for an honest support, and too proud to beg, they undertake the art of politely forming the walk, steps, and external manners of the young. Will parents, religious parents, encourage such drones of human society, by putting their children under their tuition? What do they learn but pride and extravagance, folly and trifling? Such parents betray their destitution of religion, and should not be retained in any Christian church.

Did we ever see a pious dancing master, or stage actor? Are such ever found engaged in the holy exercises of prayer? Is it not as rare to find a dancing master in a church, as to find his grave in a church-yard? No tomb-stone covers him with this inscription, *Here lies the dancing master.* This would be thought a burlesque in death, and why should it not be considered such in life?

In olden times, parents taught their children themselves to better purpose. They taught their daughters to step neatly at the spinning wheel and their sons at the plough—such children were a blessing to society, and no pest to physicians, to restore health impaired by corsetts, thin dresses &c. Such children added to their country's wealth, and respectability, and were no charge nor burden to it. Till the return of such days, better hopes can hardly be indulged. A few years ago, during the revival in our town, the ball rooms were neglected, dancing masters unknown, stage actors forsook us, and a dancing party could not be collected. As soon as our religious (rather irreligious,) contentions banished religion from amongst us, then the ball rooms and theatres were crowded—dancing masters were encouraged, and parties of pleasure, and gambling increased. This is an evidence that these amusements and religion are incompatible.

EDITOR.

☞Several advertisements of bad men have been sent me to publish in the Messenger. In one or two instances I at first did publish such; but have long since declined. The subject is of too delicate a nature, and by no means suited to a religious journal. Several communications have been also sent me, for the purpose of correcting slanderous reports. My correspondents must excuse me for not publishing such things. If I publish for one, impartiality would compel me to publish for another; and thus the Messenger would become the degraded bearer of libels, war, and strife.

EDITOR.

RECEIPTS FROM FEB. 1ST TO MARCH 1ST.

New York—Elder Ira Brown, 3, for S. Marvin, E. Ensley, and Maj. Lyon; Js. Steers 3. Elder F. R. Palmer, for Mrs. Downs and H. Ewatt, 2; Elder L. Flemming for N. Graves, 2. *Canaan, O.*—JohnMiles, 2. *New Paris*—Elder L. Purviance, 2. *Georgetown Ky.*—T. Johnson, 1; Js. Gains, 1. A. Roberson, 1. *Georgia*—Elder Jac. Callahan, 2. *Bryant's Station*—Josi. Gayle, 3. *Bethel*—Mrs. Ford, 1. *Mt. Carmel*—Eld. Palmer for A. Keller and N. Spears, 2. *Dry Creek*—J. G. Ellis for Mrs. Matthews, 1.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. APRIL, 1831. [No. 4.

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.

THE CONFERENCE IN TERRA CONFUSA.

(CONTINUED.)

The Conference met according to adjournment. After prayer, The Report of the Committee, appointed to draft a summary of doctrine as a bond of union, was called for. Bishop M——, the Chairman of the Committee, rose and addressed the Conference as follows:

Bishop M——Your Committee met for the purpose of their appointment. But though several summaries were proposed, in not one could we all agree. We therefore resolved to present to this Conference the several drafts exhibited in the Committee hoping that in your collected wisdom, one might yet be formed, and adopted unanimously by us all. He then presented the drafts to the Moderator, who delivered them to the Clerk to read. He then read the first as follows:

ART. 1. That there is but one God, existing in 3 persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of one substance, equal in powpr & glory.

2. That the second person of trinity was the eternal Son of God. That he became man by taking to himself a true body and a reasonable soul in the womb of the Virgin, and born of her; that though he has two natures, yet his person is one.

3. That he, as our surety, lived and died to satisfy the demands of law and justice against the sinner, which righteousness is imputed to the sinner for justification.

4. That, faith, which is the gift of God, receives this righteousness, and enables us to perform acceptable obedience to the commands.

5. That faith, repentance, and regeneration should be urged on all—and that whoever shall profess faith, and manifest it by repentance and an unreserved obedience to all the commands of the gospel, should be baptized, together with his household and thus be inducted into the kingdom or church of God on earth.

Doc: P—I move that these articles be read separately, and in the order in which they stand, and that this conference consider them one by one, in order that we may fully understand each other.

The motion was carried *nemine contradicente*. The first article was then read.

Doc: P—To this article I have no objection, but do cordially receive it as a fundamental truth of revelation.

Mr. B—My worthy brother has spoken my mind fully. I cordially receive it as an essential doctrine of Christianity.

Bish: M—The doctrine of Trinity, is a doctrine which I have long believed as fundamental and essential, yet I cannot fully agree to receive it as stated in the article. The idea intended may be the same, yet it is not so happily expressed. To say that the Son is one of the divine three, is to say that the Son is eternal. This I am convinced is not scripturally true. He never was Son till born of the virgin Mary: for thus it is written, "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest. Luke 1, 31, 32." By reading Dr. A. Clark on this passage, & on Heb. 1. I am fully convinced that the expressions, *eternal Son*, and *eternally begotten*, are unscriptural, as well as unreasonable. I move, therefore, that the word *Son* be stricken out, and the expression, *the Word* be substituted, as it is in the Methodist discipline.

Doc: P—I acknowledge that the terms *eternal Son*, and *eternally begotten*, are not scriptural; yet have thought with many others that they are plainly inferable. I also acknowledge that many of my brethren of high respectability reject with you the terms, and prefer as you do the term *Word*, as expressive of his divine nature. I am not a stickler for words, when the same idea is maintained; I am willing therefore that the term *Word* be substituted instead of *Son*.

Mr. B—I am not so well convinced that the term *eternal Son* is improper; because God is called the eternal Father. The very term *eternal Father* proves an eternal Son. The Son under the figure of Wisdom (Prov. 8) is said to be brought forth *from everlasting*

Bish: M—My bro B takes for granted what needs proof, and proof which the Bible cannot afford him. God is no where called an eternal Father—as to Prov. 8 where Wisdom is said to be brought forth *from everlasting*, the word everlasting is explained by the following expressions, from *the beginning or ever the earth was*. In the expression, *brought forth*, an agent, an action, and an effect are seen. The agent and action certainly preceded the thing produced, and therefore the product could not be eternal. But many of the good and great deny the application of this verse to the Son *in toto*. I am not certain that they are not correct

Mr. B—I will not contend for expressions not in the Bible; I submit to substitute the term *Word* instead of *Son* in the article just read.

Mr. R—I am fully convinced, and long have been, of the impropriety of the terms *eternal Son*, and *eternally begotten*. And I am as fully convinced that the term *Trinity* is equally improper and unscriptural. The speculations on this word have produced more discord than can be removed for years to come. I therefore think it would be better to erase the whole article, and agree to receive the simple expressions of scripture on this subject; as that there is but one God, the Father—and one Lord Jesus, the Son of the Father, and the Spirit of God. In these all agree. Let us attribute to each all that the Bible attributes, and nothing more. This will please all Christians and offend none.

Doc: P—We grant the term *Trinity* is not to be found in the Bible, but the doctrine, conveyed by this term, is plainly taught there; as "There are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one," and "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"—and "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all." These to my mind are fully convincing that the doctrine of three persons in one God, is scriptural, which I cannot willingly give up.

Mr. R—It is now generally admitted by the learned Trinitarians themselves, that the text 1 John v, 7 is spurious and should be rejected. Griesback has rejected it—Doc. A. Clark has very learnedly proved it spurious—Bishop Lowth wonders that any learned men should contend a moment for it. The Electic Review learnedly and satisfactorily proves it spurious—and some of the learned doctors of America, and even in the West reject it. I might multiply authorities to prove the same point, but it is unnecessary in this day of inquiry. The text in Matt. xxviii, 19, "Baptizing in the name of the Father &c. can never establish the doctrine contained in the article under consideration. It does not say nor hint that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three persons in one God, of one substance, and equal in power and glory. The apostolic benediction is still farther from establishing the doctrine of three equal persons in one God. I yet believe it would greatly conduce to the interests of truth, and to the promotion of harmony among us, to reject the article entirely. The doctrine of three equal persons in the one God, is even discarded by Trinitarian theorists of the highest respectability. They reject the term persons in Trinity, rightly judging that it must lead to Tritheism. Should we therefore agree to receive the article as it stands, many professed Trinitarians as well as Unitarians would be excluded from fellowship by our bond of union.

Doc: P—I well know that some orthodox Trinitarians reject the term *three persons* in Trinity; but they substitute another term, *three distinctions*, which is equivalent to the former. I am willing to reject the term *persons*, and receive it its place *distinctions* or any tantamount expression.

Mr. C—I am willing for Trinitarians to use the terms three persons, three distinctions, or three somewhats, provided they do not mean three distinct minds, spirits, beings or intelligencies, in the one infinite mind &c. Should these ideas be attached to the terms, then the doctrine of three distinct, equal Gods is clearly maintained. This is a direct contradiction of the scripture. I am certain there is no intelligent Trinitarian believes in three equal and infinite minds or spirits—nor that the one infinite Being, mind or Spirit consists of three equal finite minds or Spirits. We all believe the same thing in fact; that there is one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, and one Holy Spirit. Why then should we prolong the unprofitable and mischievous controversy, about the vain speculations and jarring opinions of our fathers on this subject? Let us agree to banish from us, the names Trinitarian and Unitarian, and all their unscriptural dogmas, and agree to use the terms afforded us by the Bible, when we speak of the Father, Son and Spirit. I therefore agree with bro. R—that the whole article be rejected.

Bish: M—Though I have professed to believe in three divine persons in the Godhead: yet I dare not define the term person, as that which is a distinct being, mind, Spirit, or intelligence. this is certainly equivalent to the doctrine of three distinct independent Gods If I define a *person* as that which is not a distinct being, mind, spirit nor intelligence, and apply this to Deity, I virtually say that neither of the persons, Father, Word, nor Holy Spirit, is a being, mind, spirit, or intelligence, and this is no better than Atheism. I gain nothing by substituting three distinctions, or any other term instead of three persons, if to these distinctions I attach the idea of distinct beings, minds, spirits or intelligencies; for this will not remove the idea of three distinct Gods; and if I detach from these distinctions the idea of being, mind, spirit or intelligence, I cannot avoid the idea of Atheism. To the terms *three persons*, or *three distinctions*, I can attach no idea so as to avoid Tritheism, or Atheism. I have contented myself in believing the doctrine an incomprehensible mystery. Such a doctrine, as is perfectly unintelligible, I am persuaded cannot be profitable: I am therefore strongly inclined to let it go, and to reject the article under examination.

Mr. B—On this subject I have said but little, because I have but little to say. During this discussion my mind has been roused to attend to what it had never seriously considered before. I had received the doctrine of Trinity from my infancy. I had been taught that though true, it was an incomprehensible mystery—that to reject it was damnable heresy—and that none, who denied it could be saved. These things completely closed my mind from examining. I joined boldly to denounce all as heretics and infidels, and denied them all claims to Christianity, who should impiously deny this holy doctrine of Trinity. I fear I have done wrong. I see I have not examined the scriptures

sufficiently respecting this point. That God is one infinite, eternal and intelligent person, being or spirit without parts, is an undeniable truth; if so, there cannot be more intelligent persons, or spirits, equal to the infinite eternal, and self existent one; if not equal, then they must be either superior or inferior; either of these ideas is fatal to the doctrine. Many such ideas at this time are rolling through my mind. I feel entirely disposed to reject the article under examination. Before I sit down I must confess that I am ashamed and confounded on reflection, that I have joined the multitude in a crusade against those who have ventured to deny that doctrine of which I am perfectly ignorant, both as to the import of the terms used to express it, and of the ideas (if any) intended to be conveyed by them. Yet if I could be convinced that those terms were used in the holy scriptures, though unintelligible, I would humbly receive them.

Mr. E—for the first time rose and spoke as follws: I have professed for many years to believe the doctrine of Trinity as stated in the article under review. I have never been so tenacious of its tecnicalties as many others. I have thought the subject was involved in so many inextricable difficulties, that the safest way was to avoid the jargon of words without knowledge, and confine myself to the simple expressions of scripture. In doing this I have been suspected for a Unitarian. Not being satisfied myself with the article now under examination, I should tremble to impose it on another; I cannot make it a term of communion, much less a test of Christianity. I fully accord with the brethren who last spoke, that the article be rejected:

Doc: P—I am willing to reject the unscriptural terms attached to the doctrine, as the word *Trinity, three distinct and equal persons in the Godhead, eternal Son, eternally begotten, &c.* Yet I am not yet prepared to reject the doctrine itself.

Mr. C—Please inform me, Doc:, how you would express the doctrine, when stript of these unscriptural terms?

Doc: P—I acknowledge I cannot express it more intelligibly in the language of the Bible, than by saying, there is a Father, Son and Holy Ghost. While speaking I will make a motion that in the place of the article, which we are examining, we substitute the following:

We agree to receive the doctrine that God is the Father of all—that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God. We also agree to speak of this doctrine in the language of the Bible, rejecting all human appendages, attached to it by the folly of man.

To this motion there was no serious objection, it was carried. A motion was then made and carried, that the Clerk read the 2d Article of the summary, which was done.

Mr. E—Brethren, from the decision just made in rejecting the first, I plainly perceive that the second now read must share the same fate.—We have agreed to reject the terms *Trinity, three persons in one Godhead, and eternal Son;* therefore we must reject the

expression, that the Son is *the second* person of Trinity, and that he is the eternal Son. The latter part of the article can alone engage our attention at this time—that he became man by taking to himself a true body, and a reasonable soul in the womb of the Virgin, and born of her—that he exists in two distinct natures, the Godhead and manhood, being perfect God and perfect man, yet but one person forever. I must confess that I am not prepared to go into this discussion at present, and would it be agreeable to the Conference I move an adjournment till this day four weeks.

Conference agreed to the proposition, and concluded with solemn prayer and singing, and parted with Christian feelings towards each other. EDITOR.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

MISREPRESENTATION DETECTED.

Under this caption in the Baptist Chronicle for February; I have read a communication from Mayslick, Ky. in which the writer charges me with the crime of misrepresentation. In order to exculpate myself, I will state what that church at Mayslick has said, and then state the remarks I made on it. The matter shall be left to the public to judge.

That church says in their protest,—"That all of us (subscribers) are willing and determined to rally round the original constitution, and covenant of the church, which has never been disanulled—associating therewith, the principles of union between the regular and separate Baptists.—And that no person shall be considered a member of this church, who will refuse to acknowledge the above, by subscribing their names, or causing them to be subscribed."

I remarked that, "None but Calvinists, immersed Calvinists, can be members of Mayslick Church; for each member must subscribe the original constitution, which is the Philadelphia Confession of Faith. Yet Separate Baptists, who oppose Calvinism, may be members, if they will subscribe the above constitution, church covenant and articles of union; that is if they subscribe what they do not believe; or in plain language, if they will become hypocrites."—C. Mess. p. 261.

Now I ask the candid public to judge, whether I am guilty of misrepresentation? John, a separate Baptist, (and such is Arminian) applies to Mayslick church for membership. The church says, you must subscribe our original constitution, the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, (this is acknowledged pure Calvinism.) You must subscribe also our church covenant, (this I have never seen, but no doubt purely Calvinistic.) Now if John, who is acknowledged an Arminian, subscribe these or either of these Calvinistic creeds, does he not openly profess to believe what he disbelieves? Is he not a hypocrite? every man, woman and child who understands language, will say, yes, except this accusing member of Mayslick church. He wishes to hide himself under

the principles of the union between the Regular and Separate Baptists. Astonishing! what have these principles to do in the case of *John* the separate Baptist, applying for membership in the Mayslick church? He must subscribe to the original constitution and church covenant, that is, he must openly profess to believe in Calvinism, although he does not—subscription to all other principles in the Universe cannot alter his first subscription, unless he should subscribe, I believe, but do not believe. Would that church receive such a person into fellowship! No: but if he will hypocritically subscribe what he does not believe, he will be received!

I will make no ungenerous nor harsh reflections on the ignorance, and temerity of the writer—or on his low abuse He has done as well as he could—I pity rather than condemn him for his weak defence of the church—I know not whether a great man, even a D. D. could have done better. EDITOR.

Bourbon County, March 10, 1831.

BROTHER STONE:—The remarks which I laid before the Christian community, in the Feb. No. of the C. Messenger, were, I then thought, all I should ever write on this important subject; and could I now believe that the love of writing, the hope of victory, the expectation of any earthly reward, or indeed, any other motive than the love of truth and a desire to enjoy the approbation of Heaven, induce me to write, my pen should remain untouched in the stand from which I have taken it. In the No. of the C. Messenger for the present month, I find an epistle, over the signature of bro. J. G. Ellis, intended, I presume, as an answer to my remarks already alluded to. It will be recollected, that my particular design was, to show, that the Holy Scriptures do authorize and require the breaking of bread, or celebration of the Lord's Supper every first day of the week; the arguments advanced by me, in support of this position, I do humbly conceive are yet unanswered by any thing bro. E. has written; of this however the brethren will judge for themselves, when they shall have read, in connexion with what has already been exhibited, what I have now to offer. Bro. E. considers some things, which have been spoken or written on this subject, dangerous to Christian liberty. Surely for these I am not responsible, unless I have written or spoken them: of this I am not conscious. My ideas of Christian liberty are, that every Christian is free indeed; free from sin, from condemnation, from the fear of death, from the law of Moses, the Jewish ritual, and from the laws and systems of fallible men. But not from Christ, his laws, authority and service: he is our Master, our Lawgiver, our Saviour and will be our Judge; him therefore we are bound to obey.

As bro. E. has not taken up my arguments regularly, I must be permitted to follow his order. He first presents us with 1 Cor. xi, 26. "For as often as ye eat this bread" &c to disprove weekly communion. For my own part, I cannot see that this verse

either proves or disproves it; and yet my bro. reasons, as though I had laid the whole burden of proof on this one verse, to which indeed I did not particularly refer at all. With the same verse he endeavors to destroy the force of a similitude I introduced, drawn from the annual celebration of the birth of Washington, intended merely to show the common acceptation of such language as is used in Acts xx, 7; this simile he presents in the language of *that verse* to which it had no allusion whatever: Bro. E. next denies that the church met at Troas on the first day of the week to eat the Lord's supper, because the cup and wine are not mentioned; might he not as well deny that Paul referred to the supper in 1 Cor. xi, 33: where he says "Wherefore my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry for one another."—because the words drink, cup and wine are not also used in the same verse, a particularity required by my brother? Bro. E. calls it communion, without mentioning either bread or wine: does he not therefore mean the supper? How customary is it both in speaking and writing to refer to some well known act or event under a general comprehensive or prominent idea. We have here the broken bread, the emblem of that precious body broken for sin; the blood which flowed flowed in consequence of the body being broken, just as necessarily as the resurrection of the Saviour succeeded his burial. In instituting the supper the bread was first broken, this is its first comprehensive idea; but this is not all; if bro. E. believes the church met at Troas, merely to break and eat bread, without wine or water, on the first day, and that they met every first day; for this he does not controvert (when indeed no meaning or design whatever is attached by the volume to such an institution) will he please inform us, why that institution is not now attended to, by those who so believe? or indeed by any one living?. Is the ordinary practice of the primitive churches, sanctioned by the apostles to have no influence on us? Assuredly it ought. Bro. E. adduces Acts xxvii, 35, to prove that the terms breaking bread, do not there allude to the Lord's supper, and therefore he strangely concludes, they never allude to it. If my brother thus interprets scripture language, without any reference to the connexion, will he not meet with many difficulties? The words cup, wine, bread and many others are used in the scriptures, in reference to very different uses and subjects, which can only be understood by attending particularly to the context, and suffering the scriptures to explain themselves; what do we find then, in relation to the breaking of bread mentioned in Acts xxvii, 35?—That Paul the Apostle, then a prisoner, with a number of other prisoners, his companions and the ship's crew, was on board a ship bound for Italy; a storm arose, which so long threatened destruction, that for fourteen days they neglected their ordinary food; Paul besaught them to take *meat* for their health 33d & 34th verses; and in the 35th we find, when he had thus besought them he took bread and after thanking God, he broke it and began to eat; then the rest *also took some meat.* And

yet bro. E. can see to difference between the bread here broken and that broken at Jerusalem Acts ii, 42, and at Troas Acts xx, 7; but on the contrary he asserts, that the language in each place, means the same. Let us examine the similarity; at Jerusalem 3000 believers were baptized and "continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayer;" at Troas, when the *disciples* came together, on the first day of the week; to break bread, Paul addressed them. Now do either of these churches thus breaking bread, resemble the prisoners and ship's crew in distress, eating meat and bread to preserve life? Surely my bro. is hard pressed for argument when he contends they do. But he says, that I brought forward Acts ii, 42, as alluding to the supper, because Luke there speaks of acts of *public worship;* and urges that if I was correct in so doing, the bread Paul broke on board the ship was also of the Lord's supper, because he gave thanks to God. and this, he says, was worship; but he forgets the important word *public*, as applied to the church. Does bro. E consider thanksgiving at his own table as public an act of worship. as thanksgiving at the Lord's table? Certainly not; and if not, my argument stands unshaken. My bro. has misapprehended my design in citing Heb. x, 25. "Let us not forsake the assembling of ourselves together" &c. Conceiving I had previously proven from scripture, weekly communion; that verse was only referred to, to show, that there must have been some order then established, and that if it was left to uninspired men to determine how often and when they would assemble to wership, and when they would neglect it, Paul's exhortation was unmeaning; since if they only met once a year, it were just as lawful and right as once a week, they having authority to decide the whole matter. Does not this look like human legislation? Does it not at once intronuce confusion and disorder? Does it not endanger Christian liberty? If the right to affix a time belongs to one man, it belongs to all; and if to such individually, no one can be compelled to surrender his right to the rest; a zealous member wishes it every day,, one less zealous says every month will do: a third more indifferent would have it quarterly or yearly. In the midst of this confusion, my brethren, how forcibly are we reminded of the necessity of a perfect Lawgiver, such indeed as Jesus: who by his apostles has completely established the entire order of his house, and wisely arranged all the affairs of his Kingdom. I have never said, that the whole order of Heaven, on this important subject, was to be found in a single verse: nor did I assert as bro. E. seems to have understood me, that the terms, first day. week. bread, cup and wine were all to be found in Heb. x. 25, or in 1 Cor. xi, 20, 21, and 33. Those references were made as my former remarks will show, only in part. to establish the position I maintained. Having thus attended to the seeming difficulties presented by our brother; I would remark that. I am glad he desires with me to adhere to the word of God; here alone we are safe, and this I conceive to be all sufficient.

Permit me now to adduce a short and plain connexion of scripture testimony, which goes codclusively, in my view, to prove weekly communion. 1 Cor. xvi, 2, reads thus, "On *the first day of every week*, let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it in the treasury," (the best version) this certainly proves they met every first day at Corinth, else how could they put their contributions in the treasury? and why on that particular day, if it was not their day to assemble? In connexion with this read 1 Cor. xi, 20, 21, & 33d verses which show that when they did come together it was to eat the Lord's supper. Acts xx, 7, combines in itself the meaning of both the above passages on this subject, as we formerly proved. If any one wishes to know who established this order, I answer the apostles, by the authority of the Saviour, who says—Matt. xxviii, 20. "Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Turn to the history of the day of Pentecost; see the order of public or social worship established by the apostles, in which the disciples continued steadfastly. Go with Paul to Troas, and to Corinth, see the same order—an order which continued, while Jesus alone reigned among his professed followers. Soon, however, that order was disturbed by the reign of Anti-Christ; puny man assumed the government, and seated apparently on the throne of Zion's King, gave laws to his subjects; but such laws as produced nothing better than strife, anger and confusion; the heart sickens at the scene, the eye wanders in search of some more pleasing object. Reign blessed Jesus—King of Order, Righteousness and Peace! reign unrivalled, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords! In conclusion, let me observe that should bro. E. feel disposed again to contribute on this subject, for the C. Messenger, he will please answer the following questions if he can, and I will answer as many for him, if I can. Is there a single passage of scripture, that speaks of monthly meetings by name? Is there any authority in the word of God for communing only every three months, or once a year? Is not this remembering a crucified Saviour in his institution very seldom? who is to determine, when we shall eat the supper, if the apostles have not? If a majority of each church are to determine, dare the minority eat oftener or seldomer, without being considered disorderly? My object is information from the Bible, for the truth's sake, under the humbling sense I feel of my limited abilities, and information. Never would I have appeared before my brethren, on the pages of the C. Messenger, had I not believed the cause was the Lord's, and that I had his word to support me—that order may take the place of confusion, and Light of Darkness—that God's dear children may flow together, and the light which eminates from Zion really tend to the glory of our Heavenly Father, is the continued prayer of your brother in the Gospel of Christ,

JOHN ALLEN GANO

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

NO. III.

The difference between the state of the Pentecostal Jews, and of Saul of Tarsus; and of the Gentiles when the Gospel was first preached to them.

In my last number I showed, by the only divinely authenticated word, that we have of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, that God remitted their sins through faith, before they were baptized. This is believed by some not to have been the case with the 3000 Pentecostal Jews, and Saul of Tarsus, from the expressions used by Peter, to the former in Acts ch. ii; and by Ananias to Saul, as stated in Acts, chap. xxii. I confess that the phaseology used in these cases, authorises this belief, in a great degree; and I have no controversy with those who entertain it; but I am unwilling that the order of the facts, and the phraseology that appeared and were employed at the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles, as we have them recorded in the 10th & 11th chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, shall be thrown aside; and those, which are recorded in reference to the Jews, be substituted for them. The Jews and the Gentiles were under entirely different circumstances, in many respects; which occasioned the difference that appeared in the facts, and in the style of address when the gospel was preached to them, and they were proselyted to it. The commission, under which Peter acted, and the circumstances attending its execution, when he preached to the Gentiles, were as distinct and peculiar as if they had had no connection whatever with the preaching of the gospel to the Jews on the day of Pentecost. And it is remarkable, that in no instance, in which he speaks of the introduction of the gospel to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, does he ever refer to the conversion of the 3000, or any thing that occurred in reference to them, as analagous to any thing that took place in the order, or facts when the gospel was preached to the Gentiles; but he uniformly refers to those of the Jews, who were converted before the day of Pentecost, who had not participated in the murder of Jesus Christ, and upon whom the Holy Ghost was poured out, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, for facts of similarity But let us attend to the distinctions that existed between the Jews and Gentiles, with some care; that we may see the consistency and propriety of maintaining, and understanding the facts and circumstances that occurred, in reference to the Pentecostal Jews, and Saul of Tarsus.

We must not forget the fact, that the Jewish nation was incorporated as the church of God, upon the old covenant, under the law of Moses, by which they were distinguished from the whole world besides. The honor and privileges bestowed upon them by Jehovah, as his people, were signified by terms peculiar to them. They were called God's *chosen or elect* people. He was said to have *begotten* them—they were called his *children*,

his *sons* and *daughters* which were born unto him; and they were denominated a kingdom of Priests unto God. In none of all these however, did the Gentiles partake; and they were on that account represented as *strangers*, and *Aliens*, and as *no people*; and being idolaters were denominated *enemies*. The above appellations of honor, and the expressions of peculiar relationship which the Jewish nation sustained to God, were owing, I repeat, to their being incorporated by the old and typical covenant, and under the law of Moses.

The Jews relied upon the extraordinary piety and merits of their ancesters, and the promise of God to bless their posterity, for the pardon of their sins. They moreover relied upon the knowledge and study of the law of Moses—and circumcision and sacrifice for the remission of all their sins. The Gentiles had no plan for the remission of sin. In consequence of the foreseen wickedness of the Jewish nation, Moses and the prophets predicted the most awful calamities, and signal destruction, that would come upon them. The period of their national ruin was styled the great and terrible day of the Lord. Duet. xxviii, 49–64. Joel ii, 28–32. Mala. iv, 1–3, 5, and Jesus Christ forewarned them of it. Mat. xxii and xxiv. Mark xii. Luke xxi; and Peter alluded to it on the day of Pentecost; Acts ii, 21. As the Gentiles did not participate in their privileges, neither did they in their guilt and danger. The Jews in the most wicked and atrocious manner murdered the Messiah, when Pilate determined to let him go: Pilate declared his innocence, and washed his hands before the multitude; saying I am innocent of the blood of this just person: See ye to it, while the Jews imprecated his blood upon them, and on their children; Mat. xxvii, 24, 25.

John the Baptist was sent to the Jews agreeably to prophecy, as the forerunner of the Messiah, who preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin; and proclaimed the approach of the Kingdom of Heaven: and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan, were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Jesus Christ moreover preached to the Jews three years, and wrought miracles, before they crucified him; preparatory to the new covenant or gospel dispensation. By the joint labors of John and of Jesus Christ, a number of Jews believed in Messiah, and associated with him as his disciples: among whom were the apostles. One hundred and twenty of these disciples, composed the congregation or church, who were met together in obedience to the commandment of Jesus Christ, when the day of Pentecost was fully come, and upon whom the Holy Ghost was poured out, as Christ had promised—these had not been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.

Let us now turn to the 2d chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and read it carefully, and it will be seen that every thing exhibited, was restricted to the Jewish nation. Peter standing up

with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said unto them, "*Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem.*" He charged upon them the guilt of having "taken and by wicked hands crucified Jesus Christ, a man approved of God among them by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the midst of them, as they their ownselves also knew. "This Jesus" saith he hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear," which consisted in visible, divided tongues of fire, which sat upon the 120 Galileans, and in their speaking in seventeen or more different languages, the wonderful works of God. Therefore said he, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ, after quoting the declaration of David Ps. 110 v. The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies or foes thy footstool, till I subdue them under thee, and cause them to acknowledge thee their Sovereign and Lord.

Now when they heard these things, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the Apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you, and to your children, &c. and with many other words did they testify and exhort, saying save yourselves from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day were added about three thousand souls.

These were *Jewish sinners*, and were in different circumstances from any company of Gentile sinners that the Apostles ever addressed. They were exposed to the vengeance of the great and terrible day of the Lord, which was to destroy the Jewish state and nation, on account of their unparallelled wickedness, Mat. xxiii, 34–36. To be saved from the guilt and danger, in which they were involved as the murderers of the Son of God, was the leading concern of these 3000. The occasion was a most suitable one, for the display of divine mercy and love, through the death of Christ. The same Jesus, whom they had with wicked hands crucified and slain, is made both Lord and Christ: his blood cleanseth from all sin, and is the meritorious ground of salvation. Peter's reply to the inquiry, what shall we do! was most appropriate. I suppose the following things were comprehended in it; Repent or Reform—change your minds and your conduct in reference to Jesus Christ, and yourselves—renounce your Judaism; your dependence upon the law of Moses, and upon your circumcision and sacrifices, for the forgiveness of your guilt and acquital from condemnation. Repent and be baptized every one of you, *in the name of Jesus Christ*, for the remission of sin. John preached the baptism of repentance for

the remission of sin, and baptized with that baptism, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Christ Jesus, who *should* come; this Jesus *is come*, and you have crucified him; and he is the only name given under heaven by which you must be saved. Be baptized into his name—*into him* for the remission of sin, that is in reference or in order to the forgiveness or removal of sins; renounce every thing else, and rely upon him alone for every thing, and you shall be saved, and shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost as a proof, and in confirmation of it, for the promise is to you &c.. They that gladly received the word were baptized—they put him on—by these means they passed from the old into the new covenant, and having been *born to God* by the old typical covenant, they are *born again* under the new covenant established by the blood of Christ, which was shed for the actual remission of sin; and thus God justified the ungodly by counting their faith for righteousness, and being justified by the blood of Christ, they were saved from wrath through him. I have little or no doubt, but that in this case an immediate miraculous manifestation of the Holy Ghost, was made to the minds and hearts of the 3000 in the act of baptism, and immediately afterwards, as there was to Saul of Tarsus, when he was commanded to be baptized and wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord, which confirmed the truth of, and was answerable to Peter's declarations. Saul was not only converted to Christ, but was made an apostle, and was to be a witness of the things which he had seen. The day of Pentecost was the beginning of the reign of the *exalted King*, and required all the miraculous and supernatural attestations that were made, to manifest, confirm, and establish his character and Kingdom. We have reason, however, to believe, that Saul of Tarsus was sealed with the Spirit before he was baptized, Acts IX, 17, 18.

When Peter preached to the Gentiles the scene was a different one, corresponding with the difference that existed between their state, and the state of the Pentecostal Jews. The Gentiles had never been under the authority of the Jewish covenant and laws. They had not been preached to by John the Baptist, or by Jesus Christ; neither had they rejected or crucified the Messiah. They were not exposed to the destruction of the great and terrible day of the Lord, which was in 30 years to destroy the Jewish state and nation, from which the 3000 were saved by their conversion, and from which the 120 had been saved by believing in Christ before his crucifixion, and by placing themselves under his instruction, guidance, and protection. The Gentiles were not *Jewish* but *Gentile sinners*, and renounced Gentile sins, the sins of ignorance, sensuality, idolatry &c. When Peter preached to them, he did not charge them with the murder of Jesus Christ, nor of being exposed to the vengeance of the great and terrible day of the Lord, that was to destroy the Jews; for had Cornelius, and kinsmen, and near friends been living when that day came; and been officers and soldiers in the Roman army, they would

have been the instruments to have brought it on. Accordingly when Peter preached to them they were not pricked in the heart or terrified. They believed his testimony concerning Jesus Christ, and the remission of sin through faith in his name, and in receiving Christ they received remission; in proof of which they were baptized with the Holy Ghost, which was God's witness that he had by faith given to them repentance unto life, and purified their hearts. In consequence of these things they were baptized in water, by which they renounced their Gentileism and put on Christ, and thus *in Christ Jesus*, they were *one with the Jews*. These Gentiles were *not in their sins when they were baptized*, and of course their sins were *not remitted in the water*. A distinction existed and must be maintained, between the state of the Pentecostal Jews and the Gentiles, and the events in reference to their order of succession, in their conversion and baptism were different, and it is a most palpable absurdity to place the Gentiles *now* in the state of the Pentecostal Jews, and address them as they were addressed in all respects. A much less distinction obtained between the 120 disciples, who were converted before the crucifixtion of Christ, or who became his disciples, and did not participate in his murder, and the Gentiles, than there was between the 3000 Pentecostal Jews and the Gentiles. The Apostles as I before remarked, when speaking of the Gentiles in Acts 10, in no case compares their conversion with the conversion of the 3000, as being or having been in situations at all analogous. But they uniformly when speaking explicitly, compare them with the 120 disciples at the beginning, who were baptized in water before the death of Christ, or the day of Pentecost. Peter considered the Gentiles in Acts 10 and 11, after they believed and *before* they were baptized in water, as in the same state of divine favor, that he and the rest of the 120 disciples were *after* they were baptized, and long after the day of Pentecost Acts XV, 10, 46, 47, XI, 15–18, XV, 7–9

I have mentioned these things to show what views and opinions of baptism are entertained in our day, derived from Acts 2 and 22. which were not entertained by the apostles, and which have a tendency to deprive, I fear, and if indulged in, will deprive thousands, as it will myself, of much happiness in participating with those we love, in the blessings of the gospel, and in preventing its dissemination. These I say are my fears, and they are my reasons for writing—Christ is the Saviour of the Jews and of the Gentiles; he saves the Jew by faith, and the Gentile through faith—and by baptism since the miraculous gifts ceased, they receive a symbolical pledge and representation of the remission of their sins, when submitted to by faith, and have the answer of a good conscience towards God—they renounce every thing else and put on Christ; as he is made of God to them wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

I desire to say something more of baptism and of the new covenant, which I will reserve for another number, and after that

shall be glad to see your remarks, bro. Stone, upon my views generally. Afterwards I desire to write a number or two on *the death of Christ*, and *the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, with a view of exhibiting the gospel principles of *Christian fellowship and union*.

ARCHIPPUS.

For the Christian Messenger.

DECEMBER 31, 1830.

Thoughts suggested by the close of the year, and the circumstances connected with it.

This is the last day of the year 1830. Where will it be to-morrow? "With the years beyond the flood." And now, while the old year, is writhing in death; while the sable curtains of night are enshrouding the world; and the cold north western winds, are whistling by my humble dwelling, I have concluded to put down a few of the thoughts, which the circumstances that surround me suggest. *To me*, the dying year, nature prostrate in death, a retrospect of the past, and an anticipation of the future, as,

"Melancholy ghosts of dead renown
All point to earth, and hiss at human pride."

Yes; they do this, and more than this: They tell of disappointed hopes; of blighted joys; of broken hearts; of truth and virtue violated, and religion outraged. They say with Job. "Man that is born of woman is of few days, and full of trouble: He cometh forth as a flower and is cut down; he fleeth also as a shadow and continueth not." Yes, and while they tell us of the fugitive state of all below, that ourselves are as mere shadows, flitting across the plain, they admonish us, to raise our eyes, and direct our steps towards those

Blest scenes of permanent delight!
"Full above measure! lasting beyond bound;"

Where pain and sorrow, and death itself, shall be no more; where all shall be perpetual, perfect, immortal and eternal enjoyment, with God, and all the blessed. Such are some of the lessons, which the closing year has for me. Yet, alas; how few seem disposed to learn and improve them! Though the language in which they are taught, is loud and plain, the ears of the multitude are deaf to it. Balls, routs, the latest fashions, the finest looking ladies, and gentlemen;—*these* are the all engrossing subjects. The voice of conscience and religion, is drowned in the sound of the violin, the noise of the dancers heel, and the loud unmeaning laugh of the giddy crowd, widening and strewing with flowers, the road to ruin. But, where am I wandering? My preface is like to be longer than my book. I have not yet touched the subject, for which I took up my pen. I must, therefore, hasten to it. It is the propriety of parents attending at balls, and taking, or sending their children to them. We expect the giddy world, to pursue their giddy dance to ruin. But O my soul! is this the way Christians should go? And is it thus, they are to

let their light shine, that others seeing their good works, may glory their Father in heaven?

Is this conduct to be justified? And can churches, that tolerate it, expect the blessing of God? To all these questions, we answer, unhesitatingly, with an emphatic *no*. We know the pleas which are urged in support of the practice. Say some, keep your children at home, refuse them the privilege of attending balls, and you increase their anxiety on the subject; but let them attend a few times, and they become satisfied, and acknowledge the evil of such a course. Strange reasoning! The old exploded sentiment, then, which was charged upon Paul, by his enemies, "whose condemnation was just," is revived, and must be received as a maxim; "Let us do evil that good may come." Besides, this sort of reasoning argues "a criminal ignorance of human nature."

A heathen could say, "Pitch upon that course which is best; and *habit* will render it agreeable." In this saying is contained much of the true philosophy of human nature. For who does not know the immense, the almost irresistible influence of habit, good or bad? Hence the strong language of scripture, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spot? Then may you, who are accustomed to do evil, do good." The wise Agesilaus, king of Sparta, being asked what things he thought most proper for young persons to learn, answered, "Those which they ought to practise when they come to be grown." A wiser than Agesilaus, has said, "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

These sentiments of the heathens, and of the wiser sacred writers are, as already remarked, founded in the true philosophy of our nature. But the sentiment I am opposing contradicts all experience, all observation, all common sense, and reason; in one word, all authority, human or Divine. It says, "Train up a child in the way he *should not go*, and when he is old, *he will depart from it*." It says, "send your childsen into the basest kind of company, into every sink of wickedness, where every principle of virtue, of chastity, of religion, is violated, that, seeing these evils, they may abhor them, and turn from them!!

But, say others, "It is necessary to send our children to balls, that they may acquire a graceful carriage and polite address, and be prepared to appear to advantage, in the best circles." This is an unchristian plea all over. The spirit of the world appears here, large as life: O, yes; "Our children must be introduced into the best of company; we cannot bear to see them looked down upon, by the rich, and the great: They must be "at the top of the pot." Yes; we had rather see our children *moving gracefully* and *politely*, with the gay and giddy crowd, though pushing eternity, and every thing serious from their thoughts, than humbly marching in the good old paths of virtue, and piety." Such is the spirit of this plea. And will a Christian urge a plea like this? Tell it not in Gath! But is it so, indeed; that there are

no means of acquiring a graceful carriage, and an easy, agreeable address, but by attending upon *balls?* And can no good company be found, but among *dancers?* These ideas are too absurd to merit a moment's consideration O, Christians! think of what you are doing. We are called "the light of the world;" but where, O, where is our light! While we pursue this course, are we not rather walking in the light of the world, than holding out to the world the light of heaven, to direct their steps?

The rich and great take the lead, in the flowing road of pleasure and folly, and *we* (foolish creatures!) have started in the pursuit of them, with the vain hope of overtaking them. And thus, we are making ourselves slaves to the fashions, and follies of the times; slaves to our own vanity and pride. O, whither has fled, that "humble pure and heavenly minded heart," which the gospel inspires? Where is the spirit of fervent love to God, and his people; of purity and holiness: of hatred to sin and every appearance of evil. and of prayer for the success of truth, which distinguished the first Christians? Christians, can you look back and contemplate the spirit of primitive Christians, and associate with it, a disposition to countenance dancing? Impossible, the connexion is too absurd to be admitted. There is no affinity between the two spirits. But I must close, with this solemn question to Christians: Do you, can you believe, that in sending your children to balls, you are bringing them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?" TIMOTHY.

☞NOTE:—[This was not received till March 21.]

From the Connecticut Observer.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

"We live in a singular period. Changes occur, unexpected by the most sagacious. Changes which once would have been thought enough to occupy years, are now only the work of a day. There is too, a mixture in the signs of the future; some seeming the harbingers of great blessings, and others the harbingers of almost unmingled evils. The principles of good and ill are in active exercise. A moral battle seems to have begun to rage in the world; and in the wide field of contest, as one or the other party gives way, the shouts of victors, or the cries of the vanquished, are heard. A day of calm and of purity is indeed foretold in the word of God; and if commentators are not altogether mistaken in their interpretation, it is not far distant.—But the earth must heave, and the volcano burst, and the tempest rush through the heavens, and the ocean toss its billows on high, before a day of calm and purity can come in a world like this. It is only after a mighty struggle that the earth will sink down into the calm of a millennium. There must be, as it were, another deluge to purify the world from its pollutions: and it seems hastening on. By us, then, who are now on the stage, commotions, and toils, and perplexities are to be expected. The energies

of all are needed in the moral reformation of the world. Let us live for God, and then we need not fear the gathering ills of the future. Let us live for God, and the joys and the sorrows of the coming year will alike be the forerunners to endless years in a cloudless clime."

From the Christian Register.

Beloved, I say these things to you with sorrow, and pray that the time may speedily come, when the various denominations of Christians shall be patient, tolerant, candid, mild, humble, and charitable! when the Christian warrior shall be found brandishing none but the gospel sword! when the fire of divine love shall melt and cement their hearts in a fraternal and heavenly union! Let not your religion consist in railing at, and reviling those who differ from you in modes of worship, and in doctrine. It will not be any comfort to you in a dying hour. Imitate the virtues, and shun the failings of all. The publican is held up to us as an example of penitence and humility; the centurion, of great faith; the Samaritan, as a good neighbor. Make it your great concern to possess the spirit and obey the commands of Christ. Acquire the habit of thinking about religion, and of meditating on its truths and precepts. Form the habit of reflection. Be frequent in the duties of mental and secret prayer and self examination. Find out your besetting sins, and guard against them. Watch and follow the indications of Providence. Have the examples and precepts of your Saviour, and the eternal world to which you are hastening, fresh in your memory and thoughts. In this way, I shall expect you will make greater progress in the divine life, than by pursuing that course which is very common in these evil days. The religion, you need to make you happy, must dwell and *reign* in the heart; and like the sun, be known more by its sweet influences, than by its noise.

I exhort the aged to be patient, steadfast, and prayerful; to cast their burden upon the Lord: to fill up the evening of their days in counselling the young, in exercises of gratitude for past mercies, in penitence for their sins, in earnest preparations for dying the death of the righteous, and entering into that rest, which remaineth for the people of God.

Those, who are in the midst of the cares and business of life, are exhorted to seek the pearl of great price, and to be careful for their immortal souls.

I exhort the *rich* to be rich in faith and good works, and to remember their accountability to God for the use they make of all things temporal;—and the *poor* to be contented, to trust in God, and to lay up a treasure in the heavens.

I exhort the young to remember their Creator, to abstain from indecent and profane language, to avoid bad company, to be sober, virtuous, and pious, to be moderate in their passions and desires, to reverence the aged, to pity the unfortunate, to love and obey their parents, guardians, and instructers, to be innocent in their recreations, and kind and generous to one another:

I exhort the sick and the afflicted to cast their care upon God, and so to believe in him and in his Son Jesus Christ, that they may endure all their pains, bear all their crosses, and find an unfailing relief for all their trouble of heart, and heaviness of spirit; and that they may enjoy that inward and heavenly peace, which the world can neither give nor take away.

I exhort those, who have professed their faith in the Lord Jesus, to walk worthy of their holy vocation, and to grow in grace and in Christian knowledge.

I exhort such, as never have made a profession of religion, to those acts and exercises of penitence, faith and piety, which shall qualify them for becoming members of Christ's visible Church; and such, as have hitherto neglected the means of grace, and been insensible to their condition and spiritual wants, I exhort to a serious and solemn consideration of their ways; to awake from their slumbering, and no longer disregard the warnings and invitation of the gospel.

I ask a continuance of your friendly regards, and an affectionate remembrance in your prayers. That your hearts may be pure; your consciences good; your faith true, strong, and active; your example blameless; your character Christian; your souls and bodies in health; that it may be well with you in time and eternity, is the fervent prayer of your affectionate pastor!

From the Reformed Christian Guide.

UNIVERSALISM RENOUNCED.

ODI PROFANUM VULGUS, ET ARCEO:—*Horace.*

Having belonged to the Unaversalist connexion for several years, and written several books in its defence; and having withdrawn from that connexion in April, 1828, I conceive the publication of my reasons, though too long delayed, to be a duty which I owe to my friends, to society, to God, and to the religion of Jesus. This public disavowal merits the greater attention, because made at a time when I am free from all excitement of personal or party feelings, and moved thereunto by no other consideration, than to exonerate my own conscience, and remedy, as far as I can, the injury I have done to the Church of God and my fellow-men, by the diffusion of unholy and dangerous opinions.

The characteristic doctrine of the sect is the salvation of all men after death; but the creed of the denomination is much better defined by these five Negatives: There is no Devil; There is no Hell; There will be no future Judgment; There is no religious distinction among men in this world; and there will be no difference in their condition in the world to come!

The doctrine of Universal-Restoration, which assumes that the punishment of the wicked, in a future world, will be *remedial*, and terminate in their recovery to penitence and consequent happiness, is totally distinct from Universalism. It neither ad-

mits the characteristic *positive*, nor any of the *negatives*. The two systems are as diverse as light and darkness. Though, therefore, the following arguments do not apply to *Universal-Restitution*, yet there are sufficient reasons, *moral*, *physical*, and *scriptural*, which induce me to reject and disavow all notions generated by an association of the terms, *universal* and *salvation*.

1. Universalism was unknown in the world till the middle of the eighteenth century, when it was conceived in the fanciful mind of a fanatical Methodist preacher, who imagined the doctrine, so far as it is affirmative to result from a union of the Calvinistic Absolute Election and the Arminian Universal Redemption. Though Mr. Ballou has written an elaborate book, entitled "The History of Ancient Universalism" from the commencement of the Christian Era to the Reformation, yet he has been unable to furnish one living testimony for the existence, or belief of the doctrine, during the whole period embraced by his History! Thus seventeen hundred years after the volume of Revelation was closed, Universalism, as *one born out of due time*, makes its appearance in the world, and without any pretence to authority for a new dispensation, solicits the homage due to a divine commission. Where are its credentials! It has none!

2. Universalism is not taught in the Holy Scriptures; for there is not a passage in the whole Bible that plainly teaches the doctrine. Those passages generally adduced by its advocates, are either *figurative* or misapplied. The *three* main pillars on which it rests, are the mere images of a dream. These are the relationship of the Deity to his creatures as father to children; equitable retribution in the present life; and a complete change at death from the earthly to the heavenly image. But the very contrary of these are the facts. God is never called the Father of infidel or unregenerate men, by any of the Sacred Writers. Nor can any man show that a parental relationship subsists between God and degenerate sinness, more than between the Creator and the fowls of the air, or beasts of the field. The Holy Scriptures state the case very differently, by declaring to wicked men, that they are of their father, the Devil. The assumption that all men are recompensed according to their deeds in the present world, is countenanced only by the mis-translation of a single passage, Prov. XI, 31, which passage translated by an Apostle, affords a very different sense, 1 Peter, IV, 18: and the whole doctrine of full retribution in this life, is directly opposed by Solomon, in these plain terms: Sentence against an evil work is not *speedily* executed; there are *just* men to whom it happens according to the work of the *wicked;* and there are *wicked* men to whom it happens according to the work of the *righteous*, Eccles. VII. 11, 14. The doctrine is contrary to all human experience, and the unanimous and unequivocal testimony of revelation. Lastly, the Apostles does not teach, in the 15th chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, that all mankind shall be the subjects of the happy change, there described. This high privilege he limits to

those who shall be Christ's at his coming, and belong to him by a *spiritual relationship*, contrasted with the *natural affinity* that subsists between Adam and his degenerate offspring. Moreover, according to the *reading* of the Latin Vulgate and the Cambridge Manuscript, two of the best authorities in the world; Paul affirms in the fifty-first verse, that *we shall all rise*, but *we shall not all be changed;* and *this reading* is confirmed by the quotations of the passage, found in the Latin Fathers.

3. Unaversalism is not only opposed to the general scope of the Holy Scriptures, but also to the general belief of all enlightened nations. It must therefore be repugnant to common sense. This new heresy outrages the plainest testimony of Revelation, and the general received Faith of mankind, by denying the existence of a *personal* Devil, and a *local* Hell, and a future retribution, which are just as explicitly taught in the Scriptures, as the existence of God, or the reality of Heaven! The fact is, that the Sacred Writers never attempt to prove the existence of these beings or places; they are every where taken for granted in the Holy Scriptures, and there exhibited as the foundation on which the whole system of moral and religious Truth is laid. He, therefore, who would expunge from the Bible and the Christian Religion, the received doctrine concerning Satan and Hell, may by parity of argument disprove the existence of God and Heaven. The Being and Providence of God, the personal existence and evil influence of the Devil, the immortal joys of the Holy, in a place of endless felicity, and the indescribable torments and destruction of the Wicked in Hell, are doctrines that have equal foundation in the Christian system; and will be acknowledged, in despite of all the efforts of Infidelity, while the world stands, and the Bible retains the approbation and confidence of mankind. To every objection to these doctrines, it is sufficient to reply:—They were popular in the days of Christ, never once reproved by him, but often made the foundation of his public instruction and impressive warnings; and, therefore, we are authorised in believing, that he gave them his divine sanction.

4. Universalism is utterly incapable of producing any moral or religious Reformation. In the present degenerate state of mankind, no religion can live where no other sanction is admitted, than a supposed balance of enjoyment in favor of the virtuous; for this is so little perceived by men in general, that it is believed only by the few who realize, that it is good to draw nigh to God. Even Atheism admits that virtue is desirable and profitable to men in the present life, but it puts an end to all distinction after death. In this respect, Atheism and Universalism are both alike with respect to religion, or motive to perseverance in virtue, in seasons of persecution or trial; or to effect that surrender of property, reputation, or life, which the obligations of religion require, when wickedness sits in high places. Many cases occur, in which much good may be done by self-denial, and even by the resignation of life itself, as in the case of our blessed Lord: and if the doctrine of future retribution be denied, the obligation to these sacrifices can never be made apparent and convincing. No wonder, then, that Universalism should raise the tongue of jealousy and slander against attempts to proselyte the heathen, or reform mankind; for she feels her own inability to effect any renovation.

The baneful effect of this doctrine, is the removal of all motives to obedience and holiness. It has been well said: If any thing will subdue the hardness of the sinner's heart, and awaken him to a sense of the folly and danger of sin; if any thing will quicken the sensibility of conscience, and impress the laws of heaven on the understanding, it is the certainty of a future judgment, a state of being where justice will raise her impartial scales, and award to each the precise measure of his deserts. The strength of this motive, and its influence on the mind and practice of every individual, will be in exact proportion to the conviction he feels, that the soul will exist hereafter, receive a just retribution from its Maker, know the pains of depravity and vice, and feel the joys of conscious innocence and purity.

5. The moral tendency of Universalism is manifestly the subversion of religion and the degradation of human nature. Being engaged for some years after I joined the Universalist Connexion, in September 1823, in preaching to people whom I had collected into new societies, I had no opportunity of seeing the tendency of the doctrine. But after I was called to preach statedly for congregations of several years' standing in that denomination, I then immediately discovered, with alarm, *death's doings*, in all their frightful forms. Appalled at the prospect, my affections to the doctrine soon chilled; and daily experience convinced me, that the delusion into which I had fallen like the forbidden fruit, spread spiritual and moral death among mankind. By removing all fear of God, judgment, and future punishment, it strengthened the hands of the wicked, inspired a false hope, and confirmed the daring folly of the Infidel, and superinduced the morbid feeling of the Epicurean, by saying, in effect, to all its votaries: "Live while ye live: Eat and drink, for to-morrow ye die." In a word, Universalism may be fitly denominated, *the grave-digger* for religion and practical piety.

6. Universalism is the most uncharitable and appalling doctrine for the poor, the oppressed, the diseased, and the unfortunate; for it suggests, that they must be proportionately greater sinners than the rest of men, seeing they are greater sufferers. This false notion, once led to the inquiry: Were those men whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, sinners above all the Galileans? To which Jesus answered: *Nay!* This *Nay*, O Universalist, is the seal of Heaven set to the sentence of thine *apostacy*.

7. Universalism is as unfriendly to civil government as it is hostile to the existence and influence of Christianity. If its favorite maxim be true, that all men are recompensed in the very instant in which the action is performed, by the exercise of a special Providence, then all executive or retributive justice administered by any form of civil government, is nothing but pure and unmixed tyranny and oppression. Hence, it appears, the ten-

dency of Universalism is to destroy order and subvert civil liberty. A great part of the learned Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses," is employed in establishing these two important propositions. "All mankind, especially the most wise and learned nations of antiquity, have concurred in believing and teaching, that the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is necessary to the well-being of civil society—and that the inculcation of this doctrine is of such use and importance to civil government." He, therefore, who endeavors to destroy the influence of this belief on society, is alike the enemy of his God and his country, and in a high degree, forfeits his claim to the protection of either.

8. Finally, I renounce and abjure the doctrine of Universalism, on account of its *Absurdity*, *Infidelity*, and *Profanity*.

Its absurdity lies in the supposition that men shall be saved, whose whole life has been one continued developement of a depraved heart, vicious and impure dispositions, and diabolical conversations; and whose very dying hours have breathed nothing but irreverence and despair. But all this comes far short of the climax. Universalism holds that the vilest miscreant can, when he pleases, dye his hands in his brother's blood, look up and attack the throne of heaven by execrations and blasphemies, then turn the weapon on himself, and by an act of suicide, compel the holy gates of heaven to open and admit him to rank as chief among the saints.

The *Infidelity* is manifest by a total contempt of the Scripture testimony, which uniformly distinguishes the righteous and the wicked, by their lives and conversations in the present world, and their awfully different destinies in the world to come; and also from its contemptuous rejection of the unanimous Faith of the Christian Church, in all ages, from its foundation to the present time.

The *Profanity* cannot be concealed; for this heresy cuts the very thread of spiritual life, by placing the profane, the blasphemer, and the assassin in the family of God, thereby rending the veil of the Holy Temple, casting holy things to dogs, and making sacred things common. By making no distinction between persons who serve God and those who serve him not, it degrades the Song of the *Redeemed* to the same rank with the obscene mirth of the *libertine*. In a word this *novel heresy*, blights with the breath of *Upas*, the very trees, as well as the fruits of righteousness, in both the moral and religious world; and nothing less than the outstretched arm of Almighty God can snatch the soul from ruin, that has once imbibed the deleterious draught of a delusion so lethal and stupifying. May the Lord in mercy pardon the sinful instrumentality of the writer, in his former efforts to diffuse the doctrine; and may the Great Head of the Church arrest the progress of this delusion, and lead its disciples to a timely repentance. Amen. JOHN S. THOMPSON.

[Receipts for this month will be given in the next No.]

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. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. MAY 1831. [No. 5.

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.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

No. IV.

The Baptism of John; and the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; and of water, as a Christian ordinance.

The baptism of John was preparatory to the appearance, and the reception of Jesus Christ. John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin, "saying unto the people that they should believe on him, who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus," Acts XIX, 4. Christ himself was to be exalted with the right hand of God, a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance and forgiveness of sins. All that John demanded from such as repaired to him to be baptized, was to declare their readiness to reform, and to recieve the Messiah, who was expected shortly to come, and to frame their lives in a manner agreeably to that expectation, Luke III, 7–14. He did not require a belief in any existing individual, as Messiah, in the previous part of his ministry, for he himself did not know him, John I, 31, 33. John came baptizing with water that Jesus Christ should be made manifest to Israel, (John I, 31–34,) which was done when he was baptized of John in Jordan, Mat. III, 5, 6, and v. 13–17. What occurred at Christ's baptism confirmed the mission of John, as Christ's fore-runner, and the mission of Christ also, as the Son of God.

John told the people that he baptized in water unto repentance, but that he who should come after him, was mightier than he, and would baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire, Mat. III, 2. John did not baptize in the name of Christ, nor by his authority. The baptism of the Holy Ghost, or the out pouring of the Holy Spirit, and the miraculous gifts, ministered by Christ after he was glorified, were promised to, and were bestowed upon *none but believers*, and upon those, who had been made to believe previously to their receiving the Holy Spirit by *external revelation*, consisting in what they *saw* and *heard*, exhibited in *miraculous works*, and *revealed words*. In proof of this, read carefully the following passages, John VII,