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

gifts were bestowed at any time upon persons without regard to a change of state, or character, or to purity of heart, it can prove nothing in favor of the remission of the sins of these Gentiles before immersion. As he makes the reception of these gifts a proof of their remission before immersion, it is essential to the truth and validity of his argument, that he prove that these were never bestowed upon persons who were not pardoned. But this he cannot prove, for something like the contrary can be proved, and this at once makes his reasoning fallacious and inconclusive. For so long as it is written that the Spirit of God fell upon Saul, (1 Sam. x. 10.) and that Baalam prophesied, and that Judas had all the spiritual gifts which were possessed by the Apostles previous to the ascension of the Saviour; and that persons have wrought miracles in the name of Jesus; and have tasted the powers of the world to come, who were not pardoned, but died in their sins—his argument, drawn from the gift of tongues, bestowed on Pagans in the house of Cornelius, is illogical and fallacious. There is nothing pardoning or purifying in such gifts. Even the *Christians* in Corinth, who were foremost in the possession of them, were, in the estimation of Paul, *carnal, and walked as men*. They even envied one another because of the gifts of the Holy Spirit which they possessed, and had not prudence to use them for the purposes for which they were bestowed. The gifts bestowed on these Gentiles were for a *sign;* and so Peter always used them when speaking in vindication of himself to his Jewish brethren. This immersion in the Holy Spirit, as Peter explained it, was bestowed on the Gentiles as it had been on the Jews. The Spirit confirmed the testimony to Jews and Gentiles at its first promulgation by the same operations. This is the legitimate use of this incident; and its falling upon the Gentiles, so soon as *remission of sins by the name of Jesus was announced, was intended to confirm that statement;* and, therefore, as soon as Peter recovered from the panic of this interruption of his discourse, he *commanded their immersion by the authority of the Lord.*

Archippus, it appears, mistakes the meaning of this incident altogether. The Jews on Pentecost, the Gentiles on their first calling, and the Samaritans, were not received into the kingdom of Jesus exactly in the same manner, for reasons which might, perhaps, be discovered.

The Samaritans heard, believed, and were immersed before they received any one of these gifts of the Holy Spirit. When the Apostles in Jerusalem heard that the Samaritans believed and were immersed, they sent Peter and John to lay hands upon them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Their former standing, and their controversy with the Jews, perhaps, required this peculiarity in the economy of Heaven towards them. At all events, they did not receive the Holy Spirit either as the Jews or Gentiles at the beginning, but by *the intervention of the hands of Jews*, whom they had nationally and unrighteous-

ly opposed. As well might Archippus urge this case to prove that men might believe and be immersed and brought into the kingdom of Jesus without the Holy Spirit, and without pardon, as to apply that incident to the house of Cornelius to prove that they were pardoned before they were immersed

But this is not all: his own argument can be retorted upon himself with all the factitious force he has given it. Can it be possible, one might say to him, that Cornelius, so good a man, so pious, so benevolent, so charitable, who gave much alms to the people, and continually prayed to God, was in an *unsaved, unpardoned state*, before Peter came "*to tell him words by which himself and his house might be saved!*" Yet this must be admitted because an angel said so, (Acts xi. 14.) But had he not been so informed, I doubt not but the same ingenuity, which discovered that Cornelius and his household were pardoned before they were immersed, would have *proved* that he was *saved* before Peter announced the gospel to him!

Having disposed of this part of the argument, we proceed to notice another saying, on which our friend Archippus relies with much assurance. The Gentiles had been purified in their hearts by faith. A very slight attention to the words in connexion, with which these stand, might have shown our friend that this saying proves too much for him, for it proves that the Jews as well as the Gentiles were saved by the same grace, and purified by the same faith. If he maintain his ground here, it must be at the expense of his identifying both the immersion on Pentecost and that of Cornelius, which subverts the distinction he would fain introduce between Jewish and Gentile baptism. But how does it read? "And God, who knows the heart, bare witness to them, (the Gentiles,) giving them the Holy Spirit, *even as he did to us, and made no distinction between us and them*, having purified their hearts by faith." So, then, God made no such distinction between the meaning of immersion to a Jew and to a Gentile, as my friend Archippus would make. He did not command the Jews to be immersed for the remisson of their sins, and the Gentiles to be immersed because their sins were forgiven. He purified the hearts of both Jews and Gentiles by faith. Alas! how short sighted are those who oppose the truth! Did Archippus think that either grace, blood, water, or obedience can purify the heart of man without faith? Neither the grace of God, nor the blood of Jesus, nor the institution of immersion, nor obedience, can purify the heart of man without faith. Faith is that principle which brings us nigh, or under, the influence which saves us. Neither can faith without blood, nor faith without grace, save or purify the heart or soul of man. And he who relies upon faith for pardon, without grace, blood, water, and obedience to every divine institution, relies upon a foundation which imagination, and neither reason nor revelation has laid.

Because faith is that principle in us which realizes, appre-

hends, and embraces the whole christian institution, it is of all other principles, natural or acquired, the most deserving to stand first, and to have the salvation of men ascribed to it.—And so it generally stands first, because, in our order of things, it is the first. But, in God's order, it is the third. In the order of things as respects him, it is first grace; second, the sacrifice, or blood of Jesus; third, faith; and fourth, reformation, or obedience. As respects our arrangement of things, it is first faith; then the blood of Jesus; then the grace of God; then obedience. To explain: Obedience springs from faith; faith regards the blood of Jesus; and then the grace, from which it flowed. But we are said to be "justified by faith," "justified by grace," "justified by his blood," "justified by works," and "saved by water." We stand up for them all; but every one in its own order. And if our friend Archippus has found out a new way for the Gentiles, in which they have only four steps, while the Jew has five, he must be honored by all the Gentile world. Hence the Gentile part of the Baptist population will thank him for nullifying immersion, and for giving to faith all that is ascribed to both grace, blood, water and obedience.—But this must suffice for the present. We shall still further expose the inadvertencies of our good friend Archippus.

THE CONFERENCE IN TERRA CONFUSA.

(CONTINUED FROM P. 132.)

On the day appointed the Conference met, and after solemn prayer and praise, proceeded to the business before them:—After the minutes of their last meeting were read, Doct. P. arose and thus spake:

Dr. P. Since our last meeting my mind has been absorbed on the subjects of our preceding conferences; especially on the doctrine of Creeds, of the Trinity, and of the two distinct natures of Christ, called the hypostatical union. With regard to authoritative Creeds, I am convinced that they are nuisances to society, unauthorized by the scriptures, and divisive in their very nature. While they exist, sectarianism must exist, and that happy state of society, for which the pious sigh and pray, must be kept at a distance. Authoritative creeds are to sectarians, what the Pope is to Catholics. Each acknowledges the divine scriptures to be the supreme law of christians; but each claims to have the true meaning of the scriptures. The Pope claims infallibility, and therefore cannot err; of course his exposition of scripture is true, and his judgment is perfect and final. An authoritative creed claims to be the test of truth; its exposition of scripture must be infallibly true, of course its judgment must be perfect and final, Each sect has its creed, which gives a different exposition of scripture. All cannot be right; all may be wrong. While all acknowledge the scriptures to be infallibly true, and that their creeds may err, right

reason dictates that the proper course is to reject all, and receive the Bible alone as the only authoritative standard of truth. With regard to the doctrine of Trinity, and of the double nature of Christ, I am willing to desist from the controversy respecting them, a controversy long, and managed with much unchristian feeling—a controversy not only unprofitable, but vastly injurious to the cause and spread of genuine religion.—Let us now proceed to investigate the third article of the summary, proposed by our committee, in the following words, as just read by our Clerk:

3d. "That he (Christ) as our surety, lived and died to satisfy the demands of the law and justice against the sinner, which righteousness is imputed to the sinner for justification." This is a subject, with which are connected our best and eternal interest. It claims our most serious attention and I hope the claim shall not be neglected by us. I view the doctrine, contained in this article, of vital importance, the very basis of our salvation and hope.

Mr. B. The Dr. has fully expressed my mind on this all important doctrine. I view it as the very marrow of christianity, and propose that we receive it without investigation. Shall I make a motion to this effect?

Mr. C. Let us not be too hasty, brethren; we should receive nothing as true, because the learned, the great and the good have believed it; but because it is contained in the oracles of God. What may appear so very plain to you, may not be so plain to another. I acknowledge that the doctrines contained in this article are involvel in difficulties irreconcileable with others contained in the Bible; indeed, examined by the Bible, not one doctrine of the article can be proved. It is no where asserted, in that book, that Jesus was our surety or substitute; that in this relation he satisfied law and justice, or that we are justified by this righteousness imputed to us. Be not alarmed, nor offended at this denial. Let us compare them separately with the scriptures. I once believed as my brethren who have just spoken; and did consider the doctrines of this article essential, without the belief of which none could be saved. But some years ago I was brought to the necessity of rejecting this doctrine, or of becoming a Universalian. I reasoned thus: If Christ as our substitute or surety, lived and died to satisfy the demands of law and justice; then against all for whom he lived and died, neither law nor justice can have any claims. As I was obliged to admit that Christ died for all; then I was also obliged, on the principle of satisfaction, to admit that all must be saved. To me the Bible did not teach Universalism, but condemned it. To be consistent I must then reject the doctrine of satisfaction by Christ the surety, and thus—

Bish'p M. Stop bro. I believe that Christ died for all—tasted death for every creature, and was the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; yet I reject Universalism as cordially as

you do, and plead perfect consistency in my faith. Christ satisfied fully and perfectly law and justice for all, on condition that they believe in him; but if they believe not they shall be damned forever.

Mr. C. A owes A $1000 and is unable to pay the debt. C becomes D's surety, and pays A the full sum. Surely C is now free from obligation to A to pay the debt. It affects not the matter, whether C believes or disbelieves that the debt is paid. He is clear. The debt cannot in justice be demanded, and paid again. On this principle, if the sinner ever suffers, it cannot be for the transgression of the law, which Christ the surety fully satisfied for him. But I do contend that the scriptures no where teach us that Christ was a surety for sinners, or for any man. He is called a surety but once in the Bible; Heb. VII. 22, "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament." Here he is called a surety of a better testament; this materially differs from being the surety of man. F gives G a note of promise for $1000 to be paid within 12 months. To confirm the mind of G that the sum shall be certainly paid at the time specified, H becomes F's surety, and associates his name in the bond. A surety is always connected with the person who gives the bond, or note of promise. Now as the Father gave the New Covenant of promise to the sinful world, and as Jesus was the surety of this covenant, therefore he is connected with the Father as his surety to confirm the minds of men in the truth of his promises. Christ is the surety of the Father, and not of men.

Dr. P. We will grant that Christ is but once in the Bible called a surety, and that your sense of his suretyship is correct; yet the scriptures abundantly teach the doctrine that he was our substitute, and died in our room to satisfy the demands of justice against us. Of him it is often said, that he was delivered *for* us—suffered *for* us—and died *for* us. The preposition *for* is translated from the Greek preposition *huper*, which is sometimes translated *in the stead of*. Hence we conclude that when it is said, Christ suffered and died *for* us, it means, he suffered and died *in our stead*, as a substitute.

Mr. C. This argument for substitution is to me very inconclusive: because of the hundreds of places where *huper* is found, it is but twice translated *in the stead of*, as 2 Cor. v. 20; "We pray you in Christ's stead," (*huper Christou;*) and Philemon 13, "that in thy stead (*huper sou*) he might have ministered unto me." In neither of these places is the death of Christ implicated. If we argue that Christ is our substitute, because he is said to suffer and die (*huper*) *for* us; the argument will be equally good that the Apostles were our substitutes; for they are said to suffer (*huper*) *for* us; as Coll. I. 24, "Who now rejoice in my sufferings *for* you (*huper*, in your stead) and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ, in my flesh, *for his body's sake* (*huper*, in the stead of his body) which is the church."

I will take the liberty on this subject to read a short section in the Christian Messenger, vol. 3, p. 229, where this argument is clearly exhibited in a condensed form, and supported with abundant testimony from the scriptures. (He read the section.) He proceeds to speak; Now it is plain that if it be argued, that Christ was a substitute for us, because he suffered and died for us, then it is equally plain that the Apostles were substitutes *for* us, yea, that they were substitutes for Christ, as they suffered *for* him (*huper*, in his room and stead.) According to this argument, it is also plain, that the first Christians were substitutes for Christ, "For to them it was given (*huper Christou*) *in Christ's stead* to suffer for his sake, (*huper autou*) in his room and stead, Phil. I. 29. The same argument would prove that the primitive christians were substitutes for Paul, and for one-another: See Rom. XVI. 4: John III. 16. And that Christ was the substitute for sin itself; "For he suffered for sin (*huper.*)—The argument proves too much, and therefore it is fallacious.

Dr. P. The force of your reasoning is admitted; yet in what sense can we receive the expressions, "Christ suffered for us;" "died for us," &c.

Mr. C. This inquiry would be an anticipation of the latter part of the article under consideration. Let it be postponed till we have satisfied our minds on the doctrine of Christ being a surety or substitute for men.

Mr. B. I cannot relinquish this doctrine without relinquishing what I have viewed as the foundation of the Christian's hope. If Jesus did not live and die as my substitute—live to fulfil and satisfy by his active obedience all the righteousness of the law in my stead, and die to satisfy all the demands of justice in my room, then I have believed in vain, and labored in vain; I am yet in my sins.

Mr. R. Let not our preconceived opinions—let not our former feelings be the standard by which we measure the truth. To the law and to the testimony let us bring every doctrine, and determine its truth or falsehood by this standard. It must be evident to all unbiassed minds, that the doctrine of Christ's being our substitute, to satisfy in our stead the demands of law and justice, is not a doctrine of revelation. It has long been the prolific source of contention and division. Some, following the doctrine to its proper end, say, that if Christ was our substitute, and if he lived and died to satisfy the demands of law and justice, and as he lived and died for all, then must all be saved. Others, seeing the force of this conclusion, and being unable to rebut it, if it be admitted that Christ died for all, have therefore denied that he died for all. Others, not willing to deny plain scripture, have admitted that he died for all, as a substitute, to satisfy the demands of law and justice against them, provided they believe in the Lord Jesus. Let the doctrine of substitution fall, and these three systems fall with it. With horror I have read the doctrines of

great and good men on this point. Hear the great Reformer Luther; "Christ sustained the person of a sinner; not of one, but of all sinners; and whosoever sins, I, thou, we, all have done, or shall do hereafter, are Christ's own sins, as verily as if he had done them—Jesus Christ was the greatest transgressor, murderer, rebel and blasphemer, that could be in all the world."!!! Hear Calvin; "The burden of damnation, from which we were delivered, was laid upon Christ. It was requisite, that he should feel the severity of the divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God. There is no other satisfaction by which, God, being displeased, may be made favorable and appeased." Hear Flavel; "God stood upon full satisfaction, and would not remit one sin without it. The design and end of this oblation was to atone, pacify and reconcile God, by giving him a full and adequate compensation or satisfaction for the sins of his elect. To wrath, the wrath of an infinite God without mixture, to the very torments of hell, was Christ delivered, and that by the hand of his own Father." This doctrine, even in this enlightened day, is advocated by many. Professor Stuart says; "Since he did not suffer on account of any guilt of his own, on what ground can they reconcile his sufferings with the justice of God, who hold that he is not a substitute for sinners?" The Westminster Confession of faith speaks thus; "By his obedience and death, he made a proper, real and full satisfaction to God's justice in behalf of them that are justified, and fully discharged their debt. By his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, he hath purchased reconciliation and procured the favor of God. The sinner is justified, accepted and accounted righteous in the sight of God for salvation, the obedience and satisfaction of Christ being imputed to him. The Philadelphia Baptist confession speaks the same language. The Methodist Discipline thus teaches; "Christ by his one offering of himself, made a perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual—that he truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried to reconcile the Father to us—that he purchased his (the Father's) grace by the price he paid." Dis. art. 2 & 2, and Art. Perf. All these discordant, jarring doctrines appear to me to flow from the unscriptural notion of Christ's substitution. It is surely time that we abandon this with every doctrine of man, and receive with meekness the ingrafted word which is able to save.

Mr. C. Our bro. R has given us a true and satisfactory statement of the doctrines emanating from the substitution of Christ, and concludes that this dogma is unscriptural, or not found in the scriptures. I will venture a step further, and pledge myself that I will prove, that it is also antiscriptural, and stands opposed to matters of fact, and to the most important truths of revelation.

1. What demands had the law upon us, or against us, which

Christ as a substitute obeyed, fulfilled, and *properly*, *really* and *fully* satisfied in our stead? It will be said, that the law required us to love God with all the heart, soul, mind & strength, and our neighbor as ourselves, &c. Now could Jesus as God or man, fulfil this law for any besides himself? If he be viewed as God, must he not love himself infinitely? and as man must he not love God with all his heart, and his neighbor as himself? If so, he could not fulfil this law for another. But admitting what appears impossible, that he did as our surety pay *really*, *properly* and *fully* this debt of obedience to law, and thus satisfied its demands for us, should we not be completely discharged or freed from this debt of obedience, and consequently under no obligations by the law to love God or our neighbor? And would not this make Christ the minister of sin? But the surety, and he for whom he is surety, are one in law. What the surety does and suffers is considered as done and suffered by him for whom he is surety. Therefore Christ's obedience to law, or his righteousness, is considered the obedience or righteousness of the sinner with whom he is connected as surety. If, as the system says, this righteousness of Christ is imputed to the sinner for justification, is it not a justification by the works of the law?—a doctrine every where condemned in the scriptures. It is now generally conceded that moral qualities, as holiness and sin cannot be imputed or transferred from one person to another. If so, Christ was perfectly innocent, harmless and undefiled, and not, as Luther says, the greatest sinner that could be in the world—and if so, the sinner with all the supposed righteousness of Christ imputed, is as unholy as ever. Can we think that God will "justify, accept and account as righteous in his sight" such a sinner? Much is said about the imputed righteousness of Christ—but such a phrase cannot be found in the Bible.—Such imputed righteousness can do the sinner no good in time, for it does not make him more holy—it can do him no good in the judgment, for there he will be judged according to the deeds done in his own body;—not according to the deeds of a surety.

But the system says, he as surety properly, really, and fully satisfied the demands of justice against us by his death. Now we are told that justice demanded of the sinner death—death temporal, spiritual and eternal, and that this debt the surety paid, and *fully* discharged for us. I have often asked, and ask again, if these doctrines be not pointedly opposed to stubborn facts? Did Christ die a natural death, and fully discharge this debt against us? Why then do all yet die a natural death? must the debt be twice paid? Did Christ die a spiritual death and thus fully discharge this debt against us? Why then do all mankind yet suffer this death? They are all dead spiritually—dead to God, have no love, pleasure, nor delight in him, nor in his ways. But how could Christ suffer this death, and not be a

sinner? Was there ever a time in his life, when he was spiritually dead—when he had no love, nor delight in God, nor in the way of holiness? If not, he never suffered such a death.—How could a holy law demand such an unholy thing as spiritual death? and how could it be satisfied with such a sinful service? How could a holy God require it, and be well pleased with it? These things we know are impossible. But did Christ suffer eternal death—an eternal suffering in soul and body? This is contrary to fact—for Jesus rose from the dead, and declares that he lives forevermore: But if the law requires death eternal, the debt cannot be paid to all eternity, and therefore the law was not fully satisfied by the death of Christ, and never can be. Thus far I have redeemed my pledge, having made it plainly appear that the substitution of Christ, as systematically taught, stands directly opposed to stubborn facts. I have also pledged myself to prove that the doctrine is antiscriptural, and opposed to the most important truths of revelation. This I hope to evince at our next meeting.

Bish. M. I feel rather disposed to examine than to condemn; yet much of the doctrine advanced to day, stands in opposition to my professed creed. Yet I feel more determined to read the Bible than I ever did, and to receive nothing as truth which I cannot find there, and to condemn and reject nothing as error, not condemned by that book. I propose an adjournment, and that we meet again this day four weeks. To this motion all agreed, and after prayer and praise, they parted in Christian love. (TO BE CONTINUED.)

For the Christian Messenger.

No. V.

The death of Christ, and the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and their effect and consequences necessary to the existence of religion in the world.

Dr. Ely said some time ago, that a few metaphysical opinions were the occasion of the principal controversies in religion among Presbyterians. I say that the controversies about the atonement, and the trinity, and the operations of the Spirit, among professed Christians, (which have existed for more than fifteen hundred years) and the almost innumerable systems of religion that have been formed by them, have originated in unscriptural views, and in a false philosophy of the human mind, in reference to religion. What occurred in the Arian controversy in the 4th century, and the unscriptural forms of expression used in the Athanasian or Nicine and Arian Creeds, or articles of faith, formed in that century, and which have been incorporated with, and given character more or less to all the creeds of this day, confirm this observation.

I believe that correct views of the death of Christ, and its effects, and of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as they are connected with the existence of religion in the world, according to the word of God, and the history of mankind, in reference to it, will obviate all difficulties upon these subjects, except what are incident to ultimate principles, and unite all Christians in faith and affection: I mean; all those, who do in truth, and in deed, regard the word of God as true, and the only mean and rule of faith and conduct in religion. With my views I cannot see any more or greater occasion for men to differ about the Christian religion, and form different sects on account of it, than there is for their dividing and forming different sects on account of their different opinions about light.

With these remarks I submit the following observations to the intelligent reader, for serious consideration.

Every doctrine of God in religion is necessary for some appropriate practical end, and without which, that end cannot be accomplished in the human mind.

The Scriptures, the history of the world, and the state of man indicate that some great catastrophe has happened to the human family in relation to God. The word of God informs us, that God created man in his own image and likeness, from which he has fallen. And from the short account that Moses has given us in the three first chapters of Genesis, it appears that the image of God, in which man was made, comprehended the knowledge, love and fellowship of God, as it consisted in a state of purity, and included the knowledge and use of language in relation to God and spiritual things, as well as the knowledge of natural ones, and the use of language in respect to them. Hence we find Adam conversing with his Maker the Logos, while in a state of innocence, in the use of words and sentences in the most famaliar manner, receiving and understanding his instructions and precepts relative to the divine will, and his own duty, expressed in the same way. And after he sinned he knew and felt his guilt, and understood his Maker's voice. In proof that Adam was endowed immediately by his creator with the knowledge of natural things, and with language suitable to express, and to distinguish them, we are informed that "the Lord God brought unto him every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, to see what he would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof" Gen. II. 19.

The image and likeness of God, in which man was made, and all that appertained to them, (as distinguished from their original natural powers) which were lost by sin, were coeval endowments, and were bestowed upon him by his munificent creator, the Logos or Word, the moment that gave him birth. These coeval endowments, though withdrawn, man's original, intellectual faculties and powers, and native susceptibilities, would remain, though destitute of the means of spiritual improvement. In this case of spiritual desertion, these faculties and powers and affections would, of necessity, be employed

upon, and engrossed by the objects of sense, animal appetite and selfishness, and be bounded by time.

In man's primitive, pure estate, to the extent of his limited powers, he saw as God saw, and loved as God loved, and willed as God willed. He corresponded in these respects with his Maker; and, possessed of immortality, he was like him. But this state was lost by sin: the image of God was destroyed, and man became mortal.

The tempter began his operations by seeking to cloud the powers of man's understanding, for without this he could not corrupt his affections, or pervert his will. He accordingly presented a different view to the mind of Adam and Eve, of the propriety and authority of God's command, from that in which God held them, and had expressed them; and in that way affected their heart, so as to bring it in opposition to God, Gen. III. 1–6. II. 15–17. Now for the first time man's intellect ceased to harmonize with God's intellect, and his affections and will ran counter to God. Man sinned by violating the will of God. He broke God's covenant and fell under his curse; the coeval endowments, in which the image of God consisted ceased; for, indeed, God left him. That communion with God, on which these principles depended, ceased, because it would have been utterly improper in itself, and inconsistent with the covenant and constitution God had established, that God should still maintain communion with man, after he had become a rebel. Man was left involved in spiritual darkness, guilt and ruin. In the whole of this transaction God exerted no power in occasioning man's fall, or in promoting the temptation that led to it, but he did every thing that he could do, to prevent it. Nor did he infuse any principle of sin or corruption into the fallen state of man. By the abuse or improper use of his moral powers, man sinned against God, and broke his covenant; and God *withdrew* from him in a spiritual point of view, intellectually and morally speaking, left him *flesh* without the *Spirit;* and by the change, man became naturally mortal. As the light withdrawn from a room leaves it in darkness, so the withdrawal of God from man left him in spiritual darkness and death, imprisoned within the walls of time and sense, under the dominion of animal appetite and passions, and under the sentence of natural death. In this case the natural presence and operations of God's spirit did not cease; had that been the case, man would instantly have died a natural death, and the human race would have ended, Job XXXIV. 14. 15. These continued, but these do not give spiritual knowledge or religion. They only sustain the natural existence of man so long as it lasts, and his original and native powers and susceptibilities, which render him *capable* of religion, but I repeat, they do not give religion, or the knowledge of God; this is given by external, verbal revelation. Religion was *natural* to man's original estate, but it is *supernatural* to his fallen state.

The process by which we must be brought to God, to holiness, and to heaven, is precisely an inversion of the process of our fall. The Devil deceived our first parents, and ruined them, by darkening their minds, and corrupting their affections by falsehood. Our minds must be enlightened, our guilt must be pardoned, and our affections purified by the merciful truth of God, and that is *Gospel truth. The Word* made man at first in the image of God, and gave him speech and knowledge upon spiritual subjects. The word, *made flesh* in his mediatorial character, under the new covenant, again speaks to man through his own blood, and is the light of life, and renews him by knowledge, after the image of him that created him. This is done by giving him the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Through faith in him we are justified, and sanctified The light of this knowledge is the gospel character of God.

I observed that in man's first estate, religion was natural to him, that is, the knowledge of God formed a part of the *state* in which he was *made;* but in his fallen state religion is *supernatural.* Agreeably to the caption of this essay, I now observe that the death of Jesus Christ, in the divine purpose and conduct, and the fact of the existence and agency of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have been, since the fall of man, intimately connected with, and concerned in the divine and spiritual communications to, and in the existence of religion in our world.

I designedly omit the terms *atonement* and *Trinity*, because they are not properly in the New Testament, and have been the subjects of much unprofitable verbal disputation; and I employ the expressions "the death of Christ," and "the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit" in their place, as they are connected with the revelation and knowledge of God, and the existence of religion in the world.

What I have now said is chiefly preparatory to what I am now about to advance in proof of the necessity of the death of Christ, and of the truth of the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and their effects and operations to the existence of religion in our world. By religion I mean a system of truth, affection and conduct, of which God is the great subject, and supreme object, and which I maintain, since the fall of man; could not exist without supernatural revelation in words.

My method of proof, in this case, will consist in the simple exclusion of the death of Christ, and of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and all their obvious consequences since man fell, in reference to religion, to show that their absence leaves the world without the knowledge of God and religion altogether, and that their existence and operations are necessary to the knowledge of God and of religion in the world.

1. I exclude the death of Christ as it was announced, and promised, and prophesied of, and all its consequences, as it existed in the divine purpose, and was made known by God

immediately after the man fell Gen. III. 15 By this the promise of the seed of the woman is excluded, who was to bruise the serpent's head, and all the communications and institutions, that were made and ordained by God in reference to it. The sufferings of Christ, and the glory that was to follow, of which the spirit of Christ that was in the prophets did speak from the earliest ages of the world, are with the revelations of them blotted out. Abel's offering by faith, and Enoch's prophecies and walk with God, and his translation, and Noah's faith and conduct, and the patriarchal and Mosaical systems and dispensations of religion, and all the bleeding victims and smoking altars, which were typical, are excluded, with every form of worship, and all spiritual ideas, whether true or false, except those which Adam may have remembered of what he knew before the fall, and which he may have communicated to his posterity. In the absence of all that was said and done in reference to Christ, there has been no communication made by God to man intelligibly, since he fled from the presence of his Maker:—I will resume the subject of the death of Christ, and its effects under the second head of the next division, as it is connected with the existence of religion in the world.

2. To prove the truth and necessity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as they have been, and are known, and employed in the manifestation and revelation of the knowledge of God, and in the existence of religion among mankind, since Adam fell; I will now exclude the office and agency of each.

1. I exclude the knowledge of the Father, as he has been made known in the system of religion, and all that he has said and done. Then there is no Father so to have loved the world as to give his only begotten son for its salvation, and no fact has ever occurred in reference to Him, or his Son, or this salvation, in word or work, by which the existence of either would be known. No spiritual object of faith, in the scripture use of the term, can be found in the whole bounding circle of human knowledge; within it there is no means of spiritual perception, or discernment without revelation.

2. I exclude *The Word*, and the word *made flesh*, who is the Son of God, and all that the scriptures tell us of him, and of all that he did and said before his incarnation and since, and what he is now doing, and will do.

I will not attempt to ennumerate all the consequences of this exclusion upon the state of the human mind, and the world, in reference to religion or to spiritual light, knowledge and life, to thought, affection and conduct—I will mention a few of them. The purpose and grace, given to us in Christ before the world began—the promises and prophecies, made in reference to them—the incarnation of the Word—his appearance in the world—the manifestation of his glory, as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth—his death and resurrection—the establishment of the new covenant—redemption through his blood, and the forgiveness of sin—his ascension into glory—his exaltation to the mediatorial throne, he being invested with all power in heaven and in earth—the new song sung in heaven to him by all the heavenly hosts, and by all that are in the earth, as the Lamb slain Rev. v.—his return again to judge the world in righteousness, to raise the dead, and save the righteous, and to destroy the world with fire, and to sentence the wicked to eternal wo—the separate existence of the spirit from the body of those that die, until the resurrection, and the termination of the mediatorial reign; all, all these are extinguished from the minds of men, and from our world!

3. Exclude the Holy Spirit in all that he has said, and done, which have been made known in miraculous and supernatural *words* and *works* since man fell. There is no spiritual light or knowledge in the world. Before Christ came into the world the testimony of Jesus was the spirit of prophecy, and after his crucifixion and glorification, the office, and agency of the spirit was to glorify him, by working miracles in his name, and by speaking in his own words and sentences, the things of Christ, and teaching things to come concerning him, and proving that he is in the Father, and the Father in him, and that he is Lord of all, and Saviour of the world—all these are extinguished, and the existence of the spirit himself, his operations and influences upon the hearts of men, are unknown; for he is not an object of sense that he can be seen, or felt, as existing distinct from our own minds, or from the phenomina or appearances of nature. He is an object of faith, and is only known to exist by revelations made in words and miraculous works.

4. In the last place; Exclude the revelation concerning all these things, which is found in the recorded word of God, and in oral tradition; and all the knowledge derived from it since the fall of man, and since the birth of Christ, whether pure or corrupted, and the world is of necessity, involved in atheism without an idea, a thought, or a feeling relative to God, except, as I before remarked, so far as Adam may have remembered, and informed his posterity, of what he knew in his primeval state before he sinned; there could however be no worship derived from such a remembrance, suited to the fallen state of man, no expiatory offerings or sacrifices, such as have appeared in all the forms of worship that have existed since.

We have now seen what would be the state of man without the death of Christ, and the offices and agencies of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in reference to religion, or the knowledge of God. We see also in what *total depravity* consists. It is true, that the scriptures assume it as a fact, that the knowledge of God existed in the world at the time they were written; but they never suppose that knowledge to have originated without revelation, but the reverse; and any person, who

now may think that it did, is invited to show the process, by which the mind can arrive at it from the existence and phenomina of nature, or by analogy, or by the analysis of its own powers. I repeat, that in man's fallen state there is properly no *natural* religion. The assumption of the truth of natural religion, virtually denies that total depravity, as the loss of the knowledge of God, as well as of the love of him, were consequences of the fall. Natural religion also involves the denial of the necessity, and the effects of the death of Christ in the divine purpose and conduct, and the existence and agency or Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to the existence of religion on the knowledge of God in our world, since man fell, in contradiction to what is demonstrably true, and to what we have seen to be true. God is an object of faith, and not of sight or of sense, and so is the *fact* of creation. *Sense* informs us that the worlds *are;* but *faith*, or the revelation of God, teaches us that they were *made* by the word of God. Under the light of this knowledge, the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work. Ps. 19; and so does the frame and constitution of man, Ps. 139: 14.

1. Notwithstanding all the controversies that have existed about the atonement, or the death of Christ, and about the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, all true knowledge, that we have of God and religion, is the effect of these doctrines. The Christian religion can no more exist without them, than light can exist without the primitive colors, or vision without light. The exclusion of either of these doctrines, with all its appropriate consequences, destroys the whole system of religious knowledge. Hence *all* that appertains to our salvation is the gift of God, and is given to us in Christ, who is the light of the world, and the life of it.

2. All that can be known of divine truth, must be found in the nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, &c. in their own statements and connections, which compose the word of God, and in the cultivation of the faith, hope, affection, and conduct, which that word is the means of producing and promoting in religion. These parts of speech are in their proper meaning, and are ultimate principles in religion. Every individual Christian, and every Christian society, is equally bound to preserve the phraseology of every passage, and to cultivate the meaning and use of it in understanding, temper, and conduct, as God's means for forming the Christian character, and for promoting the union, peace and happiness of all Christians, and for his honor and glory.

3. All Christians do agree to the extent they believe in, and love the Lord Jesus Christ, and ought to cease their divisions and strife, and cultivate mutual affection, good offices & fellowship towards each other according to the gospel.—ARCHIPPUS.

REMARKS ON ARCHIPPUS' No. 5.

Our brother Archippus is engaged in the noblest work that

can employ his mind, his talents, his tongue and his pen—the work of conciliating the children of God, and of uniting his discordant family on earth in the bonds of christian love, peace, and fellowship. His designs we highly approve; but whether the plan he is pursuing will effect the proposed end, I cannot positively determine; yet I must confess my doubts. Our bro. thinks that the controversies on the atonement, Trinity and operations of the Spirit, and the systems of Religion and Creeds, formed by these doctrines, prevent the union of christians; and that correct views of these subjects will unite them. He has, we think, inadvertently said that the atonement has been a subject of controversy for more than fifteen hundred years.—We have never read, nor heard of this before. In fact we never read of any difference on this doctrine among christians, until the plodding genius of Anselm of Laon, in the twelvth century, introduced a new meaning of atonement, (i. e) *satisfaction*, which, the learned patristical investigator, Dr. Murdock informs us, was unknown in the church till that period, but now considered as the foundation stone of true religion by the orthodox. In our memory between 40 and 50 years ago, there was no controversy in our country among the sects on these points. All were then orthodox according to the present standard of orthodoxy. All were trinitarians, all believed in the operations of the spirit—all believed that atonement meant satisfaction. Yet were Presbyterians and Baptists contending with each other sharply about Baptism, and both zealously contending with the Methodists, and the Methodist with them on the five points. They all agreed in the three grand doctrines so much controverted now, yet were they far, very far from union. Among the orthodox, ever since the third century, who were agreed in these fundamental doctrines of controversy, how many splits and divisions do we find on other subjects: mere trifles!!

Suppose, brother Archippus should succeed (and God grant he may,) in convincing the world that by revelation alone they can know any thing of God, or of his will—and that they all agree to relinquish their creeds and systems of religion, and unite on the Bible alone as the rule of faith and practice. This is truly a desideratum, for which we should ever labor. But will this union exist long, or to profit, unless the spirit of that book be possessed by every member of the great community? Let facts speak. How many in this present day have been pleading for christian union, and that this union should be on the Bible alone, all authoritative creeds being rejected!—Many have listened to the voice of wisdom, and have joyfully obeyed, and have flowed together. They have no controversy among themselves on the doctrines of trinity, atonement, &c. yet they lack the humble, loving, forbearing spirit of the gospel. The spirit of uniformity in opinion forbids the exercise of forbearance. All must see and act on a certain

point alike, or be disowned as brethren. To make proselytes to an opinion appears, in the conduct of some, to be paramount to making living christians. We hope, our brother Archippus, in the developement of his plan, will urge the practice of piety, and brotherly kindness and forbearance,—of heart and life religion,—of humility, meekness, gentleness and temperance.—We have seen all controversy fall before this heavenly, divine spirit and power—we have seen religious opponents united in peace and love—we have seen sectarians lose their anti-christian spirit, and flow together and worship together in love.—This spirit must and will yet affect what the wisdom of men must fail to do. It will unite the flock scattered in the dark and cloudy day. This spirit will the Lord give to them who ask him, to them, who believe that he will, and can give it, without philosophising *how* he can do it. Let us pray, "Lord revive us in the midst of the years." Amen. EDITOR.

QUERIES, *by Elder Wm D. Jourdan.*

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

A. The apostle enumerates the gifts of the king of his church thus; "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, &c. Eph. IV. 11. It can hardly be a matter unobserved by a scripture reader, that all the offices of the church are frequently found in the same person; thus the Saviour himself was called an apostle, (Heb. III. 1)—a prophet, (Mat. XXI. 11,)—a teacher, (Acts I. 1,)—a shepherd, or pastor, and bishop, (1 Pet. II. 25,)—a preacher, (Luke IV. 18,)—an evangelist, such was he through life. The apostles were bishops, (Acts I. 20)—teachers, (Mat. XXVIII. 20)—preachers, (Mark XVI. 16)—Elders, (1 Pet. V. 1.) Bishops and overseers are the same office; for they are translated from the same word (*Episcopos.*)—Bishops, overseers and Elders are the same. In Acts XX. Paul called together the *Elders* of Ephesus, and addressed them thus, "Take heed to the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*, or Bishops, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood." These Elders, overseers, or bishops, were also pastors, or such as fed the flock. The *Elders*, ordained by Titus in every city, were also called *Bishops* Tit. I. 5–7. The *Elders*, in general, were exhorted by Peter to feed the flock of God, taking the *oversight* (or bishopric) thereof, not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, 1 Pet. V. 2. All the Elders then were overseers, bishops or pastors. If then the office of a bishop includes teachers, elders, preachers, pastors, and even

evangelists, I see no reason, nor use for more, that of *Deacon* excepted.

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

A. Yes: For Paul and Barnabas ordained them elders in every church; which plainly implies that the churches had previously existed without them. But I think, I have in a former No. of the Messenger, shewn that no church is in full gospel order without a bishop and deacons. Yet I am very far from thinking that every church has members sufficiently qualified to be bishops. It would be infinitely better for many churches to depend on others for bishops, than to ordain one of their own members, who fills not the character of a bishop as drawn by an apostle 1 Tim. 3. Such bishops as lack these qualifications, are certainly made in opposition to the will of the Lord; and that church, that made them such, can never prosper, but ultimately must sink into disgrace and ruin. Such is the disposition of many churches in this day of making bishops of their own members, whether qualified or not, that much evil, anarchy, and confusion, are anticipated by the thinking part of the community.

Q. 3. With whom did the apostles intrust the judgment and qualifications of those, who should fill those offices.

A. Should it be asked, who made the elders or bishops in Ephesus? Paul would answer, "The Holy Spirit." "Feed the church of the Lord, over the which the Holy Ghost (not the church) hath made you *overseers*." Paul and Barnabas, by the imposition of the hands of certain prophets and teachers at Antioch, were ordained to travel abroad for certain important purposes; one of which was to ordain elders in every church, Acts XIII. 1–3. XIV. 23. The churches did not ordain, or constitute these elders, but the apostles did it for the churches. If any should, with Beza and the Genevese translation, render it, elected by lifting up the hand, still this was the act of Paul and Barnabas and not of the church See Doc. G. Campbell's Dis. 10. part 5. If it was the province of the churches to make elders or bishops, why did they not do it before Paul and Barnabas came to them? Why should these ministers of Christ have assumed an authority, which belonged to the churches? And why did they not instruct the churches the law of God, and their duty on this point? The reason must be, because this business had been divinely intrusted with the ministry.

Paul left Titus in Crete to ordain elders in every city, and he particularly described the qualifications of those he must ordain. Tit. I. 5–10. Titus, not the church, ordained these elders. If, as some contend, ordination is nothing else than a simple election; still the election was with Titus, and not with the churches; he ordained—he elected. Why should Titus be left there to ordain elders in the churches, if this business belonged to the churches? Why should he assume to do what

belonged to them? Why not rather teach them their duty, and urge them to obedience in this matter? Titus had learned from an inspired teacher, and knew his duty, therefore he ordained elders in every city.

Paul in his first letter to Tim. III. gives him a particular description of the character and qualifications of a bishop; and then gives him the reasons why he thus wrote, "That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God." On this subject, a little after, he charges Timothy most solemnly to observe all these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality, to lay hands suddenly on no man." Timothy understood the meaning of his father Paul in the expression of *the laying on of hands;* for Paul had just before exhorted him not to neglect the gift (see the gifts Eph. IV. 11) which was given thee by (according to) prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, (eldership.) 1 Tim. IV. 14. 2 Tim. I. 6. The eldership or presbytery, not the church, conferred this gift, by the will of God. Hence the elders at Ephesus were made overseers or bishops by the Holy Spirit, because they were ordained according to the divine will. By whom was the word of God to be committed to faithful men, in order that they may teach it to others? We have no account of this being done by the churches of old; but Paul tells Timothy to do it.

I must refer my querist to former numbers on this point in the Messenger. I rest assured that these thoughts do not suit the taste of many dear brethren. All I ask of them, is, that they examine the scriptures, and try me by that rule, and not by the *say so* of any man. I intreat them to search for the passage in the scriptures, and point it to me and to the world, where the churches in apostolic times ever ordained or made elders, bishops or overseers. Where any but the apostles, and such as were ordained by them directly or indirectly, ever were authorized to baptize in the name of the Lord Jesus. It is not even said that the six men with Peter baptized Cornelius and family, or that these six men were ordained or not. All is vague conjecture. I pretend not to answer any unscriptural difficulty; but proceed to,

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

A. Never: for then would the words of our Lord have failed, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Since the apostacy, the true church is hidden in the wilderness. That called the *visible church*, is not hidden but seen of all, and seen to the injury of the doctrine and glory of Christ. The true church will shortly come up in her glory, and fill the world with praise. EDITOR.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

This term I use for want of a better. It fully expresses my understanding of the subject; and so commonly is it used to express the same idea, that it needs no definition. Philologists

may object to the propriety of the term; but philology must sometimes yield to general use. While I hear daily of the great revivals in many parts in the East, my mind with a mournful pleasure reverts to the great revival in the West 30 years ago, and which continued for several years, and spread far and wide. To give a full history of it would be impossible. Often have I gazed with inexpressible emotions at the gathering crowds hurrying to the place of worship. All clothed with solemnity—many wetting their paths with tears—and thousands anxious to find the way of life—many sunk under the burden of sin, and little groups around pointing to them the hope of Israel, and uniting their solemn prayers for their salvation. Many praising God aloud for delivering grace, and cheerfully uniting with the church of God. Thousands silently hanging on the lips of the preacher, who in the warm, loving spirit of his Lord, was ministering to them the word of reconciliation. I then saw, and yet acknowledge some imperfection, some excentricities or aberrations from what I thought right, among the vast multitudes assembled. But I remembered they were but men, and that I could not reasonably expect to find perfection in such multitudes of imperfect beings. The good so far exceeded the evil, the latter almost disappeared. I saw the religion of Jesus more clearly exhibited in the lives of Christians then, than I had ever seen before or since to the same extent. The preachers were revived. I saw them filled with the Holy Spirit of their Lord, addressing the multitudes, not in Icebergh style, nor according to the studied rules of rhetoric and oratory; but in the language and spirit of heaven. Impressed with the worth of souls—of unconverted souls, exposed to everlasting punishment—feeling their awful responsibility to God; and feeling the force of divine truth, and the power of religion, in their own souls, they spoke with earnestness, as dying men to dying men. They regarded not the censure, nor the hard speeches of opposers—they might be called enthusiasts and represented as mad, and beside themselves.—This did not move them, unless to pity, to tears and prayers for their opposers. Through many difficulties, they labored night and day, privately and publicly, from house to house, from neighborhood to neighborhood, preaching the word of salvation to all, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; they labored to save souls, and to establish them in the faith and hope of the gospel,—they, feeling the spirit of love, peace and union, endeavored to promote and cultivate these essentials of religion, wherever they could.

I saw the congregations revived. The saints of every name mingling together, and together offering their sacrifices of prayer and praise in the fire of love to their common Father and Redeemer, and together surrounding the table of their Lord. How affecting! to see parents then weeping over their unconverted children, and praying fervently for them—to see brothers and sisters engaged in the same work for their brothers and

sisters—neighbor for neighbor—friends for their friends and enemies. All, old and young, even small children, engaged in the same work, not only at the place of worship, but at home and abroad. Religion was their great work, and employed and filled up their happy months and years Out of the abundance of their hearts they spoke often one to another on the subject of religion; controverted notions were not the themes of their conversation, but the soul-cheering doctrine of heaven, and its divine effects, as experienced by themselves and others. Here was unity indeed—not in opinions but in the spirit.

I saw sinners every where, of every age and sex, rich and poor, bond and free, old and young, weeping, praying, and converting to God—I saw enemies become friends, and sweetly united in the bonds of love—I saw brotherly kindness, meekness, gentleness, obedience, all the divine graces, growing and abounding among the saints of God. The Bible was read with intense desire to find the truth. This, this I call a revival. This I call the work of God.

Philosophers, dogmatists, and formalists, who were for measuring religion according to their own rules, were generally opposers of this revival. Their opposition appeared portentous of evil, but passed harmlessly over as a threatning, empty cloud. The great obstruction to this revival was the spirit of sectarianism, which like a restless demon, infected and destroyed the glorious work, wherever it came. Never can this spirit, and the spirit of Christ amalgamate. As much opposed as darkness and light—as fire and water, are they.

Shall we oppose revivals because we discover in them much enthusiasm, mismanagement, and unscriptural means employed by those engaged in them? If we do, we may also oppose every good, not perfect, or to which is attached any imperfection. The imperfection should be opposed, but in the meekness and gentleness of Christ; but great care should be taken that while rooting out the tares, we do not also root out the wheat.

Shall we oppose a revival, because we think the conductors of it are ignorant of what we may deem the most important doctrine of the gospel? If this be our privilege, it is also the privilege of all; every party will reject of course every revival not their own. If genuine religion be the fruit of such revivals, we dare not reject without incurring the divine displeasure.

I have read in an Eastern paper of the character of the revivals in one section of that country. It states that Christians of all denominations lovingly unite in worship, even in the breaking of bread at the Lord's Table. In such a work I will rejoice. Yet I have my fears that the demon of partyism will check and destroy it. Yet Christianity will prevail so far as to have enlisted under her banners many, who cannot and will not be drawn into the vortex of sectarianism, and who will remain free, and preach reformation to the sects in bondage.

Some reject revivals because they think we should always be

revived. Will such reject religion, because they do not always feel that they love God with all their heart, and their neighbors as themselves? in other words, because they are not perfect. Do they always feel the same divine affections in the same degree? Have they always the same vivid perceptions of truth? Have they always the same fervid engagedness in the cause of God? If not, why object to revivals? The flames of devotion cannot be confined; they will break forth, as in Jeremiah's case; and their effects are mighty in families, neighborhoods, and congregations, in destroying the kingdom of darkness, and in building up Zion. O Lord; "Let thy priests be clothed with salvation; and let thy saints shout for joy." Psalm 132, 9. EDITOR.

THE DEFENDER OF MAYSLICK CHURCH AGAIN.

The defender of the protest and resolutions of the Mayslick Baptist church, has again appeared in the June No. of the Baptist Chronicle, very angry and still more abusive. He yet charges me with wicked misrepresentation. I cannot let myself down so low beneath Christian character and common gentility, to notice the effusion of his choleric heart. My religion—my self respect forbid it.

The case is briefly this: That church, after grievous complaints of the confusion, into which they were thrown by A. Campbell and others, determined to purge themselves from those existing evils, and "to rally round the original constitution and covenant of the church, which has never been disannulled—associating therewith, the principles of the union between the Regular and Separate Baptists (see articles of union) which was adopted by the Elkhorn Association, when this church was a member of that body. And they farther determined, "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 will briefly observe several particulars,

1. By the original constitution I understood the Philadelphia confession of faith.

2. By the covenant of the church I understood, the particular doctrines, laws, and rules of that particular church

3. By the principles of union, I understood, those articles agreed upon between the Regular and Separate Baptists many years ago.

4. By subscribing to this resolution of the church, I understood, that whoever did subscribe, did also profess to believe in the Philadelphia confession of faith &c.

5. I concluded that no one but a Calvinist could be a member of that church, and that if any subscribed this resolution of the church, and did not believe in the Philadelphia confession, he must be a hypocrite—he professing "*to rally round* this original constitution," yet inwardly disbelieving it. Can any deny?

The defender of that church charges me with wicked misrepresentation, because I understood that by "the original con-

stitution, was meant the Philadelphia confession of faith. He adds, "Let him prove it or stand convicted." Convicted of what? that I was mistaken? This I would readily do at any moment, if evidence was produced that the church understood it differently. But this evidence has not been given. I am in common with imperfect mortals liable to mistakes; but if every mistake is a wilful, wicked misrepresentation, my accuser may not be clear. Had he only published that I had misunderstood the church with respect to the original constitution, and given me evidence of that misunderstanding, I should certainly have published in the Messenger the correction; and will yet do it, and be happy to do it, if that church will only let me know that I misunderstood her. *This* in the defender had been Christian; but this would not have answered his purpose, to crush the wretch, the Arian, the Heretic. He must aim a deathly blow with his orthodox brethren, at my moral and christian character, but like old Priam—*telumque imbelle sine ictu conjecit*. I did believe, and do yet believe, that by "the original constitution" was meant, by that church in their protest, the Philadelphia confession of faith. My reasons are the following. An association is made up of several churches—of the Elkhorn association the Mayslick church had formerly been a member. That association was constituted on the Philadelphia confession (this cannot be denied)—therefore Mayslick church was also constituted on this confession, or original constitution. When that church determined to rally round the original constitution, how natural to think it was the Philadelphia confession! Their own language plainly proves the same idea. Hear it; they "are willing and determined to rally round the original constitution and covenant of the church, which has never been disannulled." Has their church an original constitution, and covenant too? Are they the same instrument or two different ones?—certainly two; for the relative *which* being singular, as being the subject of a singular verb, cannot agree with the two antecedents, *constitution* and *covenant*.

The defender blames me for not attending to their church covenant and articles of union. I am not concerned about them; for if the members of that church subscribe their resolutions, which I understand, include the Philadelphia confession, then are they Calvinists; if not Calvinists, they must be hypocrites, though they may subscribe a thousand articles besides. Was I wrong in endeavoring to expose the error of the Mayslick church for their good, and for the good of society in general? Ought any of them to be so highly incensed as to resent it with such an unchristian spirit? Have they never endeavored to expose the errors of others, and shew the consequence of such errors? On the whole, I am convicted of several things, the correctness of my statements, with my understanding of the subject, that it is an easy matter to revile, and that the most depraved excel all others in this art. The subject is too unprofitable for religious columns. EDITOR.

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. AUGUST 1831. [No. 8.

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 FROM P. 154.)

According to adjournment the Conference met. After prayer, and the reading of the proceedings of the last meeting, Bishop M arose and thus spake:

Bish. M. My mind has been intensely engaged on the doctrine of atonement, which was the subject of discussion at our last meeting, and which we agreed to resume at the present session. The result of my examination, is, that this doctrine has been misunderstood generally in the Christian world—that great error exists somewhere respecting it—but what is truth, is not so easily ascertained by me. Our bro. C has certainly exposed the fallacy of the *orthodox* system of atonement; he has proved that it contradicts stubborn facts, and therefore cannot be true. He pledged himself at our last meeting to prove also that the orthodox system is unscriptural, antiscriptural, and in opposition to the most important truths of revelation. Should he succeed in this I must abandon it, and as a little child learn from my superiors the truth as it is in Jesus.

Mr. C. I advance to the subject without fear, without any hesitancy of redeeming the pledge, made at our last meeting. It would be almost an insult upon your judgment to attempt to prove that the orthodox system of atonement is unscriptural, or not found in the Book of God. Where is it said that Jesus as our substitute fulfilled all the precepts of the law? No where. Where is it said in that Book that as our substitute he endured all the penal demands of justice? No where. Where is it said in that Book that he felt the vengeance and wrath of an infinite God without mixture? No where. Where in that Book is it said that Jesus, by his sufferings appeased, and reconciled his Father to us? No where. I need not attempt to prove a negative. That it is antiscriptural, or opposed to some of the most prominent truths of revelation, is evident; because this scheme destroys the very idea of grace or favor,