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,

on which are predicated our forgiveness, and salvation. What our surety pays for us, is considered as paid by us. Where can grace appear in forgiveness when the debt is paid? This system represents God as changeable. For the very expression of his being appeased and reconciled by the death of Christ, implies a change from a contrary state or temper of mind. God is no where represented as being reconciled to sinners by the death of his Son, but every where as reconciling sinners to himself. As truth is our object, we are willing to receive it from whatever source it may come. (Here he read several articles from B. W. Stone's Address, and from Noah Worcester on atonement.) These ideas fully prove to my mind, that the doctrine under examination is without foundation in scripture, and in direct opposition to some of the most prominent truths of revelation, and, therefore, should be rejected from the system of theology.

Mr. R. With the bro. Bish. M: I am fully convinced, that the commonly received doctrine of atonement wants the sanction of revelation—of this I have been for some time past assured. The subject is involved in great difficulties, and to disinvolve it, is a labor not unprofitable, but of immense importance, and should therefore be undertaken with untiring patience and assiduity. The many attempts of theologians to solve the difficulties and contradictions of the system, are but specious glosses, and prove that the difficulties are seen but not removed by them. It would be in us extreme folly to incorporate this doctrine, so difficult, into a system of faith, and bind ourselves to adhere to it. I am persuaded it would be wisdom in us to erase the whole article, and receive only the plain declarations of scripture on the subject; and let each of us form our own opinion of it according to our best judgment. In this article under consideration we cannot agree; but as the doctrine stands in the scriptures we can and do agree.

Doc. P. The difficulties are acknowledged; but how can the doctrine of atonement be stated in scripture language so that we might all agree in it?

Mr. R. The doctrine is plainly stated in 2 Cor. v. 19, "God was in (by) Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." "He hath reconciled us unto himself by the death of his Son" &c.

Mr. B. I find nothing of atonement in these texts. These speak of reconciliation, not of atonement. These are certainly different subjects.

Mr. C. My bro. is mistaken in thinking that atonement and reconciliation are different subjects. They are the very same. The same word (keper) in the Hebrew is translated atonement and reconciliation—and the same word in Greek (*katallage*) is also translated into the same words. This is universally conceded by the learned; it can admit of no dispute. Indeed the words reconciliation and atonement have the same meaning in our language. Johnson, and Baily derive the word *atone* from the two words *at* and *one;* John Brown of Haddington, in his Dictionary of the Bible, does the same. See art. atone. To at-one is to reconcile, or to bring two at variance to be one in heart and affection. Sin has separated between God and man—Jesus as mediator, came to reconcile or at-one them; or to restore the union between them, whom sin had separated. This was the work or ministry committed to him, by the Father; this was his ministry or work in proclaiming through his life the word of reconciliation—it was his ministry in death, in his resurrection, and in his exaltation at the right hand of God. When the sinner believes in Jesus, he is brought to repentance, he confesses he has sinned, that God is righteous—he obeys the gospel, and receives remission of sin, & the gift of the Holy Spirit. Now he is *at-one* or reconciled to God; now the union, which sin had broken, is restored between God and man—now the at-one-ment is effected.

Dr. P. In the article of justification, which is immediately connected with the atonement, something is declared, which appears irreconcileable with the ideas just suggested. All the world stand guilty before God, condemned by his holy law, and under the sentence of death. If God forgives them, then his law and government are dishonored, and his truth, in declaring they should die, is disgraced. The scriptures declare that God can by no means clear the guilty. I cannot exclude the idea of a substitute in suffering the penalty in our stead, so that God can be just in justifying the believing sinner. If this doctrine can be reconciled to that last stated, I should rejoice to see it.

Mr. C. The doctrine of justification according to the New Testament has been misunderstood generally by theologians. They have considered it in the forensic sense. A person is arraigned at the bar of his country. He is convicted of a capital offence by undoubted testimony. The court condemns him—for the law is the ministration of condemnation and death, and can never justify or pardon the guilty. It is not the province of a court to shew mercy—law and justice are its province, and according to law, it is sworn to judge. Yet, in every good government, mercy is by the constitution vested somewhere. In the Commonwealth of Kentucky it is vested in the Governor—from him it can only flow to pardon or remit. The condemned and his friends send a petition to the Governor, imploring mercy—they state the fact that he is penitent, and grieved for the offence. The Governor grants pardon. This act is not contrary to the law, nor government. For the law and the government had given him this authority. They are satisfied when mercy is thus granted. In the government of Israel; the law candemned all who transgressed it—no mercy was to be shewn to the guilty—yet mercy was in the great Ruler and King of Israel, the great Executive of

that nation. To him the penitent applied for mercy, and it was granted to the salvation of his soul. All the world stands guilty before God, condemned by law. The penitent sinner applies to God for mercy—and mercy is granted. This act in the divine government is not contrary to law nor justice, but approved by the government. Mercy is a divine perfection, which was not vested in God, but existed in him from eternity—it breathes forgiveness. We are taught to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us" and, "If our brother repent, forgive him." "Forgiving one another even as God for Christ's sake (by or in Christ) hath forgiven us." From these, and many similar passages we are taught that the penitent is the object of forgiveness, and that we should take God as our example of forgiveness.

Mr. B. before you proceed farther, I would propose an objection to your theory. It is said, Exod. 34, that God will by no means clear the guilty. The guilty must therefore be cleared of the demands of law and justice before he can receive forgiveness. This must be done either by himself, or by the surety, Jesus Christ. If he has not made satisfaction to law and justice, or fully paid the debt of obedience and suffering in the sinner's stead, I can see no way how the guilty can be forgiven.

Mr. C. If that text (Exod. xxxiv. 7,) be correctly translated, all hope would be cut off from the world—The words *the guilty* are a supplement of the translators, evidently wrong, and contrary to every page of revelation. Who, but the guilty need pardon? and to whom, but the guilty can it be given?—The whole of revelation authorizes us to supply the words, *the impenitent*, "Who will by no means clear or forgive *the impenitent*." Besides, on the very hypothesis of the brother last up, God does by some means, i. e. by the satisfaction made by Jesus, clear the guilty, yet the text says, he can do it by *no means*. This completely contradicts the popular theory on this subject. God's forgiveness as naturally flows to the penitent, as waters flow downwards; and it is as unnatural that forgiveness should flow to the impenitent, as for water to run upwards.

The world needs repentance, and to effect this was the council of God engaged in devising the best means. That means is developed in the gospel—the very spirit of it, is, to overcome evil with good; or by goodness to lead mankind to repentance. This goodness of God is eminently displayed in the gift of Jesus Christ—his life, death, resurrection, and ascension to Glory. In order to make it appear plainly that the gospel was designed to bring mankind to repentance, that they might receive the forgiveness of sins, I will offer a few arguments from the word of God. Acts v. 31. Jesus was exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins. This is the great work of his mediation. He came

an ambassador from Heaven to call, not the righteous, but sinners to repentance. The very ministry of Christ was the ministry of reconciliation—and this is the same as repentance—for none truly repent but such as are reconciled, and none are reconciled but such as repent. It is unnecessary to prove that the gospel is the means of leading mankind to repentance; or that the goodness, love and grace of God manifested in the gospel lead to repentance; "Not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." Rom. ii. 4. Justification of the ungodly, and forgiveness, according to Paul's definition, are the same. Rom. iv. 5–8. Therefore the goodness of God, revealed in the gospel, leads to repentance, and repentance, to justification or forgiveness. But the gospel will never be an effectual means to lead to repentance, until it is believed; therefore it is so frequently declared that we are justified by faith—because faith leads to repentance, and consequently, to forgiveness. We are said to be justified by *his blood*—How? By faith in his blood. For in his blood the love of God is commended or displayed to us—believing in the blood, we also believe in the Love of God to us—this leads to repentance or reconciliation, and, of course, to forgiveness. We are also said to be justified by his resurrection; "He was raised again for our justification." How? By faith in his resurrection; for the resurrection is a farther developement of the goodness of God in the gospel plan. This believed leads to the same results, repentance and forgiveness. We are also said to be justified by works—Because faith leads us to obedience, to reformation, to baptism, and to all the requirements of the gospel. Obedience is as indispensable as faith, in order to our justification or forgiveness, and salvation. "Hence it is said "Reform, or repent and be baptized for the remission of sins." Lest I be misunderstood, I repeat, that grace, mercy and forgiveness are perfections of God—that forgiveness is exercised on the penitent only. That the whole plan of the gospel is to lead to repentance, and consequent forgiveness—and that this plan becomes effectual through faith and obedience. Now the at-one-ment, or reconciliation takes place.

Mr. B. If I understand the brother's doctrine, it confines the efficacy of Christ's blood to man entirely; and excludes the idea of its having any effect on God, his law, justice or government. To me it is evident that Jesus magnified the law and made it honorable, so that God might be just in justifying the ungodly.

Mr. C. I am correctly understood. I do deny that the death of Christ had any influence on God to make him more merciful, or gracious or placable to sinners, or more disposed to pardon them, farther than that by the death of Christ they were led to repentance. God is unchangeable. We grant the law was magnified and made honorble, not by the blood or death of Christ, (for every principle of the law was outraged by

the death of the innocent Saviour; it was the most lawless wicked deed ever done by man,) but by his unreserved obedience to all its precepts; for had it been a dishonorable law, he would not have honored it by his obedience. Our brother is not alone in thinking that the death of Christ had done someteing to make God righteous in justifying him that believes in Jesus. The text (Rom. III. 25,) does not intimate that the blood of Jesus *made* God righteous in justifying the believer, but that he was set forth, a propitiatory or mercy-seat, to declare that God could be righteous in justifying him that believeth in Jesus. This declaration is mercifully made to silence every objection, and to remove every doubt from the guilty sinner's mind, that God will and can justify him, if he believe in Jesus.

Dr. P. The scriptures abound with expressions like the following—That by the blood of Jesus we are redeemed, ransomed, purchased and bought. These effects are surely not confined to man; but must be considered as passing on others. Let this difficulty be explained, and my mind will be more clear to admit the doctrine of our bro. C to be true.

Mr. C. These expressions are used metaphorically in the bible. God is said to have *redeemed*, *ransomed*, *purchased* and *bought* his people from Egyptian bondage, when he saved or delivered them by the hand of Moses. Exod. xv. 16. Deut. XXXII. 6. Deut. VII. 8. Psal. LXXIV. 2, &c. So when Jesus by his blood is said to have done the same, we are to understand it in the same sense. Those, who take the words in the literal sense, have been long divided in opinion, whether the purchase was made from God or the Devil, and to which the ransom was paid. Justin, Ireneus, Clemens Alex, Tertullian, Origen, Basil &c. maintained that the ransom was paid to the Devil: but Gregory Naz, Augustine, Athanasius, and Ambrose contended that the ransom was paid to God: This sentiment was generally held by the schoolmen. (Dr. Murd: p. 41.) I beg leave to read a few pages on this subject in Stone's Address. (He then read p. 54, 55, 56.)

Mr. R. We have lost sight of the article under consideration. I am more than ever confirmed in the sentiment that we never can agree in any system of doctrine formed by the wisdom of man. It is a vain attempt for us to labor to do it. Let us abandon the idea, and be contented with the book of God as he delivered it to us. Had he seen it expedient that his church should have a compendious system of doctrine, his goodness would have given it. But he knew that man would have wrested this compend from its true meaning, and a party spirit would have turned this to its own interests. Let us agree to reject all creeds of human mould, and adopt the word of God alone as our directory. We may err in understanding every part of it; but let us bear with those errors, where they do not affect the holy life of those who may hold them. By this forbearance we shall be in the fairest way of convincing each other, and uniting in the truth.

Bish. M. I wish not to be hasty. Let us have one more meeting, and endeavor to come to a perfect understanding on this subject, for it is important. To this there was not a dissenting voice. They parted in Christian love to meet at some future period. EDITOR.

OBSERVER'S FRIEND.

Over this signature a communication is addressed to the Editor from Jackson, Ohio, on the subject of dancing. I should insert the whole, but for two or three reasons, which I shall name as an apology to my worthy correspondent, why I have not done it. One is, that, his eulogies of the essays, style and spirit of the humble Messenger are too high for its real merit. 2ndly. The subject has but feeble claims to serious investigation. 3rdly. The subject is but lightly touched in the scriptures, as are many others, and of which, some are not once named, yet reckoned irreligious; as theatres, card-playing, billiards, horse-racing, and scores of similar vices, (amusements, if you please,)—as well might my correspondent justify any of these practices, by saying, they are not condemned in the scriptures. Why do we condemn them? Because they are found to be demoralizing, and soul destroying. These evil streams prove the source corrupt, and in direct opposition to the revelations of God.

In conclusion of a very sensible, polite and lengthy communication, my correspondent asks two questions: 1st: "Is there any thing in the act of dancing that may be considered criminal in a religious point of view? and if there is, how far may a person be allowed to keep time with music, without intruding upon the rules of decorum, from seeming to stand uneasy while music is playing, up to the full exercise of stepping out the time with his feet on the floor? 2ndly: How far should tatling, lying, meddling with other people's business, hatred, variance, strife, envy &c. be countenanced in the church before notice should be taken of it? and what would be the most regular way to proceed in such cases."

To the first query I answer. The criminality of actions is to be determined by the motive. A man may kill his good and dutiful son, and be guiltless; because he had no evil motive or intention in the act. The very same act may be virtuous and criminal. Dancing was a virtuous act in Miriam and the women of Israel, when they played the timbrels and kept time with the music in dances. This was a religious act Exod. xv. 20. So was dancing a religious act with David, when he brought up the ark of the Lord, 2 Sam. 6. He calls upon all to praise the Lord in the dance Ps. 150. At the restoration of Israel, Jeremiah prophecies that "Then shall the virgin rejoice

in the dance, both young men and old together." Jer. xxxi. 13. Dancing was an act of worship, shall it be prostituted to the purpose of irreligious amusements! None will deny that the dances in the origies of Bacchus were profanely criminal—none will deny that the dances of the aborgines of the West Indies were detestibly wicked. I heve seen many, religiously affected, praise God in the dance; and have not one existing doubt that the praise was accepted of God. The criminality of dancing consists in the motive. If sincerely it be performed as an act of worship, I dare not condemn it. But if not, I dare nos justify it. As to the 2nd query, I say such vices should not be ever countenanced, but speedily corrected or frowned out of the church, as well as irreligious dancing. EDITOR.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. III.*

The question of *justification* is a question which all confess to be worthy of the most serious, solemn, and profound investigation. It is now revived The meaning of christian immersion has called up this question in a new form, and has elicited, and is likely still to elicit, a peculiar attention. We are bold to affirm our conviction that since the great apostacy from original christianity, justification has not been placed clearly, fully, scripturally, satisfactorily before the minds of any portion of the community.

Expecting to have seen before this date the remarks of Mr. Andrew Broaddus on the "*Extra, No.* 1, *on Remission of Sins,*" we have delayed offering to our readers any remarks on the subject of remission of sins under the term *justification.* Archippus has made it necessary that we should pay some attention to it sooner than we had contemplated. What appears to us a confused view of the doctrine of *justification*, lies at the bottom of the opposition to the immersion for the forgiveness of sins. In anticipation of the forthcoming review of Mr. Broaddus, and in reply to the essays of Archippus on the import of baptism as preached to the Gentiles, we are constrained to call the attention of our readers to the "doctrine of justification." Archippus and Mr. Broaddus, however they may agree in the import of immersion, appear to stand upon the ground that *the Gentiles are justified by faith* ALONE. Now, reader, is it not strange that differing from them both, and they differ from one another in some respects, we should take the same premises; or, in other words, contend with them that we are justified by faith, and yet preach *immersion for the remission of sins!* Such, however, is the fact, as the sequel will show.

Every thing here, as in all other discussions and examinations, depends on the proper definition of the terms. The "*doctrine*" of justification is with us the meaning of the word *justification:* for words are signs of ideas, and therefore our ideas are known by words. The first question here, then, is, In what sense did the Jews, or rather in what sense did the Apostles use the terms *justify, justified, justification?* This decided, and we are prepared to examine the objections of our dissenting brethren.

Ask the gentlemen of the forum, or rather the members of the courts of judicature, what this term imports in their usage, and we vouch for them they will not say that to be justified and to be pardoned are the same thing. Nay, they will assert that they cannot be applied to the same person in the same state. The person justified with them, cannot be pardoned; and he that is with them pardoned, cannot be justified; for he is condemned. Hence pardons come not to the justified, but to the condemned. To justify a person with them is to prove him innocent of the crime alledged—it is to declare him *just*; and, therefore, he that is justified with them has nothing to be forgiven. Commentators on law and religion admit this to be the forensic import of the term. But the question is, Did the Jews, or did the Apostles use the term in the forensic use? Or did they use it as equivalent to *pardon?* To decide this matter with certainty, we have only to examine the use of the term in all the passages in which it occurs. Some of them will doubtless furnish decisive evidences of the meaning which they applied to *justify, justified,* and *justification.*

After a diligent examination of all the passages in which this term occurs, we are assured that, with them, to be pardoned and to be justified represented the same state, or the same act; and, therefore, pardon and justification were, with them, synonymous. For examples:—

Before detailing these examples which fix its meaning in reference to the question of personal justification or pardon, it ought to be remarked that the word is sometimes used in a forensic sense when applied to persons not needing pardon. Thus Jesus is said to have been *justified* in, or by the Spirit; *i. e.* declared to be just, or fully sustained in all his pretensions to be the Messiah. "Wisdom is also *justified* of her children." "By thy words thou shalt be *justified.*" "That thou mightest be *justified* in thy sayings," sustained or proved to be just and true. But these are not to the point, and we only allude to them for the sake of the captious.

In reference to sinners, it is equivalent to *pardon.* Acts xiii. 39. "Through this man is proclaimed to you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things (from all sins) from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses." Here it certainly is equivalent to *pardon* or *forgiveness of sins.* Thus the term "justified" is used always in the Acts of Apostles. Paul, in the Romans, uses it in the same sense, chap. iv. verse 5. "God *justifieth* the ungodly." In proof of this justification of the ungodly, he quotes David saying, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose

sins are covered! Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The non-imputation of sin, the remission of it, and justification, are here shown to be convertible phrases—of the same sense and meaning. In the same chapter, verse 25, the Apostle says Jesus was delivered for our offences and raised again, not for our offences, but for the removal of them—"*for our justification*." In the 5th chapter also it is used in the same sense;—condemnation for one offence and justification from many offences are contrasted to show the difference between the Fall and the free gift by Jesus. But, indeed, it is always used in this sense when a change of state is spoken of, or when sinners are said to be justified.

The term "justify," and all its derivatives, being thus defined, we are now prepared to inquire whether a man is justified or pardoned by faith. If we ask the Westminster Assembly they will soon decide this matter. They ask the question and answer it for us:—

"*Quest.* 70. What is justification?"

"*Ans.* Justification is an act of God's free grace unto sinners, in which he pardoneth all their sin, (very good) accepteth and accounteth their persons righteous in his sight, (very good) not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone."

This, *by faith alone*, is Archippus' and I think my friend Broaddus' answer to the questions. I would say *by faith alone* too, had it not been that James positively says "*not by faith alone*." "You see, says James, "that a man is justified by works, and not by faith *alone*. That a man is justified by faith, both Paul and James declare; but neither of them will say by faith *alone* This is just the jet of the whole controversy—by faith in connexion with other considerations, or by faith alone.

Those who preach pardon by faith alone, among whom is my friend Archippus, rely upon those passages which speak of justification and faith as connected; such as "God will justify the pagan by faith," or "being justified by faith," &c. not considering that none of them says what the Assembly's catechism says, viz: that we are justified by faith alone. We preach that a man is justified by faith; but they add "*alone*." Now we have the scriptures, and they have not; and that is all the difference between us. They have not a verse, from Genesis to Revelation, which says "by faith alone"—we have one that says "not by faith alone," and some that ascribe pardon and justification to other principles, as worthy of having "*alone*" attached to them as faith.

I would ask my friends who proclaim *faith alone*, whether they would allow us to say by grace alone, by blood alone, by works alone, by water alone, by knowledge alone! and it must be confessed that sinners are said to be justified, or pardoned, or saved by each of these. "By grace you are saved;" but

not by grace alone—"God had saved you by the washing of regeneration;" but not by the washing of regeneration only—"Baptism does also now save us;" but not baptism alone—"justified by his blood;" but not by his blood alone—"you see that a man is justified by works;" but not by works alone. If, then, they will not allow us to add "alone" to grace, blood, water, works; we will not allow them to add "alone" to faith. Grace, blood, knowledge, faith, water, the Holy Spirit, and good works, are all necessary to the enjoyment of the full salvation of the gospel. Hence either justification or salvation is ascribed to each of these, in the oracles of God—"You are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus"—"Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him"—"By the knowledge of him shall my righteous servant justify many, whose iniquities he shall have borne"—"Being justified by faith, we have peace with God"—"Immersion does also now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead"—"God has saved us, not by works of righteousness (previously done) but by his own mercy through the bath of regeneration and *the renewal of the Holy Spirit*. You see that a man is justified by works, and not by faith alone." Give, then, to each of these its due, its proper place in the developement and enjoyment of the salvation of the gospel, and we have the whole Apostolic doctrine; but so soon as any sectary comes with his pen and places *alone* when and where he pleases, and thus excludes one, or changes the order of some of these great principles, he assumes the character of him whom we Protestants distinguish by the appellation of Anti-Christ. We speak not of any of the human family who have not had the gospel preached to them, but of those to whom the word of this salvation is sent, and to them we say, that each and all of these are necessary to the full enjoyment of this salvation. You must *confess* to salvation as well as believe to righteousness; you must have the knowledge of God and his Son Jesus Christ; you must have the grace of God and receive the blood of Christ, and be immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus, as well as implicitly rely upon all that is promised in the book. So we speak to all those who have ears to hear what the Spirit of God testifies to mankind concerning Jesus and his salvation.

In hopes that Archippus and my friend Andrew Broaddus will give all that consideration which is due to these remarks, I have, in reply to the former and in anticipation of the latter, hastily sketched the premises for various arguments, which shall be forthcoming when occasion requires.

Please, reader, remember these are but *premises*. Yet from them we have, we think, already concluded, to the conviction or confutation of all opponents, that, to say salvation comes, is received, or enjoyed by faith alone, is not of God, but of man.

EDITOR.

UNION.

The question is going the round of society, and is often proposed to us, Why are not you and the Reformed Baptists, one people? or, Why are you not united? We have uniformly answered; In spirit we are united, and that no reason existed on our side to prevent the union in form. It is well known to those brethren, and to the world, that we have always, from the beginning, declared our willingness, and desire to be united with the whole family of God on earth, irrespective of the diversity of opinion among them. The Reformed Baptists have received the doctrine, taught by us many years ago. For nearly 20 years we have taught that Sectarianism was antichristian, and that all Christians should be united in the one body of Christ—the same they teach. We *then* and ever since, have taught that authoritative creeds and confessions were the strong props of sectarianism, and should be given to the moles and the bats—they teach the same. We have from that time preached the gospel to every creature to whom we had access, and urged them to believe and obey it—that its own evidence was sufficient to produce faith in all that heard it, that the unrenewed sinner must, and could believe it unto justification and salvation—and that through faith the Holy Spirit of promise, and every other promise of the New Covenant, were given. They proclaim the same doctrine. Many years ago some of us preached baptism as a means, in connexion with faith and repentance, for the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit—they preach the same, and extend it farther than we have done. We rejected all names, but Christian—they acknowledge it most proper, but seem to prefer another. We acknowledge a difference of opinion from them on some points. We do not object to their opinions as terms of fellowship between us. But they seriously and honestly object to some of ours as reasons why they cannot unite. These we shall name, and let all duly consider their weight.

Objection 1st: That we have fellowship, and commune with unimmersed persons. They contend, (so we understand them) that according to the New Institution, none but the immersed have their sins remitted; and therefore they cannot commune with the unimmersed. On this point we cannot agree with them, and the reason of our disagreement, is, that this sentiment, in our view will exclude millions of the fairest characters, for many centuries back, from heaven. For if the immersed only, receive the remission of sins, all those millions that have died, being unimmersed, have died in their sins, or unwashed from their sins. Jesus said, "If ye die in your sins, where God is, you can never come." Of course they are excluded from heaven. Hell therefore, must be their portion; for protestants do not believe in a purgatory: Why are they sent to hell? For disobedience to the one command of being immersed. Hear the poor creature's complaint, while suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. On earth, says he, in obedience to the King, whom I loved, whose laws I loved, whose family I loved, I denied myself, took up my cross and followed him. I was taught that it was my duty to be baptized, and that baptism meant to be sprinkled with water; in the humble spirit of obedience I submitted, not knowing but that this was the very way the King meant this command to be observed. But now, alas! for my ignorance of the right way of performing one command, I must be forever banished from God into everlasting punishment. What should we think of an earthly king, if a province of loving subjects, being ignorant of the meaning of a certain law, and yet endeavoring to obey it according to their understanding of it, should by his order be cut off by an excruciating death! Surely, we should reprobate his conduct, and should see in his character that which is less amiable than otherwise. Is it possible to divest ourselves of the same thoughts and conclusion respecting the lovely King of saints! Should we not, by presenting his character in this view, expose it to the contempt of a scoffing world!

I know our brethren say, *We do not declare that they are excluded from heaven, but only from the kingdom on earth. We leave them in the hand of God.* But does not the sentiment lead to that conclusion? We believe, and acknowledge, that Baptism is ordained by the King a means for the remission of sins to penitent believers; but we cannot say, that immersion is the *sine qua non*, without maintaining the awful consequence above, and without contradicting our own experience. We therefore teach the doctrine, believe, repent, and be immersed for the remission of sins; and we endeavor to convince our hearers of its truth; but we exercise patience and forbearance towards such pious persons, as cannot be convinced.

2ndly. Another cause or reason, why we and they are not united as one people, is, that we have taken different names. They acknowledge the name *Christian* most appropriate; but because they think this name is disgraced by us who wear it, and that to it may be attached the idea of Unitarian or Trinitarian, they reject it, and have taken the older name, *Disciple*. This they have done in order to be distinguished from us. Hence it is concluded that they wish to be a party distinguished from us, and have therefore assumed this name as a party name. This at once bars us from union in the same body, and we cannot but believe it was assumed for this purpose, by some. We should rejoice to believe the contrary. Until a satisfactory explanation be given on this subject, we must view ourselves equally excluded from union with the congregation of the Disciples, as from any other sectarian establishment. We object not to the scriptural name, Disciple, but to the reasons why our brethren assumed it.

We are ready any moment, to meet and unite with those brethren, or any others, who believe in, and obey the Saviour

according to their best understanding of his will, on the Bible, but not on opinions of its truth. We cannot with our present views unite on the opinion that unimmersed persons cannot receive the remission of sins, and therefore should be excluded from our fellowship and communion on earth. We cannot conscientiously give up the name *Christian*, acknowledged by our brethren most appropriate, for any other (as *Disciple*) less appropriate, and received to avoid the disgrace of being suspected to be a Unitarian or Trinitarian. We cannot thus temporize with divine truth.

We have frequently, and for more than a quarter of a century, contended for the name *Christian*, as that given by divine authority, and designed to supersede all other names of the Lord's followers. We are sorry that the New Translation, purporting to give us that of Doc. Doddridge on the Acts of the Apostles, has rejected his, and given us another of Acts xi. 26. Doc. Doddridge's translation is "And the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch." If this be a correct translation, then the matter is forever put to rest, that the will of God, is, that the older name *Disciple* should cease, and the new name *Christian* should forever after take place of it. To reject the name *Christian* for any other is to act in opposition to the will of God; so it appears to us. Doddridge in justification of his translation, observes in a note; "I think with Dr. Benson, that the use of the word *Chrematisai* (*named*) implies that it *was done by a divine direction*. As proof he refers us to Matt. ii. 12, 22. Luke ii. 26. Acts x. 22. Heb. viii. 5–11. vii. 12, 25 where the same word is used. Let us examine every passage in the N. Testament where the word *Chrematizo* (*was called*) occurs; and, I think, that the translation, *were named by divine appointment*, will be found correct and true. In Matt. ii. 12, 22 the word is translated, "*being warned of God*"—or divinely warned. In Luke ii. 26, the word is translated, *It was revealed* to him by the Holy Ghost. In Acts x. 22, the word is translated; Cornelius "*was warned of God* by a holy angel to send for thee." In Heb. viii. 5, it is translated "Moses *was admonished of God*." Heb. xi. 7, it is rendered, "By faith Noah *being warned of God*." In Heb. xii. 25. "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh; for if they escaped not who refused him *that spake* on earth—the word *spake* is translated from the same word *Chrematizo*, and should according to the translations above, be rendered, refuse not him that *divinely spake*, *admonished*, or *warned* on earth." It is too plain to deny, that Moses spake by divine authority, and therefore his warnings and admonitions were divine oracles. The same word occurs Rom. vii. 3. "So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she *shall be called* an adulteress," that is, she *shall be called by divine authority* an adulteress. This is the natural meaning, from which none can dissent.

Doc. A. Clark on the text, (Acts xi. 26.) is of the same opinion with Dr. Doddridge with respect to the meaning of *Chrematizo;* he says, it signifies, in the New Testament, to *appoint*, *warn*, or *nominate* by *divine direction*. The learned Doc. adds, "A *Christian*, therefore, is the highest character, which any human being can bear on earth; and to receive it from God, as those appear to have done, how glorious the title!"

To confirm this meaning of the word *Chrematizo*, I will add a few extracts from Josephus, a classic Greek writer. They are cited by Dr. Parkhurst on the word. "Moses *Echrematizeto*, was *instructed* by God in what he desired." "Josephus calling an *oracular dream* of *Jaddus* the Highpriest's, *to Chrematisthen*, what *was divinely communicated* to him." I think, I have referred to every passage of the New Testament where the word occurs, and it is now left with the public to determine whether Dr. Doddridge's translation be not correct, *i. e.* That the disciples were by divine appointment first named Christians at Antioch."

This translation of Doddridge fully comports with the prophecy of Isaiah lxii. 2. "And thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." Again lxv. 15, the prophet speaking of the fall, rejection and overthrow of the Lord's people, the Jews, says. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." This *new name* the ancient fathers believed was *Christian* Eusebius thus speaks of the first converts of christianity; "It is most certain, when as the coming of our Saviour Christ was now fresh in the minds of all men, that a new nation neither small nor weak, neither such as was conversant and situate in corners of fountains and well-springs, but of all other most populous and most religious, secure as touching danger, and of invincible mind, aided continually by the divine power of God, at certain secret seasons, suddenly appeared, the same I say being beautified among all men by the *title and name of Christ:* The which one of the prophets foreseeing to come to pass, with the single eye of the divine Spirit, being astonished spake thus: Who hath heard such things? Or who hath spoken after this manner? Hath the earth travailing brought forth in one day? hath any nation sprung up suddenly and at one time? In another place he hath also signified the same to come to pass, where he saith; They that serve me shall be called after a new name, which shall be blessed on earth. Isai. 66, and 62. Although presently we plainly appear to be upstarts, and this name of *Christians* of late to have been notified unto all nations &c." Lib. 1. ch. 5. In this same chapter Eusebius goes on to shew, that the saints of old as Noah, Abraham and others were Christians *in deed*, though not *in name*, and quotes as proof the 105 psalm, "See that ye touch not my Christs (that is, anointed) neither deal perversely with my prophets." This name *Christian* was

the new name given by the Lord to his people, according to the early fathers, and by which they were called.

It was the name by which the Disciples of Christ were peculiarly distinguished after they were called so at Antioch. Agrippa said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Acts xxvi. 28. Peter said "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed," Pet. iv. 15. The Lord commends the church in Pergamos that "thou holdest fast my name," and the church in Philadelphia, "thou hast not denied my name." Against the name *Christian* persecution raged, and thousands suffered martyrdom for it. Had they denied the name, their lives would not have been taken. It is an old argument, yet its antiquity does not make it weak, that as the woman takes the name of her husband—so the Bride the church, should properly be called by that of her husband, Christ. It is believed there are none who deny that *Christian* is the most appropriate name for the followers of Christ, though many prefer others, for various reasons. It is the name which must and will supersede all other denominations, and be a means of uniting the scattered flock.

Our brethren, the Disciples, ask us, How can you grant the privileges of the kingdom to such as have not been immersed, when it is plain that by immersion only they are born or made members of the kingdom? How can you commune with such at the Lord's table? I answer, that there are many things done under the New Institution or covenant, which were divinely instituted before that covenant was fully confirmed, and declared; yet these things were designed to be perpetuated to the end of time. Thus prayer, praise, thanksgiving, teaching, preaching, and even the Lord's supper, were divinely instituted, before Jesus died, was buried and rose again; consequently, before the foundation of the New Institution was fully laid, and of course, before any were built upon it. John's baptism brought none into the new kingdom. The Disciples, and the rest of the 120 on Pentecost, were therefore not inducted into this new kingdom by immersion, yet they prayed, praised and communed with those in it, and these divine acts were reciprocated. As well might we forbid unimmersed persons to pray, to praise, to teach, as to forbid them to commune. These priveliges were enjoyed before the kingdom was established, and before the New Institution took place; and we dare not say, they are now taken from them? It was not done at Pentecost. It has not been divinely done at any period since. What authority have we for inviting or debarring any pious, holy believer from the Lord's table? Though it is done by many, we see no divine authority for it. The King's will is, that his friends do this in remembrance of him—and all that his law expressed on the subject is, "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat and drink—If he eats and drinks unworthily, he eats and drinks damnation to himself, (not to others)

not discerning the Lord's body. He has no where established a court of inquisition to fence his table, nor to prevent any from praying, praising, or worshipping him, unless they have been immersed. We confess we cannot see why so much more importance should be attached to the Lord's supper, than to the other divine commands. We have long feared that the feast of love has been made by designing men an occasion of discord and division among the saints. We have seen many unimmersed possess the spirit of the kingdom; and we have seen many immersed destitute of it. To receive the latter, and to reject the former, we cannot view divine.

If we philosophize on religion, we may amuse the intelligent, but are unprofitable to all. Nothing but truth, truth felt, truth preached in the spirit, and truth copied in our lives, will arrest the attention, and gain and fix the heart of a drowsy, dying world.

I have long thought, and seriously thought, whether a formal union on the Bible, without possessing the spirit of that book, would be a blessing or a curse to society—whether it would be better than faith without works, or than a body without the Spirit—whether it would not rather be a stumbling block, a delusive snare to the world. O, my brethren, let us repent and do our first works—let us seek for more holiness, rather than trouble ourselves and others with schemes and plans of union. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost given unto us, will more effectually unite, than all the wisdom of the world combined. Endeavor to walk in peace and love with all. Then shall we feel a reviving from the presence of the Lord, and see, flowing to the Lord, weeping penitents, pleading for mercy, and praising aloud for mercy received through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

EDITOR.

P. S. We continually receive heart cheering accounts of great revivals in the East and in the South. I am one of those, who believe that God is a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, and therefore urge the brethren to turn their attention from the noise and strife about religion to humble fervent prayer for religion. Would it not be profitable and conducive to this end to have frequent prayer meetings? and that we agree, throughout America, to devote one particular day in every month for this work? The question is submitted, and an answer awaited. EDITOR.

REVIVALS.

SANGAMO CO. ILLINOIS, April 8, 1831.

BRO: STONE:—I take this opportunity to let you know our situation in this country. Blessed be God, we have had a refreshing time from his presence this winter. Notwithstanding the severity and coldness of the season, our hearts have been

often warmed with the spirit of our Lord. We planted a church in this settlement in Nov. of eleven members. It was a happy day. While the brethren and sisters were rejoicing in the Lord, the congregation was in tears. I gave an invitation to those, that wished us to pray for them, to make it known. Every non professor in the congregation gave their hand. The work is still going on—our congregations are large—many are putting on Christ, by being buried with him in baptism.

Yours in the bonds of Christian love,

HUGHES BOWLES.

PENDLETON CO. KY. May 24, 1831.

BRO: STONE:—We constituted a church at my house in Oct. last, of 19 members, taking the scriptures alone for our faith and practice. The work of the Lord has continued among us, and our number has increased to 26. Last Saturday and Lord's day was our communion. A number of the Baptist, and Methodist brethren, communed with us. And we can truly say where sectarianism did once abound, union and love do much more abound. Our meeting is the fourth Lord's day of each month. My house is eight miles above Falmouth on Main Licking River. We wish the preaching brethren to call, and preach for us.

F. McKENNEY.

BRATTONVILLE, S. C. June 9, 1831.

DEAR BROTHER—I have just left my plough a few minutes to inform you how I am doing. I have four stated places of religious worship, where I attend, and, in my way, labor in word and doctrine—I hope my labor is not in vain in the Lord. I have immersed since I last wrote you, six hopeful converts to the Christian religion. Liberal Christianity is gaining ground in this country. There is a greater door open here now for the developement of truth, than has ever been since I have lived here, I am still alone. Oh that some of my brethren would find it in their heart to visit South Carolina! I do think it would not be in vain. The C. Messenger is doing good here, and so is the M. Harbinger. I hope that neither of them will be diverted from their original object. I am not so well pleased with some of bro. Campbell's remarks respecting the people called *Christians*, he is but man, and can only see in part; and I know that Christian forbearance is a great and a rare virtue in our age.

Wishing you grace mercy and peace, I am your brother in the hope of immortality.

JOHN L. DAVIS.

From the Christian Herald.

CATO, CAYUGA CO. N. Y, May 30, 1831.

BRO: FOSTER—It is with much pleasure that I can inform you that the good work of reformation still continues to spread with a glorious influence on the mind and conduct of many; 43 have been baptized in this neighborhood, and many more will soon unite in church fellowship.

Brother G. Showers jr. (as I am informed) baptized a number yesterday, and is about organizing a new society in the town of Hannibal, North of us.

Within the bounds of the church in Granby, the work of reformation has lately commenced with greater rapidity.

'In Wells,' says a correspondent of the Christian Mirror, "the Lord is triumphing gloriously. About 1000 attended an inquiry meeting on the 26th ult. Aged men with whitened locks may be seen there, bowed down to the earth under conviction of sin, and may be heard one after another, in a religious meeting, to avow their determination to forsake all for Christ. Oh, these are times, when language is weak and thought is poor, and man feels his nothingness, and Jesus seems all glorious. Let the Redeemer be exalted, men and brethren of every name, who love him, and you shall see his power and grace displayed."

Stillwater, N. Y.—A correspondent at Schenectaday, says: the work of God is progressing with amazing power in Stillwater. Some families have all been brought in, and scarcely a single family remains unaffected. *Ros. Ch. Her.*

City of Washington.—A revival of religion is now witnessed in this city. Large numbers have already found the Saviour, and been added to the different churches. Between three and four hundred came forward for prayers at the close of a four days meeting, recently held there.

From the Morning Star.

REVIVAL IN NORTH CAROLINA.

BRO: BALL:—The present seems to be a time of awakening and revival among many of the churches of the Redeemer in these United States. Whilst the conversion of thousands in many of the Northern States, has created joy in the bosom of every christian who has heard the tidings, it is peculiarly gratifying to know that in our own and the neighboring State of North Carolina, the Lord has commenced and is carrying on a glorious and most extensive work.—You have already received intelligence of the revival which commenced some time last fall in the counties of Wake, Franklin, and Nash; and as I have recently had the privilege of visiting that region it may not be improper to communicate through the medium of the Herald, what my own eyes beheld of the salvation of God. There are ten or twelve churches in the above named counties, to which this visitation of mercy has been chiefly confined. A few of these have received large accessions, whilst among others, the shower of mercy is just beginning to descend. The

glad countenances of the recently renewed, and their songs of rejoicing, indicate a consciousness of reconciliation with God, and an earnest desire to live no longer to the lusts of the flesh, but to Christ. There is also a large number, who seem deeply concerned to know, what they shall do to be saved.' At one place of worship I attended, there were about twenty persons; and at another thirty, who presented themselves as anxious to be reconciled to God. With the character of the work, I was much pleased. So far as I can judge, there is nothing of extravagance or enthusiasm in conducting the revival. The preaching of our brethren Crudup, Purify, Crocker, Worrell, and Bennet, (who are the principal laborers) is simple, evangelical, and faithful, and the feelings of the people seem to be scriptural and rational. The number baptized by these brethren since last fall, may be safely estimated at not less than four hundred.

Yours, affectionately,

JAMES B. TAYLOR.

FROM BENJAMIN KEITH,—*South Truro, Mass. April* 28, 1831.

"We have for several weeks past been enjoying a gracious out pouring of the Divine Spirit and a blessed revival of the work of God. It is a work of conviction, and pardoning condemned and guilty sinners who were wounded by the Holy Spirit, burdened with the guilt and condemnation of sin, and groaning for deliverance through the blood of the Lamb of God. It is a work of holiness in the Church, in quickening, reviving, and deepening the work of grace in the hearts of believers. Many who were stout hearted and very far from righteousness, have been brought nigh by the blood of Christ, and adopted into the family of God. Some who had strayed far from God and happiness, and were miserably backslidden in heart and life, have returned to their heavenly Father's house, where they now find bread enough and to spare. The definite number which have become the subjects of this work I am not prepared to state. But I keep within due bounds when I say there are more than forty who have been converted to God, and are now rejoicing in Jesus their Saviour."—*N. E. C. Her.*

A gentleman in Edgartown, Mass. writes April 28, 1831:—"We are blessed at present with the greatest revival of religion ever witnessed in this place. It is now about six weeks since its commencement, and scores have been brought out of darkness into the glorious light of the gospel, and the work still continues with increasing power.

"We have conversions every meeting, and our meetings are every evening, and sometimes in the day. It is one of the most pleasing reformations I ever witnessed."

The Boston Chr. Herald observes, "The Lord God hath wrought and is now doing a great work in extending his kingdom and his reign. Here are souls who believe in the operation of the Holy Spirit on the heart, they feel it, they know it, they have been brought up from the lowest degradation and are rising to a standing with them that love God. Tell such that experimental religion is delusion and they know *you* are deluded; they know in whom they have trusted. The number of such it is impossible at this time to tell; but we confidently say and believe there are hundreds of this happy number.

From the Christian Herald.

In Wells, in Kennebunk, and in Portland, the work of God is going on with power. In one of the places, the Lord is pouring out his spirit in the Unitarian Congregational Society, many have been converted and many more are anxiously concerned to know, what they shall do to be saved; their preacher is much engaged for the salvation of souls, ond in his visits from house to house, earnestly urges the necessity of speedy repentance, and turning unto God with full purpose of heart.

In Portland there is a general out pouring of the spirit; both of the Christian societies are sharing in the work. In Monmouth at the General Meeting, the Lord was there. The preachers and brethren who had assembled appeared to feel his presence and could rejoice to bring the joyful news of salvation—here too the weeping penitent seemed to add solemnity to the scene, and the attention of all appeared more or less called up, either to speak of the things of the kingdom of God and talk of his power or to hear what God the Lord would speak, through his people—The accounts which the preachers brought of the work of God in many places, of sinners bowing, of penitents finding pardon, of the unity of the Saints—of the planting of churches—of the effectual working of God's power in calling young men to the work of the ministry—of happy converts following their Saviour, in his command by being buried with him in baptism, and of the work of God in many of the different denominations, all tended to heighten the interest of the scene, and fill the heart with a glow of heavenly ardour.

We could but be deeply affected, with that gospel simplicity which seemed to pervade the heart of those who gathered to preach the glad tidings of salvation in the name of the once crucified son of God; and while so many have been captivated by the trappings of pride and conformity to the world—they seem to have been preserved—for which we thank God, and pray that that holy simplicity, which characterized the primitive disciples of the Lord Jesus, may always be recognized in them till the great Master shall bid them leave the walls of Zion to appear in his presence, to receive their reward.

We hope to hear, that lasting good was the result of that meeting—which will be the case if christians there, pray in faith, live near to God and are faithful in his cause.

On our return we understood that rising of forty were Bapti-

zed in Portland, in different societies on Lord's Day the 19th inst. Thus the work of God is going on and it will spread with rapid power, through the land if every christian will become a missionary of the cross, and feel as he should feel, the responsibility he is laid under, by the mercy of God, and by the compassion of Christ to him, to labour in his sphere, for the good of souls, and the upbuilding of the cause of Christ.—Ed.

Extract of a letter to the Editor, from Jonathan Maiston, dated, Monmouth, Me. May 20, 1831.

Bro. Clough:—The work of God has been progressing gloriously in many places in this section of our country, during the fall and winter past. In the town of Albion, more than two hundred have been brought to the saving knowledge of the truth.

There have been great revivals during the winter past in Livermore, Wilton, Chesterfield, and Farmington, with the adjoining towns.

There is great union among all denominations in these parts. The Methodist have gove into our chapel here, and preached when their own stood empty, which is not a very common thing. This to me looks like Christian union, which we have been so long contending for. My desire is, that sectarian principles may be swept from the earth, with all other refuges of lies—and that Christian love and union may universally prevail; then the cause of truth and righteousness will prosper. [*Gospel Luminary.*

Extract of a letter to the Editor of the Christian Herald, from Elder Samuel Nutt—Who in Jan[illegible] went to the province of New Brunswick, and preached to entire strangers for 15 months. In the first six weeks upwards of 100 experienced salvation in the parish of Wakefield—a short time after he baptized upwards of 80 more in Queensbury, and united them in a church on the New Testament. "I have, says he, in this town (where he wrote) baptized 217 souls, who have given satisfactory evidence of a deep and powerful work of God in the heart. I have ordained two brethren to the work of the ministry, who have baptized nearly 100 more. The work of God is still going on marvelously."

The Journal of Elder Nutt is truly interesting—written in the spirit of an humble, pious servant. The want of room prevents the insertion of the whole.

NOTICE.

The Miami C. Conference will meet in Day[illegible]O. the Friday before the 4th Lord's day of the present month.

The Union C. Conference will meet at Flower c[illegible]k, Pendleton co. Ky. on Friday before the first Lord's day [illegible] Aug.

The N. Ky. C. Conference will meet at Cynthiana the Friday before the 3d Lord's day of September next.

The Wabash C. Conference will meet at Busserun creek, Ia. on the Thursday before the 2nd Sunday in October next, at 10 o'clock in the morning.

STATISTICAL INFORMATION.

Southfork, Casey co. Ky. June 25, 1831.

Bro. Stone:—The South Kentucky Conference met at Union Meeting house in Whitly county Ky. on Friday before the 4th Lord's day in Sept. last, and continued four days, and about the half of three nights, as the brethren were encamped on the ground. The Elders present, were, James Storm, John H. Dunn, and myself; and unordained, John Cox, David Wilson, and John Storm (who in compliance with petitions from the churches where their membership was,) were set apart to the work of the ministry by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the Eldership. There were presented, and read, letters from 10 churches, representing the number in fellowship in said 10 churches to be about 370. This being only about one third of the churches belonging to this Conference. This meeting was truly a refreshing time to the brethren present. Not the smallest discord appeared, but all acknowledged the one Lord, one Father, one Baptism, and one God and Father of all. Several came forward (amongst whom were some Methodists) to put on Christ by baptism. And on leaving the place on Monday, we were surrounded by a crowd of weeping souls, to whom we had been trying to teach the old Gospel. We appointed to meet again on Friday before the 4th Lord's day in September next, at the town of Liberty, in Casey county, Ky. when and where we hope to be met by a number of the brethren from a distance.

THE FOLLOWING IS A LIST OF CHURCHES IN OUR BOUNDS.

Names of the houses or places of worship; and what built of	County in which located	Year when plant'd	No. of members
1 Pergamos (*wood*)	Casey	1819	59
2 Rolingfork (*Do.*)	Do.	1833	18
3 Liberty Town	Do.	1828	72
4 Russells (*wood*)	Do.	1830	15
5 Casey's creek	Adair	1822	15
6 Freedom (*wood*)	Russell	1828	21
7 Jourdan (*wood*)	Do.	1829	25
8 Price's (*wood*)	Do.	1824	45
9 Beaver creek (*wood*)	Wayne		40
10 Golson's (*wood*)	Do.	1828	9
11 Robertson's creek (*wood*)	Green	1825	14
12 Rockhouse (*brick*)	Cumberla'd	1826	28
13 Stogdon's valley (*wood*)	Do.	1826	18
14 Cedar & Bear creek	Do.	1830	10
15 Rushbranch (*wood*)	Lincoln	1829	17
16 McCormick's (*wood*)	Do.	1829	50

17 Schurlock's (*wood*)	Do.	1829	66
18 Union (*wood*)	Whitly		74
19 Poplar creek (*wood*)	Do.		18
THE FOLLOWING IS FROM ELDER WM. D. JONRDAN.			
Burksville	Cumberia'd	1829	14
Cumberland meeting-house	Do.	1828	68
Crocus creek	Do.		20
Overton	O'rton Ten	1830	22
		Total	742

Reformation is still advancing, and opposition increasing amongst the sectarians.

Yours, &c.

JOHN JONES, jr.

RECEIPTS FROM JUNE 1ST TO AUGUST 1ST.

Shelbyville Ky:—By C. C. Scott agent $5, of which for Wm. McDonald 1, for Ward McDonald 2, for A. Long 1, for Doc. Carter 1. *Maxville Ky:*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 2; 1 for T. Smith, and 1 for Wm. Short. *Danville Ky:*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 1, for J. Mahon. *Harrodsburg Ky:*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 2, of which for Js. Debond 1, and for A. Maury 1. *Versailles Ky:*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 1 for J. Mitchum. *Crawfordsville Ia:*—By Wm. Fisher 2, for S. Fisher. *Georgetown O:*—By Js. Clark agent 5; 1 for J. Stewart, 1 for H. Oakwood, 1 for P. M Devore, 1 for G. Baker, 1 for H. Lindsey. *Cheshire O:*—By Elder Wm. Caldwell agent 3. *Hartford Ky:* By Tho. Ross 3. *Union Ky:*—Js. Hurst 1, J. W. Moore 1, Elder T. M. Allen for Js. Hildreth 1. *Cynthiana Ky:*—Tho. Ware 1. *Fulton Mo:*—Elder M. P. Wills 3; of which 2 for Dr. Hobson, 1 for Wm. Nash. *Dayton O:*—By L. Bruen 5. *New Burlington O:*—By Elder G. Adams for Js. Carnahan agent, 6 50. *Greenville O:*—By Elder G. Adams, 7; of which 1 for L. D. Roll, 1 for A. Scribner, 4 for H. Lauramore, 1 for Job Westfall. *Malcolm Miss:*—By John Mitchell 2. *Gallatin Ten:* By Geo. Crocket agent 5; of which 1 for J. Wallace, 1 for Sam Moore, 1 for S. Gourley, 1 for Wm. Bell, 1 for R. Winham. *Liberty Ky:*—By Elder J. Jones agent, 5; of which 1 for Jac. Huffaker, 1 for C. Huffaker, 1 for J. Hardwick, 1 for C. Hardwick, 1 for J. Ballenger. *Milleford O:*—By Walter Marsh 5; of which, 1 for Elder Jas. Bailey of N. Y. 1 for J. Washburn, of Pa. 1 for Sam. Kelly, of Erie Pa. 2 for himself. *Newtown Ky:*—By T. Brockman for Anderson J. *Paris Ky:*—By W. Wilson agent, for Robt. Ayres 2, Elder Wm. Parker 1. *Cameridge Ky:*—By Js. Houston agent 6; of which 1 for bro. Laughlin, 1 for L. Houston, 1 for J. Barnett, 1 for C. Colcord, 1 for Wm. Henderson, 1 for Wes. Jamison. *Millersburg Ky:*—By Elder Josh. Irwin for Ab. Moore 2. *Cincinnati O:*—By J. D. Garrard agent 8; of which 2 for S. Jessup, 1 for Isaac [illegible]ts.—*Union Ky:*—Elder T. M. Allen for R. C. Wilmott 1. *Jason's Store:*—G. Cathey 5. *Liberty Ky:*—Elder J. Jones 5. *Georgetown Ky:*—John Strickler 1. *Dover O:*—Sam. Holliday 8.

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. SEPTEMEER 1831. [No. 9.

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.

REPLY TO ARCHIPPUS—*No. IV.*

A letter received from James Fishback, D. D.. of Lexington, Ky. assures us that he is the writer in the "Christian Messenger," signed "Archippus." Having been favored with the missing Nos. of the C. Messenger, by the kindness of its Editor, we lay before our readers the 2nd No. already replied to in our April number. Before we can in propriety publish any thing more from the pen of Dr. Fishback, we must review what he has written on this subject. Had he wished to discuss the subject in due form, he would have sent us one argument or essay, and waited our reply; but as he selected the Christian Messenger, and continued his numbers till he had delivered himself fully, (to which course we had no objections,) he cannot expect us to hear or answer any thing from him until we have examined what he has already made public property. When we have finished our review, if he feel disposed farther to discuss the question, the main question, we will hear him through the pages in which he commenced, and thus, if agreeable to brother Stone, all *his* readers will hear the Doctor as well as mine. I must, however, inform my readers that he has complained in the June No. of the Messenger, and in a letter to me, of some injustice done him in [illegible]ting him as contending for a baptism peculiar to the [illegible]entile, which he called "Gentile baptism."

Before seeing this complaint in th[illegible]nger, I expected to have seen him either *atone* for the unfairness complained of in our first No. or make an attempt to sustain his references to the history of the Novatians. But as he only *complains* in turn, it is presumed he wishes to balance the charge of injustice by a credit of so much injustice received in return. Thus is my prediction already more than verified. In April last we predicted (page 164) that "before many moons he will surrender either his Jew's baptism or his Gentile baptism in the esti-