proved, are rejected from publication. One moment's reflection will convince all of the propriety of my course, and free me from censure. "A searcher for truth, and pure charity," from Belmont co. Ohio, for the reason above stated, cannot be admitted a place in the Messenger. It is requested again that my correspondents pay the postage of their letters. My agents alone are excepted. I have many communications on hand, which shall hereafter receive attention. EDITOR.

RECEIPTS FROM MARCH 1ST TO MAY 1ST.

Little Sandy Saline Ky.—From G. Scott, for self, Wm. Jourdan, Moses Kibby, John Everman, Geo. Henderson, $5.

Lexington, Ky.—By Elder T. M. Allen, for M. Yates, 2: by Ben. Cassell, $5; for Dr. Fishback, 1 for vol. 5; for Js. Towler, 1 for vol. 4; for J. Steel, 1 for vol. 5; for J. Curd, 1 for vol. 5; for Jac. Stone, 1 for vol. 5. By Ben. Cassel, for others, $4. *Pennsville, O.*—By Wm. French, 1 for vol. 5. *Felicity, O.*—Elder John Powell, by Js. Conn, 3 50. *Georgetown, O.*—By Js. Clack, $5; for self, 1; for J. D. White, 1; for R. Allen, 1; for H. Pickering 1; for O. Johnson 1. *Cincinnatti, O.*—By J. D. Garrard, Agent, $7; for self 2; for Js. McCash 2, for vols. 4 & 5; for Mr. Gillaspel 2, for vols. 3 & 4; for E. Lockwood 1, for vol. 4. By James Long, of Manchester, O. 1. *Elkton, Ky.*—By Thos. Philips 2; for self 1; for Js. Coleman 1, for vol. 5.—*Georgetown, Ky.*—By Wm. Moseby, 1; Sam. Benton, 1; Ann Leonard, 1; Robt. J. Ward, 1. *Versailles, Ky.*—Charles Ware 1; J. Hunter, 4, for his father of Lawrenceburg, Ill. for vols. 1, 2, 3 & 4; B. Gains, 1. *Fulton & Fruits, Mo.*—By Wharton Moore, $4; for Wm. Grant 3; for Js. Grant 1. *Abbotts Mill, Tenn.*—Ross Houston 1. *Lawrenceburg, Tenn.*—A. Miller 1. *Meigsville, Tenn.*—By A. Kirkpatrick $5; for self 1; for James Kirkpatrick 1; for Thos. Hutchison 1; for E. Sanders 2.—*Princeton, Ky.*—By Dr. C. Webb, $4; for self 1; for Stevenson 1; for Black 1; for Gore 1. *Union, Ky.*—Dr. Ennis 4; Elder T. Waller for Mrs. Hallock 1; for Jac. Sidener 1; for Js. Hurst 1; for H. Lighter 1; for Gen. Russell 1; for Wm. Cox 1; for A. Rice 1; for T. A. Russell 1; for Maj. Moseby 1. *Paris, Ky.*—Thos. Stamps 1; Dan. Smedley 1; S. G. Martin 1; B. M. Riggs 1; Mrs. E. Garrard 1. *Paoli, Ia.*—By Elder Lewis Byram $10. *Royalton, N. Y.*—By Wm. Smith 2. *Newcastle, Ky.*—By M. Sidener for Geo. Shivel 1. *Gites C. H. Va.*—By A. Stewart 5; for Isaac Hale 1; for Chas. Hale 1; Andw. Johnson 1 for Jacob Peck; Monroe Va. 1; Tho. Hale 1; all for vol. 4. *Somerville, Ala.*—By Eld. E. Randolph $15. *Newnan, Ga.*—By Js. Meriwether 1. *Greensburg, Ia.*—By J. Corbin 1 50. *Maysliek, Ky.*—Js. Tebbs 1 for vol. 5. *Leesburg, Ky.*—Wm. Bodkin 1 for vol. 5. *Harrodsburg, Ky.*—By L. J. Flemming for Thos. Allin, Sen. 1 for vol. 5. *Carlisle, Ky.*—By Elder J. Rogers $4. *Cameron, Ky.*—By John Graves, 2; for G. T. Dennis 1 for vol. 5; for John Sleat 1 for vol. 4. *Mt. Carmel, Ky.*—By Elder F. R. Palmer for R. Mock 1 for vol. 5.

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. JUNE 1831. [No. 6.

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.

As truth is our object, we feel disposed to aid its progress in the world, by impartially exhibiting its claims to be attentively heard by all concerned to know. We have given Archippus a patient hearing in the four preceding numbers; we design now to hear our brother A. Campbell in reply. To this course I am advised by brethren of eminence in society. It is hoped that my correspondents will be silent on this subject, till I shall have come to a close of Mr. C's reply.

REPLY TO ARCHIPPUS BY THE EDITOR OF THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Always willing that our readers shall have the same opportunity of judging for themselves that we have, I am solicitous that they may hear both sides of every important question, and know all that can be said against, as well as for every proposition which we offer. This is what we ask from our opponents, and although they will not yield to our importunities, still we feel ourselves compelled by the controlling principles of our religion, not to imitate them, but to give a fair exhibit of both sides.

The essay above quoted from the Christian Messenger deserves special attention, because it contemplates a new ground of opposition to the Apostolic Gospel, as we consider it. The writer of it seems to be a half reformer or middle-ground man, who divides baptism into two species; one for the Jews, for remission of sins—and one for the Gentiles, after they are pardoned. He has taken a middle ground. To the Jew he would preach baptism for remission; to the Gentiles, baptism without remission. From the versatility of his genius in other matters, we shall not be surprised to find him abandon his Jewish baptism, that he may secure his Gentile baptism.

But it will be time enough to examine the grounds and reasons of this opinion when he has presented them to the public.

In the mean time, we shall offer to him and the public a few remarks on the essay before us:

The author of this essay is supposed to be a reformer, but a reformer of a peculiar class; and if public fame be worthy of credit, the "car of his reformation" moves in a circle, or, after starting from the city of Presbyterianism, and after much hard toiling for some years, it has stopped in the suburbs of the old city again. He has the same doctrine of communion which this essay exhibits on baptism. He admits that among the old converts there was no breaking of the loaf, save among the immersed disciples; that sprinkling infants is a human tradition; yet he teaches that among the Gentile Christians of the present day, all Christian union, even to the breaking of the loaf, ought to be practised irrespective of the views of the participants in favor of infant sprinkling, or Christian immersion. It is not to be wondered at, then, that he should divide the institution of baptism, as he has that of the Supper, and give it one meaning to a Jew, and another to a Gentile. I doubt not but this peculiarity arises from a warm desire to promote brotherly kindness and love. We only state these premises to enable the reader to appreciate the conclusions to which he has come.

But we have some complaints to offer which we think are worthy of the attention of Archippus, and these we will arrange in numerical order:

1. Why should he assert that our views of immersion throw us back upon the ages which succeeded the Apostles? He would insinuate not to the age immediately succeeding, or the age of the Apostles itself, but to the third or fourth age after the Apostles. This is "*ad captandum vulgus*," to catch the thoughtless by representing that we had not gone back to the Apostolic Age, but only to some dark age subsequent to that age. But where is the proof? This he has as yet kept to himself!! Will this saying prove any thing? Nothing for him, and nothing against us. It is only to prejudice, or to inveigle the undiscriminating. Why tell us of the conversion of Constantine, and his notions of baptism? What will this prove? But he wished to introduce the Novatians, and he tells us that Constantine was a Novatian. This we complain of as an unlawful, wanton, and pointless attempt to prejudice, rather than to convince.

2. Why introduce the name of Novatius, or the Novatians, and represent the idea of baptism for the remission of sins as originating with them? or at least, as the first public advocates of this view? This is not a fact. We challenge him for the proof.

3 Or does he intend to side with the Catholics and call the Novatians heretics, and thus ally us with heretics? This is unmanly, unjust, and every way illogical. We complain of these things, as unworthy of a high-minded man, and of a fair controversialist. But in the next place,

4. We complain of his alleging *false facts* in his allusions to history. The following sentences he cannot sustain from any authentic document on earth. "The Novatians formed a sect that sprung up in the third century, which, on *account of their views of baptism* [not a fact] in washing away sin, and their interpretation of Heb. vi. 4–6, believed that no person who had been excluded from the fellowship of the church ought ever to be restored, even upon repentance. A practice contrary to this sentiment caused them to separate from the church, [what church? Ask Mr. Jones] and to form a new sect." This is in a great measure imagined by our friend. He cannot adduce any documents to sustain him. I have no doubt but he thought that his imaginations on this subject was all true history. I was confounded when I read these sentences, and immediately brushed the dust off Eusebius, from whom all the moderns borrow. But behold, Eusebius says no such thing. The Catholics call the *Novatians* heretics, and our friend catches their spirit. But Eusebius never once mentions any peculiarity in their views of baptism He only says (London Edition Folio A. D. 1709, page 120) that Novatius "disalloweth of Holy Baptism," without a single specification. In a note it is explained, that he contemned the baptism of the Catholic Church as inefficient. Yea, the very reverse of 'Archippus' saying, is the fact, as stated by Valesius, In his note upon the passage, he says: "The confession of faith made by the catechumens before baptism, when they said 'they believed the remission of sins,' he abolished; for, says Valesius, Novatian did not allow remission of sins." I have examined every allusion to Novatian in Eusebius, and find no countenance for the assertions of Archippus.

Mosheim, vol. 1 p. 299 of his history, exonerates the Novatians from the charge of Archippus. He says, "Novatian, a presbyter of the Church in Rome, was a man of uncommon learning and eloquence;" of an "austere and rigid character." The sect of the Novatians, (he avers) cannot be charged with having corrupted the doctrine of Christianity by their opinions. Their crime was the unreasonable severity of their discipline—by which they made an unhappy rent in the church.

Again, page 309, Mosheim says, "There was no difference in point of doctrine between the Novatians and other Christians. What distinguished them was, their refusing to re-admit to the communion of the church those who after baptism had fallen into the commission of *heinous crimes*, [such as idolatry or apostacy, not every offence,] though they did not pretend that even such were excluded from all possibility or hopes of salvation." Mosheim assigns them no peculiar views of the meaning of baptism. "They only," says he, "considered the baptism administered in those churches [which were lax in discipline] which received the lapsed to their communion even after the most sincere and undoubted repentance, as absolute-

ly divested of the power of imparting the remission of sins, which was the doctrine of the whole church at this time: for "*in doctrine* the Novatians differed not from other Christians." Mosheim refers to Eusebius; but Eusebius does not justify all his remarks. I have read the references. They baptized all whom they received from the Catholic Church, not because they had a new or different baptism, but because they considered that church immoral and impure.

Jones, whom I think Archippus regards as one of the best historians, condemns all his allusions to the Novatians. So also does the historian Robinson. These worthy Baptists speak in the highest terms of the Novatians. All Jones alleges against the Novatians, and this he does with considerable doubt, is, that *it is said* Novatian refused to receive into the communion of the church any, who in time of persecution, had been induced through fear of sufferings or death, to apostatize from their profession, and offer sacrifices to the heathen deities, a principle which he founded upon a mistaken view of Heb. vi. 4–6. The following is one of the fairest accounts of the true character of the Novatians which we can find on the pages of any historian:—

THE NOVATIANS.

"The following is the account given of Novatian by the late Mr. Robert Robinson, in his Ecclesiastical Researches, p. 126; and I the more readily submit it to the reader, because none who knew Mr. Robinson, can, for a moment, suspect him of having any undue predilection for the principles of Novatian. "He was," says he, "an elder in the Church of Rome, a man of extensive learning, holding the same doctrine as the church did, and published several treatises in defence of what he believed His address was eloquent and insinuating, and his morals irreproachable. He saw with extreme pain the intolerable depravity of the church. Christians within the space of a very few years were caressed by one emperor, and persecuted by another. In seasons of prosperity many persons rushed into the church for base purposes. In times of adversity they denied the faith and reverted again to idolatry. When the squall was over, away they came again to the church, with all their vices, to deprave others by their examples. The bishops, fond of proselytes, encouraged all this; and transferred the attention of christians from the old confederacy for virtue, to vain shows at Easter, and other Jewish ceremonies, adulterated too with paganism. On the death of bishop Fabian, Cornelius, a brother elder, and a violent partisan for taking in the multitude, was put in nomination. Novatian opposed him; but as Cornelius carried his election, and he saw no prospect of reformation, but, on the contrary, a tide of immorality pouring into the church, he withdrew and a great many with him. Cornelius, irritated by Cyprian, who was just in the same condition, through the remonstrance of virtuous men at

Carthage, and who was exasperated beyond measure with one of his own elders, named Novatus, who had quitted Carthage, and gone to Rome to espouse the cause of Novatian, called a council and got a sentence of excommunication passed against Novatian. In the end Novatian formed a church, and was elected bishop. Great numbers followed his example, and all over the empire *Puritan* churches were constituted and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterwards, when penal laws obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in private they were distinguished by a variety of names, *and a succession of them continued till the Reformation.*"

"The same author, afterwards adverting to the vile calumnies with which the Catholic writers have in all ages delighted to asperse the character of Novatian, thus proceeds to vindicate him:—

"They say Novatian was the first Antipope; and yet there was at that time no pope, in the modern sense of the word. They call Novatian the author of the heresy of puritanism; and yet they know that Tertulian had quitted the church near fifty years before, for the same reason, and Privatus, who was an old man in the time of Novatian, had, with several more, repeatedly remonstrated against the alterations taking place; and, as they could get no redress, had dissented and formed separate congregations. They tax Novatian with being the parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans all over the empire; and yet he had no other influence over any than what his good example gave him. People every where saw the same cause of complaint, and groaned for relief; and when one man made a stand for virtue, the crisis had arrived; people saw the propriety of the cure, and applied the same means to their own relief. They blame this man and all these churches for the severity of their discipline; yet this severe discipline was the only coercion of the primitive churches, and it was the exercise of this that rendered civil coercion unnecessary. Some exclaimed, it is a barbarous discipline to refuse to readmit people into christian communion, because they have lapsed into idolatry or vice. Others, finding the inconvenience of such a lax discipline, required a repentance of five, ten, or fifteen years; but the Novatians said, You may be admitted among us by baptism; or, if any Catholic has baptized you before, by rebaptism; but if you fall into idolatry, we shall separate you from our communion, and on no account readmit you. God forbid we should injure either your person, your property, or your character, or even judge of the truth of your repentance or your future state; but you can never be readmitted to our community, without our giving up the last and only coercive guardian we have of the purity of our [fellowship.] Whether these persons reasoned justly or not, as virtue was their object, they challenge respect, and he must be a weak

man indeed, who is frighted out of it, because Cyprian is pleased to say they are the children of the Devil"

"The doctrinal sentiments of the Novatians appear to have been very scriptural, and the discipline of their churches rigid in the extreme. They were the first class of Christians who obtained the name of (*Cathari*) Puritans, an appellation which doth not appear to have been chosen by themselvns, but applied to them by their adversaries; from which we may reasonably conclude that their manners were simple and irreproachable." [*Jones' History.*

Upon the whole, the Novatians are defended by Lardner and by Jones, Robinson, and some others, as the purest branch of the Church, as it is called; and notwithstanding their requiring apostates to be re-baptized, they stand with the fairest character of any sect on the page of history down to the times of the Waldenses, or even to the time of the Reformation, though merged in other names. They are the parents of the Baptist sect, so far as it has any parentage out of the Church of Rome.

—

The vindication of the Novatians is no concern of mine; for it avails nothing with me whether they taught the Jews baptism, or the Gentiles baptism, according to my worthy friend Archippus. But we must do justice to the dead as well as to the living, and *nothing can be more unwarranted, from all history, than to say that "they were excluded from the church of Rome because of their views of baptism in washing away sin."* I now call upon Archippus to retract this charge, or to make an effort to sustain it. And here I will take occasion to say, that he cannot find any man of any note, or any sect mentioned in history from Peter's Sermon on Pentecost till Constantine the Great, who held his views of baptism; nor any man who taught that baptism was not connected with the remission of sins. Both *his orthodox church* which excluded Novatian, and *his* heretic Novatian, agreed in their views of "baptism, as washing away sin." Let Archippus name the man in all antiquity who opposed baptism for the remission of sins. We only use this as an *argumentum ad hominem.* When an opponent would represent us as reviving old heresies, or as holding the views of heretics, we wish him to remember that the orthodox, *his own* orthodox and the heretics were one in this matter. In this style does the present orthodox Roman Church represent all the Protestants, as reviving old heresies.

Upon the whole, we are glad to see Archippus make his issue on this question, seeing he is determined to be opposed; much more so, however, to have seen him act a more consistent part both towards me, himself, his friends, and the community. He has thrown down the gauntlet on a mere phantom of his own creation, and joined issue with the very persons, whom, of all others, he is the most bound from his own principles, conces-

sions and professions to have sustained. We know his love for his own offspring. No father ever loved an only child with more enthusiasm, than this good doctor loves his own creations. We know it will require him some months to get to the temperature of calm reason and dispassionate inquiry; and therefore we expect a vigorous effort on his part to maintain his Gentile Baptism. But, reader, be assured he will have to surrender either his Jews baptism or his Gentile baptism before many moons, in the estimation of all men of sense and intelligence; and among these I would include himself. He has a good library, and has access to all the libraries in Lexington, Ky. And as he has fairly made an issue, we expect him to put forth all his powers in his own defence.

I have been at some pains to convict him of the loose and declamatory manner in which he alludes to facts and documents. Facts are stubborn things, not so pliable as speculations and opinions. We will show that his scripture allusions are as fanciful as his allusions to ecclesiastical history. His distinction between the import of baptism when a Jew and a Gentile is the subject, I would inform him is not new to me: for that thought occurred to me years ago, and was thoroughly canvassed. It amounts to little more than this, and all his preliminary questions amount to no more than this; *A* was a drunkard; *B*, a thief; *C*, a liar; *D*, a Samaritan; *E*, an Ethiopian; *F*, a Frank; *G*, a Briton; *I*, an Italian; and *H*, a Hellenist: they were all converted to Jesus Christ. Now did baptism signify the same thing to *A*, *B*, *C*. &c. and was there no difference between these persons, national or characteristic, which caused baptism to mean one thing to one, and another thing to another? But I enter not into the merits of his views until he have farther committed them to writing. In this I only complain of his unfairness.

ARCHIPPUS, AGAIN.

P. S. The Editor of the M. Harbinger, in his April number, has taken some notice of the first number of Archippus. I regret that he has done injustice to my statements and views in what he has said. He intimates that I maintain two baptisms, one for the Jews, and the other for the Gentiles, and the opinion that God has two methods for the remission of sin, one for the Jews, and the other for the Gentiles. These are not my sentiments. There is but one baptism, as a gospel ordinance, and God has but one method of remitting the sins of Jews and Gentiles.

The leading point of difference between bro. Campbell and myself, is contained in the following question, "Is or is not the efficacy of the blood of Christ in the remission of the sins of believing Gentiles suspended, according to the authority of the New Testament, upon their being baptized in water?" He defends the affirmative, and I maintain the negative side

of the question. I say that whatever may be said in behalf of the connection of the remission of sin with, and its dependance upon baptism, and of its being simultaneous with baptism, in the case of the Pentecostal Jews, it is as certainly true, that the sins of the Gentiles, in Acts x, were remitted through faith, God purified their hearts by faith before they were baptized, as it is that they were remitted at all, or that they were baptized. These truths are established by Peter's testimony, which was confirmed by the Holy Spirit in Acts x. xi. and xv. I therefore conclude that the apparent connection of the remission of sin with baptism on the day of Pentecost, and its dependance upon it, and its seeming to have been simultaneous with it, from the words of Peter, were altogether circumstantial, and were owing to the peculiar situation of the Jews as distinguished from the Gentiles. If God remits the sins of the Jews, and of the Gentiles in the same way, the essentiality of baptism to remission, must be excluded and given up from both, and the ordinance be regarded only as a symbol, figure, or representation of it, as it is certainly true that the sins of the Gentiles were remitted through faith before they were baptized. Besides all this, it deserves particular notice, that the phraseology used by Peter to the Pentecostal Jews in reference to remission and baptism, which seemed to make the former dependant upon the latter, was in no case used by Peter or any other apostle, when preaching to the Gentiles, but the reverse; insomuch that baptism was exhibited as dependant upon, and subsequent to remission in the case of the Gentiles. Is it not rather an evidence of erroneous views and of a Sectarian Spirit, to hear public teachers of the christian religion particularly, using the phraseology of Peter to the Pentecostal Jews, when they address modern Gentile congregations, while they sedulously avoid, and indeed oppose the style and order of address, and action, which were uniformly employed by Peter and Paul in preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles!

ARCHIPPUS.

THE CONFERENCE IN TERRA CONFUSA,

(CONTINUED FROM P. 78.)

The Conference met according to adjournment. After prayer and singing with much animation, the Clerk read the minutes of the preceding meeting.

Mr. E rose, and thus spoke: Brethren, at our first meeting I became almost incredulous as to the good results of our Conferences; but my mind is now happily relieved from those fears. I now am persuaded, that by prosecuting the subject in that Christian spirit, which has marked our former meetings, incalculable will be the benefits both to ourselves and society in general. I therefore move that we examine the second article proposed for our consideration; which is,

ART. 2. "That the second person of Trinity is 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 was born of her—that though he had two perfect natures, the Godhead and manhood inseperably united, yet he exists in one person forever.

Mr. R—In our last meeting we agreed to drop the expressions, Trinity, three equal persons in the Godhead—eternal Son, and eternally begotten, as not being the language of scripture, and terms fruitful of endless and unprofitable controversy. What of the article remains for consideration, is, That he became man &c.

Mr. U:—I rise for the first time to speak. I cannot avoid expressing the delight of my heart with the spirit and progress of our Conference. As our communications are free, and untrammelled by fear, I object to the expression, "*The Son of God became man*" This would plainly imply that the Son of God existed prior to, and independent of the man. The scriptures plainly declare that the Son of God, and the man existed coetaneously—they were the same individual being. "That holy thing, which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke II.

Bish. M:—I acknowledge with Doc. A. Clark on this text, and on Heb. I. That Jesus was never called the Son of God till he was born of Mary. I therefore object also to the expression, and propose that we substitute the term, the Word of God became man &c. My reasons for this amendment, are, because it is said that the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son, full of grace and truth," John I. 14. From this it is plain that the Word existed before he was made flesh, or became man, and therefore the word and the man were not coetaneous. "In the beginning was the Word;" can this be said of the man? Again, the scriptures plainly speak of Jesus coming down from heaven—ascending up where he was before—praying for the glory he had with the Father before the word was—that the world was made by him—that he, who was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, this very divine person made himself of no reputation, but took on him the form of a servant, and was found in fashion as a man, being made in the likeness of sinful flesh—this same person, whom the Father called God, took flesh and blood such as the children had—all such expressions evidently hold forth the idea that a divine, intelligent being existed anterior to being born of Mary, or of his becoming man. This being I call the Word of God.

Mr. C.—Our bro. M has proved demonstrably that an intelligent being, called the Word, did exist prior to his being made flesh. This divine being, called the Word, was a distinct being from the Father, and therefore not the Father himself, or

the only true God. The very texts our brother has quoted to prove that he existed prior to taking flesh and blood prove these positions; for there are things spoken of him that are inapplicable to the only true and self existent God; as "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." The only true God could not thus speak of himself.—Again. He ascended up where he was before, even at the right hand of God. This cannot apply to the only true God. Again; he prayed to the only true God, the Father, to glorify him with the glory he had with him before the world was. Nothing of this can we apply to the only true God.—Again; he who was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be as God, emptied himself, took on him the form of a servant, and was found in fashion as a man, who humbled himself by suffering the death of the cross; who was by God exalted, and given a name above every name, that all should worship him—all to the glory of God the Father. Surely none of these things can apply to the only true God. Again; All things were made by him, (*di'autou.*) by him instrumentally; for so says Paul, "God created all things by (*dia*) Jesus Christ." Eph. III. 8. 2 Cor. VI. 8. Heb. I. 2.—This same divine person was born of the Virgin, suffered, died, and rose again—none of which things apply to the only true God. If the very and only true God was inseparably united with the man, never to be divided, then how can any affirm that God is without body, parts or passions? Again; Jesus says, the testimony of two is true. I am one that bears witness, and my Father is another. If they were one, and not two, the argument is inconclusive. As these, and many similar things spoken of Jesus, cannot apply to the only true God; so are many things spoken of him in the same connexion which cannot apply to man. Hence it follows that an intelligent being, distinct from the Father, existed, before creation, in heaven, as the Word or Son of God, and in the fulness of time, he came into the world, was united with a body prepared for him, lived, died, and rose again, and ascended up where he was before

I also object to the expression, He took to himself a reasonable soul. Of this we have no intimation in the scriptures. That he took flesh and blood—a true body—was made flesh—was the seed of David according to the flesh, is plainly declared; but that he took a reasonable soul is no where declared in the book of God. We think Paul has put this matter beyond dispute, Rom. I. 3, 4. "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, &c. Thus according to the flesh he was the seed of David; but according to the spirit of holiness, or holy spirit, he was the Son of God. That he had a soul is undisputed; but this soul was the holy spirit, or intelligent part of Jesus.

Bish. M:—I have ever believed that the Word was God in the supreme sense of the term. It is so explicitly stated that "the Word was God" that I cannot deny it without denying the scriptures. If he be not God supreme, I cannot trust my soul's salvation to him—I cannot worship him and be guiltless of idolatry.

Mr. C:—Nor can you deny that Moses was called God without denying the scriptures—nor that the judges of Israel were called God—nor, that they were called Gods, to whom the word of the Lord came, whether they were angels or men—Yet who will say these were Gods supreme? Why cannot we trust in him whom God has chosen, qualified and anointed to be a Saviour? Hear God supreme speaking to his Son, "Behold my servant whom I have chosen; my beloved in whom my soul is well pleased; I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles—and in his name shall the Gentiles trust." Can we think that this person, on whom the Gentiles trust, is God supreme, and yet his servant and chosen? (By whom chosen?) Can he be God supreme, and yet receive his spirit—the spirit of wisdom, and of understanding, and of might? Did not Jesus receive all power in heaven and on earth from the Father? power to forgive sins—to give eternal life—to save to the uttermost? Will he not retain this power till the end come, when he will put it down, and become subject to the Father, that God may be all in all? Why not trust in him? Has not God engaged to help him and to preserve him in the day of salvation until his work be finished? You think it idolatry to worship the Son, unless he be God supreme. The disciples and many others worshipped him while in the world, not as God supreme, without being rebuked by him as idolaters The angels were commanded by the Father to worship him. The redeemed in glory worship him. It is the will of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that every knee in heaven, earth, and under the earth, should bow to him, and that every tongue should confess him Lord to the glory of God the Father. Can all this be idolatry? Surely, our brother spoke, what, on calm reflection he will disavow:

Bish: M:—I fear we shall never come to an agreement on this subject. Much can be said plausibly on both sides of the question. Many theories have been invented to free this subject from difficulties, but they have rather bewildered than relieved the inquiring mind. The double nature of Christ is acknowledged a mystery incomprehensible; yet I believe it true. I wait to hear the sentiments of others in Conference, and humbly hope that something may be said to relieve this subject from the dark clouds in which it is involved.

Br. R:—Brethren, we are now wading in deep waters, and evidently not directed by the light of the Lord. Whenever we leave the language of the Bible, and speculate on unscriptural terms and notions, we rush into darkness and error. The doc-

trine now under consideration is no where expressly taught in scripture,—it is only inferential. To talk of this doctrine as a mystery incomprehensible, and yet revealed in the scriptures, to me is idle; for I consider a revealed mystery a contradiction in terms. We may wander over the controverted grounds of fifteen centuries on this subject, and in the end of our excursions be as far from an agreement as we were when we started. I wish to see this second article entirely erased, and that we substitute the common expression in the New Testament, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, sent by the Father to be the Saviour of the world. We will believe whatever the Evangelists and Apostles, and Prophets have said of him, and nothing more, nor less. Let all who heartily believe this and prove their faith by works of humble obedience, be acknowledged brethren.

Mr. B.—I dare not reject the substitute proposed by the brother last up:—I dare not receive with my present state of mind this 2d article. It is clogged with insuperable difficulties. I move therefore that we reject the article *in toto*, and receive only what the scriptures plainly teach on this subject. The motion was carried unanimously. The conference agreed to meet on that day four weeks. After prayer and praise they affectionately parted and retired to their several abodes.

(*To be continued.*) EDITOR.

DRY CREEK, CAMPBELL CO. Ky. April 5, 1831.

BRO. STONE—I hope you will pardon me for again asking the indulgence to occupy a page or two of the C. M. in reply to some remarks of bro. J. A. Gano, in the April No. of the Messenger, on the subject of weekly communion. My bro. rather seems to insist that his arguments remain untouched by any thing that I have written; and seems to complain, because I did not take his arguments in detail; and then proceeds to give a quotation that I made from 1 Cor. II. 26, "for as often as ye eat this bread" &c.; and then says, that he cannot see that this verse either proves or disproves weekly communion, and tries to evade the force of the language, "as often" by saying, that I reasoned as though he had laid the whole burden of his proof on that verse. I can assure my bro. that I had not the smallest idea of that kind, but on the contrary, to show that the language, "as often" does not specially refer to a limited time or day. This I am persuaded he knows; if he does not, for his information, I will present him with a fact on that subject, viz. By an act of the Legislature of Ky. the county court of Campbell county, holds its session, specially the 4th Monday in each month, for nine months in the year. I will now ask him, if the act of the Legislature, authorising the special sitting of the court the 4th Monday in the month, had have said, for as often as you hold court in Campbell co. ye do show that the Legislature gave you that authority; would

not the magistrates of Campbell county have thought, that they were to hold court often, and not be limited to a special day? I think my brother will answer, yes. I shall not attempt to answer his arguments in detail, as I am fully persuaded, they bear the marks of refutation themselves; and for a proof of my assertion, I refer to his own language, &c. "If common acceptation of language be proof, we may construe the Scriptures to prove all the different, pretended religions in the world." Again, his ideas of "Acts of public worship."—Here he wishes to hold out an idea that Paul did not perform an act of public worship on board of the ship, in giving thanks in presence of 276 persons: Acts XXVII. 37. Also, that it would not be an act of public worship for me to give thanks at my own table, although I might have 100 friends with me. John Walker, who is acknowledged by the learned a good definer of the English Language, thus defines the word public; "*general*," &c. and the word private; "*secret, alone*," &c. My bro. contends strongly for a general connexion of scripture to prove any one point. To this I heartily assent, and if he had have been as ready to yield to this, as to contend for it, my other reply to his piece would have been sufficient to save me the trouble of a second to him. He again refers us to Acts xx. 7. and makes it his ruling point, and strong hold, and contends for a command of Christ and his Apostles. I really feel astonished to see him refer to Acts xx. 7: and contend for a command. If I was to admit the position he has taken (which I do not for reasons before given by me) that Acts xx. 7, is a positive proof, that the disciples met at Troas on the first day of the week, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, he would fall short of proving weekly communion by a command either from Christ or one of his Apostles. And if there is a command in all the New Testament to meet every first day of the week, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, I cannot find it: therefore he would only prove, that on one first day of the week the Lord's Supper was celebrated by a congregation of disciples without a special or positive command to meet on that day, (the first day of the week.) Again; to prove first day, or weekly communion he presents us with 1 Cor. XVI. 2, and uses what is called Campbell's translation, which 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." King James' translation reads thus: "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store." I suppose my Bro. made choice of the new version, because the words *every* and *treasury* are used. I ask him to read his quotation and see if he can find even the shadow of a command to meet every first day of the week, to celebrate the Lord's Supper? I answer, no; he cannot, for there is only a request of the Apostle Paul to his Corinthian Brethren to lay by something in store for the necessity of the saints at Jerusalem; and the Apostle does not even

say, that they should put it into the Treasury on the first day of the week. He next proceeds to quote Matt. xxviii. 20, to prove weekly communion, as though he had positively produced the command of Christ specially on the subject of weekly communion. I should have been pleased, had he pointed us to the place where Christ or his Apostles commands any Christians to meet on the first day of each week to celebrate the Lord's Supper, before he uses the language of Jesus, "Teach them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." I shall here take the privilege to say, and that with candor, that if he has, in either of the pieces that he has written, quoted one passage of scripture as a command of Christ or his Apostles to prove weekly communion, I acknowledge that I lack intellectual powers to comprehend it. Therefore I would ask all the lovers of religion to read both his pieces that he has written on weekly communion, and see if I am mistaken, and if I am not, and am right in my ideas, I think my Bro. will begin to conclude that his system of weekly communion has some appearance of law-making or legislating for the church of Christ (if neither Christ nor his Apostles has commanded us to commune the first day of each week.) My christian brethren, when we attend to the commandments of uninspired men, and leave undone the commandments of Christ and his Apostles, we at once feel the force of Bro. Gano's Language, used in the first piece he wrote in the Feb'y No. of the C. M. which is—"what coldness and indifference, what a want of affection, sociability, and fellow-feeling, pervades society." He seems to infer that I am an advocate for monthly Meetings, and quarterly communions. From whence he has drawn the inference, is unknown to me, as I have not given the least hint of either. I believe it to be the duty of christians to meet often together, and to commune or celebrate the Lord's Supper often.

As Bro. G. and myself are both fond of a connexion of scripture proof, special and positive, to one point, permit me here to give a list of scriptural proof on the subject of the Lord's Supper: Neither of the texts commands any christian to meet the first day of each week to celebrate the Lord's Supper.—Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. Mark xiv. 22, 23. Luke xxii. 19, 20. 1 Cor. xi. 20–24, and 1 Cor. x. 16. I can assure my christian brethren that I do not intend to write another sentence for the C. M. nor any other paper on the subject of weekly communion, as I am fully of the opinion that the scriptures authorise no such thing.

I wish to invite my C. Brethren to examine minutely what bro. G. and myself have written, and compare it with the word of God. My prayer is that all christians may closely adhere to the word of God, that we may all grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

JOHN G. ELLIS.

REMARKS.—Bro. J. G. Ellis, by private letter, informs

me that he shall write no more on this subject for the Messenger. In private conversation with bro, J. A. Gano, I understood that he no farther designs to prosecute the subject, being willing to rest it with the public to examine, and to decide upon its claims to truth, after they have read carefully the pieces written by bro. Ellis and himself. It must be acknowledged that but little is said in scripture with reference to the weekly communion, but all must acknowledge, that it was the practice in the first centuries of the church. Let us never make this subject a cause of debate and contention amongst us. My mind has been long in the belief that weekly communion was according to truth, yet I could never find sufficient scriptural reasons to convince my brethren that it was a positive command. What satisfied me, could not satisfy them. We are all free, nor would I willingly take away the liberty of one christian.

EDITOR.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER:

No. II.

Statistical information of the church of Christ in Ky. continued.

The No. of members in the 14 preceding churches are 889.

Number and name of the churches.	County in which they are located	Year when the church was planted	No. of memb's.
15. New Castle	Henry	1816	125
16. Cynthiana *b*	Harrison	1827	72
17. Indian creek *l*	Do.	1803	56
18. Leesburg *b*	Do.	1828	32
19. Beaver creek	Do.	1816	34
20. Kentontown *l*	Do.		30
21. Concord & Carlise *l b*	Nicholas	1803	315
22. Month Johnson	Do.	1828	17
23. Sandy and Tiger	Greenup		185
24. Union *b*	Fleming	1803	130
25. Antioch	Oldham	1830	44
26. White Oak	Bath	1829	58
27. Tribues	Madison		45
28. Flour creek	Pendleton		64
29. Union	Boone		22
30. Republican	Campbell	1827	30
31. Harrodsburg *b*	Mercer	1803	85
32. Minerva *w*	Mason		40
33. Stone meeting-house	Do.		42
34. North Fork	Bracken	1828	48
35. Cabin creek *l*	Lewis	1803	156
36. Beach woods	Fleming		47
37. Georgetown *b*	Scott	1816	85
38. Bethlehem	Do.	1827	45
		Total	2710

Those churches marked (*b*) are built of brick, (*l*) log, (*w*) wood.

In the above churches there are about 20 Elders.

The necessity of placing before the public, the above information will be apparent from the fact, that I have lately seen in the public papers a statement, purporting to give the strength of the different religious societies in our country; which gives the *Christian Society* but 23 preachers, and 2000 members in all the United States. From the above statement it will be seen that in 38 churches in Ky there are several hundred more members, than we are represented to have in the U. S. which at once exhibits the great ignorance that prevails in reference to the strength of the Christian society. I do therefore humbly hope, that some brethren in each state, will endeavor to ascertain the number of churches and members, in the Christian society, that the public may be correctly advised upon the subject.

I have also been informed, that a late writer has observed in a very popular periodical, that the first church that was planted in the U. S with no name but Christian, and no creed but the Bible, was in the year 1804 at Portsmouth N. H. it will however appear that before that time, there was a number of large and flourishing churches in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio. I once more urge my brethren and friends in different parts of the state, to forward on to me at Lexington, an account of the Christian societies in their respective neighborhoods—and wherever mistakes may appear in the above, or any subsequent communication, I am in hopes some friend will correct me;—for I again repeat that my object is fairly, and correctly to present the number and strength of the Christian society.

THOMAS M. ALLEN.

P. S. I have within a short time past immersed several disciples, upon profession of their faith in the Lord Jesus; O Lord, revive thy work.

T. M. A.

DEBATE BETWEEN Mr. McCALLA AND Mr. LANE.

I have lately read with much interest the debate between Mr Wm. McCalla, a Presbyterian preacher of Philadelphia, and Mr. Wm. Lane, a Christian preacher from Ohio. The debate is published in the Gospel Luminary. I am pleased to find the most weighty and influential arguments, long used against us, are becoming ineffectual with the intelligent community. The arguments to which I allude, are, detraction, vituperation, misrepresentation, German and Boston infidelity, blasphemy &c. &c. These arguments it must be confessed Mr. McCalla used with wonderful adroitness; for the management of these he has a natural talent, and this improved by long practice. When he found his arguments produced not the desired effect on the listening assembly, he wisely declined

the debate, and left the impression behind, that his doctrine of trinity was indefensible. In the debate, with others he lugged in my name, and stated that I had been taught my errors on Trinity and atonement by an old man from Virginia. This is no disparagement of my character, for I confess I have no innate ideas. I have been dependent on others for the greater part of my little stock of knowledge. It is a mistake in Mr. McCalla, when he says I received those errors from an old man from Virginia. I cannot recollect of any old man or young man from that state or any other, that taught me these errors. I suppose he alludes to old Mr. Patillo of N. C. a Presbyterian preacher of the highest standing. I never yet have known that he denied orthodox atonement. The views of the Son of God I had received before I had ever seen or heard his. I am sorry that the most learned part of the Christian community should be foremost in intolerance. The more liberal spirits among them will *certainly* become alarmed at the view of such an unchristian course, which will *assuredly* lead them to investigate the ground on which they stand. Such investigation will eventuate in reformation. Indeed, the prognostics of such a happy state are already visible Many are evidently dissatisfied with their creeds, and are ashamed of that exclusive system so rigidly enforced, especially of late. The noble idea of soon converting the world to religion by Bible societies, Tract societies, Missionary societies, Sunday school union societies, &c. &c. for a long time has absorbed the mind and attention of that people, and kept out of view the jargon of their creed; but the reports of these all engrossing societies begin to pall on their minds, and give place to inquiry after the simple truth of revelation. O that this inquiry may become universal! *This* honestly pursued, together with a zealous and humble practice of the truth, when found, will bring on that desirable state of religion, which human wisdom must forever fail to do.

EDITOR.

Extract of a letter from Elder Isaac N Walters, to Elder T. M. Allen, dated,

"STRASBURG, Shenandoah co. Va. May 2, 1831."

"The Christian cause in these regions demands attention. Many of the people are becoming very tired of their creeds and forms. I have held several very interesting meetings—Elder Jas. Smith of Mt. Vernon O. is with me; he is truly an able minister of the N. Testament. I expect to return to Ohio in about three weeks. The Lord is prospering the good cause very much in this state. I have planted and organized several churches lately, and baptized many believers since I last wrote. I expect to visit Georgetown Ky. the ensuing fall, as I am very anxious to see bro. Stone, and the brethren generally in your section."

[The accounts of revivals, especially in the state of N. Y.

are very encouraging. It appears that it is equally enjoyed by all who do not stand in opposition to them. In Cincinnati the revival among the Christians coutinues. EDITOR.]

An Extract, from the Herald of Truth.

I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE.

Let us now consider what a new and bright light the text (*I and my Father are one*) throws upon the character of God.

It is of the first importance to know the moral character and purposes of that invisible and almighty Being, in whose hands we must feel that we are. We examine the system of things of which we are a part, and we discern luminous traces of wisdom and beneficence. We have many, very many reasons to believe that God is good. In the various arrangments of the universe we have so many instances of benevolence. There is a gladness throughout creation, as if it were conscious of the presence of a kind and generous Protector. And at seasons, when we survey the beautiful appearances of nature, and see all things rejoicing together, and hear voices of joy and praise resounding through all space—when the earth puts on her beautiful garments, and the stars hang out their golden lamps, or the clouds wait in irregular groups upon the setting sun, and catch his last smiles, until they blush at his amazing splendour; when the bow is bent over the landscape by the hand of the Almighty—at moments like these we feel a rising confidence in the Author of all things. The same effect is produced, when we contemplate the rich and exhaustless provisions made for the comfort of earth's countless inhabitants. And the general conclusion is that God is good.

But, after all, we do not obtain that deep and perfect conviction of the boundlessness of the divine love which we desire. It is rather a floating speculation of the mind than a settled habit of feeling And circumstances are sometimes combined around us in such a gloomy and distressing manner, that we lose sight of the benevolence of the Deity, and if we do not go so far as to suspect that we are under a malignant providence, we are afraid that the Almighty is indifferent to our welfare; and thinks not of us in the grandeur of his own vast purposes. Our most beloved hopes are rudely blighted. Our most valued sources of happiness are suddenly closed or dried up. Our most faithful efforts are frustrated, and disappointment is continually presenting itself in the place of success, and we are almost led to suspect that there is some evil power that is adverse to our peace. Our tendency to superstition is roused, and we fear, and tremble, and lose all our confidence and our spirits, and have no faith to mount upward through the clouds that hang over us to the unclouded light above. In truth, we need more abundant evidence of the good intentions of the overruling Power, with regard to us. There are proofs enough

of general benevolence, but we wish to be fully satisfied, that as individuals we are the objects of Divine care.

We turn to the New Testament. We there read the history of one, the perfection of whose character knows no parallel on earth. Whatever is thought of the claims of Jesus of Nazareth, as a messenger sent from God, all unite in testifying to the finished excellence of his character. While he is perfectly original, and incomparably superior to every other pattern upon which mankind have gazed, he is at the same time equally natural. The naturalness of his character is so striking—he acts, under all circumstances, so exactly as we should expect such a one to act, and in such perfect harmony with every thing else that he has said and done, that we cannot help believing, apart from all external evidence, that such a person as Jesus Christ must actually have existed. If we doubt whether he existed, we do not get rid of the difficulty. The question then comes, who could have feigned such a character?—Who could have imagined such an individual? It transcends the loftiest powers of human genius. Certainly such men as the authors of the gospels, the Evangelists appear to have been, never could have produced so magnificent, so sublime a fiction. The character of Jesus was altogether in advance of the age in which he appeared. Nay, it is altogether in advance of the moral sentiments of men, even at the present enlightened period. It is impossible that the ignorant and degraded minds of the men of that generation, could have been equal to so glorious a conception. So we have to return to the supposition of its reality, as the most rational way of accounting for it. I insist that no one can fully study the history of Jesus, and escape the conviction that he is reading the life of one who did actually exist.

Supposing, now, that we are fully convinced that such a being as Jesus Christ is represented in the New Testament, did really exist, then the moral prenomenon is altogether so extraordinary and unparallelled, that we can find no difficulty in believing that there was something miraculous and supernatural in his appearance and office in the world. That is, if we believe in Jesus Christ—in his moral character, as it is described and illustrated by the Evangelists, we believe in what is as miraculous and unaccountable upon any ordinary supposition, as any thing recorded in the New Testament. The step is direct and easy, therefore, to a belief in the divine authority of the blessed Teacher.

Believing, now, that he had an extraordinary and sufficient sanction for all that he did and said, how delightful is it to hear him declare that he and his Father were one—that God is *actuated*, (if I may so speak,) by the same spirit which breathed in him. O, how full of joy and confidence and hope is the assurance that that stupendous and unseen Agent, the evidences of whose existence and energy lie scattered around us, in measure-

less profusion, is one in spirit and purpose with him whose love not all the ingratitude, and insults, and injuries of men could extinguish—whose whole heart was poured out in tenderness upon the ignorant and sinful children of men! How inexpressibly delightful is it to follow our blessed Saviour round upon his unwearied errands of mercy—to see him doing good to those whom he knew would reject him, and heap their imprecations on his head—to hear him commanding his disciples to forgive a sinning brother not only seven times, but seventy times seven—and, finally, upon the dreadful cross, and amidst untold agonies, breathing out a prayer and an excuse for his savage murderers, bequeathing a religion to the world which teaches us never to be overcome of evil, but to overcome evil with good. When we have considered all these things, how unspeakably affecting is it to remember that this illustrious personage, who gave himself cheerfully up for the cause of truth and of man, declared that he and the Being who sent him were *one*.

QUERIES,—*Proposed by Elder James Kinkennon of Ia.*

Q. 1. What is the office of a Deacon?

Ans. This subject has been fully answered according to my views in several Nos. of the Messenger. To these the querist is refered. I have stated that the office of a Deacon is to serve tables—the tables of the poor—the table of a needy bishop of a congregation, and the table of the Lord. From this office teachers, elders and bishops are excluded, "For it is not mete that they should leave the word to serve tables." Whenever a Deacon becomes a teacher or an Evangelist, as Stephen and Philip, he relinquishes his office of Deacon for one more laborious and responsible.

Q. 2. What is the office of a Pastor?

A. A Pastor and Shepherd are synonymous, and signify one that feeds the flock. This belongs to a Teacher, an Elder, that labors in word and doctrine—an Evangelist—a Bishop—and to an Apostle; for even Peter was required to feed the sheep and lambs. The food to be administered, is the pure unadulterated truth of God—that which strengthens the faith and hope of the christian, and which promotes divine affections, and incites to good works, the works of love, peace and union. To this end should a Pastor's efforts be directed, not only in the pulpit, but in private families by which such food is needed. How vain is it for a Pastor to attempt these offices, unless he feels the force of that truth he administers to others! The man of piety, and full of the Holy Spirit is only qualified for this work. How many, called pastors. walk not in the truth, nor feel its divine, life-giving power! An awful day awaits them. Let all, who profess the name, remember their responsibility to their coming Lord and Judge! EDITOR.

QUERIES,—*by Elder Wm. D. Jourdan.*

1. Were there any other offices than those of Bishop, and Deacon to be continued in the Church of Jesus Christ?

2. Can there be a Church of Jesus Christ without these offices filled in that Church?

3. With whom did the Apostle intrust the judgment of the character and qualifications of those, who should fill those offices?

4. Has there ever been a time, since the reign of Heaven began, when there was no Church of Jesus Christ on earth?

Bro. Jourdan requests the Editor or some other brother to answer these queries, as soon as can be done. In the next No. the answers shall appear. EDITOR.

OBITUARY.

ANOTHER HERO OF THE REVOLUTION GONE.

CAPT. JOHN McHATTON was born in Pennsylvania Anno Domini 1739. No remarkable incidents marked his life till he arrived at the age of 16 years. At this time a war broke out between England and France The French had settled a colony at Quebec about the same time that the English had settled one at Jamestown in Virginia The French by exploring the country to the S. W. had discovered the valley of the Mississippi; charmed with the beauty, fertility, and commercial advantages of the country, they made settlements from Fort du Quesne (Pittsburg) to Orleans, and were establishing posts, in order to secure to themselves all the country west of the Alleghany mountains. This country was claimed by Britain, who protested against these usurpations. Negotiation was tried, but tried in vain, to establish the boundaries of the two nations. War was declared by Britain and her colonies in America against France, as the last resort. Young McHatton, sensible of the injuries done his country by the ambition of France; unwilling to have the fairest portion of the world unjustly wrested from us by the perfidy of that nation, at the age of sixteen shouldered his rifle, offered his services to Gen. Braddock, and marched through the hostile Indians, through a rough and long wilderness to the disastrous scenes near Fort Du Quesne. After the death of Gen. Braddock, McHatton served under the Generals Stanwick, Forbes, Monkton and Bouquett; nor did he leave the fields of battle till peace was concluded between France and England, and the country, for which he fought, was secured to us. A part of that country is the very soil we now tread—the soil on which many of us first drew the breath of life—which has kindly poured forth its abundant fruits for our comfort and wealth. Shall the man be forgotten, by whose dangers, privations and labors, under a kind providence, so many blessings are by us enjoyed! No.

Peace did not reside long in our country. Britain, the mother country, began to oppress her children, the Americans.

They took up arms in defence of their liberty and rights. In 1776 we declared independence. In this year McHatton again left his home and family for the tented field. He was appointed a Captain of a volunteer company in Pennsylvania, and soon after Captain of a Flying Camp in Col. Watt's regiment. On the 17th of Nov. 1776, McHatton was sent to Fort Washington on the Hudson for its defence, under Col. Magaw. Sir William Howe, while Washington was retiring from New York, seized the opportunity to reduce this Fort. The contest was severe, and continued nearly all day. Col. Magaw, for the want of ammunition surrendered the Fort, and with it 2700 prisoners, of which McHatton was one. They were taken to N. York, and thence to Long Island, and confined in the prison ship Jersey. Their sufferings here were almost incredible. The British weary of their prisoners for so long a time, took an unjustifiable method of ridding themselves of them. Arsenic was put in their food, which had the desired effect of destroying all but a few, of which few, McHatton was one. After an absence of four years and eight months, he returned to his family.

He afterwards served under Washington and Lafayette, and was their intimate in war, and served with them as a Free Mason in the same Lodge. He served his country till peace returned, and liberty was established in our happy country. Soon after peace was proclaimed he emigrated from his native state to Kentucky, in the year 1784. Here again he met savage war with the Indians—he took an active part in the contest, till they ceased from their depredations on our country.

From this period he lived happily with his family, retired from all public business. He spent the evening of his life in preparing for eternity, to which he was fast advancing. He, a few years ago publicly. professed his faith in Jesus, as the Saviour of the world, and united himself with the professed people of God in a church capacity. He had too deeply drunk into the spirit of liberty, to become the slave of a party. He had learned that the good man was not a noisy, bigotted dogmatist, but an humble follower of Christ in the practice of piety, benevolence and virtue. With such he would associate; with such had he Christian fellowship.

A short time ago he was attacked with a cancer, which soon brought a period to his days—excruciating were his pains, but he suffered like a Christian—not a murmur escaped his lips—not a groan did he ever utter. He breathed his last a short time ago, being 92 years of age. Inured to hardship from his earliest days, his constitution was formed to endure He was unusually healthful and active. He walked erect and with remarkable ease, till a few months before his death. He was benevolent, humble and social, temperate and peaceable, beloved by all, hated by none.

Another hero of our Revolution is gone—gone from all his

toils and pains—gone to his Lord and his God, to receive the crown of righteousness, graciously promised to the faithful. Gone to the abodes of the blessed, with them to share in the felicities of eternity.

Departed this life on the 15th March Mrs. AMY MILES, daughter of Mr. Joseph Guthrie, and consort of Elder Barzillai H. Miles, of Rutland, Meigs co. Ohio, after a painful illness of fifteen days, which she bore with the greatest christian fortitude, witnessing to her relatives and friends, her hope of a glorious resurrection, and leaving a doating husband, two infant daughters and a numerous connexion to bemoan her loss. It would be fruitless for mortal eulogy to magnify her endearing qualities: as a wife truly affectionate, a daughter obedient, a mother indulgent, and a friend sincere—ever ready to assist the needy, and sympathize with the afflicted.

She's gone the path the sainted virgins trod,
Weaned from the earth, her soul triumphs with God;
The angels called, they called her, from above
And bid her hasten to the realms of love—
Her soul with transport heard the happy doom:
I come, ye gentle messengers, I come.
Her husband, children, friends she bids adieu,
And asks no more the rising sun to view. [*Spectator.*

Also, on April 30, Died, ELIZAJANE C. SHACKLEFORD, daughter of B. W. STONE, and wife of Alexander Shackleford, in Maysville, Ky. aged 23 years and 11 months. She had been baptized on the profession of her faith in Christ a few years ago—lived the life of a Christian and died in the fearless and triumphant hope of immortality. Her warm affection—her cheerful temper—her modest, unassuming conversation—her patience in suffering—her devotedness to her God, her parents, her husband, her sisters, brothers, and friends, were surpassed but by few. These endeared her in life—these will endear her memory to surviving friends. She and her infant daughter which died the evening before, sleep in the same coffin, interred in the same grave.

Also died in Lexington Ky. on the 8th of May, Elder THOMAS ADAMS. He had lingered long, and suffered greatly towards the close of life; yet he suffered patiently and cheerfully to his last moment. He died perfectly composed in mind; inspired with the blissful hope of immortality, he lived, suffered and died happily. He was born in the year 1798—professed faith in Christ in his nineteenth year, and united with the Christian church in Ohio, where he lived. At the age of 21 he commenced preaching the gospel—success in converting souls attended his ministrations wherever he went. The year after he commenced preaching, he travelled as far as Pennsyl-

vania, Green co. where a great revival took place. There he was ordained to the work of an Evangelist. After an absence of nine months, he returned to his fathers in Ohio; but his mind was strongly drawn to the young disciples which he had left in Pennsylvania; soon after he returned to Pa. and to his joy, the glorious work of God progressed and increased. Here, as is common with young preachers during a great excitement, he labored too incessantly and hard for his strength, and contracted the beginning of that disease, which, terminated in his death. He became weak and hoarse, and returned to his father's after an absence of six months. He continued preaching in his father's neighborhood, New Burlington, and South Bend. A great revival in these places was the effect of his labors—many professed faith in Christ, and were united with the church. In this revival he lost his health, and declined gradually for years till he died. He was a man of a strong and discriminating mind, humble and engaging in his manners, in his conversation, and in preaching especially. Never was a man more universally beloved by his acquaintances—many will be his sheaves in the day of the Lord. He had married the eldest daughter of James Carnahan Esq. of New Burlington, O. but the happy tie was soon broken by her death. The last public work in which he engaged was that of co-editing the Christian Hymn Book. He at his own request, was buried at the new Christian meeting house in Lexington.

God planted religion amongst men as a *tree of life;* which, though it was to spring *upwards*, directly to himself, yet it was to spread its branches to the benefit of all below. —*South.*

RECEIPTS FROM MAY 1ST, TO JUNE 1ST.

Paris Ky.—Tho. Rule $1 for vol. 4, Tho. Stamps 1 for vol. 5, Hez. Martin for vol. 5. *Maysville Ky.*—W. Miller for vol. 5, Mr. Spalding for vol. 5 *Hopkinsville*—By agent, Elder W. Dunkerson 5. *Union Ky.*—P. Sidener for vol. 5, Tho. Andrews for vol. 5. *Lexington*—David Cassell for vols. 3 4 & 5. *Bethel Ky.*—David Cassell for Elder H. Osborn agent 3. *Frankfort Ky.*—Js. Brooks 1 37½ in full. *Felicity O.*—Elder J. Powell agent 5. *Cincinnati*—J. D. Garrard 9, G. Vanousdol 15, O. Austin 2. *New Paris O.*—C. Ferguson 5, for self, J. P. Ireland, Sam. Walker, John Ireland, and Js. Ireland. *Mt. Pleasant Ten.*—A. Crawford 2 for self and Morrow. *Williamsport Ten.*—Sam. Baker agent 5. *Locust Shade Ten.*—Elder W. D. Jourdan 5, for J. Overstreet 1, for Allen Smith 1, for Judith Casey 1, for Rob. Smith 1, for Wm. Taylor 1. *Montgomery Ala.*—Elder Ishmael Davis agent 8. *Paris Ky.*—H. F. Wilson for Mrs. E. Baylor 1, for Mrs. Edwards 1. *Columbia Mo.*—By Asa Stone 2 for self vol 4 5, for Tho. Grant 1 for vol. 5, for J. J. Nelson 1 for vol. 5, for Richard Gentry 1 for vol. 4. *West Liberty O.*—A. Black 2 for vol. 4 & 5. Wm. Wadsworth of Ga. $5.

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. JULY 1831. [No. 7.

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 Millennial Harbinger.

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. II.*

WE had fully intended to publish all the essays of *Archippus* on the question of Gentile Baptism not for the Remission of Sins; but by some fatality, the numbers of the "*Christian Messenger*," containing his 2d and 3d essays, have been mislaid, and we can only for the present cite from our recollections. We have written for a copy of these numbers, and if we have omitted any of his strong points, we shall notice them hereafter.

His strongest argument, and, indeed, his only argument that has any plausibility, is, that "the first Gentile congregation addressed by Peter, were not commanded to be immersed for the remission of sins, but that the Holy Spirit fell upon them before they were immersed; and that they were afterwards reported, Acts xv. to have had their hearts purified by faith."—From which he infers that they were pardoned through faith previous to immersion. This is, we think, a fair statement of his argument. With seeming confidence in the irrefragable strength of his position, he asks, "Can we suppose that those persons on whom the Holy Spirit fell were yet in their sins? and certainly they received the Holy Spirit before they were immersed—consequently, while in their sins."

It is always expedient, as well as lawful, to have the whole strength of an argument or objection presented before an attempt is made to meet or repel it. Having in the above the full strength, as we conceive, of the argument in favor of immersion after remission, or immersion not for the answer of a good conscience, or not for the remission of sins, we shall devote a few periods to its examination.

In the first place it will be conceded by Archippus himself, that the gifts of the Holy Spirit, bestowed on the house of Cornelius, were those gifts now called *miraculous;* such as the gift of speaking foreign languages, or the gift of interpreting, prophesying, &c. This being conceded, it will follow that if these