common than for censorious persons to be censured? Or for warriors, duellists and assassins, to perish by the sword, or suffer a violent death?

Another precept of Christ is this—"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This precept is as applicable to judging one another as to any part of human conduct. But where is the Christian who "would" that his brother should impute supposed errors of opinion to the wickedness of his heart? If I would that others should forbear thus to judge me, then of course I should forbear thus to judge them. This is called the Golden Rule on account of its excellence. But alas, how often is it treated by professed Christians as of no worth at all!

OBITUARY.

Departed this life on Tuesday the 19th of July last, of a bilious fever, after an illness of thirty-five days, ABRAHAM REMAY HATCHITT, son of Elder *Joseph Hatchitt* of Ia. aged fifteen years and nine months. Previous to his sickness, he became serious, and was thought by his friends to be under religious impressions. During his affliction he was constantly engaged in prayer, when he enjoyed respit from pain, or was not overcome by drowsiness. At length he professed to enjoy peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. A few days previous to his death he pronounced the following words with an audible voice:

"O Jesus my Saviour I know thou art mine,
For thee, all the pleasures of earth I resign;
Of objects most pleasing, I love thee the best,
Without thee I'm wretched, but with thee am blest."

The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, and blessed be the name of the Lord. J. H.

Also died a few months before MARGARET MILLION, consort of Dr. *Million* of Bourbon co. Ky. She was truly among the excellent of the earth, a Christian in deed as well as in name. She was young, when cut off by a sudden death, yet had she united herself with the church some years before. She was not surprized at death's approach, but with boldness met the tyrant and by faith triumphed.

SOLITUDE.

Crowded towns and busy societies may delight the unthinking, and the gay—but solitude is the best nurse of wisdom.

In solitude the mind gains strength, and learns to lean upon herself: in the world it seeks or accepts of a few treacherous supports—the feigned compassion of one—the flattery of a second—the civilities of a third—the friendship of a fourth—they all decieve, and bring the mind back to retirement, reflection, and books.

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.—OCTOBER 1831. [No. 10.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—*No. V.*

AFTER reading the above essay, no person, I think, can say that I have erred in representing this writer as making a difference between the meaning of baptism to a Jew and to a Gentile. Why, else, all this explanation of the differences subsisting between the state and circumstances of the Jews? Why so often contrast them with the Gentiles, and Peter's address to them with his speech to the Gentiles, if he preach not one baptism for the Jew and another for the Gentile! Immersion, as respects the *action*, is the same whether man, woman, child, table or cup, be put under the water. It is the meaning of the act which characterizes it; and if immersion has one meaning to a Jew, and another meaning to a Gentile, then there are two baptisms instituted by Jesus Christ. This I contend is the legitimate import of the above essay But the writer does not mean what he says! He explains himself as making no difference between the Jew and the Gentile, as respects the meaning of immersion. We must, then, ascribe to him what some of our good preachers ascribe to the Holy Spirit, viz: "He says one thing and means another."

But Archippus will tell us that he reasons upon the differences between the Jews and Gentiles, not to show that Peter preached baptism *for remission* to the Jews, and baptism *because of remission* to the Gentiles, but merely to justify *the style* that Peter used to the Jews. For, in truth, according to him it is only a difference in style; and the Jews, owing to their peculiar circumstances, ought to be spoken to in one style, and the Gentiles in another. This is his plea, as I understand him.—Well, then, it follows that if the difference in style be merely rhetorical, and not logical; if it be only in the selection of synonymous words, and not of words conveying different ideas, baptism must mean the same thing to Jew and Gentile, and the question will be, whether shall we explain literally the address

to the Gentiles by that to the Jews, or that to the Jews by the address to the Gentiles! May we not rather say that Peter spoke the meaning of baptism literally in his first address; and that if ever he spoke of it in any other style, his meaning must be ascertained from his first address, when the introduction of the institution required the greatest plainness! We have, we think, all the principles of interpretation in our favor, and against Archippus: for according to his own exposition the difference is only in style, and reason and universal usage require that we explain every other address by the first, and not the first by the subsequent addresses.

Admitting then, for the sake of argument, that there is a difference in the style of his address to the Jews from that to the Gentiles, and that baptism means the same thing to Jew and Gentile, only expressed differently, because of differences in their condition, the question will be, whether we shall learn the meaning of baptism from the Pentecostan address, or from some subsequent address! *This is the only question which lies between us, on the hypothesis that he give up his Gentile baptism as not of a different meaning from the Jew's baptism.* I repeat it again, the question now is,—*whether shall we learn the meaning of baptism from the Pentecostan speech, or from any subsequent one addressed either to Jew or Gentile?* I answer, from the Pentecostan, and for the reason already assigned.

It was the *first* time that the christian immersion was ever preached: it was the *first* time that the gospel, as perfectly developed, was ever announced; it was the *first* time that the Apostles spake under the last commission; it was the *first* time that Jesus was proclaimed on earth, after his ascension into heaven, as a "Prince and Saviour to grant reformation and forgiveness of sins;" and it was the *first* time that the Apostles spake under the full influence of the Holy Spirit, and therefore it was the most appropriate time, to open the meaning of the institution. This is in effect the argument used by all the intelligent Baptists against those who plead for sprinkling. It is admitted that the first baptism was in a river, that it was literally an immersion, and that no subsequent allusions to the blood of sprinkling can weigh against the clear and fair import of the word or action as first explained. I use their own argument when I say, that we are to expect the full and explicit developement of an institution at its first promulgation. If I err, the Baptists have always erred in their reasonings against their Pædobaptist brethren; for this is the strong plea of every Baptist writer, that we must examine the first preaching under the commission to know *who was to be baptized*, and how *the action* was to be performed. When they reason from the Epistles and other remote documents, we tell them we are not to learn the literal import of an institution from mere allusions, or oblique hints, or figurative representations, but from the distinct and primary discourses of the Apostles upon the subject. This is

reasonable; for when any new custom or institution is introduced, then, if ever, it must be explained. So it was with circumcision, the passover, and the Jewish feasts. They are only once fully explained, and that is on their institution. So was the Lord's Supper at the time of its institution; and so, I argue, was the christian immersion, commanded in the charge given to the Apostles. On this ground I stand, in answering this question; not because we cannot establish our views from even the first Epistle of Peter, as well as from many other passages in the book, but, were there not another, we must contend that the first time an institution is commanded, it must be most fully and literally explained: for that *has always been God's time*, and right reason says it is the proper time.

But to this reason we might add another, of very considerable weight. This discourse on Pentecost was addressed to "persons out of *every nation under heaven*." No person ever did, since or before, address such a congregation as that which Peter addressed on this occasion. "Men of *every nation*" were spoken to; Jews and proselytes indeed they were, but they were born in all nations, and spoke all the tongues of their native countries. Some thirteen or fourteen of the nations are mentioned, not as the whole, but as a specimen of men of every nation under heaven. Now as these persons were all addressed in their own languages, and all taught the same views of immersion, it was of the utmost consequence that, returning back to their homes enriched by the Gospel of Jesus, they should carry with them a literal and explicit developement of this institution; because, as they understood all the nations whither they resorted, and all the persons with whom they conversed, after their return, must learn the meaning of this institution from them. If Peter told them to be immersed for the remission of their sins, they would tell all nations to be baptized for the remission of their sins; or if Peter told them to be baptized because their sins were pardoned through faith and repentance, then they would tell the same story to all nations under heaven whither they went. Not only, then, because it was the *first* time the Reign of Jesus was announced and christian immersion introduced, but also because it was spoken to the whole world in convention, and from that people to spread every where, it became necessary to speak clearly and unambiguously upon this subject.

Hence we are constrained to understand every other speech on immersion, and every allusion or reference to it, by the Pentecostan address; and if, as our friend Archippus *now* pleads, there are not two baptisms, one for Jews and one for Gentiles, but only a difference in the style or manner of representing it, then it follows that all differences in the form of address, phraseology, or figure, being necessarily to be explained and understood by the first speech, we have only to inquire what is the fair import of the institution as proclaimed on Pentecost,

This will settle the whole controversy, unless there be two baptisms, or a baptism which means one thing to Paul and another to Cornelius; and that we have seen is equal to two baptisms.

The question now is, *What is the fair construction or the literal import of the immersion which Peter preached on Pentecost?* Archippus is too candid, too honest, to dissemble here. He admits that remission of sins is promised through or in immersion to the 3000 of all nations under heaven. "I confess," says he above, "that the phaseology used in these cases (the Pentecostan and that of Saul of Tarsus) authorises this belief:"—to this he adds, without explanation, "*in a good degree*," "and I have no controversy with those who entertain it." But he will have the words used to the Gentile congregation in Cesarea substituted for those on Pentecost, rather than those on Pentecost substituted for those in Cesarea. His "good degree" is a mere salvo, a special exception in favor of his own peculiarity: for he does not define this "good degree," nor say aught about it He, in fact, admits that Peter's words on Pentecost teach immersion for the remission of sins, preceded by faith and reformation. This he does, and will admit. In truth his *convictions* of this had almost forced him to a new theory, that there is an immersion for Gentiles whose sins are pardoned, and one for the Jews whose sins were not pardoned. This latter opinion he will not *now* defend; and only attempts to prove that in explaining immersion to Gentiles we should substitute Peter's sermon in Cesarea for that on Pentecost; or, perhaps, that will not suit so well, as there is some ambiguity in the meaning of baptism as proclaimed to the first Gentile audience: but that we should preach *justification or pardon through faith alone;* and dispose of Peter's words as well as we can, as some bold eastern figure, as some rhetorical license, of such latitude as to give play to the imagination of the Arabian, Persian, and Mesopotamian genius when carried from Jerusalem to their own country.

The question "*What shall we do?*" proposed by the penitents in Jerusalem, appears to be better understood by Archippus than by others who are daily quoting it. The persons who proposed this question, with all their circumstances, must be taken into the account before we understand the answer. They were Jews and devout proselytes. They were all acquainted with the law and the prophets. They were all *now* BELIEVERS in Jesus Christ. THEY HAD FAITH AND REPENTANCE. They only wanted information, or to "*reform and be immersed.*" They knew nothing in the law or prophets which reached their case; none of the sacrifices, none of the sources anciently ordained could relieve them: "*What shall we do*, with a reference to this Jesus, this new economy, and to ourselves!" "Reform and be immersed, *every one* of you by the authority of the Lord Jesus, *for the remission of your sins*," was the oracle of God to them.

Now my question to Archippus is, *Had all the world been there assembled, and could they all have heard the same discourse, and proposed the same question, would not Peter have given them the same answer?*

The truth appears to be this; There are more fears entertained touching the bearing of this view of christian immersion upon the sects, and upon the "evangelical" views of *justification by faith alone*, than there is either argument or proof to oppose it. I find no reasoner who has courage to argue the question fairly out, and those who begin to debate it soon lose sight of the proper question, or merge it in some speculation upon grace, faith, regeneration, &c. For our own part we are willing to examine every question, to discuss every topic upon its own merits, and to bow to the authority of the Book. We find no difficulty in understanding the sayings of the Apostles on all those subjects touching grace, faith, repentance, &c. We may, perhaps, yet show that there is nothing more consistent with the teaching of the Apostles concerning justification or righteousness by faith, than immersion for remission of sins.

Indeed, we have yet to meet with the first objection of any real merit against the literal understanding of Peter's command to the inquiring Jews. And as there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, as "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and as the Gentiles were "dead in trespasses and in sins," and sold to idolatry, they stood in as much need of forgiveness as the Jews. But in those remarks we have confined ourselves to the main objection, which runs through the preceding essay; and as the ground of Archippus' reasoning has been examined, we shall leave these reflections with him until the moon changes again.

Dover, Ohio,—July 18, 1831.

BROTHER STONE;—I am well satisfied with the matter contained in the Messenger as I believe all my acquaintances are. The "conference" is deserving of strict attention, and is, I believe, conducted in a better spirit, and on better principles, than any of which I have ever been a spectator.

There are some remarks in "Archippus No. 5," that, either, if scriptural, have eluded my researches, or I have read them through a "jaundiced eye," which is not improbable.

One, in particular, is, "He corresponded in these respects with his maker; and, possessed of immortality, he was like him." I am willing to confess that the ideas I have formerly entertained of immortality are here completely exploded. I had, by some means, concluded that, as the scriptures expressly said "God only hath immortality," that had that attribute of the almighty been the likeness between God and man, the fall never could have happened. I know it may be argued, as Archippus has done, that "before the fall religion was natural to man," and consequently was, and is, the tie that made God and man

of the same likeness. But from thence we cannot infer that immortality as natural ever was conferred on man, any more than we can impute almighty power from the same cause. We know 'tis a hazard, at best, to risk an opinion concerning what man was before the fall. That he was purer and happier than after, is admitted; but that being made in the likeness of God implies any thing like an indication of possessing equal attributes, is what I am not yet convinced of. "God is not tempted, neither tempteth he any man." I am therefore led to look to some other source than the attributes of God, conferred on man, for that likeness. If I understand that happy state of existence, to which, I hope Archippus and thousands of the Human family are, by patient continuance in well doing fixing the eye of faith and hope upon, as the ultimate goal of their wishes, it is a state where temptation never can reach us, where death can never enter, and change and grief are unknown. Such being the state of Immortality, taught in the scriptures, I have from that source received my ideas of it; consequently have been unable to place Adam in that situation. It is not for the sake of argument that I have made these remarks, but from a desire either to be convinced of an error, if in one, or established in my present ideas. I am willing to acknowledge that I am yet susceptible of improvement in understanding the scriptures, and shall be glad to profit by the teachings of one, whom I esteem capable. I am indebted to Archippus for some excellent ideas, or rather the combination of some scriptural ideas, in perusing which I have taken much pleasure. JUVENIS.

TO JUVENIS.

You, my young brother, have concluded that because it is written "God only hath immortality," therefore no other can be a partaker of it.—Will not the same conclusion follow, that, when God is said to be, "only wise," therefore none else can be partaker of wisdom?—that, when it is written, "God only doeth wondrous things," (Psalm LXXII. 18;) therefore no other can do them!—In the latter cases you will acknowledge that the power and wisdom of God can be communicated to others, and what hinders us from concluding that immortality can be communicated also? We are assured that it will be communicated; for the saints shall ultimately possess it, as a promise of the Father. You will, by a little reflection, be convinced that Eternal existence, and immortality, are two very distinct ideas, and very far from being convertible terms. The wicked, we believe, shall forever exist, but without immortality; the righteous, shall exist forever with it.—I can as easily conceive how sinless Adam existed in glory, honor and immortality, as how sinning Adam existed without glory, honor and immortality; I can see nothing absurd, or contrary to sound doctrine in the idea that Adam before he sinned was possessed of glory, honor and immortality—that these by transgression were taken away—and that by the Saviour they shall be restored finally to the obedient believer. The scriptures certainly teach us that God only hath power, wisdom, immortality, holiness, &c. in eternal, infinite, unchangeable perfection—he is the fountain of all perfection, and from him proceeds every good and perfect gift to his creatures, immortality not excepted.

These thoughts I have suggested for your consideration. If they should have the effect of leading you to search the scriptures for correct information, I shall have gained my object.

Your fellow-servant of our Lord Jesus.——EDITOR.

QUERIES BY ELDER C. SINE.

If Baptism is the *sine qua non*, without which nothing can be done acceptably; why did Paul thank God, that he had baptized none of the Corinthians, but Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus? Is it not strange, that if baptism be the ancient gospel, that Paul was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel?

Ans. One class of professed christians rejects water baptism *in toto*. Another class contends earnestly for it, as the door into the church or kingdom of God, and warmly insists that infants have this right, and that sprinkling or pouring water on them is divine or christian baptism; yet these same people admit members into the church without baptism, and retain them there. While these classes are nullifying the ordinance, there are others who seem to run to the opposite extreme. I know of none who make baptism the *sine qua non*, yet too much ground is given by the more imprudent in treating on this subject, for opposers to draw such a conclusion. They who say that immersion is the ancient gospel, I suppose, mean, that it is figuratively so, as holding forth the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus; and these facts Paul calls the gospel, 1 Cor. xv. 1—5, The reason why Paul did not baptize many, we are not informed. As all is conjecture on this point, I will suggest, that the reason, was, because he was a weak and small man: hence his former name *Saul*, (the large king of Israel,) did not suit his small stature; therefore it was changed into Paul, the little man; for this the word literally signifies. The work of immersing would be to him oppressive, and was therefore left to others. EDITOR.

QUERIES BY WALTER MARSH.

1. Is a preacher of the gospel to preach all things to the unconverted; or is he only to preach faith, repentance, and baptism (to them?)

Ans. The query to me would have been obscure, had you not before remarked, that there were some among you, who maintain that the whole gospel consists in faith, repentance and baptism, and that this alone is to be preached to the un-

godly—and that whatever else the Saviour and apostles preached, is for the disciple after he is baptized into the kingdom.—With these teachers I cannot agree; because, properly speaking, neither faith, repentance nor baptism, is the gospel, or glad tidings; but effects produced by the gospel. The gospel begets faith, "These are written that ye might believe"—"the goodness of God, exhibited in the gospel, leads to repentance; and this qualifies us for baptism. These brethren, probably have erred by accepting as true the exposition of Matt. 28.—"Go, disciple all nations, baptising them, &c." The exposition given by some, is, Disciple all nations by baptising them, that is, make them disciples by baptising them. However specious this exposition may be, yet the collateral passage in Mark 16, inclines me to reject it. In Mark the commission, is, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, &c."—Matthew's "teaching all nations, is explained in Mark, by preaching the gospel to every creature—to saint as well as sinner.—Does not the preaching of the gospel fire the devotion of the saint, as well as encourage the sinner to approach his God?—Have we any authority to tell our congregations, We have no gospel to preach to you, ye saints of God; we can only teach you what you must observe—and to you, O sinner, we have no authority to preach the gospel; but to tell you, that you must believe the gospel, repent and be baptized? How can they believe the gospel till they hear it preached to them?

Query 2. Has our Saviour two kingdoms—an earthly and a heavenly kingdom?—and had he reference to these two kingdoms in his conversation with Nichodemus, John III. 12?

Ans. Daniel, prophesying of Messiah's kingdom, which God would set up in the latter days, says, "It shall never be destroyed, and it shall stand forever." This is the kingdom preached by John the Baptist, by Jesus and his apostlas. Its character, as described by Paul, is, "righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." No unbeliever, no impenitent nor disobedient person, can enter into it.—Faith, repentance, and obedience are indispensible prerequisites for entering it—none are members of it, who have not the spirit of the kingdom, which is the spirit of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. Though the King may cease to rule his kingdom or church on earth, yet will he transplant it to a happier abode, to heaven, where his dominion shall be everlasting, and forever and ever. "To him be glory and dominion forever and ever," will all his subjects eternally sing. I have no idea of two kingdoms of the Lord—the kingdom is one in two different states—one state is on earth, the other is in heaven—one is in mortality, the other in immortality.

If the kingdom, church or body of Christ be one, then to say that believers may enter into the kingdom in heaven, who could not be admitted into the kingdom on earth, is, to say that the kingdom on earth is purer than that in heaven—that the terms of admission into the one, are different from those of the other—and that God will admit the pious, believing, penitent soul into heaven, though he has not been immersed, being ignorant of the proper meaning of the law; but will not admit him to the priviliges of the kingdom on earth, unless he is immersed, though he gives him the spirit of the kingdom, righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.—If I have this spirit of the kingdom, I have all that is valuable in it. And who will deny that thousands of unimmersed believers do really possess and enjoy this spirit? I plead not for disobedience to the gospel precept, Be immersed; but for charity, consistency, and christian forbearance.—To say none is in the kingdom, but the immersed, is an outrage on charity or brotherly love; for how can we believe a man to be a brother in Christ, and love him as such, yet deny that he is a subject of his kingdom, or a member of his body? If he is not a subject of his kingdom or member of his body, he is destitute of the spirit of the kingdom or body, and therefore, not a follower of Christ. To say, many are christians, and in union with the body of Christ, and possess the spirit of that body, and the very character of the kingdom, righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, and that these people will enter the kingdom above, and yet deny them the priviliges of the kingdom on earth, because not immersed, is an outrage on consistency,—they are fit subjects for the kingdom above, but not for that on earth. As if the Lord had two kingdoms of different characters. To admit the falibility of man—that he may err in opinion, and yet be honest and pious, and yet may posses the spirit of obedience—to admit this, and yet exclude him from christian fellowship, is an outrage on christian forbearance. Thus it appears to me; but I shall be the last to criminate those, who think differently.

Query 3. Was the blood of Christ shed for the remission of sins to those out of the kingdom; or was it shed for the remission of sins committed after being adopted into the kingdom by baptism, and for them only?

Ans. You say that some teach that the blood of Christ was shed only for those in the kingdom by baptism, and not for those out of the kingdom. This doctrine is perfectly new; rather an improvement on the most rigid limb of antinomianism, which is, that the sovereignly elect were in Christ from eternity; and were eternally justified, and that for these alone Christ died. Your query reminds me of the subtilties of the schools of yore. If speculation begin to appear so soon in professed enemies to speculation, it is truly to be lamented. Such glaring contrariety to scripture doctrine to support a dogma, argues the fallacy of that dogma, or detracts from its credibility. Such queries, my brother, I leave for those to answer who may esteem speculation above simple truth. The last query is answered under the first. With due respect, your brother and fellow servant of the Lord. EDITOR.

Bloomington, August 13, 1831.

DEAR BROTHER:—On the 40th page of No. 2, Vol. 5, of the Messenger, stand five questions proposed by myself and answered by you. Not being satisfied with the answers, I sat down, and wrote my best thoughts on the subject. On reviewing them, this morning, I concluded that, perhaps, the hints might lead your mind into a train of reflection, that might bring forward truth, calculated to relieve our honest brethrens' minds, and, at the same time, show the dignified nature of our republican, or American institutions.

1. In your first answer, you make the church capable of judging in cases of debt. Is not this the sin of his Holiness to judge in temporal matters, not named in the book of God?—(Says Jesus, "my kingdom is not of this world.") Where, brother Stone, is debt made cognizable by the church in the gospel? In vain you may quote a matter, from 1 Cor. VI. and 1st. the indefinite article may be made to point out a thousand matters, or only one matter, and certainly we must look to the balance of the paragraph for its truth and bounds: now sir: what matters are therein contained? See 9 & 10th verses, also 10 & 11th verses of fifth chapter, same epistle, Paul appears to be so determined to make the Corinthians understand what matters he intended, that he quotes them twice. Would you not esteem it strange conduct in the Judges of Indiana, because the Legislature had passed a number of acts specifying crimes cognizable before said Judges, declaring that if any of the citizens of Indiana, had a cause of action, a plea, a matter, &c. they should, by means of the proper officers and documents, bring their cases before the said Judges; I say if the aforesaid Judges were to take up a case and deliver judgment for an offence not named in the list of acts of the Legislature, would you not esteem such judgment strange, unlawful and unconstitutional? Are not the cases perfectly analagous?

Should we not then, understand, a matter, to mean, any matter and every matter, named by an author while treating upon the same subject.

It does appear to me, that you have entirely misapprehended me in my third question. With my present views I would sue a christian brother for debt, just as soon as I would a sceptic, because I affirm, and I think you will admit, upon more reflection, that the church in the United States cannot do me justice in case of debt. I will state a very probable case. A professed brother owes me $200; I call for it—he sets no certain time, but professes great sorrow that he cannot pay me; says he will pay as soon as possible, but in heart is determined never to comply with his promise. I cannot in such a case take one or two more, to tell him his fault; for this good reason; I am unable to judge of the intentions of his heart. Now, pray tell me how I shall get this brother before the church for trial: And if I could get him there, has the church power to coerce

my dues from him, or will not the church rather have to send him and me, to the higher court of Cesar at last. This looks like an appeal from an inferior, to a superior tribunal.

It appears then, in case of debt, that the civil judge can do me more justice than Jesus Christ; for this plain reason; Christ's kingdom is not of this world. But in the list of crimes above quoted, the church can acquit me of censure, if my innocence is proved; and can censure my adversary if proved guilty; and as to imposing a fine, this is not done in justice to me; and often his family would be beggared by it. Is this justice to rob the innocent wife and children, to pay me a fine, because the villain has stolen the affections of my wife, or committed fornication in my family?

It does appear to me that censure, cast upon the guilty in all such cases, is as much as can be done for the injured, on the score of moral justice:—all the gold of Peru converted into a fine, could not heal the wounded mind Look again at the answer to my fourth question, and tell me if it does not lay a very tempting foundation for brethren to plunge into debt, profess willingness to pay, plead inability, and request help of the church to get out:—Where has Christ or his apostles given such a rule?—Such a practice may be called mercy in a church towards C. but as respects the justice of the practice, may we not be allowed to be a little sceptical.

B. has got in debt and thereby disobeyed God (Rom. XIII, 8,) Owe no man any thing: D. E. and F. must suffer, each, five dollars in justice to save C. from B's. injustice. The fifth question and answer stands or falls with the first. Very respectfully.

BARTON W. STONE. STEPHEN ROACH.

REPLY TO Dr. ROACH'S LETTER.

DR. BRO.—You had asked me in the No. referred to, Whether Paul in 1 Cor. VI. 1, forbade suing at law a brother for nonpayment of debt? I answered, "he did not forbid to go to law before the saints." I further observed, "not to pay a just debt, when we have the means, is an open violation of the laws of our King, and suit against such a culprit should be made to the church of which he is a member, and judgment given by the church." I add, that when such are excluded, we may appeal to Cesar, and turn him over to his jurisdiction in order to obtain our due. You think "this is the sin of his Holiness to judge in temporal matters, not named in the book of God," and therefore, it is a sinful, unwarrantable assumption for a church to judge in the case alluded to. You then ask, "Where is debt made cognizable by the church in the gospel?" I also ask, Is not the withholding from us our due unjust and sinful, when the means to pay it are not wanting? Is not this in opposition to the plain precept, "Render, therefore, to all their dues—Owe no man any thing, but to love oneanother?" Rom. XIII. 7, 8. Is it any more a temporal matter to judge of this case, than of

those matters mentioned in 1 Co. 6, 10. 11. and chap. 5, 10, 11, especially of thieves, covetous and extortioners? Is it not extortion to withhold from me my just due? Is it not an injury done me? Does it not proceed from covetousness? Is it not dishonesty? Of these, you grant, the church may judge, because these matters are expressly named in the book of God; and is not the precept, "owe no man" as expressly named in that book? If we must have an express nomination for every aberration from right in the book of God before the church can judge, how shall she judge of horse-racing, billiard-playing, card-playing, and scores of other nameless evils?

I am far from thinking that the church should coerce the debtor to payment; but simply judge him as guilty by the royal law of liberty; and if he has the means to pay and will not, he should be excluded from fellowship as a transgressor; and that church is unworthy of the name of Christ, who would retain such a man in their society. As well might she retain the unrighteous, thieves, extortioners, and the covetous. I make no remarks on your legislative and judicial departments in civil government. What I have written supercedes the necessity of any. Nor of the case of a brother owing you $2?. Such a brother proves himself *ipso facto* a transgressor, a very bad man, and should be excluded from the church, and arraigned at Cesar's bar, and coerced to pay.

You are not satisfied with my answer to your 4th query. I said "If he (the debtor) is willing, but unable to pay, the church should assist him, so that justice may be done to the creditor." This, you say, would be a temptation to run in debt. To a christian indeed it would be none, or a very weak one. There are innumerable cases in wh ch the most upright man may fai l to meet his lawful contracts—fire, water, or something else beyond his control, may destroy his property, and render him unable to pay his creditor. Is it just that the creditor should lose all? Do not the tender mercies of the world incline them to give relief to the sufferer! and shall the church forbear? I incline to mercy, and recommend relief to the needy.

EDITOR.

The Division of Lambs; or dismemberment of Christ's body.

We copy the following communication from the Christian Secretary, published in Hartford, Conn. which will give our readers some idea of the manner of doing business in some places in our country; We know not the place referred to, but presume it is somewhere in the western part of New York.

MR. EDITOR:—I have just received a communication from a Christian brother at the west, from which the following is extracted for insertion in your paper.

"The Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, recently held a four days' meeting," not far from this place, at which nearly one hundred were hopefully converted. At the close of said meeting they mutually agreed to use their influence, to induce all, who had passed from death to life, to unite themselves with the people of God immediately. Accordingly, a Presbyterian minister arose, and after stating his object to the congregation, addressed the young converts, advising all whose minds were not made up upon this subject, to take their Bibles and come to a decision as soon as possible. He then proposed that three papers, one for each denomination present, should be placed together, and recommended, to those who had already decided in their minds, that they should pass around and subscribe their names to the paper where they chose to unite. He gave as his reason for this advice, that if they went home much would be said to them,—many would be proselyting,—some would be led contrary to their minds,—and others would be confused and unite nowhere. His proposition was complied with, and resulted as follows:

For Presbyterians, 15; for Methodists, 15; for Baptists, 50.

The history of this transaction should be registered in every journal, in order that two great objects might be effected,—the one, to awaken the present generation to the horrors of sectarianism, and the other, that posterity may thankfully look back at the pit whence they have been taken. How much more like christians would these ministers have acted, had they called together those young converts, and have thus addressed them. We advise you, young brethren, to avoid the destructive rock on which we have been wrecked—the rock of sectarianism.—God has joined you together in love, in the same spirit. We assure you that sectarianism will quickly cut those ties, and sever you into envious, contending parties. We advise you, as the truth has made you free, to remain free, and be not entangled with any yoke of bondage; but take the yoke of Christ ALONE upon you, not that af Moses, nor of any sect; but rejecting our particular creeds, which have long been an unhappy cause of division, unite yourselves on the divine scriptures, which are able to keep you, and to give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified. Be called by the name of your Lord and Saviour, *Christians*, and labor to glorify and adorn your profession, by walking even as he walked in fellowship with all the saints. We advise you to unite together in a christian society, meet together at least every Lord's day to worship your God in reading the scriptures, in prayer, praise, exhortation, and in the breaking of bread often. You will soon find some among yourselves, whose gifts qualify them for teachers; let such be ordained to this work, and let one be appointed an overseer or bishop of your society. Receive and baptize all obedient believers, and let strict discipline, by the word of truth be observed. Our prayers, and labors for your advancement, shall be yours. You may ask us, If this be the right way, why do you not walk in it? will you advise us to that, you will not do yourselves? We answer; These are puz-

zling questions—we cannot satisfactorily answer them. We hope the time is not far distant when we shall all unite in your ranks, and walk with you in the way we advise you to walk in.

Such advice, we say, would be *christian* indeed; and such as none would conscientiously reject. And yet, because we give this advice, we are reprobated by all, and rejected from the communion and fellowship of sectarians? Fear not, brethren; truth must, and will prevail. EDITOR.

Proceedings of a meeting, held by Christian brethren, at the house of Bro. Moses Adkins, Sinking Creek, Giles county, Va. begun August 20, 1831.

1. The Church of Christ (Clover Hollow) sat together in her official character.

2. Said church officially invited and received the brethren present from other churches of like precious faith.

3. Elder Thos. Kirk was chosen to preside as moderator to the assembly, during the time of its sitting, and Landon Duncan clerk.

4. The business of the meeting was called for; and the following presented:

1. Proposed and agreed to, that brother Isaac Scott, of the church in Clover Hollow, be set forward to the office of Elder in the Church of Christ.

2. That bro. Parker Lucas, of the church on Sinking creek, be appointed to the office of Elder, and that Elders Kirk, Beller and Duncan act conjunctly as a presbytery in this business.

3. The presbytery proceeded to their duty and found ample testimony in favor of each of the brethren being separated to the work of the ministry.

4. Query, Is a Deacon legally authorized according to the gospel to administer the ordinance of baptism? After some debate between Lucas and Duncan, the former advocating the affirmation of the question, and the latter the negative, the question was put to the assembly, and a majority of those, who gave their voice, were in favor of its being right for Deacons to baptize, especially in the absence of an efficient Elder.—Some of the members declined expressing any opinion.

5. Proposed and agreed to, that Elder Barton W. Stone be requested to give these proceedings an insertion in the Christian Messenger, and that the clerk transmit the same to him for this purpose.

6. Adjourned to meet at 10 o'clock on to-morrow.

Met together according to adjournment;

And, having fasted and prayed, the presbytery laid their hands on the two brethren, and thus consecrated each to the office of Elder in the Church of Christ.

Signed in behalf of the Church.

THOMAS KIRK, MOD.
LANDON DUNCAN, CLK.

REMARKS.

On the question, Is a Deacon legally authorized, according to the gospel, to administer the ordinance of baptism? the majority it seems, voted in the affirmative. The only argument adduced must be the case of Philip, who had been ordained a deacon, and was found afterwards preaching and baptising.—The brethren, who voted in the affirmative, had probably not well considered some important points in connexion with this case. The apostles themselves had acted as deacons in serving tables, till they found that the office of a deacon and of a preacher were incompatible. They say, "it is not meet for us to leave the word and serve tables." Men full of the Holy Spirit must be ordained to this special work of serving tables, and not to preach; because, to preach and serve tables could not be attended to by the same person at the same time. But it may be said, Philip did preach,—yes, he did; but not while he was a deacon, or while he served tables. We never hear of his preaching nor baptising till he became an Evangelist, or travelling preacher, and commenced these works in Samaria. How could he serve tables, and travel extensively and preach the gospel. It may be said that we have no account of Phliip's appointment to preach and baptize. And have we any account of the appointment of Sylvanus, Niger, Lucius, Manaen, and scores of others, to preach or baptize? Yet we believe they were appointed and ordained, according to gospel order, to these works.

I hope the brethren will re-consider the subject, and not leave the plain word for human tradition, or for new inventions and notions of men. I hope they will remember that truth does not always rest with the majority—that the minority may be right, and should therefore be respected, and not prostrated by superior power, and trodden upon as errorists. It is hoped, that brethren will exercise forbearance, and not break the bonds of peace on a subject (to say the best of it,) of but little importance. I fear you have but few to baptize; and why dispute and break the peace of brethren in disputing whether deacons should baptize? I think there are Elders enough to do the work of baptising. If the converts should become very numerous, it will be then the proper time to inquire whether deacons may officiate in the work; and as their right cannot be plainly determined from scripture, would it not be advisable to set them or others apart to the work, as were brothers Scott and Parker? In this, all agree, there exists no doubt.—Dear brethren, let not opinions divide you. Let us remember, that much knowledge may be gained by reading the Bible; therefore it should be read often and attentively—but also let it be remembered, that all knowledge without charity or love availeth nothing—knowledge without charity puffeth up. The character of the wisdom which is from above, first pure, then peceable, gentle, easy to be intreated, &c. &c. Let us all aspire to this

wisdom; and if we lack it, let us ask of God, who giveth liberally to all men and upbraideth not, and it shall be given; but let us ask in faith nothing wavering.—Live in peace, and the God of love and peace shall be with you. EDITOR.

P. S. I seriously doubt whether brethren collected together have any business with questions and decisions of the nature of that above. If the decision be not made already in the Book, we may make one, just like ourselves, a fallible thing, not to be trusted. Such decisions have ever been the cause of discord and division. ED.

Downingtown, Meigs county, Ohio, Sept. 8, 1831.

DEAR SIR: A General Reform is abroad in our land. Light and Knowledge are on the march in many places. The word of the Lord, and that only, will suffice the people;—the mere opinions, doctrines, and commandments of men, are fast giving way, and the wholesome truth of the gospel of Jesus about to succeed the ruins thereof.

I perceive (not with the ken of a prophet) the time not far distant, when the truth of the gospel will be coveted and relished by every disciple of the Lord. Elders Jas. Michell, Geo. Long, John Sargent, Benj. Sanders, John Chriss, with some others, have lately held three days meetings through this part of the state: at Salisbury, Meigs co. O. six were immersed into the Saviour. At Sunday Creek, Athens co. O. seven came forward and were immersed—also at Wolf Creek, on the Muskingum river, 12 or 13 owned their Saviour by being immersed—at Kaats Creek, O. there was a general reception of the truth, which operated with much power; 25 were immersed—also many other places, which would be tedious to mention.

The brethren in this part are very anxious for you to pay them a visit this fall, if you possibly can:—if you should deem it prudent to come up this fall and hold a meeting on Leading Creek, (Rutland, O.) please forward an appointment. Br'n. E. Rathburn, Jas. Michell, and B. Sanders, wish to be remembered by you. We all feel much encouraged in the reform of the christian religion from the errors of mankind.—In much haste, I remain your friend and brother in Christ.

RODNEY DOWNING.

Bro. Downing; In a few days I start on a string of appointments to the west, and cannot attend with you this fall.

B. W. S.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

It is worthy of remark, that the anniversary meetings of some of the oldest, and most venerable religious associations of this country and Great Britain, have this year been scenes of disgraceful and unchristian contention. In the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers, and in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, subjects of dispute were introduced, and the debate upon them conducted, particularly in the Convention, with as much personal abuse, and a display of as unholy and malignant passions, as we ever remember to have seen in the most riotous political assembly. At the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in May, a similar scene occurred. It seems, a proposition was introduced, to exclude from the society all who did not believe in the "Triune Jehovah," and though there were independence, charity, and good sense enough in the assembly ultimately to negative the resolution, yet the uproar and confusion of the debate, if such it may be called, the violence, bigotry, the intolerant and persecuting spirit displayed by many of the members, must leave a deep disgrace upon the character of the society, and afford a new subject of ridicule and contempt to the enemies of religion.

We cannot at this distance, say with certainty, but we should suppose, from the weakness and absurdity, the want of thought and argument in those parts of the speech of Capt. Gordon, the mover of the resolution, which we have seen, that he must himself be a mere tool in the hands of those who possess, and are determined, if they can, to retain ecclesiastical power in Great Britain. And we are forcibly reminded by the proceedings in this society, and also by the conduct of the orthodox in this country, of one of the proverbs of the wise king, "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." The hour is at hand, we apprehend, when the Church of England must either yield, or fall; retrench and reform, or be swept away by the besom of revolution,—and in our own country, the signs of the times point no less distinctly to the diminution, at least, of the spiritual power of the orthodox clergy; yet, with that perverseness which is so justly described in the text above, they are hastening these very events, by a proud and haughty attempt to crush opposition by oppression, and stop the progress of truth by the votes of a majority. But this cannot be done. The light of truth is in the world, and it cannot be extinguished; the sectarian zeal, and love of power, which will not yield to the progress of religious freedom, must be crushed by its course.—*Unitarian Monitor.*

From the Herald of Truth.

OPINIONS.

What is the origin of opinions? They are the result of evidence: the conclusion the mind arrives at on any subject, to which the attention is directed. But the minds of men are so differently constituted, that the degree of evidence which produces conviction in one, will make no impression upon another. Nature, it is fair to presume, has made a wide difference in the strength and activity of the mental powers. Education and habit have contributed to make this original difference m

obvious. The cultivation of the mind, like exercise to the body, strengthens and invigorates the intellectual faculties. The habit of close thinking and application to study, discipline the mind, quicken its perception of the light of truth, and qualify it to discriminate justly. Nature, education, habit, and the different circumstances by which we are surrounded, cause as great a variety in the mental powers, as we perceive in the external features of Mankind. It is impossible, therefore, that there should not be an endless diversity in the opinions of beings thus constituted—differing so widely in their means of acquiring knowledge, and in their ability to judge correctly.—"To err is human." The finite nature of our faculties subjects us to error in judgment; our limited means of acquiring knowledge, to imposition. The most upright man that ever lived was subject to the common lot of humanity—error of opinion; the most honest and conscientious man may "err in vision, and stumble in judgment." But he may always be preserved from any act that will impair his peace; infringe upon his rights, or encroach upon the happiness of his neighbour.

How unreasonable, then, how cruel and unjust is it, to condemn, or to persecute a fallible being for errors of opinion, real or supposed. My neighbour differs from me in his opinion, on some abstract doctrine in religion. Shall I presume to censure him, and call him a heretic, a blasphemer, one who is to be excluded from the privileges of christian fellowship because his conclusions are different from mine? What infallible standard have I to determine that I am absolutely right? Am I exempt from the common lot of man, and my neighbour "perversely wrong?" But it will be answered, "the scriptures are the infallible standard, the unerring rule." Be it so. I know they are accepted as such; professedly at least, by the different sects in christendom. I have no disposition to object to the rule. It is not necessary to my argument, even if I had. But the scriptures are written in the language of the nation or people to whom they were given. All language is liable to ambiguity and misconstruction. The same words are often used in different senses—and through the lapse of time, words change their signification entirely. The scriptures have undergone various translations, by men who did not profess to be inspired. These men may have erred in their construction, and may have been mistaken in the meaning intended by the writers. The same fallibility attends our expositions of scripture doctrine that accompanies us in all other investigations. We have need to exercise the same charity and forbearance in the conclusions we form with regard to scripture doctrine, as on every other subject. Nay, more; for in matters of faith and worship, mankind are prone to be more tenacious of their opinions than any other subject; because to these they attach the highest importance, and very justly too. This importance, however, not properly belong to the opinions, but to the uprightness

of our intentions and the purity of our motives. We may form very erroneous opinions, (and who can say with certainty that his are not erroneous,) yet if our motives are pure, and our intentions honest, who has a right to condemn us? The inspired penmen convey their instructions to mankind through the medium of language. The human understanding takes cognizance of this mode of communication, and construes it according to its capacity, or the light with which it is furnished. Is it marvellous, then, when we consider the fallibility of all human judgment, and the imperfection of all language, that the same texts should be understood differently, by different minds, equally honest in the pursuit of truth? The presumption and folly, the injustice and cruelty of condemning any man for his opinion on questions of doctrine, is just as plain and certain, as on any other subject to which the human mind can be directed. It is usurping the prerogative of the Deity, to look into the heart, and to attempt to scan the motive, of which no man has a right to judge. We are accountable to God alone for our thoughts and opinions—to society for our actions, when they interfere with the convenience or happiness of others.

If men were willing to grant to others what every man claims for himself, the right to enjoy his own opinions, untrammelled by human authority, it would put an end to bigotry, intolerance, and sectarian feelings. Persecution and denunciation for difference of opinion would cease; and the different sects would meet as brethren on the broad ground of universal toleration. Their honest difference would not break the unity of the spirit—a difference which must always prevail, so long as men exist upon the earth.

The mind set free from the shackles of prejudice and superstition, would be open for the reception of truth and the acquisition of knowledge, and would experience a more perfect expansion and developement of all its powers. The benevolent affections would be enlarged, and the happiness of the human family immeasurably increased. When we meet with a mind unshackled, free as the eagle to soar above the grovelling, plodding occupations of the tenants of this terrestrial planet; unchecked by the narrow boundaries which ignorance, bigotry, and superstition have prescribed for the human understanding, it is as refreshing as the limpid stream to the thirsty traveller, or the cooling shade to the labourer who basks in meridian heat. We breathe freely in his company. The mind is drawn forth into healthful activity. The heart expands with benevolence and kindness; and the whole face of nature assumes a more engaging appearance. As Moses said of the Jews, "would to God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that he would put his spirit upon them:" so might we with equal earnestness exclaim: "Would to God that all mankind were free"—free not in their bodies only, which is but a small advance towards that perfect freedom we desire—but free to *think*

—to investigate, to examine all things by the light of truth—wedded to no opinions for their own sake, but free to change to-day, upon further evidence, those of yesterday—free to examine without fear the opinions most generally received, or deemed the most important and sacred, being well assured that truth has nothing to fear from the most rigid scrutiny, but that error alone seeks to shun the light. L.

"He is a freeman whom the truth makes free,
And all are slaves beside."

For the Christian Messenger.

Brother Stone:—I have informed bro. Campbell that I am the author of the numbers published in the Messenger, over the signature of Archippus. I received a letter this morning from him, in which he informed me that he has not in his possession the 4th and I suppose the 5th Nos. of Archippus. He has published the three first numbers. Will you be so good as to send him the numbers of the Messenger, which contain the 4th and 5th numbers, which he is to publish in the Harbinger. He has suggested to me a wish that before he shall publish the two last numbers of Archippus, that I reply to his reviews of the three already published in the Harbinger.

I design not to reply to his reviews until he shall have published the whole five numbers. They are all connected together in the investigation in some degree. From any thing that I have yet seen of what bro. C. has said in refutation of what I have written, I feel confident that his views of the gospel doctrine of the justification of sinners are erroneous, and after he shall have published the two remaining numbers of Archippus, will endeavor to render them obvious to all who take the word of God for their guide and instruction on the subject. The question at issue between bro. C. and myself is this, Is a sinner justified by faith alone or by faith and baptism? I defend the sentiment that he is justified by faith alone, and that baptism in relation to justification is figurative or symbolical.

Bro. C. has done injustice to my statements and sentiments in the first number of his review, I wrote him last May a correction of them. This however he declined to publish in the Harbinger, and by my request, he returned it by the mail of yesterday. I am yours &c.

JAMES FISHBACK.

Lexington, Aug. 18, 1831.

NOTICE.

The free people of color are at length awaking to their true interests—many in our western country are now determined to go to Liberia—the land of their fathers. In our county (Scott) we understand about 30 are now willing and anxious to go. They are daily applying to us of the Colonization society for counsel and assistance. We have therefore agreed to meet together on Friday the 30th day of this month, at 2 o'clock P. M. in the Court house. Every member of the society is requested, and urged to attend; and we solicit all friendly to the society to meet with us, and unite in the good cause. Js. F. Robinson Esq. will address us on the subject. Never did justice and mercy more cordially unite their pleas for our aid in any cause—never were louder calls addressed to our long slumbering country. Shall we lend a deaf ear? Awake, awake to righteousness—to happiness, and to our country's salvation from ruin, and from present and future woe. Editor.

JUDGMENT OF ANOTHER LIFE.

We beg our correspondent Juvenis, to excuse our not attending to his communication sooner. His leading views are, no doubt, correct. The passage he quotes and remarks upon, is one of the many scriptures that clearly teach the doctrine of a righteous retribution after death. We do not know of any theological error so entirely without even a shadow of support, both in reason and revelation, as that upon which he animadverts, viz. that all mankind, good and bad, will be equally happy so soon as they enter on the future life. It is a doctrine which cannot extensively prevail among intelligent and virtuous believers in the immortality of human beings. The whole current of Scripture is opposed to it; the manifest dealings of Providence are opposed to it; the deductions of right reason are opposed to it; the natural sentiments of the uncorrupt heart are opposed to it. For ourselves, we should just as soon think of denying that men will exist at all after death, as think of denying that on passing into the other world they will all, the holiest and the vilest, be on the same footing as to enjoyment. But we will not enlarge on this topic. It has not been our custom to combat this error in our columns, because, among other reasons, we have deemed it so obviously inconsistent with the plain import of the gospel, and intrinsically so unreasonable, that it must disappear of itself, without the aid of formal argument, in the general progress of christian intelligence and virtue. *C. Register.*

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING IN LONDON.

We have just received the Anti-slavery Reporter of May 9. It contains an account of an anti-slavery meeting at Exeter Hall in London. "This," the Reporter informs us, "was the most numerous meeting of the friends of the anti-slavery cause probably ever yet assembled in England under one roof. The new and spacious hall where it met, and which is capable of containing nearly three thousand persons, was filled to over-

flowing long before the proceedings commenced; and multitudes went away without being able to obtain admittance." The meeting was successively addressed by Lord Suffield, the chairman, Mr. Buxton, Sir James Mackintosh, Dr. Lushington, Rev. Daniel Wilson, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Shiel, Mr. Pownall, Rev. J. Burnett, Rev. R. Watson, Mr. Evans, Mr. George Stephen, and Rev. J. W. Cunningham. These addresses were all animated and some of them impassioned and eloquent. They breathe throughout a high moral feeling, a deep abhorrence of slavery, a burning zeal for its abolition, and a firm conviction that this consummation is rapidly approaching. The speakers generally advocated *immediate* abolition, and the expression of this opinion was in most cases received with "great cheering." One of the resolutions adopted was, "That the object of this meeting is the entire extinction of negro slavery."

From what passed at this meeting we infer, that though the present ministry is in favor of the entire extinction of slavery, they are not prepared for the measure of immediate abolition. There can, however, be no doubt, that measures for the gradual or immediate abolition of slavery throughout the British empire will be proposed, with the sanction of the ministry, at the present session of Parliament, and in all probability be carried. [*Christian Register.*

—

REMARKS:—Shall England be awake to the evil of slavery? shall the people of that kingdom be roused to activity to its abolition? and shall America, the land of boasted liberty, lie supinely inactive? Forbid it, heaven! Let the freemen of America blush to be last in this great cause of removing oppression and bonds from the poor Africans, and of restoring them to that liberty which has been unjustly wrested from them by superior power. Let Christians of every order engage in the work of reformation from this evil, and set the example of righteousness to the world. We recommend to their attention the Colonization society—now increasing in number and respectability, and which will doubtless ultimately sweep the black population of America across the Atlantic to the shores of Africa. EDITOR.

OBITUARY.

DIED in this county on the 17th Sept. at his own house, COL. ALEXANDER TILFORD—beloved and respected. He was not a professor of religion until he lay on his death bed. He then appeared indeed penitent, and we hope died reconciled to his God. He has left a numerous family, which sensibly feel his loss.

NOTICE.--Two more No's. will complete the 5th vol. of the C. Messenger, and these will be issued together in Dec. I once more wait the decision of my brethren, friends and patrons, whether I shall prosecute the work in another vol. or desist entirely. This decision will be made known to me through a general agent in every state, to which the Messenger is sent. The sub-agents and others, who may feel disposed to continue the work, will as soon as possible, ascertain their subscribers' wishes, and forward their names to the general agent. This is done to avoid the heavy tax of postage. The general agent will immediately send the list of names and places of residence to me, against the middle of December. It is hoped that those who have not paid for the former volumes, will also transmit their dues to the general agent, or to me. The propriety of this I need not urge. Should I continue the Messenger, I wish a more extensive circulation of the work; therefore urge my agents to increase the number of their subscribers. If each subscriber, when alone in a neighbourhood, would endeavor to get at least five, it would be easy to remit the money. Every such person, who shall obtain five subscribers, and shall collect and remit me the money within six months, shall have one volume for his trouble.—No discontinuance till the end of a volume.—The price as usual $1 for a year, or 12 nos.

I now subjoin a list of *General Agents.*

Ky. Ben. Cassell, Lexington; or myself.
Ia: Elder Beverly Vawter, Madison.
Ohio. Jeptha D. Garrard, Esq. Cincinnati.
Ten. Wm. Wray, P. M. Monroe, Overton co.
Ala. Elder Js. E. Matthews, P. M. Barton's Landerdale co.
Ga. Elder Jacob Callahan, Monroe.
Ill. William Mitchell, P. M. Palestine.
Mo. Charles H. Allen, Esq. Palmyra.
La. Js. D. McCoy, Alexandria.
Va. Elder C. Sine, Back Creek Valley, Frederic co.
Pa. Elder David Wallace, Waynesburg, Green co.
Md. Elder Js. McVey, Baltimore.
N. York. Elder D. Millard, West Bloomfield.
N. Ca. I. Johnson, P. M. Reedy fork, Guilford co.
S. Ca. Elder John L. Davis, Brattonville, York Dist.
Wm. Smith; Jacksonburg, Michigan.

To many of my agents I feel grateful for their prompt attention; They will please accept my thanks—and it is hoped that others, who have been negligent, will oblige me in future, by collecting my dues and transmitting them to me by mail, or otherwise, and by attending to the list of subscribers to have it sent as early as possible, at farthest by the 15th of December next. EDITOR.

Our Annual Meeting commenced on Friday before the third Lord's day of Sept. and closed on Monday following, at Cynthianna, Ky. This meeting will be thankfully remembered through eternity by many. It was a season of refreshing to hundreds—not as many professed faith in the Lord and united with the church, as we have seen. About 1[illegible] during the meeting. A particular account may be expected in the next No.—The meeting was numerously attended. EDITOR.

RECEIPTS FROM AUG. 1ST TO OCT. 1ST.

KENTUCKY.—Salvisa, By Elder Leonard Flemming, $1 for I. Allen. *Harrodsburg*, By ——, for Mary Allen 1, and Agnes Moseby 1. *Georgetown*, By ——, for Robt. Ramsey, 1, Jas. Grant 1. *Dry Creek*, By J. G. Ellis $5, of which 1 for J. Ellis, 1 for Jas. Dedman, 1 for W. G. Ellis, 1 for Fred. Kleet, 1 for W. Stevens. *Bethel*, Hill. Roberts 1, Betsey Williams 1.—*Athens*, Nathan Petit 1. *Lexington*, By Ben. Cassell, 2 for John Wilson and Geo. Shivery. *Leesburg*, By Jo. Wasson, 2 for self and A. Chinn. *Centreville*, Geo. Palmer 1, P. Ward 1. *Frankfort*, By A. Dudley 5, for Mrs. Harvie 1. for Sam. Ware 1, Jas. Ross 1, for P. Dudley 1, for self 1, O. T. Major 1. *New Castle*, By Elder S. Marshall 3; for S. Scott 1, E. Thomas 1, C. Sanford 1. *Williamsburg*' By W. Workman 1 62½ in full. *Carlisle*, By J. Rogers 2; by W. Hall 1. *Corneliusville*, By J. G. Ellis, for John Terril 1, Wm. Terril 1, J. Gilman of Newport 1, Mat. Dobbins of Gains' ✕ Roads 2, for Fredenburgh of Dry Creek 0 50, J. Taylor of do. 1 50. *Cane Run*, By John Graves for self 1, I. Rungan 1, J. Henderson 1, by Mr. Farrell 0 50, *Minerva*, By A. Alexander $5. *Paris*, By H. Parker 1; Mr. Henderson by T. M. Allen 1. *Flemingsburg*, By Geo. Sousley for self 1, T. Taylor 1, F. Freelin 2. *Republican*, By Maj. Faulconer, 11 50; by R. & A. Ray 2. *Cynthianna*, I. Cartmel $18; L. Woolen 1. *Paris*, By Philip Grimes 1. *Millersburg*, By Jo. Mitchel 1. *Falmouth*, By F. Chalfant $5; for self 1, for C. Kennett 1, McArta 2, Wm. Rule 1. *Mt. Carmel*, Ben. Brandon 1. *Union*, By Elder T. M. Allen, for Thos. Moore 2.—*OHIO. Rutland*, By Rodney Downing 2 for Nathan Simpson, *New Paris*, By P. Dickey, for John Adams 1, By H. D. Palmer for Danl. Davis of *Bruceville, Ia.* 1, for P. Ursley and self, of *Carlisle, Ia.* 2, for Danl. Travis of Bloomington 1.

INDIANA. Bloomington, By Dr. Roach $12. *Rockville*, By T. Nisbit for P. Harris 2. *Edinburg*, By Gav. Mitchell 5; for self 2, for E. Dawson (vol. 3) 1, for H Maskill (vol. 3) 87½, for Elder Jo Hatchill 12½ for Jas. Vanzant of Columbus 1.—*Cynthianna*, John Johnson 3.

ILLINOIS. Springfield, By Mr. Trumbo 5; for Merriman 1, Henry 1, Radford 1, Goolan 1, himself 1. *Palestine*, Wm. Wilson 3.

☞ Many communications on hand, which shall receive all due attention. ED.

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.—NOVEMBER 1831. [No. 11.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

REPLY ON UNION, COMMUNION, AND THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

In speaking or writing on this subject of *Union*, more than on most others, we deceive ourselve and one another, without knowing or intending it. The want of precision in the meaning attached to our terms may be the cause of this. It might appear hypercritical, or perhaps something worse, to ask the worthy editor of the Christian Messenger what he means by "*union in form?*" Does he mean a formal confederation of all preachers and people called "*Christians*," with all those whom he calls *Reformed* Baptists? (rather *reforming* than *reformed;*) or (as he represents them as prefering for a *sectarian* purpose the name) disciples. If so, what shall be the articles of confederation, and in what *form* shall they be ministered or adopted?—Shall it be in one general convention of messengers from all the societies of "Christians" and "disciples," or one general assembly of the whole aggregate of both people? Shall the articles of agreement be drawn up in writing like the articles of the "General Union" amongst the different sects of Baptists in Kentucky?

Hast here been an incident in ecclesiastical history of a whole people formally and in good faith uniting with another whole people without such a formal confederation? Or does he expect a "union in form" without any form of effecting it? If he does not, then it is out of order to complain of the want of a formal union until a proposition made to that effect shall have been submitted by the complainant, and rejected by the defendant. But such a proposition has not, as we have heard, been tendered; nor have we heard of any general meeting among the Christians to deliberate upon the terms and conditions. Or does he think that one or two individuals, of and from themselves, should propose and effect a formal union among the hundreds of congregations scattered over this continent, called christians or