ty, which are in a prosperous way. We expect to form another shortly in Tippacanoe, near the battle ground."

The good work continues in Oldham and Henry counties. Bro: S. Marshall lately baptised, at one meeting, 10 in Oldham, and 4 in Henry a few days after. Many, we have lately heard, are waiting to be baptised.

BROTHER STONE:—I have been a constant reader of the C. Messenger, and C. Baptist, and with pleasure view how easily truth can triumph over error. The advocates for truth have nothing more to do, than to disply it in its native simplicity, unadorned with human frippery; while its opponents are obliged to labor hard in trimming and adorning in proper apparel, in order to make it appear splendid in the eyes of the world. Sarcastic invective is losing its edge very fast, and nothing but truth will stand; while the rubbish of human invention will be burnt up by the fire of the word of God. It would be gratifying to some of your readers, if you would give us a proper difinition of the terms *iniquity*, *transgression* and *sin*. Are they synonymous or not?

T. SCOTT.

NOTICE.—The Christian Church met in Conference, at Boon's Creek meeting house, E. Tenn. August 17, 1829. The Elders present were Jas: Miller, Jeriel Dodge, Robt: M. Shankland, John Wallace, and Wm. Slaughter, Jun. The number of members, composing the Christian churches in this section of country, were ascertained to be 472. After conferring comfortably together, we agreed to meet again at the North Fork Church, Washington county, Va. on the Saturday before the 3rd Lord's day in August, 1830. WM. SLAUGHTER, Jr.

NOTICE.—Bro: F. R. PALMER and the Editor design attending the Miami Conference, near Franklin, Ohio, on Friday before the 4th Lord's day of August. The Editor hopes the agents and patrons of the Christian Messenger, and such as have our Hymn Books, will remember us at that time, as our necessities are urgent. The Editor wishes to know whether his agents and patrons will continue another year. If not, it is hoped they will let him know in time, at as little expense of postage as possible.

ERRATA.—The Editor was absent when the 8th number was printed. Some *Errata* are discovered, as follows—Instead of 1 Col: xx, read Col: i, 20, page 171—for raise, read rise, p. 173—for onergies, read energies, p. 175—for temporial, read temporal, p. 179—for temporeal, read temporal, p. 180—between *created* and *things*, read *all*, p. 182, line 1—for will, read well, p. 182, line 10—between *had* and *himself*, read *by*, p. 182, line 2[illegible]—for controversalist, read controversialist, p. 185, line 32—for 1 Cor: xii, 1, 12, read 1 Cor: xii, 1–12—for impropriety, read impropriety, p. 185, line 39—for sentance, read sentence, p. 185, line 48—for no, read any, p. 186, line 41.


# 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. SEPT. 1830. [No. 10.

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.


## *Dialogue between a Preacher and Anomos.*

(CONTINUED FROM P. 134.)

*Pre:* My dear Anomos, I am truly glad to meet you after so long a separation. Let us retire to that grove and converse awhile on the important subject of religion.

*Ano:* Most willingly do I comply; and I am thankful that kind providence has brought us together at this time especially.

*Pre:* Come, tell me some of the most interesting events of your religious course since we last parted. You then appeared strong in the faith, and firmly fixed on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. Your joy was full, your love to the brethren was fervent and endearing, and you, I believe, was drinking deeply into the spirit of holiness. I hope my brother is still steadfast in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and abounding in the fruits of the Spirit.

*Ano:* Ah! my brother, were I to give you a relation of all the incidents of my religious course, since I saw you, it would be wearisome and unprofitable. I will relate a few, which I consider most interesting. Soon after I parted with you, I visited a near relation, who was a Calvinistic preacher of considerable note, and, I think, of deep piety. After common salutations, I informed him of my reformation and change as to religion. Joy sparkled in his eyes, and he embraced me again most affectionately. He soon asked me to what church I had attached myself. I told him, to the Church of Christ. I saw his countenance fall, and his joy was turned into sorrow. After a while, he expressed the emotions of his heart in words—that he was truly sorry that I had united with a people whom he viewed no better than infidels—for, says he, they deny the trinity—they deny the divinity of Jesus, the Son of God—they deny the atonement—they deny the operation of the Spirit on the heart—they make regeneration

to be nothing else than immersion—in a word, they deny all the essential doctrines of religion. Besides this: they are perfect anarchists and disorganisers, having rejected all Creeds and Confessions of faith, and all names but that which least suits them, the sacred name *Christian*. Surely, said he, you did not know these things when you joined with that people! I answered him, that I well knew that these things were commonly said of them, and that I once believed the reports to be true, as coming from, what I thought, good authority; but that I had been convinced of my error, forwhich event I cannot be too thankful; nor can an eternity of thanksgiving pay the just tribute to my God and Saviour.

Do they not deny the trinity? Yes—they deny that to be a scriptural term; and they deny the vain speculations of man concerning it: but they do not deny the one God, the Father; nor the one Lord Jesus, the Son of the Father; nor the one Holy Spirit of God. They do not deny that they are one, in the sense of scripture, not one person, not one substance, but *one*, as all believers are one. John xvii. They do not deny that Jesus, the Son of God, is divine, as being God's own Son, his only begotten Son. They firmly believe every thing the scriptures say of him, but nothing more. They deny and reject the wild and absurd inventions of men on this subject. Stop, my friend—Do they not deny three persons in one God? They do; because they cannot find this expressed in scripture. How? Not in the scripture? Is not 1 John, v, 7, to the very point? I adverted to the Christian Messenger, I think in the 4th No. of Vol. 4, and shewed him the abundant and undoubted testimony of trinitarians against its genuineness. I informed him that some of the doctors of the West, as well as of the East, were now rejecting it. That even his neighbor, Doct. T. Cleland, had rejected it as undoubtedly spurious, although he had so warmly defended it a few years ago. I will not defend it, said my friend, for there is proof enough without it to establish the doctrine. Where, uncle, shall we find this proof? In Matt: xxviii, 19, 2 Cor: xiii, 14, said he. These facts mention the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we admit; but do they declare that they are one God, or one substance? This is the point to be proved. As to the argument drawn from the Hebrew word *Elohim*, I really wonder that men of intelligence should even urge it.

But, said my uncle, do not those people deny the atonement of the Saviour? This, surely, is the doctrine which distinguishes christianity from infidelity. I answered, they do not deny the atonement; but they have rejected the explanation of the *orthodox* on this point. Yes, said he, they have rejected the very life and soul of it; which is the satisfaction made to law and justice by the Saviour, in the stead of sinners. I asked him to state his doctione in a plain manner; I had, perhaps, not understood it. He did, in these words—God gave man a law, sanctioned by his authority, with the penalty of death—If God forgive the offender, or remit the penalty, his truth is forfeited, his law dishonored, and the bands of his government weakened—Man sinned, and incurred this penalty—There is no hope of forgiveness, till law and justice be satisfied—Jesus becomes substitute for the guilty, and pays, in his stead, the debt to law and justice; and thus satisfaction being made, forgiveness is granted, or remission of the penalty made. Remember this, my friend, if God were to forgive the debt without satisfaction, it must be at the expense of law and justice, and then you must see an end of the righteousness of God. I felt the force of his argument, and made no reply. I told him I would honestly examine his doctrine, and after a few weeks, would inform him the result. My mind has been chained to this point ever since, nor can I come to any certain conclusion respecting it. I wish my brother to give me his views of this subject, before I proceed to any farther incidents in my religious course, since I saw you last.

*Preu:* His argument is plausible, that if the penalty be remitted, or forgiven, it must be at the expense of justice, which demanded it. But consider, if the penalty be inflicted, it must be at the expense of mercy; for mercy's plea for remission, is equally strong as that of justice for infliction. On this principle, if God exercise mercy, it is the expense of justice; if he exercise justice, it must be at the expense of mercy: If, therefore, he act mercifully or justly, he must act wrong. This is an awful dilemma in which your friend's argument has placed the Almighty. His holy perfections at war with one another, and can never act but in opposition to each other. I will state a similar case. A person commits an atrocious murder—he is arraigned at the bar of his country—he is tried by law, and justly condemned by his judge to death. Mercy is vested by every good government, either in the King, the President, or the Governor, with the right to exercise it to whom he will. A petition is preferred to the Governor, to grant remission to this poor condemned murderer. The Governor grants it, the condemned is forgiven, and discharged from the punishment. Will any say that this exercise of mercy was at the expense of law or justice? No: For law and justice had placed this right to exercise mercy in the Governor, and when he exercised it, it was by the authority of law and justice, and consequently not against them.

Let us apply this case to the Sovereign of the Universe. That mercy and forgiveness are perfections of his nature, as well as justice and truth, will, we presume, be denied by none. Who, but the guilty and needy, are objects of mercy? And who, but the penitent guilty, are the objects of forgiveness? Whenever a poor sinner repents, then he comes within the sphere of forgiveness. God forgives the penitent. Why? Because it is a principle in his eternal nature to forgive the penitent. Is this forgiveness granted at the expense of law, or justice, or truth? No! Because justice and truth are well satisfied that these perfections should be in Jehovah, and that he exercise them on the

proper objects. Thus God hath set forth his Son to declare that he can be just, and yet justify the ungodly that believe, and, consequently, repent.

*Ano:* Stop, brother—Do you make repentance the ground and reason why God forgives? This, I am told, is a tenet of deism.

*Prea:* I do not make repentance the ground and reason why God forgives; but the very reason is, because forgiveness belongs to him, and is a perfection of his nature. Repentance is only the condition of forgiveness. This the scriptures constantly teach; as, he forgives *for his own name's sake;* and forgives the repenting sinner only. I know this is said to be a doctrine of deism, and so is every doctrine called, that is in opposition to boasting orthodoxy. But whence did deists get this doctrine, or any other doctrine of God, but from revelation? Shall I deny a doctrine because a deist believes it? If so, I must deny the fundamental of all true religion, the being of God, and many of his perfections. The great difference between the Christian and the deist, on the doctrine of forgiveness, is this: The Christian believes that the goodness of God, manifested in the gift, the life, the death, the resurrection and ascension of his Son, leads him that believes to repentance. But the deist rejects the Saviour, and, of course, is never led to genuine repentance and forgiveness.

*Ano:* I am clearly convinced of the justness of your remarks. Yet I wish you to be a little more explicit on the doctrine of my uncle. He laid great stress on Gal: iii, 13: "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 hangath on a tree."

*Prea:* The whole context shows plainly that the law spoken of in the text, is the whole law of Moses; those spoken of as delivered from it were the Jews; for they only were under it; to the Gentiles it was not given; consequently, they were not under its curse. Two or three particular ideas are contained in the text, to which I will call your attention: 1. What is the curse of the law? 2. How Christ has delivered from it; and 3. For what purpose?

1. What is the curse of the law? I answer—It was the ministration of bondage, condemnation and death. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them."

2. Christ has redeemed the Jews from it. How? By being made a curse for us, by hanging on the tree, or by being crucified for us. In other words, he redeemed the Jews from the law by his death. For by his death, the law became dead by the body of Christ—he nailed it to his cross, taking it out of the way. He was the end of the law—it was done away—it waxed old and vanished away. If the law is dead and done away, of course, its transgression is done away, and, consequently, its curse. "For where there is no law, there is no transgression."



"And for this cause he is the Mediator of a better testament, that *by means of death*, for the redemption of transgressions which were under the first testament, they that are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

3. For what purpose did he suffer this death, or curse for us, or on our account? I answer in Paul's language—"He hath redeemed us (Jews) from the curse of the law, that the blessing of Abraham (the gospel) might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." 14 v. He, by his death, freed us from the law, that we might be married to another, even Christ; that we might receive the promise of eternal inheritance, glory, honor, immortality and eternal life; that he might unite Jew and Gentile in himself, and bring them with himself to reign as kings and priests for ever more.

*Ano:* You have left out the idea of Christ paying our debt to justice, as our surety or substitute.

*Prea:* This idea I have never found contained in the scriptures. I beg my brother to read attentively Stone's Address, 2d edition, and his 9th letter to Doc: Blythe, on the atonement. There you will learn that the idea attached to Christ as surety, with the whole system of doctrines founded on it, are the specious inventions and speculations of men; and that they stand opposed to the whole doctrine of grace, once delivered to the saints, by the spirit of inspiration. I would simply remark, that to talk of forgiveness, when the debt is paid, is a solecism.

*Ano:* Farewell. At another time I wish to hear you again.

EDITOR.

---

*From the New-York Evangelist.*

## INNOVATIONS.

Mr. Editor—In these days, I find that many are afraid of innovations, and much opposed to them; especially, in things which concern the kingdom of the Lord Jesus, and its prosperity. But why all this? Is it because they are afraid that truth will fail in the earth—that the cause of Christ will suffer—that sinners will go down to hell? Or is it something else? And do not they, who are all so much alarmed lest innovations should be made, manifest the same spirit, and exhibit the same character, that the Jews did in the days of Jesus and the Apostles? Were they not afraid of innovations in matters of religion? They certainly were: But why? That is the question. I answer, the very reason why *they* were so much afraid of the innovations which were made by Christ and his followers, was this—they and their fathers had made very great innovations on the religion which had been revealed from heaven, by God himself, through the instrumentality of Moses and the succeeding prophets. Had they been candid, honest men, they would not have been afraid of the light; they would not have feared the strictest scrutiny.

The Jews are still afraid of innovations: and this is the grand hindrance to their conversion. Mahomedans and heathens too are opposed to innovations in things of religion: And why? Not because they have truth on their side; but because they love that darkness with which they are surrounded; and hate the light of truth, because their *deeds* are evil.

No people have been guilty of greater innovations, on the religion of Jesus Christ, than those of the Roman Catholics; yet none have ever raised a greater *hue and cry* against innovations, than they. They have persecuted many millions, even unto death, on the ground of innovations; they have done it for ages; and they manifest the same spirit to this day. Witness the manner in which our missionaries and their converts have been treated in Palestine—witness the thunders of the Vatican, against *Bible* Societies, and *Bible* men—yes, witness the frequent murders in Ireland, by Catholic mobs to this day. This is because they are unwilling that innovations should be made on *their* religion—not the *Lord's;* but their *own.*

But, Sir, I ask if any improvement can be made in any thing, without innovation? Can the true and living christian "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," without change? Can he constantly grow wiser and better, without continual change? Surely not: And what is change but innovation?

Again, I would ask, can the *promises and prophecies* that have gone before, ever be fulfilled, without great innovations? Must they not be made as the millennial glory nearer shines? Do ministers and Christians suppose that *they know* as much of God, and feel the *power* of Godliness, as much as the people will who shall live in that happy day, when the light of the *moon* shall be as the light of the *sun*—when the light of *one* day shall be as the light of *seven* days—and when "HOLINESS to the LORD shall be written upon the *bells* of the *horses?*" Are *we* as holy, as humble, as charitable, as spiritually-minded, as *they* will be? And why need many to run to and fro, and knowledge to be increased?

But, Sir, let us take the several denominations of christians as we now find them—say, the Episcopalians, the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians: they are all very jealous over their rights, or privileges—they are very tenacious of *creeds* and their forms; but if great innovations are not made amongst them, will their watchmen ever "see eye to eye?" And can the glories of the millennium ever be realised on earth? And will the people of that day be governed by that narrow mind, that sectarian, contracted, selfish, worldly spirit, which characterise all the churches of the present day? Will they waste their lives in endless speculations, and doubtful theories, and neglect prayer and practical godliness, as we now do? If not, great innovations must be made.

Again: Is not the Christian religion, as it is now taught—believed—practised, almost any thing, or every thing, rather than



the religion which was taught and believed, and which shone in life and conversation, in the days of Paul? Who believes, and prays, and prevails in prayer, as the Christians did in those days? Who is now willing to deny himself, and take "joyfully the spoiling of his goods," as did the Christians of that time? Who can be found, in these days, that could wish himself "accursed from Christ for his brethren, his kinsmen, according to the flesh?" Were the Christians of those times as much in love with earthly things as we are? Did they delight as much in gay attire, in lascivious pampering of the body, and in an elegant, expensive parade, as christians of the present day? Did they affect the fine gentlemen? Were they mere beaux and belles? If not, did they much resemble professors of the present age?

Again: Is the same doctrine taught now, which was then proclaimed? Is it not plain matter of fact, that the grand topics of apostolic preaching but little thought of now, while a thousand speculations are advanced, of which an apostle never dreamed? The religion of that day consisted of principle, heavenly principle, reduced to living, ardent, persevering practice: Is it so now? Does not the religion of the present day consist more in opinion than practice? Is it not the custom of the present age, to adopt a set of opinions, make little advancement in the knowledge of God, refrain (*not always*) from grosser acts of wickedness, and attend to a few *forms of godliness*, while the heart is full of every thing but love to God and man? And is not this *called* the religion of Jesus Christ? I will not say there are no exceptions; for if there were none, the world might sink at once to hell: But, I ask, is not this the fashion, or custom, which widely prevails in the churches of the present day? If any shall answer in the negative, let them answer by practice, and the answer will be, so far as they are concerned, both good and true.

If these things be so, (and the world cannot but see that they are so,) is there not the utmost need of vast amendment? Most certainly. But the amendments which God requires can never be made without vast innovations. The world must be turned "upside down;" the churches must be shaken, sifted, and purified; the watchmen must blow the trumpet, not with uncertain, but with significant sound; they must blow it loud and long; they must learn to be ministers, and nothing but ministers, of Jesus Christ, or the world itself will do as it has done for ages, it will empty almost all its contents into hell!

Innovations must be made—reform must, of necessity, take place—great changes must be introduced—they must overspread the world, for the world must be converted. Yes, the knowledge of the Lord must cover the earth as the waters do the sea. It is desirable that innovation should be made, that changes, very great, should come. I know, very well, that troubles, great and many, will attend the mighty revolution which the world must shortly undergo. But let them come—let us look to God for help, and arm ourselves for the conflict—let us acquit

ourselves "like men;" follow the captain of our salvation; fight the battles of the Lord, and come off more than conquerors, through him that loved us. Now let us endure hardness, as good soldiers, and wear the brighter crown. Light afflictions will increase our "eternal weight of glory," beyond the grave: and there is much truth in the ancient proverb, "no cross no crown."

I said, it is desirable that innovations should be made—made in those things *called religion*, as well as other things: I say so still And why? Because the good, the infinite, eternal good, which God has promised, can never come, can never be enjoyed, without innovations People are not prepared to receive those blessings. Nay, much of the good which God has in store, consists in the very changes which shall take place. Glorious things are spoken of the city (i. e. the church) of our God: but they can never be fulfilled, unless the church is revolutionised. She is not now prepared to receive them. She must come up out of the wilderness—she must learn to be separate from the world, remembering that its friendship is enmity with God, or she can never receive those glorious things

Why, then, are so many ministers and churches afraid of innovations? Are ministers afraid they shall lose their livings? Are they afraid they shall become unpopular? Are they afraid they shall be persecuted as Jesus, and Paul, and Luther, and Whitfield have been? Why are churches so much afraid of innovations? Are they afraid their slumbers will be broken? Or are they afraid they shall be obliged to dissolve their partnership with the world? Are they afraid they shall be necessitated to lay aside their gay equipage, their gewgaws, and all their extravagance in dress and other things? Are they afraid they shall be obliged to deny themselves, take up the cross, follow Jesus daily, watch, pray, and live, as for eternity? Or are they afraid the zeal of innovators will put them to shame, and that they shall be obliged to forsake all for Christ, bear the cross, or else be exposed to themselves and to the world, in the light or character of mere hypocrites, having no more religion than is requisite for a decent or comfortable standing in and with the world?

Sir, I wish you to publish this, or produce a better article on the same subject: for something of the kind is greatly needed.

A.

## LETTER TO J. C.

Dear Brother—With gladness I received your letter dated July 13th, and have preferred to give you an answer in the columns of the Messenger, for reasons which will at once be suggested to your mind. You have stated the exercise of your mind with regard to preaching the gospel, and you wish to receive advice from me on the subject. You state that you see the world in darkness, sin and death, and the sight so affects your heart,



that you long to see them rescued by the gospel. You say, you have tried to exhort and pray for your fellow creatures with some success, and are urged by some brethren to labor more extensively and constantly. Believing you to be well versed in the scriptures, and that you are able to exhibit them with clearness, I would without hesitation unite with those brethren in urging you to go forth and preach the gospel of your Lord. I will suggest a few things to your consideration, by attention to which you will become more useful in the vineyard.

1st. Be careful that you live and walk in the spirit every day. Your addresses will then be spiritual, and profitable to your hearers. A dead, worldly and spiritless ministry, is a curse to the world. Such a ministry, is a ministry of death.

2d. Avoid as much as possible controversy on religious subjects. This strain of preaching is unprofitable, and tends to turn the attention of the people to speculation, rather than to Godly edifying.—It is observable that young preachers generally are fondest of preaching on controversial points; and they generally are the least qualified to do it profitably. Were they to examine their hearts, they would find the reason why this kind of preaching is pursued by them. If I am not mistaken, the spirit of devotion and love is absent, and the love of popularity reigns within. Did the love of God possess their hearts, they would address the hearts of their hearers. Remember the advice of an old apostle to young Timothy, "preach the word." This preached in the spirit with clearness, is the only effectual weapon to overthrow error and save souls.

3d. Learn to know your proper gift, whether it be exhortation or teaching. I have seen many profitable exhorters, who leaving this for teaching, have immediately sunk from usefulness, and into contempt. We are prone to imitation in every thing, even in religion. The popular mode of preaching with many now is, to take a whole chapter or more for their text. This is a happy method to teach, when a person of teaching talents, use it; but for the young and ignorant to undertake it, is most generally unprofitable, and frequently disgusting. More darkness than light is generally exhibited in their teaching essays. I advise you when you commence preaching to select an easy short and practical subject. Let your exposition be short, and if a lengthy address must be made, let it consist of lively exhortation, and warm entreaties to your hearers to attend to wisdom and her ways.—You will generally see that lectures from whole chapters seldom are blessed to the awakening of sinners, or of warming the hearts of God's people. The reason is obvious, because so many subjects are brought to view, that the truth, which had began to fix the attention, is immediately checked in its effects by the introduction of another, and so passes off without leaving any lasting impression. Let not the declamation against what is called *scrap-preaching*, deter you from taking short and plain texts,

when you attempt to preach. Learn and progress should be your motto.

4th. Too many preachers, especially the young, destroy all the effect of their addresses by a pompous display of *self*, or an affected *non-descript* in the pulpit. O! how hateful! how unnatural! how unbecoming! for a minister of Christ to strut and plume himself at any time, but especially in the pulpit, to *affect* to be really affected, when the intelligent plainly discover thro' the vail, the hypocrisy. To give a display of learned words and rounded sentences in Iceburgh style! From such a minister the holy angels turn away their eyes with disgust, and holy men on earth hang their heads with shame at the sight. Endeavor to feel yourself as in the presence of God, and labor to please him, and to save souls; then you will evade these hateful things.

5th. Many preachers destroy their usefulness by unprofitable conversation. I have heard a preacher deliver a warm discourse which affected his hearers. I have immediately after service seen him indulging in mirth, in laughable witticism, and anecdotes, or in political controversy; and the subject of religion barely named. How offensive is such conduct to those who see it! Will they not conclude that the preacher is insincere in his profession? My dear young brother, avoid such a course. Preach at the fireside as well as in the pulpit—in private circles as well as in the public. Let your life be so holy, as ever to witness to the world your devotion to the cause of your master. Then, you will be a profitable preacher.

6th. Be careful not to wound the feelings of the least christian of any name. View all the children of God as your brethren, whatever name they may bear. What, if they have received wrong opinions of truth? This is no reason why you should despise or reject them. Consider the best method of correcting those errors. It is not angrily or dogmatically to declaim against them. Such a course never did convince any of his errors.—The correct course is to establish the truth by sound argument, and then in meekness to instruct opposers by answering their objections fairly stated. This will never wound a good man; but has convinced many of their errors, & reclaimed them to the paths of truth. Let any preacher declaim against any people in a furious, ill-natured manner; he will labor in vain with respect to profit; but his labors will produce barrenness, and a hard spirit in himself and in them that hear him; hatred instead of love; strife instead of peace, and division instead of union. Such preaching is a curse, not a blessing to society; and the sooner it is hissed out of the world the better.

7th. Beware of a sectarian spirit, the greatest evil in the christian world. It introduces itself into the most benevolent institutions, and perverts their good designs. See it in even Bible societies—in Missionary societies—in Sunday schools—and even it begins to appear in anti-intemperance societies. Who shall go to the Heathen as a Missionary to preach? The Presbyterian rejects all but his party—so do the Methodist—so the Baptists, and so do all sectarians. The poor heathens are supplied with missionaries of all sects—they all profess to be sent of God, but preach contradictory doctrines. Is it any wonder that the poor creatures should reject them all as impostors? From the spirit of sectarianism as a fruitful soil, is now springing and growing a crop of infidels, which may yet threaten the empire of Emanuel. O! that the smoke of the bottomless pit were removed from the eyes of professors, that they might clearly see the fruit of their sectarianism! Dear brother, the best and only antidote against this evil is, to keep yourself in the love of God—to give yourself to the reading of the sciptures, and to labor after perfect obedience.

8th. Beware of the spirit of the Athenians; "For all the Athenians spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing." A fondness for novelty has ruined many a promising young preacher. To exhibit something new, figures are strained and plain facts allegorized. Such a method of sermonizing disgusts the intelligent, and sinks the preacher in their estimation; while it leaves the audience untaught, unless in trifles.

I might add other things as advice to you; but recommend to your serious attention on this subject the epistles to Timothy and Titus. May the Lord direct you and prosper your labors of love! May you never be warped from truth or duty by the love of money, ease or fame! May you never be deterred from faithfully declaring the whole counsel of God, by the frown, threats or persecutions of men! May you at last hear the plaudit of your judge, "Well done good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joys of thy Lord."

EDITOR.



## THE TIMES.

I am disgusted, and wearied, and sickened, at the spirit and practice of the times. Righteousness and peace, mercy and truth, are so outraged and abused by men, that they appear on the point of forsaking the world entirely. Instead of harmony, discord rages; instead of love, hatred; instead of peace, war; and instead of forbearing, intollerance every where presents her scowling face. Were these things to be seen among the men of the world alone, we should pity and weep over their miseries, and be urgent to reform them. And how pleasant and easy would be the work of reform, if all, who professed religion, were Christians indeed. Truth shining in the humble, holy lives of Christians, has an overwhelming influence, & produces an irresistible effect on the minds of the wicked and profane. But alas! the still small voice of truth is drowned in the din of party strife and unhallowed declamation. When truth is presented, it is so clothed and decked in the tinsel of human trappings, and so mingled with the wisdom of men, and so carelessly delivered in Iceburgh style, that it makes but feeble impressions on the minds of

the hearers. The professed friends of truth, the professed followers of the lamb, alas! how few honor their profession! "What shall I eat, and what shall I drink, and wherewith shall I be clothed," seem to engage their attention more than, "what shall I do to be saved—how shall I please God—and how shall I promote his cause to the good of my fellow creatures." Our worshipping assemblies exhit a brighter display of extravagance in dress, and fashionable etiquette, than of seriousness and humility. Look at that young sister, a professed follower of the meek and humble Saviour, how gorgeously apparelled! how decked off with ribbands, rings, earrings and braceletts! how tightly and miserably laced! Would a stranger suspect her for a christian? The young brothers, are they less plain and less extravagant? How glad should I be, if I could except the elder sisters and brothers from the circle of extravagance! Alas! how driven is society to toil and labor to support such a style! What little time is allowed for preparation for eternity! The mind is literally overwhelmed with cares, and divine subjects are crowded out by mere trifles. It is surely a time that calls aloud for reformation; and it is humbly hoped that the call shall be attended to and obeyed by all in the spirit of reform. EDITOR.

---

QUERY.—By Elder John Scott of Indiana. "Did the ancient christians take the Lord's supper every Lord's day.

ANSWER.—It is evident that from the institution of this ordinance as recorded by the Evangelists, nothing decisive can be adduced as to the frequency of receiving it. The same institution as recorded by Paul, who received it from the Lord, is more decisive as to time. I. Cor. 11. 25, 26. "This do ye, as oft as you drink it, in rememberance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." Yet it cannot from this be determined, how often, whether once, twice, or a dozen times a year. Some have thought that Acts 2. 42, 46, refers to the Lord's supper; but others have thought differently. It cannot be determined, which opinion is most correct. I incline to think with the latter, though I am not positive.

Acts 20. 7, seems to me to decide how often the ancient christians received the supper, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them." From this it is plain that the disciples came together on the first day of the week, and the great end of their coming together was to break bread. This was the principle part of their worship, mingled with songs of praise, with prayer, reading the scriptures and exhortation or preaching. This is further confirmed by I. Cor. 11, 20, "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper." The meaning of the Apostle, doubtless, is this "you come together professedly to eat the Lord's supper; but your abuse of this holy ordinance, is a profanation of it rather than any thing else." These



are all the passages in the N. Testament on this subject, & these plainly to my mind prove that the practice of the ancient christians was, to take the Lord's supper every first day of the week. This, we are informed by church historians, continued to be the constant practice of the church for the first three centuries after Christ. Whenever the church shall be restored to her former glory, she will again receive the Lord's supper on every first day of the week. Certainly then, christians should seriously take this subject into consideration and reform. EDITOR.

---

## REFORMATION.

Reformation is the order of the day. Against it have been marshalled all the powers of hell and earth in every age, as in the present. For laboring to reform the people, the ancient prophets suffered imprisonment and death—the Saviour of sinners and his holy Apostles were also persecuted to death—Luther and other reformers were opposed with malignant fury—and so were the Wesleys and their coadjutors. Should we be asked, who were the persecutors?. we should be obliged to answer, with shame and confusion of face; the *orthodox* clergy were generally the leaders and instigators! Such were the persecutors of our Lord and his apostles—of Luther and his companions—of the Wesleys and their people. And who but the *orthodox* clergy, as leaders, are now opposing reformation, persecuting the reformers? But what reformation is needed? Why is such reformation opposed? And how shall such reformation be effectedly carried on? These three particulars shall fix our attention for a short time.

1st. What reformation is needed? The church was once united as a band of brothers on the one foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. Now it is rent and torn into many contending sects, and divided into many jarring communities. This the reformers know to be in opposition to the will of God, who says by his inspired apostle, "Let there be no divisions among you." This is contrary to the law of Christ, and stands in opposition to the salvation of the world. Believing these facts the reformers labor to convince the christian world that they are wrong, and urge them to reform and be converted to the truth as it is in Jesus—that they all unite in love and peace, that the world may believe in Jesus and be saved.

2. The church once had but "one faith"—the faith once delivered to the saints—the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ—the law of Christ, our only lawgiver and head. According to *this same rule* they walked, and grew, and multipled. On this foundation they were established. Now, they have faiths many, drawn up in certain books called creeds, or confessions, which their members have to subscribe, and thus each becomes a party etablished on another party, & every party established on a foundation different one from another. While these establishments continue,

there can be no hope of peace or unity—we therefore labor to show our brethren their error, and urge them to reform, by casting their creeds or systems of opinions to the moles and to the bats, and receive only the Bible as the system of truth delivered from heaven, and the New Testament as the rule given us by our lawgiver, by which we are to walk.

3. The church of old had one name given to it by divine authority—that name is *Christian*—this name was sufficient while they walked in the truth. But now their names are as numerous as the parties. Each party has a name by which he is distinguished from all others. We also labor to convince our brethren of this error, and exhort them to take the old despised name, and consign their party names to the winds.

4. The church of Christ once had but one lawgiver; and they found his laws sufficient to unite them in one body and in one spirit, and keep them united in the bonds of peace. We have seen the church now have many lawgivers, who issue laws in contradiction to each other; and thus divide those whom God intended should be united, and to enslave those whom God had made free. We have seen that no man, nor body of men have any divine warrant to make laws for the church, and that the assumption is iniquitous—we therefore labor to dissuade others from this course, and to labor to obey what are given by our great and divine lawgiver.

5 The church once had ministers, who dare not lord it over them, as the gentiles do—they were humble, and had more care for the flock than the fleece. But now the ministers have assumed high grounds. The church is now *ipso facto* under their dominion—ruled by their laws, and expelled at their pleasure.—There is a semblance of church power, but it only in appearance; the power is in the priesthood. We call aloud for reform in this particular, and labor to put the ministry in their proper place.

6. The church once had a pure gospel—but now it is so mixed with philosophy and human absurdities, that its glory is darkened; its beauty defaced—its power diminished, and its divine effects almost destroyed. It is made to be a mystery to the inquirer, a laugh to the infidel, and a stumbling block to the world. It is urged to prove contradictions—forced to establish absurdities—and enlisted to support every whim of vain man. We grieve to see the book of eternal life thus abused—we labor, therefore, to reform this evil by calling the world to the simple facts as stated in the scripture—that these believed and obeyed will eventuate in good, and restore Zion to her former glory.

2dly. Why is such reformation opposed? It is evident the Jewish clergy opposed the reformotion, preached by Jesus and his apostles, not because they loved religion; (for they were proverbially wicked;) but because of the honor, ease and wealth they acquired by their religion. They plainly saw that if their religion be taken from them, their wealth ease and honor would also be taken. This they could not bear, therefore they opposed reformation. The same cause yet exists.



The Jews were blinded by their own traditions, so that they could not see the truth, and therefore opposed it when presented by the Saviour and his apostles. The same reason has caused, and yet causes thousands to oppose reformation.

3dly. How shall reformation be effectually carried on? By the power and spirit of truth. By a faithful exposure of the errors, a bold refutation of them by the word, and by an effectionate exhortation to reform. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and clamor, and evil speaking be put away—never let such appear—but let moderation be always seen and known by all. Let the spirit of love and peace reign and rule in our hearts. Then will our addresses have weight and influence. EDITOR.

---

The Jews' confession of faith drawn up at the close of the eleventh century, by Maimonides.

"1. I believe, with a true and perfect faith, that God is the creator, (whose name be blessed!) governor, and maker of all creatures; and that he has wrought all things, worketh, and shall work forever. 2. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator, (whose name be blessed!) is one; and that such an unity as in him can be found in none other, and that he alone hath been our God, is, and forever shall be. 3. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name is blessed!) is not corporeal, not to be comprehended with any bodily properties, and that there is no bodily essense that can be likened unto him. 4. I believe with a perfect faith, the Creator (whose name be blessed!) to be the first and the last, that nothing was before him, and that he shall abide the last forever. 5. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed!) is to be worshipped and none else. 6. I believe, with perfect faith, that all the words of the Prophets are true. 7. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the prophesies of Moses, our master, (may he rest in peace!) were true; that he was the father and the chief of all wise men that lived before him, or ever shall live after him. 8. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the law, which at this day is found in our hands, was delivered by God himself to our master, Moses (God's peace be with him!). 9. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the same law is never to be changed, nor any other to be given to us of God (whose name be blessed!). 10. I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed!) understandeth all the works and thoughts of men as it is written in the prophets; he fashioneth their hearts alike, he understandeth all their works. 11. I believe with perfect faith, that God will recompense good to them who keep his commandments, and will punish those who transgress them. 12. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Messiah is yet to come, and, although he retard his coming, yet I will wait till he come. 13. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the dead shall be restored to life, when it shall seem fit unto God,

the Creator (whose name be blessed, and memory celebrated, world without end!—Amen.)"

This creed furnishes additional evidence (not necessary indeed) that the doctrine of a trinity was wholly foreign from the thoughts of the Jews. Upon this circumstance, then, in connexion with the silence of Jesus, as well as of all the New Testament writers, on the subject of the trinity, we ground a presumptive argument against this doctrine, which we know not how fair and candid minds can resist.—*Christian Register.*

---

*From Flint's Western Review.*

There are in the United States one hundred thousand young ladies, as Sir Ralph Abercombie said of those of Scotland, "*the prettiest lassies in a' the world,*" who neither know how to toil nor spin, who are yet clothed like the lilies of the valley,—who thrum the piano, and a few of the more dainty the harp,—who walk as the Bible says, softly, lest brisker movement might snap tapes drawn to their utmost tension,—who have read romances, and some of them seen the interior of theatres,—who have been admired at the examination of their high schools,—who have wrought algebraic solutions on the black board,—who have shown themselves no mean proficients in the casuistry of Paley,—who are in short, the very roses of the garden, the ottar of life,—who, yet can never expect to be married, or if married, to live without—shall I speak or forbear?—putting their own lily hands to *domestic drudgery.*

We go into the interior of our recent wooden country. The fair one sits down to clink the wires of the piano. We see the fingers displayed on the keys, which we are sure never prepared a dinner, or made a garment for their robustuous brothers. We traverse the streets of our own city, and the wires of the piano are drummed in our ears from every considerable house. In cities and villages from one extremity of the union to the other, wherever there is a house, and the doors and windows betoken the presence of the mild months, the ringing of the piano wires is almost as universal a sound, as the domestic hum of life within.

We need not enter in person. Imagination sees the fair, erect on her music stool, laced and pinioned and bishop sleeved, and deformed with hair torn from another scalp, and reduced to a questionable class of entomology, *secundo more*, dinging as Sawney would say, at the wires, as though she could in some manner hammer out of them music, amusement and a husband. Look at her taper and cream colored fingers. Is she an utilitarian? Ask the fair one, after she has beaten all the music out of the keys—"pretty fair one, canst talk to thy old and sick father, so as to beguile him out of the headache and rheumatism?"—"Canst write a good and straight forward letter of business?" Thou art a chemist, I remember at the examination. "Canst compound, prepare, and afterwards boil a good pudding?" "Canst



make one of the hundred subordinate ornaments of thy fair person? In short tell us thy use in existence except to be contemplated as a pretty picture?" And how long will any one be amused with the view of a picture, unless it have a mind, a heart, and we may emphatically add the perennial value of utility.

It is a sad and lamentable truth after all the incessant din we have heard, of the march of the mind, the talks about Lyceums, and the interminable theories, inculcations and eulogies of education, that the present is an unbounded desire of display and notoriety, of exhaustless and unquestionable burning ambition; and not an age of calm, contented, ripe and useful knowledge for the sacred privacy of the parlor. Display, notoriety, surface and splendor, these are the first aims of the mothers, and can we expect that the daughters will drink into a better spirit? To play, sing, glide down the giddy dance, and get a husband, is the lesson; not to be qualified to render his home quiet, well ordered and happy.

It is notorious that there will soon be no intermediate class between those who toil and spin, and those whose claim to be ladies is founded on their being incapable of any value or utility. At present we know of none, except the little army of martyrs, yclept school mistresses; and still smaller corps of editorial and active blue stockings. If it should be my lot to transmigrate back to earth, in the form of a young man, my first homages in search of a wife would be paid to the thoughtful and pale-faced fair one, surrounded by her little noisy refactory subjects, drilling her soul to patience, and learning to drink of the cup of earthly discipline, and more impressively than by a thousand sermons, tasting the bitterness of our probationary course, in teaching the young idea how to shoot. Except as aforesaid school-mistresses and blues, we believe, that all other damsels, clearly within the purview of the term of *lady*, estimate the clearness of their title precisely in the ratio of their uselessness.

---

*To the Editor of the Christian Messenger.*

DEAR BROTHER: BALTIMORE, July 24, 1830.

In reading over the seventh number I found somethings which to me appeared objectionable, and I concluded to give you my thoughts on the subject—& as it is a subject which most reformers pass over, and concerning which all seem to be of one mind, I feel a deep interest in bringing it forward in order to hear the best arguments that can be brought in defence of that, which appears to me a great inconsistency.

The inconsistency to which I allude, is contained in your answer to objections, page 162. In answer to Query 11, you contend well for the ancient order of things, viz. that, "it is evident that we become united with the one body, or become members of the Church or kingdom of Christ on earth, by baptism." But I am sorry to see you in effect give up the argument in your answer to the objection, that you "unchurch all who are not immer-

sed, now the inconsistency is here, you say, "if the baptism instituted by Jesus be immersion, then any thing not immersion is not christian baptism." This you say you believe, and conclude that all who have not been immersed are not lawfully members of the church of Christ, this is the inevitable conclusion; but you seem to think that Pedobaptists, notwithstanding they have not been immersed, are christians. This, brother, is bad logic; how can it be, that persons can be christians without entering his kingdom? and you truly say, that we become united to the body, or become members of the church or kingdom of Christ by baptism; and this baptism is immersion—and none who are not immersed are lawfully the members of Christ—and yet some way or other christians!! I would ask further, for information, what is it to be an unlawful christian? (as all must be who are not immersed.) This at present shall suffice on this part until something shall be said by abler men than myself.

To me, brother, it is evident, both from scripture and reason, that no man or woman has any right to the name of christian, only as he or she is found obeying the commands of the Saviour; and as to warding off the difficulty we only plunge ourselves into a thousand more, to avoid one (and that of the raising of sectaries.) Suppose we wish to say that people may be christians, who never seen it to be their duty to be immersed for the remission of their sins, and of course are ignorant in this matter; the moment we say they were excusable because they were ignorant, we rob all the more intelligent of any pretensions to salvation. Every one, (and there are hundreds of them) who concedes that baptism is immersion, and that believers are the only subjects, these, I say; with all their candor and concessions, only by so doing condemn themselves; and, therefore, when we see a man honest enough to declare, that baptism was immersion, if he does not obey himself, must finally perish. This, brother, appears to me to be the consistent conclusion; if not so, show me better. You know we do not content ourselves with the paltry excuses of the sectaries; we go on the footing that nothing is an article of faith but what is clearly revealed in the scriptures of truth, and where is it said the disobedient shall be saved? or where is the man or woman termed believer, who does not believe part of the testimony which is to be accredited? By showing me how you understand these things, you will confer a favor on me, and perhaps cause light to be elicited on the subject.

In reply to the objection, "you cannot commune with them at the Lord's table," you say "we can pray with them, and praise and perform every act of divine worship: And I have no authority from scripture to forbid me to commune at the Lord's table with them. This, in my ear sounds rather strange, especially, as it comes from one undertaking to reform the evils that are in the world, commonly (though wrongly) called christian. As to worshipping God in their presence, it is what no one should have any objections to, but to join with them in worshspping God is another



thing. It is impossible to worship God in any way but the one he has appointed and therefore when people make to themselves Gods and worship them, it is our business to warn them of the danger of worshipping false Gods, and not to join them in their idolatry; for whatever is proposed and received as worship, which God has not instituted is idolatry. It, no doubt, is well known to you, that, the Lord's table was in the primitive days confined to the people of God: it was an institution peculiar to the kingdom of Christ, in order to come to which even the Church at Corinth, (all of whom were baptised into one body) were exhorted to examine themselves that they might not come into condemnation. And, as you said before, that the way to enter this kingdom was by baptism, and that immersion only is baptism, we conclude, according to your own reasoning, that they (while not immersed) are not subjects, as yet fitted to participate in the blessings held out to believers in the Lord's supper. God is a God of orders, and not of confusion. You need not, brother, act the inquisitor in this matter, because the Saviour has given ample instruction on this subject. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." John 14, 21. "He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings" 24. The same apostles informs us how we may know who really are believers, 1 John 2 chap. 3, 4 ver. "And hereby we do know that we know him: if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." It does not suffice us, to say that they experience great conflicts in their minds and feel converted to God. There is something in the kingdom, or reign of Heaven, which takes the attention of our eyes and ears, and we are not to be imposed upon, for there is the rule, and when men walk not according to this rule, we are justified in saying, there is no light in them. Wishing that you may be very useful in your day and generation, and that you may be kept from all evil and all error,

I subscribe myself your brother,
JAMES HENSHALL.

---

## REPLY.

Bro. James Henshall:—There are several items in your letter, which claim my special attention.

1. "I had asserted that none, who have not been immersed, are lawfully members of the church of Christ; and yet I admitted that many unbaptised persons, and many pedobaptists, were christians;" by which was meant they were holy, pious people. I will not contend that unbaptised persons are *christians* in the full sense of the term: nor was this intended when I wrote that article. That men may be holy and pious, without being baptised in water, is a sentiment cherished with pleasure by me. I must believe that the household of Cornelius were made holy and recevied the holy spirit previous to their baptism; yet before they were baptised they were not *christians* nor united with the

church of Christ, or become members of it according to this law. Surely you will not dissent from this sentiment. For this would truly be to make baptism a *sine qua non*, it would exclude from heaven as impure every person not immersed—the poor penitent thief, and millions more, who had no opportunity to be baptised, and were ignorant of the ordinance as ordained by Jesus; yet were they pious and holy men.

You deny the name *christian* to any who are not found obeying the commands of the Saviour, consequently they, who are not immersed, live in disobedience to the command, and therefore are not christians—you will not admit the plea that they may have been so wrongly educated, that they have never seen it their duty to be immersed, and are ignorant of it as a command. I grant that when any person believes it to be his duty to be immersed, and does not submit to it, he is guilty: for, says James, "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." But to denounce all not immersed as lost, and to cut them off from salvation however holy and pious they may be, appears to dethrone charity and forbearance from our breast If I err, let it be on the side of charity. You say, "nothing is an article of faith, but what is clearly revealed, and where is it said the disobedient shall be saved?" I answer, no where. I ask again, where is it said, that none but the immersed can be saved or be holy? My brother's next query I do not understand, and therefore cannot give an intelligible answer.

I had remarked that we could pray with unimmersed, holy people, and praise, and perform every act of divine worship with such; and that I found nothing in scripture to forbid me to commune with them at the Lord's table. You condemn this sentiment, and contend that christians should not join with unimmersed persons in any act of worship; for in doing so they would be joining with idolatrous worshippers; as all worship, not instituted by God, is idolatry. To my unknown brother, I refer my former number on this subject; hoping that he may yet see, that the best method of reforming our fellow creatures in error, is to wield the powerful arms of truth, love and forbearance towards them. Let us shew by our holy conversation that we are more humble, more obedient and more holy than they. It would be an awful disgrace to religious exclusionists and reformers, to be outstripped in holiness, justice and goodness by others, who are denounced by them as idolaters, and on the broad road to hell. Let us obey every precept of Jesus, as well as that of being immersed, lest the just retort be made, that you are no christian, because you are disobedient. How should we fell, if we were asked, are you doing to all men, as you would they should do to you? How cutting must this be to the slave-holder, when an opportunity is now offered to colonize his slaves on the African shores without expence to him! Wishing my brother all good for time and eternity, I conclude.

EDITOR.



*For the Christian Messenger.*

BROTHER STONE,—In the 5th No. of the "Millennial Harbinger," there is a letter written to the editor from "F***" and dated "March 30, 1830," upon which I wish to make a few remarks. With Mr. Campbell as a man, a scholar, a teacher of the christian religion, a defender of the faith once delivered to the saints, and as an editor, I am generally pleased; but what he could have seen in the letter of his friend "F." to induce him to take up near four pages of the Harbinger with it, I am utterly unable to ascertain. If there is any Millennial light, or any information in this letter, that is calculated to facilitate the introduction of that blissful state of society, I must say, it has entirely eluded my reasearch; such illiberal, dry, and fulsome productions, as the one now under consideration, may retard, and prevent the union of christians, but can never hasten that desirable state.

This Rev. Reformer tells us, he is in a "*pleasant village*, containing five meeting-houses, and five different religious denominations, viz. Baptist, Orthodox Congregationalists, Methodist, Friends, and Christian. The Baptist church is the oldest largest and has the best meeting house. The Christian Chuch, *I am told* numbers about 100 members, is Unitarian in sentiment, and from the *other information received*, concerning them, *I should judge*, very ignorant, and enthusiastic. Were it not for the abuse of this holy name (did it not in this country designate a *sect*, and were not those who bore it here as much sectarians as any others,) I would be called by no other, but as it is, I shall for the present, I think hold on to my letters of commendation, certificates, &c. *which call me a Baptist.*"

If reformer "F." was the *great* and *good* man he endeavors to make himself out in this disgusting epistle, I am certain, he could not have penned so pitiful a paragraph as the above. I do not know where this "sectarian" Christian Church is, and cannot therefore speak with absolute certainty, as to the truth or falsehood of the above remarks; but from my knowledge generally of the Christian church, I entertain no doubt of their being totally unfounded, particularly as he "*judges*" from idle, (and perhaps) sectarian rumor. My objection is principally to the evidence upon which reformer "F." denounces the "Christian Church." He says "I am told"—"and from other information received concerning them, I *should judge* they were very ignorant and enthusiastic." And is this the kind of evidence upon which Mr. "F." will thus denounce 100 christians? Was is not his duty before he penned such slander, or attempted thus publicly to clothe them with obloquy, to have ascertained that the character given by him of that congregation was true, instead of condeming them in this merciless manner, upon the vague and uncertain authority of "I am told," and "other information I have received!" If this is the kind of testimony, that a man whose soul is warmed by that love that thinketh no evil, regards as sufficient to authorize him to hold up to execration and contempt a

large and respectable portion of his fellow men;—If this is the kind of evidence upon which people are to be denounced, what man, or church, may not soon fall beneath the denunciation of such a cruel, and malignant creature as reformer "F." Where could his "dear friend" Campbell be, if such authority is to condemn either churches, or men? In how many "*pleasant towns*," could he have been "*told*," that Mr. C. was one of the worst of men; and would reformer "F." feel himself authorised upon such evidence to publish Mr. C. to the world as a *bad* man? If not, how dare he thus meanly speak of 100 professing christians? We know that if "F." had spoken upon such evidence (and plenty of it is to be had) of Mr. C. his remarks would have been unfounded, and are we not permitted to draw a similar conclusion about his remarks on the christian church? But they "are Unitarian in sentiment." I have no doubt, they believe in one God, as well as one Lord Jesus Christ, the son of this one God. But is this criminal? I *presume* they have rejected human *creeds* and consequently have rejected the trinity, a doctrine common to *those works*, but unknown to the Bible;—this has subjected them to the appellation of Unitarians, by sectarians, and such illiberal bigots as reformer "F;" but the fact of this appellation having been applied to them by the vulgar, does no more constitute them unitarians, than the appellation of Campbellites makes those to whom it is applied the followers of a man; and this church "ignorant" as they are regarded, I have no doubt is entirely able to support and maintain the views of the Father and Son, before reformer "F." or any one else who may think proper to put them to the test. He lets the world know that this name *Christian* designates a *sect*, and they who bear the name are as much sectarians as any others. By what evidence does he determine this? Is it because we exclude any humble christian of any name from our fellowship, or communion? Is it because we have made, or adopted a sectarian creed or name? Is it because we reject those, who reject our peculiar notions? Of these there is not a shadow of evidence, but the reverse is true. Why then are we sectarians? Is it because we are shut out from fellowship with every sectarian society, and have the temerity to band together, and worship the God of our fathers, according to the New Testament of our Lord? Is it because we have boldness to read and think for ourselves, and speak our thoughts one to another? Is it because we, by reading the Bible, have generally received ideas different from orthodoxy on the Godhead—on Jesus—the designs of his death, without binding them on others? If for these reasons we are a sect—Amen. Mr. "F." is not satisfied of speaking of the ignornance, and enthusiasm of this society, but tells us of the abuse of the "holy name" (Christian.) I wish I knew where this congregation was, that it might be known what christian church is walking disorderly, and abusing that worthy name. The christians, as a people are not in the habit of abusing their profession; *at least by* indulging in ungenerous reflections, and inuendoes, or by publishing slanders against an innocent people, upon the idle tales, or garbled information of bigots.



This *pink* of the reformation lets us know, that if it were not for the abuse of this holy name, he would take it himself. Now as the abuse of the name is the only reason he assigns for not taking it, let us see where he will be taken by the same parity of reasoning. Have not many Baptists *abused* and disgraced their profession, and must not friend "F." therefore give up the name Baptist? Has not the christian religion itself been abused, and must he not therefore give up christianity? To be consistent, he should join Mr. Owen in his crusade against all religions, especially the christian; and this would be just as consistent as to refuse to take the name christian because it has been abused. Have not rogues under the garb of honesty, *abused* their profession, and must not our reformer, cease to be honest? Nay, what virtue may not in this manner be denounced and condemned? What people, or individual, is not liable to *suffer loss*, if the vague, and malignant rumor of "ignorant enthusiasts," is to prevail? What profession in this way is not liable to be slandered, or what virtue may not be abandoned? Well may such a man be denominated "ignorant," and I will add malignant too. That there are members of the Christian church who have abused their holy name, and are ignorant and enthusiastic, I readily admit; such has been uniformly the case from the days of the Saviour, to the present time. But will any man of common sense seriously urge that as his reason why he will reject the name christian, and refuse to be the follower of the Lord Jesus? truly may such a creature be denominated "*ignorant*."

I shrewdly suspect, that the only abuse of this holy name in the estimation of reformer "*F.*" and other kindred spirits, is the simple fact, that they cannot be foremost in this thing. The christians, whom they stigmatize as ignorant and enthusiastic, have taken the name christian, to the exclusion of all others, and the Bible as the only rule of their faith and practice, & therefore Mr. "*F.*" and others, will not be called by the name christian, because it is now too late to be leaders in the work of reform, and rather than acknowledge themselves as followers of Jesus, they endeavor to stigmatize the christians as a *sect*, as *Unitarians*, *ignorant enthusiasts*, &c.; but from such charges they can and will be vindicated at a proper time. As a member of the church of Christ, and feeling the force of the apostles remark, that if one member suffer the whole suffer with it, I have been induced to make these few remarks upon the illiberal epistle of Mr. "*F.*" The only thing that gives it any consequence, or renders it worthy of notice, is the fact of its *sanctification* by the "*Millennial Harbinger*." It grieves me much to see such ungenerous remarks, and illiberal observations spread before the world in that paper, without note or comment. The christians deserve better treatment, and have a right to look for more friendship at Mr.

C's. hands; but of this, let him be the judge—if he and those under his influence see proper to draw a line of demarcation, they can do so. With feelings of entire good will and christian regard for Mr. Campbell, I have, from a sense of justice to my injured brethren been induced to make these remarks; and however "*morbid my sensibility*" may be called, I regard it as a christian duty to step forward and shield them from the foul imputations, that the envious and malevolent make without the least provocation upon a respectable and unoffending people.

PHILIP.

## HOLINESS THE PURPOSE OF THE GOSPEL.

It was an old reproach of one of the bitterest enemies of Christianity "that it was a doctrine of licentiousness and not of purity." "Your Jesus," says he "came to collect the most dreadful and horrible societies. He said himself that he came to call sinners and not the righteous, so that the body he came to assemble is a body of profligates separated from good men amongst whom they were heretofore mixed. He has rejected all the good and collected all the bad in the world." False, cruel, and base aspersion!—Hear how Origen the Christian Apologist rebuts the malignant misrepresentation. "True," says he, "Our Jesus came to call sinners, but it was to repentance. He assembles the wicked, but it is to convert them into new men or rather to change them into angels. We come to him covetous, he makes us liberal;—unjust and extortioners, and he makes us equitable;—lacivious, and he makes us chaste;—violent and passionate, and he makes us meek;—impious and profane, and he makes us religious." In this triumphant manner did Origen vindicate his calumniated master. But what was it that gave the principal energy to his reply? Its agreement with truth. If we know any thing of the Gospel, we are witnesses that this is the true effect of communion with Christ Jesus. It transforms us into his image, and this transformation is so infallible a consequence of real religion that if none of it appear in any particular professor, we are obliged to conclude that he is not yet in communion with this great Saviour. The holy Jesus cannot unite with a prevailingly unholy disciple.—*Butcher's Sermons.*

NOTICE—My necessities urge me to solicit my agents and patrons of the Christian Messenger to do something speedily for me. The present volume is nearly closed, and my printer and paper maker are unpaid. Let every one consider himself addressed, and determine to send immediate relief. The probability is that the October No. will not be issued before November; and if I continue publishing the Messenger, the first No. will not appear before January next. I shall print no more, nor deliver them to subscribers, until the money be paid in advance; unless an agent shall procure five subscribers, and be responsible for the payment of the money within six months from the commencement. For every ten subscribers one volume is allowed to the agent.


# 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. OCT. 1830. [No. 11.

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 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.


*From the Christian Advocate and Journal.*

## INFIDELITY.

But I next turn my attention to the nature and properties of that religion which the Bible reveals to me, and which I think I have found by happy experience. By a close inspection, although it is variously described, I find it all comprised in LOVE—*love to God and man.* On attentive examination of my heart, I find that when I was led to embrace the Saviour of sinners, and when he shed abroad his love in my heart, I found the character of my religion perfectly to correspond with my own experience of it; for when this love sprung up in my heart, it expanded towards all mankind, and ascended to its source in strains of sweetest praise and thanksgiving. Now I think every one must heartily respond to the inspired declaration that "love worked no ill to his neighbour"—and this is the very essence of the religion of Christianity. If I love my neighbour as myself, I cannot intentionally injure him. If I love my God sincerely, I delight in his law, cheerfully obey his commands, and patiently submit to whatever he orders. This is the religion which the Bible reveals and enjoins, and to establish which Jesus Christ bled, died, and ever liveth.

Will the infidel condemn this? Then he condemns what his soul abhors. And does his soul abhor love? Then is it filled with hatred! Who will trust him after this? Does he say that be far from me to condemn the religion of love? Then is he no longer an infidel. He is a Christian. Let him choose either horn of the dilemma, and his infidelity falls, while Christianity lives and triumphs.

But he will say that this is not the religion of the Bible, because its professors have all along contradicted it. Will he still sacrifice upon the altar of ignorance? Will he still confound