parties to which they belong, and which, as far as they are successful, must render it impossible to restore and keep the unity of the Christian spirit in the bond of peace, which are so necessary to the happiness of God's people and the success of the Gospel.

The design of this paper is to expose the absurdity and sin of the Christian divisions, which produce so much carnality and strife, and retard the progress of the Redeemer's kingdom, and to assist in rescuing the truth of the Gospel, as taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, from the contradictions, absurdities, and darkness, in which the wisdom of this world and a false philosophy have involved them.

Believing that nothing is true, or of divine authority in religion, but GOD'S WORD, which is as well the mean of faith as it is the directory of conduct, and which admits of no alteration with impunity, THE BIBLE will be zealously defended as the only religion of Christians, and the only system of orthodoxy, to the exclusion of *all authoritative human creeds and confessions.*

Nothing will be said with a design to build up one sect in preference to another, as all are considered wrong to the extent of their sectarian peculiarities. But the editor's best efforts shall be used to unite all the contending parties on the *one* broad and solid foundation of the Gospel of Christ as revealed in the New Testament, which is the only true standard of the religion of God's Messiah. In short, a complete restoration of the Gospel or Apostolic order of things in religion, will be zealously advocated to the extent of his abilities.

It is to those who have the moral courage and ability to oppose and expose popular prejudice, corruption and error—to those who prefer the love of truth, the favor of God, and the *permanent* happiness of man, to the smiles and emoluments of party, and to the transitory glow of sectarian excitement, that the editor looks for aid in this undertaking: and he confidently relies on the truth and faithfulness of God, and the justice and benevolence of the cause, for success in the end.

— J. G. NORWOOD.

CONDITIONS.—This paper is published about the middle of every month, on good paper and new type, in numbers containing 24 duodecimo pages each, making in the year a volume of 288 pages.

The price is One Dollar per annum, to be paid in advance.

Postmasters and others who will obtain 10 subscribers and act as agents, shall have one copy gratis.

Lexington, Ky. Nov. 1829.

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. IV.] GEORGETOWN, KY, JANUARY, 1830. [No. 2.

From the Christian Register.

OPINIONS AND CONCESSIONS OF THEOLOGICAL PROFESSORS.

The following extract is from the seventh chapter of Dr. Worcester's late work on the Atonement:

Professor Stuart has expressed the following opinions:—

"God is just: therefore he will punish sin; and if we read only the book of nature, must we not too say with Seneca—*Therefore he cannot forgive it?* But revelation discloses his attribute of mercy; and mercy consists essentially in remitting the strict claims of justice, either in whole or in part.—In the agonies of Christ, a personage of such transcendent dignity and glory we see the terrors of divine justice displayed in the most affecting manner, and are impressively taught what evil is due to sin. In the pardon purchased by his death, we contemplate the riches of divine mercy." p. 25.

I shall not remark on the account here given of the "book of nature," except so far as to express my belief, that a due consideration of the long-suffering of God and his innumerable favors to sinners, might naturally excite a hope, that with him there is forgiveness for the penitent,—and that this hope might derive some strength from observing how far vice is connected with misery, and reformation with happiness, in the course of natural providence. But I may seriously ask, Who can see "*riches* of divine mercy" in pardon conferred on the penitent only on the ground that it was "purchased" by the sufferings of an innocent substitute? If such representations were just, would they not evince rather the *poverty*, than "the *riches* of divine mercy?"

The Professor admits that "mercy consists essentially in remitting the claims of strict justice, in whole or in part." Hence the mercy displayed in pardon must be in proportion as "the claims of strict justice" are remitted. I may then ask, how much is there of mercy in a pardon "*purchased*" by a substitute who suffers an equivalent to all the demands of the law? In respect to the sinner, the whole of the claims of justice may be remitted; but this does not decide the question as to the degree of

mercy displayed by the sovereign; for all that is remitted to the sinner, is supposed to have been required of the substitute, and suffered by him.

But what are "the claims of strict justice?" Does strict justice claim a right to inflict penal evils on the innocent, as a substitute for the punishment due to the guilty? If not, how can the claims of justice be answered by such infliction, "either in whole or in part?"

It will be said, that the Son of God *consented* to suffer as our substitute. But where is the record of such a consent? I know not. Supposing, however, that it could be found, would such a *consent* make it right to inflict the evil on him? Could a father thus derive a right to punish the innocent instead of the guilty son? Or could a king thus derive a right to punish an innocent subject? The answers to these questions must be in the negative. It is an object in every just penal law to distinguish the innocent from the transgressor, by exposing the latter only to be punished. When just and necessary sufferings are inflicted on the transgressor, these sufferings may be said to answer the demands of the law, or the claims of justice; but as neither the law nor justice has any such demands on the innocent, I cannot see how "the claims of strict justice" can be answered, "in whole or in part," by the penal sufferings of an innocent substitute.

DR. MURDOCK'S CONCESSIONS.

Dr. Murdock has made one concession relating to this subject which surprised me. Speaking of the divine law, he says—

"When once a creature becomes a transgressor of its commands or prohibitions, it never is satisfied and never can be, by anything short of the full execution of the threatened penalty on the transgressor himself. And the same is true of criminal law under human governments. No judge can admit an innocent person to suffer an infamous or capital punishment in place of the person found guilty. If a few rare instances of such a procedure can be gleaned from ancient history, they must be ascribed to the ignorance of the times; for neither distributive justice nor the sound maxims of criminal law will vindicate them."—*Discourse on the Atonement.* pp. 32, 33.

He then mentions the case of Zeleucus, the Locrian lawgiver, whose son, by adultery, had become exposed to the loss of both eyes; and the father wishing to honor the law, and at the same time to favor his son, caused one of his own eyes to be plucked out instead of one of his son's. On this strong case Dr. Murdock remarks—"The father's loss of an eye was not what the law demanded, nor any part of it." In applying the anecdote, he observes—"And thus, also, the bloody sacrifice of the Mediator was not what the law of God demanded, or could accept, as a legal satisfaction for our sins. All it could do, was to display the feelings of God in regard to his law; and to secure, by the

impression it made, the public objects which would be gained by the execution of the law."

Who could have expected, that a writer possessing such clear views of the barbarity of substituted sufferings under human governments, would have appeared as a public advocate for such sufferings under the government of God! If the "few rare instances" of such sufferings among men are to be "ascribed to the *ignorance* of the times" when they happened, can it be doing honor to Jehovah to impute to him such a policy?

Besides, if the "bloody sacrifice of the Mediator was not what the law required or could accept," what were "the feelings of God in regard to his law," which were displayed by the supposed substituted sufferings? Was it *possible* for God to show *respect* for his law, by doing what the law did not require, and could not accept? To honor a law, respect must be shown to its principles as well as to its precepts. If the sovereign himself violates the most important principles of his law, he does it more dishonor than a subject can do by violating its commands. If a law makes no provision for substituted sufferings,—does not require them, and cannot accept them, how can it be honored by such substitution? May we not then suspect that the doctrine of substituted sufferings, like "the few rare instances" of their occurrence, should be "ascribed to the ignorance of the times" in which it had its origin?

Any being, who has a right to make a penal law, must be supposed to have a right to remit its penalty, in whole or in part, whenever he sees reason for so doing, and on such conditions as in his opinion will have the most salutary influence. But whether any being in the universe can properly be said to have a *right* to transfer a just punishment from the guilty to the innocent, is at least very questionable; for no being can have a right to do wrong. Considered as an expedient for honoring a law, or for vindicating the honor of a sovereign, what can be less adapted to such purposes than substituted sufferings? Conduct which violates the principles of every just law, cannot be made equitable by the *authority* of a sovereign, nor by the *consent* of an innocent sufferer. If God were now standing on the ground of substituted suffering, would it be possible for him to repeat his appeal to the consciences of men—"Are not my ways equal?"

Dr. Murdock has another concession which I shall quote, in the hope that it will excite more candor than is now generally prevalent. Prior to the statement of his own views of the atonement, he observes—

"For the attainment of salvation, it may be sufficient that we know, and believe firmly the simple fact, that there is forgiveness with God for the penitent believer, on account of something which Christ has done or suffered. Not much beyond this have the knowledge and faith of the great body of Christians in every age extended." pp. 6, 7.

It is doubtless desirable to obtain more definite views of the subject than is here supposed to have been possessed by "the great body of Christians." But it is very questionable whether more light than darkness has been thrown on the doctrine by metaphysical reasoners, who have not been contented with the simple manner in which the doctrine is stated in the New Testament.

I may add—if "for the attainment of salvation" more is not necessary than is supposed by Dr. Murdock, how melancholy is the fact, that this affecting subject has been the occasion of so many bitter controversies, and anti-christian censures one of another, among men who have professed to be followers of the Lamb! The defect of temper thus evinced, is, in my view, more dangerous than any defect of mere opinion.

Communicated for the Christian Messenger.

THE ORTHODOX BETRAY A WANT OF CONFIDENCE IN THEIR OWN SCHEMES.

I was led to this reflection from a recent effort, at no great distance from Georgetown, to establish a "Sunday School," auxiliary to "The American Sunday School Union."

The preachers aware that their views, with regard to this School were opposed, as sectarian in their character, made an effort to remove that objection. They asserted most positively, that it was perfectly catholic in its character and objects; that there was nothing sectarian about it; that it was under the direction of Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, and Congregationalists, as well as Presbyterians. That, therefore, it was *slander*, to say their object was sectarian, or to make Presbyterians. An important concession, truly, to the cause of Bible christianity. For it is acknowledging, in effect, that they are a *sect*, and that there is a wide difference between Presbyterians and Christians. Reader—be not astonished at this conclusion; it necessarily follows from the premises. For, as we have seen, these teachers consider it slander to be charged with aiming to make Presbyterians in their Sunday Schools. But would these gentlemen consider it slander, to be represented as using great exertions, and manifesting great zeal, by means of Sunday Schools, or any other means which they esteem scriptural, to make *Christians?* O no. This they would esteem their highest honor. And yet, if Presbyterianism and christianity are identical, as upon other occasions they would have us believe, why not consider it as great honor to make Presbyterians as christians? Or as great slander to be charged with aiming to make christians as Presbyterians?

We confess we cannot tell why. Is it not clear then, that they want confidence in Presbyterianism?—That they acknowledge a great difference between it and christianity?—Insomuch, that while they esteem it their highest *honor* to be represented

as laboring to promote the interests of the *latter*, they consider it *slander* to be charged with aiming to promote those of the *former*. Would these Rev. gentlemen be caught in the pulpit laboring to prove that they had been falsely accused of trying to make *christians?* And yet it is slander to say there are aiming to make Presbyterians in their Sunday Schools!! The legs of the lame are not equal.

How will they dispose of these plain matters?

If they are unwilling to acknowledge that Presbyterianism & christianity are different, then they stand before the public self-convicted of the charge of having labored to prove it slander to make christians! But if alarmed at this consequence, they deny that Presbyterianism and christianity are the same, then they say, in effect, that they are aiming to promote a religion different from christianity! Here then, for the present, I leave these gentlemen, hoping that the time may come, when they, and all sectarian teachers, and hearers, may not only *consider* it slander, but when it shall indeed *be* slander, to charge them with seeking to promote sectarianism. Amen. TIMOTHY.

TRACTS AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Sunday Schools, in their first institution and management, met my decided approbation. I viewed them as blessings to the poor children of our country especially. It was soon seen how easily religious principles, whether right or wrong, could be instilled into their minds; and sectarianism turned this to its advantage, to add numbers to its party. Tracts were soon prepared for the young disciples—tracts calculated to teach most efficiently the peculiarities of the party, who were training and drilling the children into their systems.

Sunday Schools and Tract Societies are now made the engines to support the most anti-christian monster in all its various forms; I mean Sectarianism. Who does not see that sectarianism stands in opposition to the very essence of religion, which is love, peace and union among the whole family of God? To promote sectarianism is to promote that which is anti-christian. Such a sentiment, just expressed, is extremely offensive to many in the present day; but the day will come, when it will be universally acknowledged correct and true.

In looking over a box of Tracts, sent by the Tract Society, to indoctrinate their little pupils in the Sunday Schools, I could not but wonder at the ingenuity manifested to interweave the peculiar doctrines of Calvin, and to make them appear as serious, fundamental prinoiples of christianity; enforced too by an apparent benevolence and piety. I will give a few extracts for the information of my readers.

In No. 115, 3d series, page 22:—The Clergyman was teaching his little pupils, James and Francis, how the heart of a sinner is to be cleansed—that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from us from all sin.—1 John, i. 7.

James.—How can this be? I do not understand you, sir.

Clergyman.—I will try and explain it, James; suppose a man owed more money than he could pay, and was sent to prison.

Francis.—My uncle is in prison for debt.

Cler.—Suppose I was to go and pay your uncle's debts for him, would he still be in debt to his creditors?

Francis.—No.

Cler.—And what would have set your uncle at liberty if I had paid his debts?

Fran.—Your money, sir

Cler.—So that it might be said, a friend's money had taken away your uncle's debts.

James.—I understand you now, sir; you mean to explain to us, that Christ has paid our debts.

Cler.—It was for this he came into the world; for what reason do you suppose he was accursed of God?

Fran.—Was our Saviour accursed?

Cler.—Is it not written—"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree?" Gal. III. 13.

Fran.—But why was he cursed?

Cler.—I will try to explain it to you; all men are sinners: all have sinned against God. There is not one who has kept his holy law. Not one of us can cleanse himself from sin; how then can they be taken away? Jesus Christ, our Saviour, seeing we deserved punishment for breaking this holy law, took our sins upon himself, he became answerable for them, and has himself suffered for us the punishment which we deserved. He has obtained forgiveness for those who believe in him; it does not remain to be done now. If you were to come and say, "Sir, you have paid my debts, and I will now go and pay them," you would talk nonsense, or it would be a proof that you did not believe that I had really paid them. What has been already done, cannot remain to be done now.—Christ was punished for our sins instead of us.—Christ came down from heaven to save us; this was done when he was nailed to the cross," &c.

Again—In No. 9, series 4, p. 14:—A father is represented as bringing to the remembrance of his little son, some parts of Mr. Johnson's sermon, immediately after their return from church, as follows:

"You know Mr. Johnson said, as God was holy, and a God of truth, he would not pardon sinners without satisfaction being made to his divine law; and as man is continually breaking it, it is impossible he can give that satisfaction which it requires. Mr. Johnson then showed clearly how the law and justice of God were satisfied in the obedience and death of his Son," &c.

In proof of all this but one text is introduced, which is Rom: v. 8—"While we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

Again—In No. 4, Series 5, pa. 28:—A Shepherd is introduced as instructing a dying youth, as follows:

"You must endeavor, therefore, to procure the righteousness

of a man who never sinned; and being clad in this righteousness you may safely appear in the presence of a holy God. This man is Christ; God revealed in the flesh; he, of whom it is said, 'He hath fulfilled all righteousness.'"

After this the Shepherd instructs him into "the nature of God, the three sacred persons in the divinity, and the offices of each. He showed how the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, worked together in the Salvation of man. The Father by his love in giving his Son, the Son by his sufferings, and the Holy Spirit by cleansing and purifying his heart."

Here is a fair specimen of instruction, given by the Tract Societies to their Sunday School disciples. What a pity, that these unscriptural *dogmas* should be instilled into the tender, docile minds of the rising generation! These have long, too long beclouded the character of God, and obscured the simple gospel of the Son of God. These traditions, taught as the oracles of God, have caused many to reject the revelation of heaven, and turn from it to learn from nature's dark book a purer theology. Had these men acted wisely they would have first examined the scriptures for themselves. There they would not have seen that the one God was divided into three equal persons—and each person performing a separate work in the salvation of sinners—God the Father giving God the Son—God the Son suffering to satisfy the justice of God the Father, &c! They would never find there that God the Son paid the debts of sinners in order that God the Father might forgive them—nor that God the Son was accursed by God the Father—or that God was cursed by himself! They never would discover in the scriptures, that God the Son ever came to satisfy law and justice. They would in vain search for the active righteousness of Christ. as a garment thrown over our defilement, and that in this dress alone we can safely appear before a holy God! We beseech the world to read the Bible before they reject it. Read it attentively and they will clearly see that these, and many such absurdities have been unrighteously charged against that book!

This may by many be considered an uncharitable sentiment. I am not so uncharitable as to think that among the millions of Jews, in the days of our Saviour, there were no good men. Yet they were blinded by the traditions of the fathers—traditions, that made void the law. For these traditions they were so zealous, that they considered it equal impiety to speak against them, as against the oracles of God. So long had they received them as divine, and so long habituated to read the scriptures in accordance with them, that nothing less than miracles could convince them of their error, and indeed this failed with the majority of the nation. In this manner I have viewed the christian world. So long have we been in Babylonish confusion—so long in the wilderness—so long have we received the systems and traditions of men for truth—so long habituated to read and hear the scriptures tortured to suit the systems and traditions of men

that it appears almost impossible for many good men to see differently from what they have been taught, though not found in the Bible. We feel revived that the night is far spent and that the day is at hand. Inquiry is awake, and truth will triumph in spite of her adversaries. EDITOR.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Brother Stone: I want to ask you a few plain questions, and wish you to answer me in your next Messenger. Are not idolators, whoremongers, and blasphemers classed together in the Bible? What is idolatry? Is it not worshiping as God what is not God? Then how can the Christian Church and the Presbyterian commune together?—for if the Christian is right, the Presbyterians must be *idolators;* for they worship Jesus Christ, as the *Supreme God*—while the Christains believe he is *not* the very and eternal God. How can any denomination commune with the Presbyterians, when they have been charged by them *all* with trying to establish their religion? They must be *bad people*, if they do; or the others must be *very bad*, in making the charge without they thought they could *prove* it. You may say people may all worship Jesus as they please; but I think if the *Christians* are right, it is breaking the command, that says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, and *him only* shalt thou serve," to worship Jesus as God. I want you to answer these questions plainly, without saying any thing about loving *all* christians; for we ought not to love and commune with *idolators*, and we ought to say so openly, let the world say what it will. In the Messenger you are abusing other churches, and are always saying they are going down continually, and *still* you would commune with them. It is *inconsistent*, and the world notices it, and are talking about it. You had better come out boldly and charge them with idolatry, *for they are such;* and say you will *not* commune with them, and you will be more consistent in the opinion of the world, and many of your own church. A B C D & E

REPLY.—It is not usual for us to reply to any communication without knowing the name of the author. However as the thoughts expressed by our anonymous correspondent are current, and with much zeal urged against us every where, we have for once determined to depart from our usual course, and give the communication a serious though short reply.

1. He asks, "are not idolators, whoremongers, and blasphemers, claased together in the Bible?"

Ans'r. We have not seen them classed together in that book; yet we are willing to acknowledge these crimes are every where condemned in the Bible.

2. What is idolatry? Is it not worshipping as God, what is not God?

Ans'r. An idol is the visible form, image, or representation, of some invisible being. Idolatry is literally the worship of an

idol or image of the true God, or of a false God. Man has ever been prone to represent the invisible object of their worship by some invisible representation or image of that object. This they have done by forming a molten or graven image, made of metal, wood or stone. To fall down before these images and worship them as Gods, is not only absurd, but criminal. Moses was warned of God, that as he had not seen the invisible God, therefore he should not presume to make any likeness or similitude of him, nor worship it.

According to the views of our correspondent, with regard to idolatry, he says, "If the Christians are right the Presbyterians are idolators, for they worship Jesus Christ as the Supreme God." No doubt it was also in his mind to say, If the Presbyterians are right, the Christians must be idolators, for they worship Jesus Christ, not as the Supreme God, but as his Son. To reply fully to this would lead us again into the same controverted grounds, on which the christian world has been too long contending, whether Jesus Christ be the supreme God, or the Son of the supreme God. We have accepted the latter as true, and do believe that to worship him, not as God supreme, but the Son of God, is according to the will of the supreme God, and therefore, not idolatry. This doctrine, we think, is fully established in the preceding volumes of the Messenger; but lest our correspondent may not have read them, we will present to his view a few of those arguments by which our minds have been convinced.

Heb: 1. 6. "When he (the Father) bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." It is too plain to be controverted, that, from this verse and the whole chapter, the Father and Son are held forth as two distinct, intelligent beings. These two beings cannot both be eternal infinite, self-existent, and independent Gods; for this would destroy the doctrine of God's unity. Yet in this chapter they are each called God. "Thy throne, O God (says the Father to the Son) is forever and ever, (shall never end,) Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This address cannot be applied, without violence, to the supreme God. The conclusion is plain, that the Son is called God, and yet not God supreme. He is called God by the supreme God himself, and what better authority can we have? If any cavil, let him remember he cavils against God himself. The angels, or messengers, whether of heaven or earth, are commanded by the Father to worship the Son. Therefore they are commanded to worship a being, called God, who is not God supreme. Are they guilty of idolatry in obeying their Creator? So our correspondent seems to think!

Phil: II. 6–11. "Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should con-

fess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." That this is spoken of the Son of God, none dare deny—that it is the will of God that all in heaven and earth worship him, is equally plain—and that this person is not God supreme is evident from the whole connexion; because it is said of him, he emptied and humbled himself—became obedient unto death—that God exalted him—and gave him a name, &c. These cannot apply to God supreme. Therefore, it is not idolatry to worship the Son of God, though he is not God supreme. Nay, to worship him is to obey and glorify God, even the Father. Is this Idolatry? We are assured it is not.

Rev: v. 12. John heard countless myriads in heaven, saying with a loud voice, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain (not God supreme) to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing"—and in the verse following they all give worship to him that sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever. Here are two distinct objects of worship, one of which is not God supreme; but the Lamb that was slain. Shall all heaven thus joyfully worship the Son, and shall mortals be silent? Shall vain mortals stand aloof, and charge the heavenly hosts with idolatry! God forbid! Though many, by their systems, in word deny him the worship due, yet their lips often express the devotion of their hearts in praise to his name, maugre all their prejudices.

Some pious, and honest persons think that Isa: XL. 8, is an insuperable argument against the worship of the Son of God. "I am the Lord, that is my name. My glory will I not give to another; neither my praise to graven images." We do contend, that the supreme praise, glory and worship due to the Father alone, should be given to any other, no, not to the Son, much less to graven images. We read in the scriptures of worship given to inferior beings without the charge of idolatry. I Chro: XXIX. 20. "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord, and the king" (David.) None presume to think that these people gave equal worship to Jehovah, and to king David.

Rev: III. 9. The Lord addresses the angel of the church in Philadelphia: "Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not; behold, I will make them come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." Surely, none believe that God would lead these impostors to the sin of idolatry! See Luke XIV. 10.

Another difficulty with many is the command, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." This can only mean, that supreme worship and service are to be given to God alone. If it is a difficulty, it equally lies on others as on us to solve it. For we have proved that it is the command and will of God that his Son should be worshipped, but not as God supreme.

Our correspondent asks a question respecting the Presbyterians' attempt to establish their religion, and complains that all other denominations charge them with it. He thinks, that if the Presbyterians are attempting this, they must be a bad people; and if they are not attempting it, they who charge them with it must be bad. On this subject the readers of the Messenger will find but little said. Should I say, that an attempt to establish religion is a mark of a bad heart, I should certainly condemn the established Kirk of Scotland—the Church of England—the Lutheran church in Europe, &c. All these attempted to establish their religion, and effected it. Are they, therefore bad, and wicked? And those who charged them with the attempt to establish their religion by law. were they bad men? We think not. Charity, which hopeth all things, hopes they were all honest. We are constrained to say, that some of the leaders of the Presbyterians have given sufficient ground to excite suspicion, that they wish their religion established by law. Their plans, and monied institutions, seem well calculated to effect the object. But the generality of Presbyterians are as innocent and as ignorant of these schemes as an infant, and therefore, criminality cannot attach to them. Should these grounds of suspicion be called for, they are at hand; and may be found in the Christian Advocate—Priestcraft Exposed, and in the Christian Baptist.

Our correspondent charges me with abusing other churches, and always saying they are going down continually, and still would commune with them. This, he says, he has learned from the Messenger. I do not acknowledge the charge of abusing churches in any one of my former numbers. Of this the public must judge. Is it criminal to give true history of facts?—to report that sectarian churches are dividing, and crumbling—stubborn facts which cannot be denied? Is this abusing churches? And are sectarian divisions of such a nature, that we must conclude they are bad men, who thus divide, and have no communion with them? Strange! Our correspondent is very urgent that I should denounce all, who systematically oppose the worship of the Son of God, as idolaters, and that we refuse to have any communion with them. This advice may be given by him in order to throw off the odium of his church in excluding Christians, and to cast it upon us. Whatever the world may think and say of us, we still will labor to act up to our convictions. We believe that there are good christians of every denomination, whose piety and holy lives correct the errors of their systems in practice. Wishing peace and health of soul and body to our *incognito*, we bid him farewell. EDITOR.

Should our correspondent write again, he shall be attended to, if he shall have given us his name. EDIT.

As sins proceed, they ever multiply; and like signs in the arithmetic, the last stands for more than all that were before it

ROYALTON, NIAGARA Co. N. Y. 9th of 9th mo. 1829.

Beloved Brother B. W. Stone—

Feeling better satisfied with the Christian Messenger than with other religious periodicals, which we have been receiving, on account of the spirit of the work, religious intelligence, and the useful scriptural instruction it contains: and as the 3rd volume, thus far, has come very regularly, I have thought proper, agreeable to your former wishes, to conduct the agency of the Messenger to such, in this place, as wish to patronize the work; I therefore send you Five Dollars enclosed herein, requesting that you forward to me five copies of the 4th volume of the Christian Messenger, directed to me as heretofor

I am highly pleased with your manner of conducting the Messenger, by throwing light upon scripture. It is about sixteen years since the Lord opened my eyes to behold the impropriety of subscribing to any man-made religious creed, and became resolved to follow no man farther than I could discover, agreeable to my judgment, that he followed Christ by his Word and Spirit: and I find a peace and consolation in having but one Master, even Christ.

Observing the first piece in No. 10 Vol. 3d of the Messenger, my mind was excited afresh to a subject which occupied my attention considerably for two years. And sincerely desiring to understand the will of my heavenly master, on the important subject of the Sabbath, is the reason of my submitting the following *Queries* for your consideration, allowing full liberty that you use them, or any part of them, at your discretion; but particularly desiring to read your scriptural observations on the subject. The following queries are an epitome of the best light which I have had for three years past on the subject.

Query 1st. If the weekly Sabbath was not instituted at the creation of the world, when was it instituted? See Gen: II. 2, 3.

Before Moses' day the children of men, probably, did not have the commandments from God in writing, but the Lord, in his own way, gave communications of his will to their understandings.—Therefore, in giving the history of ages then past, Moses was not so particular to describe what the commandments were, knowing if the people had disobeyed, it was then too late; but the Sabbath was probably observed. See Gen: VIII. 10–12—XVIII. 19—XXVI. 5. But when Moses had led the children of Israel through the Red Sea, and they had obtained deliverance from the hand of Pharaoh, and being led by the pillar of cloud and of fire, the commandments of the Lord were revived among them. See Exod: XVI.—an institution, 23, which was before appointed, 4, 5—in Egyptian bondage likely they had not kept the day, 28. Remember a day before appointed, referring to God's example at the creation for the institution thereof. See Exod: XX. 8–12. Was it not made for man at the creation? See Mark II. 27. If I mistake not, the indefinite "a" is prefixed to the word "Sabbath" but twice in the scriptures, when it has allusion to the 7th day of the week, in which cases, it follows a statement of what particular day is meant, and that the definite "the" is never prefixed to the word "Sabbath," in the Old Testament, when it refers to Jewish feasts.

Query 2d. *Are the ten commandments*, (Exod: XX. 3–17,) *a general law of righteousness, and favorable to man in all ages of this present world, standing unrevoked, or any part thereof, and confirmed and established under the New Covenant, or Testament; or are they repealed?*

Let Christ, and not Moses, be now heard in all things. In changing an old covenant for a new one; an old ministration for another; one government for another, does it not appear to be an important point, and one of the first necessary to be understood?—To have a line drawn between the old and new, that the subjects may have a knowledge what part of the laws, instructions and regulations in the old will be considered good in the new, and what part thereof must not be admitted into the new? Has our Saviour left this undetermined? Did he not plainly, fully and absolutely draw this line in the beginning of his public character, in his sermon on the mount, that most interesting and instructing discourse that was ever delivered to lost man? In Matt: v. 17, 18, 19, does he not establish as positively as language can express what part of the Old Testament shall be good and abiding under his authority in the kingdom of grace, viz: "*The Law and the Prophets?*" Five things are evidently declared in this text:

1st. That Christ did not come to destroy, abolish, or do away the Law or the Prophets.

2d. That he came to fulfil and magnify the law and make it honorable, and thereby prove to the world that "the *law* is holy, just and good," (Paul) and that God is not a hard master in requiring our obedience thereto.

2d. That not one jot or tittle shall pass, or be done away from the law, till heaven and earth pass away, and till all be fulfilled—until the inhabitants of the earth shall have benome so perfected in the knowledge and will of God as (through the Spirit) to fulfil the whole law.

4th. Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall *teach men* so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.

5th. But whosoever shall do and teach them, the same snall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

In the above text, as well as many which will follow, if, by "*the law and commandments,*" Christ and the Apostles did not mean the ten commandments, written and engraven on stone, I confess I do not know his meaning. For in the next verses Christ proceeds to explain the spiritual nature of the law; and by a few examples, opens to view that it requires the heart to fulfil the law; therefore the Pharisees were found wanting.—Verse 33, Christ proceeds to give an epitome of the Mosaic

ritual, describing the nature thereof to be in opposition to the Gospel; therefore must not be received nor practised. The ten commandments were given in a different manner from any of the other laws. See Exod: xxxi. 18—xxxiv. 1. Were not the *lively oracles*, given to christians, (Acts vii. 38.) the same that were committed to the Israelites by a lively voice from God? Exod: xx. 1–22. Christ approved of men's obeying the law. See Matt. xix. 16–19. xxii. 40. Mark x. 19. Luke xviii. 20. xxiii. 56. Believing the Holy Scriptures to harmonize in all their parts, we may therefore be assured, that if the "*Royal* Law," (James ii. 8–12,) was given to man to remain to the present as a law of righteousness, we shall find nothing in the holy book which will contradict the same.

WILLIAM SMITH.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

REPLY TO WM. SMITH'S LETTER.—No. I.

Bro: Smith—With considerable interest and attention I have examined the contents of your letter. I shall make a few remarks, the result of much study, on the subjects of your inquiry. I shall defer an answer to your first query to a subsequent number, because it is involved in your following queries. Your second query now claims my attention, i. e. "Are the ten commandments," &c.

You have plainly expressed your opinion, that the ten commandments stand unrepealed, and do yet exist confirmed and established under the new covenant; and therefore the seventh, and not the first day of the week, is still to be observed as the true Sabbath, enjoined by the Lord. Let us learn of Jesus, and hear him.

I agree with you with regard to the importance of understanding the change of an old covenant for a new one; of an old ministration, or government, for another, in order that the subjects may know what part of the laws of the old are admitted into the new, and what part rejected. I also agree with you, that our Lord has not left this important matter undetermined, but has plainly declared it. The difference between us is, that you think the whole of the old covenant is disannulled, except the ten commandments; I think the whole, including the ten commandments, is disannulled. If your position be true, then undeniably the seventh day is the proper Sabbath under the new covenant: for I have never read in the scriptures of a change from the seventh to the first day. If my position be true, we must find the christian Sabbath in the new covenant. I will now state the evidence I have receiced from the New Testament, on which I base my faith, that the old covenant, including the ten commandments, is disannulled in the new dispensation; then I will consider your reasons, why you believe that the ten commandments are not disannulled, but confirmed.

My reasons for believing that the old covenant, including the ten commandments, is disannulled, are the following:

1st. Because I frequently read that the ten commandments alone are called the covenant. Exod: xxxiv. 28. "And he (Moses) was there (on Mount Sinai) forty days and forty nights—And he wrote on the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Deut: iv. 13. "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments; and he wrote them on two tables of stone." Deut: v. 2. "The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb." This covenant was the ten commandments, as the following verses shew. The Apostle Paul in Heb: ix. 4, in relating what things were in the holiest of the tabernacle, particularly mentions *the tables of the covenant;* and all acknowledge that these tables cantained the ten commandments; therefore, the ten commandments were the covenant. This very covenant was declared by the same Apostle, in the former chapter, to be the first and the old covenant—and that which had decayed and vanished away by the introduction of the new covenant. Heb: viii.

2. The Apostle says, Gal: iv. 24. "These are the two covenants, the one from the Mount Sinai (this is the ten commandments) which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar." But what says the scripture must be done with Hagar, or the old covenant? Cast out the bond woman with her son. This is plain. Gal. iv.

3. The law which was 430 years after Abraham, and of which Moses was mediator, and therefore the old covenant—this law was the Jews' schoolmaster unto, or until Christ. "But after that faith (the new covenant) is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster, or under the law." Gal. iii. 25.

4. In Rom: vii. the law is represented as the Jews' husband, and this law was the ten commandments, as the 7th verse declares. The Jews were bound to this husband as long as he lived. But this law is dead, and died too by the body of Christ—it was nailed with him to the cross. Since that time neither Jew nor Gentile is bound by it, but are free to be married to another.

5. 2 Cor: iii. 7. The Apostle calls the ten commandments the ministration of death written and engraven on stones, (none but the ten commandments were engraven on stones.) Yet he states that this ministration was glorious; and then says, (v. 11.) "If that which *is done away* was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorions." You may say, it is the ministration which is done away; but Paul says it was that which was written and engraven on stones, and nothing but the ten commandments were thus engraven.

6. The commission given to the Apostles was to "preach the *gospel* (not the law) to every creature, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I (Jesus, not Moses,) have commanded

you." The law is not the gospel, for the law is not of faith. Yet, as I have several times observed in the former volumes of the Messenger, all the articles contained in the law, or old covenant, which our Lord intended to be binding on us, are included in the second, and are embodied, or incorporated with it. This I have attempted to illustrate by our Commonwealth of Kentucky having formed and adopted a second constitution. In the second all the good articles of the first are received and embodied. As soon as the second, or new constitution was adopted and established, the first was disannulled and vanished away. We do not go to the first, nor direct others to go to it, to learn the government of Kentucky. While the first existed in force, all under it were bound by it, but when it was made null by the establishment of the second, all were freed from it. If any thing existed in the first, or old covenant, which is not found in the new, it is not now binding.

You think that Christ, in his sermon on the mount, has established as plainly and positively as language can express, that the law and the prophets are the parts of the old covenant, yet authorized by Christ to be retained as good in the kingdom of his grace. For this opinion you have five reasons, to which I shall now attend.

1. Because Christ did not come to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil. Matt: v.

The scriptures plainly shew that Christ was made under the law, and therefore must fulfil it, or become a transgressor. It is equally plain that the old covenant was binding on all, who were under it, till it became dead by the body of Christ. After his resurrection he thus addressed his disciples: Luke xxiv. 44–46. "These are the words, which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me," &c. "But Christ did not come to destroy the law." True—for while he lived, he enjoined the observance of it on all, both by precept and example. But my brother must acknowledge that after his death, the old covenant, or ministration, written and engraven on stones, was done away—the bond woman, Hagar, was cast out—the old husband died, and the first covenant waxed old and vanished away. Did Christ ever attempt to destroy the prophets? If he had attempted it, he certainly would have endeavored to prove to the people that they were false prophets, and consequently their prophecies were mere fictions, not to be believed. This impostors would have done; because the prophecies not being fulfilled in them, must detect them as impostors. But in Christ, the true Messiah, all were fulfilled, and are good testimony that he is the very Christ. Had Christ attempted to destroy the law, he might have been suspected an impostor; for Moses wrote of him, and the types and ceremonies of the law pointed to him. As these could not be fulfilled in an impostor, such would have labored to destroy

the law as well as the prophets. "Do we then make void (useless) the law through faith? nay; we establish the law." Christ has in his life, death and resurrection established it as divine; and its use is highly appreciated as a testimony that Jesus is the very Christ.

But why should my brother restrict the passage in Matt: v. to the ten commandments? A few of them are mentioned, and others beside them, which are not found in the ten commandments. It cannot be proved that our Lord intended only the ten commandments; but it is easy to prove from the same expression that he intended the whole law of Moses. "The law and the prophets were until John; since then the kingdom of heaven is preached"—"All written in the law and the prophets concerning me must be fulfilled." If then, as you contend, the law stands unrepealed, it must be the whole Jewish law, given by Moses. Then truly the seventh day of the week is still the Sabbath—then every Sabbath breaker must be put to death—then we must keep the passover—and sacrifice our lambs as the law requires—in a word, we must be Jews. But you may say all the judicial and ceremonial part of the old covenant is abolished, but not the ten commandments. I ask you, are the ceremonial and judicial parts of the law ever called the ministration written and engraven on stones? Are these parts ever called the old covenant, separate from the ten commandments? Did the covenant of Mount Sinai in Arabia, represented by Hagar, include only these parts of the law? You must answer no. Then why can you say that these only are *done away*—these only are *cast out*—these only are *vanished away*—when the scriptures so pointedly teach the contrary?

2. Your second reason why the ten commandments stand unrepealed, and therefore binding on all in the new dispensation, is, because Christ came to magnify the law and make it honorable, and thus prove it to be holy, just and good. Who informed you that by the law in this text was meant the ten commandments exclusively? Till you can produce some inspired writings to establish this, it can only be considered as fallible assertion. But because the law is holy, just and good, is this a good reason why it is binding on us *now*? If so, the whole law of Moses is binding; for who will say that the whole law was not holy, just and good? But the very ten commandments which Paul calls holy, just and good, are by him, in the same chapter, (Rom: vii.) said to be dead by the body of Christ—the very law too which said "Thou shalt not covet." This was found written on tables of stone.

3. Your third reason why the ten commandments stand unrepealed, and are still binding, is, "that till heaven and earth shall pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Let us read this according to the new translation of George Campbell, and your speculations will be removed: "Heaven and earth shall sooner perish, than one iota or

one tittle of the law shall perish, without attaining its end." I need not repeat, that you cannot restrict this law to the ten commandments, without perverting the text. If this proves the perpetual obligation of the ten commandments, it equally proves the perpetual obligation of the whole law.

4. Your last reason why the ten commandments stand unrepealed, is, "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; But whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." My brother yet takes for granted that these commandments are the ten exclusively; yet I have proved that in this he is mistaken. While Jesus lived he taught obedience to the old covenant in all its parts, both by precept and example. Matt: xxiii. 1, 2. "Then spake Jesus to the multitude and to his disciples, saying, The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; All, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Such obedient souls were pleasing to God, and should be highly honored in his kingdom when it should be established. But the opposite character should be dishonored.

[TO BE CONTINUED.] EDITOR.

QUERIES PROPOSED BY THOS: PARSONS OF IA.

1. Is any soul naturally immortal? Or is immortality the gift of God through Jesus Christ?

2. What was the situation of a sinner, landed in death, under the law? Was it endless misery, or was it misery at all?

3. If in your opinion, endless misery is not a doctrine of the law, but is peculiar only to the gospel, how has Jesus Christ bettered the situation of mankind in general. since "broad is the road that leads to death, &c.?"

4. If God is unchangeable, can creature-actions affect the eternal mind?

ANSWERS.

Query 1st. Is any soul naturally immortal?

Ans: No: For "God only hath immortality." 1 Tim: vi. 16. He only possesses it absolutely and independently. If the soul of man was naturally immortal, he could not have lost immortality without having lost a part of his nature. But it is evident he has lost it, as well as glory and honor; and therefore is represented as seeking for glory, honor and immortality. Why seek it, if naturally immortal? We therefore conclude that God gives or communicates it to such as seek for it. Rom: ii. 7. But to them that seek not for glory, honor, and immortality, there is a different portion to be assigned, "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile." Rom: ii. 8, 9.

We must carefully distinguish between the two ideas, immortality and eternal existence. Man has lost immortality by transgression, but he has not lost existence; he yet exists, though mortal—he yet lives, though represented as dead. I ask, can a soul exist without immortality? Fact proves that it does. I ask, how long can it exist without immortality? Fact proves that it can exist 70, 80 or 969 years. The scriptures no where, that I have seen, limit to any definite period the existence of a soul without immortality. We can as easily conceive of a soul existing without immortality to eternity, as to any definite period. The scriptures plainly make a difference between eternal life and immortality. 2 Tim: i. 10. "And hath brought life and immortality to light."—"Now to the king eternal, immortal and invisible." 1 Tim: i. 17. Also, Rom: ii. 7. "They who seek for glory, honor and immortality, shall have eternal life;" not barely an eternal existence, but a life connected with glory, honor and immortality—filled with all the felicities of eternity—and stript of all the evils of mortality, and time.

Que: 2. What was the situation of a sinner, landed in death, under the law? &c.

Ans: We will take, for the present, as granted, what I shall prove in this, or the next number, that the soul of man exists after the body is dead—and exists too in a state of consciousness; and consequently is either happy or miserable. The apostle says, Rom: viii. 29, 30. Whom he did foreknow (or whom he approved of formerly, or of old) them he also predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, (that is, they should be raised from the dead and bear the immortal image of his Son,) whom he predestinated he called, justified and glorified." The souls of the saints, who died before the law, under the law, and since the law, are glorified, and are waiting for the adoption, the redemption of the body. This is the state of the righteous. But the state of the souls of the wicked is different. They are not said to be predestinated to immortality, to be justified, nor glorified. "The angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." You may say, these did not die under the law. But if this be the fate of those sinners, who died before the law, under a darker dispensation, shall we for a moment think that those sinners under the law, (a more glorious dispeniation,) shall suffer less or not at all? This is contrary to God's just ways, and judgments. Our civil governments can only inflict death on the most atrocious criminals—no more could the government of Israel do. Yet God, the judge of all, will award to all according to the deeds done in the body. If so, he cannot deal the same reward to the souls of the righteous and the wicked. A sorer punishment awaits the gospel sinner, than the law sinner, or than even the Sodomites. The sentence of the judge upon

all transgressors will be, "Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."

Que: 3. If in your opinion, &c.

Ans: You in this take for granted that endless punishment is not a doctrine of the law, but of the gospel; and therefore, the gospel is a curse rather than a blessing to mankind. My friend has forgotten that the gospel was preached at least 430 years before the law and that the law was added and entered that the offence might abound. You seem also to take for granted that the transgressors of the law aro not worthy of eternal misery, or misery at all, and that the transgressor of the gospel is alone liable to misery whether limited or eternal. I know not from what parts of the Bible you may have learned these doctrines; and as they appear to me merely speculative, I feel no disposition to pursue them, seeing the doctrine of a future state of existence is a doctrine of revelation alone. The inference you have drawn, that Jesus Christ has not bettered the situation of mankind in general, but rather made it worse, I must believe you abhor, as all christians do. As it is an inference (to say the least) from uncertain premises, it can have no weight on any mind, honestly searching for truth.

Que: 4. If God is unchangeable, can creature actions affect the eternal mind?

Ans: We do not suppose that God is affected as men are, though he is represented as angry, grieved, loving, hating, &c. His anger is a fixt, eternal and immutable perfection of his nature, which disapproves of sin, and stands in opposition to it. If he did not manifest this principle in his government, he would give a wrong view of himself. If the creature goes on to act wickedness, God's anger or eternal opposition to sin will overtake him, and punish him with everlasting destruction from his presence and from the glory of his power. These subjects are too plain to need exposition. To a believer in revelation there can be no difficulty. But to a skeptic every thing is objectionable. To such a mind right reason has as little weight to convince as revelation has. Believing that your mind is not engulphed in this horrible vortex, I refer you to plain revelation to satisfy your mind on a subject in which our future and eternal destinies are involved. Beware of unprofitable speculations. If the scriptures be true, (and that they are, we have the best evidence) learn from them. They will *certainly* teach the docile, and that in a short time too, what doubtful, erring speculation will not, cannot forages—forever. I submit these hasty thoughts, wishing you all good in time and eternity.

August 21st, 1829.

Brother Stone—The brethren and friends of the north western section of this State, (Georgia) having solicited me to inform you of the present situation of the Churches of Christ among

us, I have, in compliance with their wishes, been induced to make the following statements:

In the bounds of my circuit there are 23 churches, or congregations. These churches, it is thought, will, upon an average, number 25 members of good standing.

If I am correct in these calculations, and I feel confident that in them I have fallen below the real number of communicants, you will discover our number to be at least 575 church members. With us there are 20 Elders and 6 licensed preachers and exhorters.

We have an annual Conference of the Elders and Preachers. Deacons, delegates, and private, or lay members, present, have the right of participating in all matters which come before the Conference. Our Conference assumes no authority to legislate—nor does it carry into effect its own resolutions by penal enactments; but by simple recommendations. The powers of the Conference are restricted to the bare regulation of the temporal concerns of the church—nor can it go one step beyond this, without manifest innovations, in which case the members are not bound by any natural or moral tie to submit. Our annual Conference takes place, or rather commences on Friday before the third Sabbath in December, annually.

Our Camp-Meetings commence the last of July, or first of August in every year, and are carried on till the first of the ensuing November at various times and places. They are conducted in the main after the fashion of the Methodist Camp-Meetings.

With regard to doctrine, perhaps I ought not to say any thing, for fear it might be said that I exhibit something too near a tie to a confession of faith. But an idea of this kind I as heartily discard as I do any and every confession of faith under the sun, the Bible excepted.

Of this sacred repository of the divine will I think I can say it is the first and the last with the Christians here. We know of no other road to heaven—consequently, we feel disposed to travel along the king's highway till we be passed the borders of all confessions of faith and authoritative creeds.

This book, the Bible, we love, because we do believe it the truth from God. We regard it as the only rule of christian faith, and consequently we defend it to the last point. Our only source of sorrow is, that we have not sufficient strength to proclaim it out to Christianized Infidels and to heathen lands. Yes, my brother, I feel, as regards myself, willing to spend and be spent in the glorious work of bringing back a lost and ruined world to the purer fountain of life, whence flow the clear streams of eternal salvation. But with regard to the doctrine generally taught by our preachers here, and which is, with some slight shades of difference, received by the churches, I can say, they are such as are taught in other States by the Christian Preachers.

We believe in the first place, that Jesus Christ is truly and

properly the Son of God. Secondly—That he existed with the Father before the world was created. Thirldly—We believe that Jesus Christ, our Saviour, is the CONSTITUTED LORD of all things. We believe in atonement as expressed in your letters, or address to the Churches in Kentucky. We believe in Baptism by Immersion, after conversion, &c. Our cause in this State is advancing in some neighborhoods rapidly, and in others but slowly. The 3d day of last July I baptized an old lady of 70 years. She had formerly been a Methodist. On the 4th Sabbath of the same month I baptized 4 of the following ages—sister Montgomery 80—sister Jones 63—sister Truett 61, and brother Truett 73. It was almost a novel sight to see these persons, bending under accumulated years, submitting at the last stage of life to the great command of Christ. Surely the word of God is powerful. At our Camp-Meeting in Clark, near Scull-Shoals, we had a good time. The number of converts I know not, but I think comparatively few. With great respect I remain yours, in the bond of the gospel.

ARTHUR DUPREE.

Extract of a letter to the Editor, dated

WALTON COUNTY, Ga. Nov. 11th, 1829.

Brother Stone:—We have seen some glorious seasons lately, particularly at several Camp-Meetings, where a number found peace in Jesus. At one, near thirty professed faith, and sixteen joined the Church.—At another, twelve or more professed faith, and nine joined the Church. At the close of the meeting I baptized ten. We are gaining ground, through much opposition. Many are alarmed, fearing the consequences. Our Conference meeting will commence on Friday before the 3d Sunday in December next, near the Stone Mountain, in Dekalb county. May we all be faithful until death, and receive a crown of life! Amen.

JACOB CALLAHAN.

DEKALB COUNTY, Ga. Nov. 2d, 1829.

Brother Stone—I am truly glad you intend continuing your useful paper. May God, of his infinite mercy, enable you, if possible, to make it more useful than ever in accomplishing the desired end.

In Dekalb county, our Camp-Meeting commenced on the 7th of October. The preachers and brethren came together in the spirit—the word was delivered to the accomplishing of great good in the destruction of prejudice, and the works of darkness. About twenty professed faith in Christ, and fourteen joined the Church. At this meeting there was as much good done as at any former meeting in the State; yet we have had more than double the number of converts at one meeting.

On the 21st of Oct. I attended another Camp-Meeting in Jackson county; and it was truly a comforting season to christians. While many cried, what must we do to be saved? they

were pointed to the Messiah; and the result was, about fifteen professed faith in him; ten joined the Church, and about the same number were baptized. The meeting continued four days.

Also—there was one held at the same time in Pike county, and I am informed great good was done. At the Pike county meeting about ten made an open profession of faith in Christ, while chhristians were much encouraged.

On the whole it may be said that prejudice is greatly destroyed—those dark clouds of persecution, that used to threaten us and deter some of the brethren, have terminated in nothing more than squalls of wind, to the great mortification of our enemies, and to the advantage of our Redeemer's kingdom. Thank God! the powers of darknes are giving back—Christians are comforted—mourners are converted—and sinners are alarmed, and cry, what must we do to be saved. May the Lord, who has lighted up the torch, and begun the good work, ride on victorious, conquering and to conquer, until vice and immorality shall hide their deformed face, and knowledge fill the whole earth—the wish and prayer of

JAMES BUYS.

ERRATUM.—In Vol: 3, No. 2, the name of Elder JOSHUA PARKER was undesignedly omitted from being inserted among the Elders at that Conference.

EDITOR.

DECEMBER 12, 1829.

Brother Stone—As the Christian Messenger is circulated through various parts of the United States, and supposing your patrons delighted to hear of the spread and success of the gospel of Christ, I shall give you a short account of the success of truth where I have travelled the past summer and fall. My labors were confined principally to Muskingum, Athens, Meigs, Ross, Guernsey, and Belmont counties, Ohio. In the above counties there are a number of congregations, which have no creed but the Bible, which are serving God by faith in Christ, and in obedience to his commands. There has been a considerable revival in Athens county; upwards of 40 have been immersed there the last summer and fall, for the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit; and more than twice that number in Meigs county. The prospect in Ross county is encouraging. I immersed several in that county. In Fayette, Clinton, and Pickaway counties the truth of God is rapidly spreading—Sectarians are alarmed, and of course are trying to stop its progress; but the light is shining—error falling—darkness receding—and soldiers volunteering under the banner of the king. It seems to me that the day is not far distant when the swords will be beaten into plough shares, and the spears into pruning hooks, and that the nations will learn war no more; when all will be received as brethren, who do the will of our Father in heaven, without regard to difference of opinion; each brother

practising what the heud of the church has said, without being bound by a human creed. No more. I remain your brother in Christ. JAMES G. MITCHELL.

Elder B. W. STONE.

[SELECTED.]

Something like a "pious fraud."—Dr. Beach, the Editor of the New-York Telescope, states that he has in his office "a copy of ALL THE NAMES to the petition which was presented to the last Congress, from the city of New-York, praying for the SUNDAY RESTRICTIONS. It makes a book of 76 pages of Foolscap paper, being in all 6286 NAMES:—ONLY 3013 NAMES of which are to be found in the City Directory: the remaining 3273 names, being more than one half, are not to be found in that Register, and therefore, prove a gross fraud and imposition practised on the supreme Legislature of the nation, and calls for the loudest expression of indignation and reprobation of an injured and insulted community."

OBITUARY.

DIED—October 26th, WILLIAM LINDSAY, and on the 31st of the same month, his son Doc: MILTON LINDSAY. William Lindsay was among the early adventurers to Kentucky, and was always esteemed a valuable citizen. In the great revival in Kentucky, nearly 30 years ago, he became a lively christian, and to the end of his life maintained his profession. A few years ago he removed from Kentucky to Missouri, and there, a few months before his death, he lost the amiable and pious companion of his youth and old age, the mother of his children. Our old and dear brother met death without fear. He left the world in triumph.

Also, on December 10th, Mrs. POLLX ROBERSON, wife of Andrew Roberson, near Georgetown, Ky. Her virtues and piety were great and undisputed by all who knew her. She had long ceased to fear death—to her he was a welcome messenger—she joyfully looked forward to immortality and eternal life. She died at the age of 60 years without a struggle.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for his trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1¼ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

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. IV.] GEORGETOWN, KY. FEBRUARY, 1830. [No. 3.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1¼ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

The following extracts are taken from the Watchman, an English periodical. The work is Unitarian, and the sentiments here expressed are truly evangelical.

Hitherto our view has been retrospective; let us now confine ourselves to the existing state of things. Still is religion cultivated amongst us too exclusively in its intellectual relations. This is our great fault—a fault preceptible in all the bearings and workings of the system. Our periodicals contain excellent nutriment for the mind, almost none for the heart. In respect of the talent they exhibit, they are far superior to any thing of the kind proceeding from the orthodox press. They will teach you, and teach you well, to think—to think accurately and liberally, 'with modesty and candor;' they establish truth and recommend its adoption and avowal; they expose error and deprecate calumny; they vindicate the rights of Christians of every denomination. Holy and religious employment! But more is needed—much more. There are, in our estimation, more errors than the doctrine of the Trinity—heresies more fatal than bigots ever imagined. The only fatal heresy is in fact the heresy of a wicked life. Nor is there any so difficult of cure. A man will more easily part with all his opinions than resign one evil habit. If so, then the moral part should receive the chief attention. The exposition should be followed up by the application of truth.—Truth as it relates to the government of the conversation and the passions—that truth which is emphatically life—the life of God in the soul of man—the means of quickening all the elements of holiness within us, the means of gaining the Divine favor, and of saving the soul; this kind of truth, embracing interests of infinite importance—yet, alas! how neglected—this truth, the one thing needful—in comparison of which how little do all