RECEIPTS

DECEMBER AND JANUARY, 1834.

KENTUCKY.

Cane-run—John Runyon for vol 8; Mrs. Gaines for do—*Republican*—By L. Falconer for 3,00,—*Georgetown*—O. Austin for 7: W. Roberts for do; I. Crumbaugh for vol 8; Tho. C Kelly for do; Lewis Sebastian for 7; Js. D. Nelson for 6 & 7 $2 35,—*Dry-creek*—Wm. Ellis for 7,—*Shelbyville*—By R. Ramsey and Wm. Standifer for 7,—*Lawrenceburgh*—Geo. Bean for 7,—*Versailles*—J. M. Depew for 8,—*Hopkinsville*—Wm. Davenport sent $5—for E. G. Herndon for 7, for I. Hay do, for A. Blue do, for self 2 00, of which 1 00 for 7, 50 cents for half of vol 6 and 50 cents for half of vol 8—lost by mail,—*Long-run*—Wm. O. Bohannon 3 00 for 7 and two copies of 8, and J. Helm 7 & 8 vols,—*Williamsburgh*—Js. Shackelford for his father vols 5, 8 and for Geo: D. Stockdon 2 50 of which 1 00 is for 7,—*Raven-creek*—J: Miller for 7,—*Bethel*—Jac: T. Judy for 7,—*Leesburgh*—M. Roberson for 7,—*Waidsboro*—J. M'Cartney for 7.

OHIO.

Milfield—B. Sanders, I. Pugsley and B. Bachelor for 7,—*Hillsboro'*—Sam: Gibson for I. Miller, I. Easter, Jac: Easter, I. Easter, sen, M. Belcher, A. Belcher, A. Blount, W. M'Coy & Sam: Horn, all for vol 8,—*Williamsport*—G. Alkire for self, Cade and Grimes for vol 7,—*Chilicothe*—Elder Js: Baker 3 00 for old nos.

MISSOURI.

Clarksville—I. Mulherrin 5 00 for 7.

ALABAMA.

Montgomery—Ismael Davis 5 for 7.

INDIANA.

Rising-Sun—J. Fisher and W. Higbee for vol 8.

NEW-YORK.

Youngstown—D. Wiers for Dan. Betrand, Abm. Hostetter, N. Gilmore, and K. W. Shavelier, for 7, 4 00.

We have been so much crowded with other matter, that I have deferred further strictures on the Franklin creed to some future occasion.

J. T. JOHNSON.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 2.

EDITED BY BARTON W. STONE & J. T. JOHNSON,
Elders in the Church of Christ.

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

GEORGETOWN, KY.....FEBRUARY, 1834.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers, if paid on the reception of the first number—or $1 25 if not paid within 6 months. They who procure eight subscribers, and remit the money to the Editors, 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.

TO MR. SAMUEL TAYLOR.

SIR:—I should not again trouble myself to address you upon any of the other propositions discussed by us, but for the constant impression which your Brethren abroad, are labouring to make in relation to the result of that discussion. Had you given the arrangement and facts urged, in support of my position, I should feel no farther concern as to the impression, the world might receive upon the subject. But this you have not done—You have dealt largely in your reasonings, but have avoided an appeal to the divine testimony. The trumpets however have been sounding abroad by your Brethren, that a great victory has been achieved; at home a differant course has been pursued. We heard of none of all this; And methinks, the best testimony ought to be found here, where the enemy was captured, his bones deposited and a monument in memory of your achievements ought to be seen. But Sir, it was truly unfortunate for myself and the cause which I advocate, that I had no Editor of a Religious Messenger present to endorse for me, and shout Victory; a great triumph has been achieved; and the enemy captured.

But we must approach the second proposition. Is faith in Jesus Christ, produced alone by divine testimony, without any operation of the Holy Spirit. I shall now sir, give some of the testimony of the inspired witnesses, which was offered in proof of the affirmative of this proposition. And first, it was argued, that what ever was the object of one of the Apostles in writing the Gospel, must necessarily, and primarily be the object of

all, in as much, as there is but one Gospel given from Heaven, and if this be true, then the object of the Evangelist must have been the same, to-wit. to convince the world of Messiahs claims commands, promises and judgments. If this be not true, we shall be in difficulty to understand Paul, when he declares that if any man preach,—Yes if an angel from Heaven should declare any other Gospel than that which he had declared, or made known, let him be accursed. However great and diversified, then were the topics discussed or cummunicated to the world by the four Evangelists, we must admit that they all aimed at the establishment of one grand truth, that is, that Jesus was the very Saviour. This then being conceded, what was the means afforded in order to this conviction. Go with me and inquire of John 20, chap. 13 v. And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name. This testimony is clear, without figure, and altogether in point; And does legitimately prove, not only the object of John in writing his Gospel, but virtually and in fact, the object of all. Here then the corner stone was laid, and we begin to inquire, whether the means were successful in accomplishing this important result. We will summon John again in proof of this fact, chap. 4th, to 31st, verse and from 39 to 43d, verses of same, where it is asserted, that many of the Samaritans of that city believed on him for the saying of the woman, which testified, he told me all that ever I did. And in 41 verse it is said, that when Jesus went into the city, many more believed because of his word. Here the means accomplished the desired effect. Again, it was urged, that the History of the Apostles preaching, recorded in the Acts, clearly sustains the same facts: See acts 14 chap. 17 chap. to verse 5 and from 10 vs. to close, 18 chap. 9 verse. I will only transcribe one account, as a fair sample of the balance, see 14 chap. Acts. Where the Historian informs us, that Paul and Barnabas went into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake, that a great multitude, both of the Jews and Greeks believed; and to these facts bear all the Apostles witness without one dissenting voice.

As a further proof of this already well established fact it was urged, that the spirit was not promised by Messiah, previous to his ascension and glorification, John 7 chapter and 39 vs. But this spake he of the spirit, which they that believe, should receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified. From this positive assertion from the mouth of our Lord, three things are clearly to be seen, 1st. that there were disciples before the Saviour was glorified; 2nd, that as a matter of course they had believed without the operation of the Spirit on their hearts; and 3rd, Jesus being witness, the Spirit was promised to believers only, But we shall now sustain the affirmative of this question by another appeal to our Lord, who, when addressing his disciples John 14 chap. 15 vrs. thus speaketh. If you love me, keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father, and he shall send you another Comfortre, that he may abide with you forever, even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him. And what does all this prove? To my mind, it proves first. that the promise was only made to those who loved and kept his commands. Upon this his prayer was predicated. And secondly, it would be impossible for God even to send another Comforter to them, and yet, that should be the same, which they were already in possession of, for Paul being witness, there is but one Spirit.

But again; our Lord as positively declares that the world cannot receive this spirit! I presume sir, we all agree, that the term world, has an allusion alone to the unconverted. To this you must agree. This argument for ever sets at variance your system and our Lord. The above testimony we then thought, and now think, incontrovertible.

But we shall ascertain how far Paul will concur in these facts. In his epistle to the Gallatians, chap. 3rd, vrs. 14. That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, not in unbelief. Again hear him chap. 4 vrse 6. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father. But we shall examine this witness again in his Epistle to the Ephesians, chap. 2, vs. 1. And you hath he quickened (i. e. filled, says McKnight,) who were dead in tresspasses and sins. Here, says Mr. Taylor is evidence of the special operation. Yes, and so say all our opponents. We shall try the proof' 1st. I admit that if any people upon the face of this globe needed the special operation of the Spirit, they had as strong claims upon that necessity as any could have. Why? Because Paul asserts, that they were dead i. e. to Holiness. They worshipped about 20,000 Gods; And yet they were without God, and hope. Now I will admit the fact, that they were not only dead, but quickened, made alive i. e. filled with the spirit. But when, sir, is the question at issue? You say before faith; I say through it. Now go with me to 1st. chap. 13 verse. (Your confession asserts, that the scripture is its best interpreter, to which I agree.) and there we shall see the whole secret unveiled. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy spirit

of promise, referred to in Gall. 3 chapt. 14, vs. no doubt you must perceive, that the Ephesians, did not receive this spirit, until they had first heard, believed, and trusted in it Yes, say you; but this same Apostle asserts chap. 1st 19 verse that the Ephesians believed according to the working of his mighty power, admit it. but where was this power displayed? In their Hearts, says Mr. Taylor; where does Paul say it was? hear him verse 20. Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead; what a mistake! Yes, and thus are all mistaken who think and teach, that this power is wrought in the hearts of sinners when they believe divine testimony. Please sir, first to notice one fact, that Paul was here speaking to christians, and that the power alluded to, had to do alone with the resurrection of the body, they having been already converted.

Having now given many positive assertions from the divine records, permit me to offer you an illustration upon this subject to-wit. We have but one body, and of course but one spirit, and this spirit dwells alone in and not out of the body, this is true beyond contradiction, so Christ has but one body i. e. his spouse or church; and there is but one spirit, says Paul, and where does this spirit dwell? We operate on our neighbours mind by our spirit through our words; and so does our Lord convince the world of sin. of righteousness, and of judgment by his spirit through the words, motives and promises, urged by the mouth of his Apostles and Prophets. And to this fact, Paul offered his testimony in proof. Hebrew 1 chapter, God who at sundry times and divers manners spake in time past unto the Father by the Prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his son. This assertion of Paul proves one of two things, to-wit. That God spake alone to the Jews, i. e. reproved them of sin, or promised deliverance from it, and their enemies, alone through the instruction conveyed by the prophet; or else the whole truths is not told upon the subject; and thus we say in relation to his son. And that in these last days he now speaks alone through his Son, and his Son through his Apostles upon the subject of Christianity.

Let us however make one more appeal to the divine record. I am the vine and ye (my disciples,) are the branches, says our Lord 14 chapt. John. Was it ever known that a vine imparted any of its sap or spirit to a branch, not grafted into the stock? Surely not sir; and yet you labour to prove that the Gentiles, who are wild olives, not grafted into the body of Christ, while in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity, must have the sap, yea, the spirit of the vine itself, without a union with the vine or body! This sir, is bad Philosophy, as well as Divinity. We must now take a passing view of your divinity, for which you spent several years at Princeton, and now labour to pass its

notes off upon the people as pure coin. You will recollect, sir, that you opposed the Idea, that faith was produced alone by divine testimony; from the fact, as you asserted, that we are born of God previous to faith in his Son, or in order to faith that is to say, we are regenerated, made anew, or over again, without faith, and of course regenerated unbelievers, this you urged from John 5, chapter 1 vs. What a monster! a regenerated sanctified, and of course an adopted unbeliever, but I must transcribe the proof. "He that believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." From this you argue the birth first, the impregnation, or begetting, second; so then, be it known (for the discovery is marvellous) that the birth is the cause of the impregnation. Yes, God regenerates by his spirit, without faith in order to faith! Who when so regenerated, are neither fit for Heaven nor Hell! for without faith it is impossible to please God; to Heaven then he can never go, and the devil has no claims upon any such, says Mr. Taylor. See how Purgatory triumphs in the victory over Campbellism. One more such achievement, and Campbellism, or the word of God itself will fall never to rise more. Your logic and divinity being about equal, defies not a comparison with the Alcoran.

But, sir, as the champion of other days, You must be heard further, You again urge the old Calvinian and Fullerite dogma as a master piece of sound logic, and pure divinity. You say, In order to obey a natural law, We must first have natural life; therefore in order to obey a spiritual law, we must also have spiritual life. This is pure logic, and incontrovertible, say all. Be it then admitted as truth, and here we will ask a question, or give you a syllogism to answer at your leisure. If a natural or spiritual law cannot be obeyed, without natural or spiritual life; please tell us how either can be disobeyed without life. And not being disobeyed, of course there can be no punishment; for that is inflicted for sin, and sin is the violation of law, in order to which we must have life. See sir, how you triumph in universalianism for upon this plan all must be saved. But this is the result of pure calvinism; either to save a very few or all, saint and sinner. But as all skilful combatants and generals hold, in reserve the last and best artillery, so does Mr. Taylor, and here he shall speak for himself. On a certain occasion, at a very large collection of persons, you preached (the Gospel, you say, and as I was not present I cannot certainly dispute it,) that you were very stentorious, i. e. energetic both in voice and body. Yet, no person was converted. You afterwards delivered the same discourse word for word almost (and of course you had learned it by heart. and perhaps borrowed it) to a large audience; that you were more feeble, both in body and voice, than in the first delivery, and yet, God converted many the last time, but none

the first. Hence you said, you see, that the spirit must have operated on their hearts in order to their believing divine testimony. Sublime philosophy! Irresistible logic, and pure divinity! Yes, what a monument, Sir, have you here erected to the memory of pure orthodoxy. A few more such achievements over the word of God, and all must be cast to the moles and bats. But sir time will not permit me to run with you farther into additional arguments, which were urged by you, in opposition to the fact that faith in Jesus Christ is produced alone by divine testimony. Yes, your modes of believing, historical faith, evangelical faith, saving faith &c. are so many babylonish phrases, and too tedious to notice. Wishing you more health in the faith of the gospel, I refer you to the pure word of God.

Nicholasville, Ky.

GEORCE W. ELLEY.

EXTRACT FROM CHRISTIAN CASKET.

A PICTURE OF THE PRESENT AGE.

Or, a Catechism adapted to the Logic of Modern Preachers.

QUESTION 1st. Is not sprinkling valid Baptism?

ANSWER. Let us draw near, with a true heart, in full assurance of faith; having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, *and our bodies washed with clean water.* Heb. x. 22.

Q. 2nd. Is not pouring valid Baptism?

A. Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into his death; therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. Rom. vi, 3, 4. Buried with him, in baptism, wherein also, you are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead. Col. ii, 12.

Q. 3rd. Are not unbaptised persons, who believe in the blood of Jesus, and repent of their sins, legal members of the kingdom of heaven, which is set up in this world?

A. Except a man be born of water and spirit he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of heaven. John iii, 5.

Q. 4th. Has the Lord Jesus promised to save those who believe, and repent, and will not be baptised?

A. He that believes and is baptised shall be saved. Mark xvi, 16.

Q. 5th: Is it not presumptuous, and ridiculous, to teach that baptism was designed, expressly for remission of sins?

A. Repent and be baptised every, one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Acts ii, 38.

Q. 6th Were not Paul's sins pardoned, before he was baptised?

A. And now, why tarriest thou, arise, and be baptised, *and wash away your sins,* calling on the name of the Lord. Acts xxii, 16.

Q. 7th. Are all the pious, unbaptised persons; members of the bride, the Lamb's wife?

A. Husbands love your wives, even as Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for her, that he might sanctify her having cleansed her in the bath of water by the word. Eph. v, 25–26.

Q. 8th. Is not the phrase, "baptism is the bath of regeneration," an invention of ALEXANDER CAMPBELL?

A. After that the kindness and love of God, our Saviour, towards man appeared, not on account of works of righteousness which we had done, but according to his mercy, he saved us through the *bath of regeneration,* and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Titus iii, 5.

Q. 9th. Is it not a slander upon the institutions of heaven, to say that baptism saves us, in any sense of the word?

A. The like figure whereunto, even baptism does also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. 1st Peter iii, 21.

Under the Reviewers *head*, of "The Religious Herald" there are some most excellent observations in reference to an immediate submission to the Lord Jesus by the penitent believer. Coming from the head quarters of the Baptists in Virginia, we ask for the extracts, we shall publish, a faithful hearing from the baptists of the West.

The Reviewers treat the doctrines of the Doctors of Divinity very unceremoniously, and bring all their sayings to the infallible standard the Bible.

It is conclusively shown that the cause of truth has suffered greatly in the keeping of the Doctors of Divinity. The time has come when something more will be required to sustain, "what is truth," than great names and high sounding titles.

Christians have commenced looking into the standard authority. The Bible is the great standard—the light of Heaven, which casts into the shade all the reasonings of men. But let us hear.

"How can a man show that he repents and believes before he has time to show the operations and fruits of repentance and faith?" Dr. Woods knows he is safe here—but what does he mean by "time to show." One minute? or one day? or one month? or, as is the custom in some Presbyterian and Congregational churches, will the Dr. hang up his friend's name in the vestry a *whole year* before he admits him to the church! How much "time" does he take to have "operations" of "repentance?"

The genuine effect of repentance is to forsake—to leave off—sin. Will Dr. W. say how much "time" it takes to *leave off* doing any thing? What is the "fruit of faith?"—obedience;—and what is the first act of obedience? (Aye, Doctor "now] adhering *conscientiously* to the *Word of God* as our rule?") Baptism—Dr. Woods—Baptism—and what time does it take to baptise a believer? That of course the Dr. does not know, never having "adhered" to the "rule;" but we can tell him—just one minute: "Believe and be baptised"—That puts an end to sudden conversions being "contrary to scripture;"—and if the Doctor will run foul of "reason and sober judgment," he must take the consequence. Let us look at the reason of the case.—We overtake a man on the road—he tells where he is going—we inform him he is mistaken—that he is going a perfectly contrary direction to that which will answer his purpose—he sees his error, or is converted—he changes his mind, or repents—he turns round or converts—he walks the contrary way, or obeys. How many miles will Dr. Woods have him walk before he believes he has repented, or changed his mind? Again; I am the friend of a merchant who is going to Europe, and he has left under my care his only daughter, an amiable girl of 14. I learned that my friend died on his voyage, and so far from leaving a large fortune for his daughter, his affairs are insolvent. I break the intelligence to the orphan girl, and to cheer her bursting heart, assure her that though I cannot restore her father to her, I will be her father, and she shall share alike my affections and my property with my own children, if she will only accept the offer. I see the smile of gratitude tinge hear tears with colours more beauteous than the rainbow—she falls on my neck, and her heart bursts with thankfulness. She tells me she feels unworthy of so great a favor, but that she knows me too well to doubt my sincerity or affection. She confides herself wholly to my care, and assures me that my kindness has bound up her broken heart. "What rashness" Dr. Woods exclaims, "for us to make up our mind confidently" respecting this youth's acceptance of my offer, and her joy at the reception of it, or "to speak of it confidently to others when she has had opportunity to give but slight and dubious evidence." Cold hearted suggestion! alike directly opposed to the oracles of truth, to the philosophy of the mind; and to enlightened experience;—*si sic omnes!*—but happily it is not so. Calvin Colton, though destitute alike of a diploma and a Professor's chair, has inconceivably more just views on this subject; and were the D. D. to pay a visit to Europe, and write for the New York Observer, while Calvin Colton occupied the Andover Chair *pro tem*, so far as just ideas of theology were concerned, the students of Andover, would have a sudden revival. How the readers of the Observer might approve the change, we know not. But let us hear.

And those, who object to sudden conversions, would seem to maintain, that the longer the sinner holds this question in suspense, the better. Or how long will they say?—A year?—He may be dead, and in hell, in half that time. Six months? The same objection lies here. One month?—One week?—One day? *One hour?*—The same objection lies still. Can he safely, and without disobeying God to the peril of everlasting damnation, continue *one moment* in a state of impenitence?—The *more* sudden a conversion, then, the better. *Immediate* repentence, on the present instance is the only safe course—the very and the only requisition of the Gospel.

The length and breadth of the question, then, seems to me to be this:—whether it is better, that the motives to repentance should be so grouped, accumulated, concentrated, and forced upon the attention and upon the heart as to induce *immediate* repentance,—or whether it is better, that the motives should be so scattered, and so comparatively inefficient, as to suspend the crisis, and throw it a greater distance?

Conversion, I think should not be regarded as a mystery—should not be covered with a cloud, as a thing which cannot be looked into. It is a plain common-sense, practical business, intelligible to all. It is a decision in the mind and heart of the simplest question:—'Shall I love and serve God, or shall I love and serve the world?'

The remainder of Dr. Wood's Introductory Essay is sui generis; but we shall dismiss it with this observation—in dealing with souls the main point is to work with *the truth and nothing but the truth.* When we are going *right*, there is no danger of going too fast. With muddy views and unscriptural theories, the slower people move the less mischief they will do certainly; but work with "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned:" and then, with the Professor's permission, if three thousand repent and believe, they may be baptised in one day.

Loyd's Essex co. Jan. 6th. 1834.

Dear Brethren Stone and Johnson:—I am this day fifty one years old; how much longer I am to remain on this earth, is only known to my Heavenly Father. The last six years of my life, has been spent in resisting *the traditions of the Baptist Clergy*, around me, and proclaiming the gospel. I combatted alone in old Virginia for three years, since which, several thousand of Soldiers have entered under the banners of our king; whose motto is *victory or death.* Some of our opponents, talk of *union with us*, while their black flag remains in their minutes over our heads, and on their "*Religious Herald*," so called. They had as well talk of uniting night and day, as to talk of our union

with those who have solemnly and *prayerfully* decreed us as "*disorganizers and demoralisers of society.*" We cannot condescend to *corrupt these men*, who have publickly said, "stand by thy self, we are more holy than thou," they must first condescend to acknowledge their errors. Those that talk of union, *when with our friends*, are trying we fear, to act the part of Sanballat and Tobiah over again. What has been their language towards us? We have not forgotten it, nor can we forget it, while those decrees are remaining upon their minutes unatoned for.

These men begin to see, that their conduct has so trammelled themselves as to have brought themselves into the most unenviable condition, that ever mortals could well place themselves. They have laboured so hard to destroy us, before the principles of this restoration were developed, and created such a stock of prejudice (*a horrid and destructive sin*) in the minds of those under their influence, that there cannot be found *one man, a preacher among them*, that possesses moral courage enough to confess his errors, and return with us to the noblest work that men or angels can engage in. *Their opposition to our return to the teaching alone of Jesus Christ and his Apostles*, has driven, in a few years past, just around me, from 15 to 20 of the *Baptist Children*, brought up under the teaching of our intolerant opponents, into the Methodist and Episcopal Churches. The people begin to see, and I hope will make the move themselves, that if they wait for their teachers, or the usurpers of our rights, they will leave a lasting reproach upon themselves and posterity of not being the worshippers of God, but the *dupes and tools* of a few ambitious men. Now if the teachers come out first, to embrace this restoration of the ancient gospel, all who follow them will expose themselves to this censure. The preachers will escape, as you know they can very easily say, they did not understand us until now. If the churches themselves make the first move as one of Mr. Broaddus's has done, and Mr. Balls, they well know, that the inteligent part of the community, will lay at the preachers door the sin of their decrees, and the schism they have produced among the disciples of Jesus Christ. But the preachers *are afraid of each other*, more than they are afraid of the people, and the people are afraid of their preachers. This, every unprejudice intelligent man begins to see, and talk as one of *their own members* said a few days past unless there was a change in *the conduct of their preachers*, they would soon drive every intelligent man and woman outfrom among them, into the reformation.

Strange indeed, that such a man as Elder *Andrew Broaddus*, should oppose the gospel of Jesus Christ, and substitute the *theory* of *Andrew Fuller*. There was a time when Broaddus was just as afraid to preach "*Fullers gospel*," of natual ability and moral inability," as he is now, to unite with us to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ. I well remember his conversion to this theory, when Dr. Staughton embraced it. His last effort in the Herald of the 20th December, is a condemnation of himself. He certainly began in old Virginia, to proscribe *his brethren*, & the Ketocton and Columbian association, followed his example. Every stroke he attempts to give them falls doubly as severe upon his own head. I have frequently informed him, *his theory of opinions* produced, and will continue to produce *factions and sects*. He now admits "he is *forced* to refer the settlement of these matters to God," after having thrown out the bone of contention among his brethren, which Solomon says "are like the bears of a castle." What a pity he did not in the beginning, when *he acted as moderator to proscribe me*, agree then, and advise his brethren, "to refer these matters to God, It is, I fear too late now, when *schism has been made by him*, to talk of referring these matters to God for settlement, and yet is using all his influence to keep up their contentions. His conduct in the last Dover association in appointing committees, *to divide the churches*, is evidence of the truth of my assertion. The account has become an enormous one; he will have to settle with God, for dividing his church, for no other cause than *our preferring to obey God, rather than man.* No wonder he may "*groan*," when he has *usurped the sacred rights of conscience.* If it be asked, why I speak of Mr. Broaddus alone in these decrees, and his writings; I answer, he was the moderator, and is requested by a resolution of the association to become as a mouth piece for them. I do most cordially sympathise with Mr. Broaddus. He rejected my friendly advice in the beginning of this reformation, of referring these matters to God. But I rejoice his conscience is not seared, for he groans. He admits, it is the *right of every disciple*, that has believed, repented and been immersed, to read the scriptures for themselves, to form their own judgment of God's word, and *as christians to speak their own sentiments.* This admission must hang as a millstone around their necks, when they think of *their decrees.* For it ought to have *warned him*, and every other man of righteousness, not to *molest the disciples in their exercise of this admitted right.* If such is *the right of every disciple*, (and who will deny it, but the Pope and his tools?) he and all his brethren, concerned in proscribing others on account of *their opinions*, stand condemned as unrighteous men before heaven and earth, upon his own admission. This is the reason we cannot unite with them, until there is a reformation among them. Is this "*one side of the road*" he was guarding when discussing his views with brother Campbell? If so we are constrained to say, he had visited some *sectarian* tippling

theory, and made every side of the road his side, like some tottering tipler. But he tries to escape from this state of self condemnation, by saying, "the *church has rights too.*" This reminds me of an anecdote related by McDuffie in Congress, of a Dutch Judge. A case came before this Judge, respecting the *right of opinion.* It was argued by the party that it was the *right of every man to fully express his opinions. The Judge having determined to decide against the man*, said, "O yah; every man *haf de right* in dis free republic; to dink for himself, *provided he dinks with the corte.*"

This is the unvanished *principle*, upon which Mr. Braoddus and his brethren has produced the shameful, nay disgraceful faction in old Virginia; and proves to demonstration that *sectarianism*, cannot be sustained at this day, by *speaking and acting according to the principles of truth, and rigeteousness.* Were I to tell Mr. Broaddus, that the *authority he has assumed in guarding every side of the road*, and will suffer no man to pass into, or remain in the kingdom of Jesus Christ *without paying the usual toll for such logic*, that it was *unauthorised* by any law, published in heaven or earth, except from the *man of sin*, the *Pope* and *their minions*, that it was destroying the world, and placing the sectarian professors in a condition to become the proper subjects for the wrath to be revealed against all unrighteousness of men that hold the truth in unrighteousness. He would say this was a heavy charge indeed and must destroy us if true. Let us camly examine, whether or not, this is a true picture of *his and all sectarian logic.* He admits the *inalienable rights of every disciple* within the kingdom of Jesus Christ, to read his word, think and speak the convictions of his own judgment as every one of us shall have to give an account of himself to God; for all must appear before the judgment, seat of Christ. that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad. No man will be justified for making the *opinions or views* of any uninspired man or set of men, *a rule of his conduct*, when he has the *teaching of Jesus Christ and his Apostles*; for Jesus has said, if the blind lead the blind, *both shall fall into the ditch.* I say, he admits all this, then tells us, the *churches have rights* to put out from among them, those that exercise the *rights that God has given them*, and will hold us responsible for yielding the right to *him or any set of men.* If this is not making God an unrighteous being, or the churches usurpers of *those rights*, he admits God has granted to us, and for the use of which, we shall have to account with him; and teaching the church to hold the truth in unrighteousness there is no such thing on earth? Surely they would, if they have two eyes two ears, and a heart to understand, never put themselves under the government of such principles, *if acted up*

to, must be just as fatal to them, at the bar of God, as to remain where they are; thus the world and the *porscribing sects of opinion*, stand in an awful predicament at this day. Suppose they had even the right to make laws for the subjects of Jesus Christ; which is far from being the case, Where is their authority to make void the laws of Jesus Christ, in order to deprive us of our inalienable rights. The Governor and Legislature of Virginia nor the President and Congress of these United States, *have no right* to pass a law in time of peace to molest or deprive me of the enjoyment of any *legal right* I possess, so long as I manifest my attachment and support of the Government without becoming *arbitrary, despotic, unrighteous.*

He speaks of "divine sovereignty, which involves the conduct and operations of God" and "of the glorious character of God." Is this his glorious character of God; giving to us the *rights and priviledges of the sons of God* and holding us accountable to him, for the use of them, warns us against being servants to men, *at the same time gives to him, with a few more of his brethren, the right to deprive us as disciples of Jesus Christ of this right and make us their servants.* Surely he has measured the character of God by his own preconceived views of right and wrong *pleasing, the system-makers out.* When *Wm. F. Broaddus's* (who agreed with A. Broaddus) *rights* were restricted by the Ketocton and Columbian associations, for *only a difference in opinion with his brethren, all is wrong in these associations*, and the report of *Dr. Chapin*, with the minority, was forthwith published *as being right.* This reminds me of another Dutch anecdote related by the same author as the first. He says "there was a lottery to be drawn in some Dutch settlement; when the first two or three tickets were drawn blanks, *all was wrong*; a large bully with *his hickory club*, threatened to smash the wheel, declaring the whole affair, was a piece of villanous cheatry. Presently some one steps up to this bully, asked him if he had heard the good news, you have drawn the highest prize. What! ha! the highest prize! "IT IS AS FAIR A THING AS EVER WAS" Let any man of common sence take up *Mr. Broaddus' decrees*, and defence of those decrees, then look at his letter in the Herald of the 20th Dec. last, look at his lamentations and sympathy for his brother Broaddus, and his conflicts with his profession *of aiming to keep not the path of gospel truth, "turning to the right hand or the left,"* after labouring to make it appear, *we were all a set of rebels for having dared to differ in opinion with him.* And see how near a kin, his views of right and wrong are with the Dutch bully's. Is it any wonder Mr. Broaddus should contend for the necessity of a special influence to remove the *indisposition of sinners to whom he preaches*, before they can believe his *fullers gospel* after he has so indisposed them, as to *make them believe*, although Jesus

Christ came into the world to save sinners, he failed in *leaving on earth such a gospel for sinners (who were then as much indisposed as ever they have been)* as to enable them to receive and submit to, and damn every one that is *so indisposed*, for not receiving what he knew they could not receive, without *he first removed this indisposition*? This is the substance of his "excellent Fullers" gospel; not the gospel of Jesus Christ. But I have far transcended the object I had in view when I sat down to write to you. Permit me to say, how much I am pleased at the truly christian spirit of brother Stone in the X No. of the Messenger. Go on my brethren, this reformation will as surely triumph as there is a God of truth in heaven. It seeks not to *mend the cobweb, sectarian system of man*, or any improvement of a previous reformation. No reformation can ever exceed this, if consummated. It takes *God upon his own word*, and Jesus Christ and his apostles as the only divinely authorized teachers to a dying world, *and grants the rights of all men, who constitutionally enter the kingdom of heaven, so long as they respect the laws and government of our king*. We are increasing in numbers, and they are of the most intelligent and influential part of society. Brother and sister Burnett, left my house for Richmond on Friday last, in fine health and spirits. We hope to be able to prevail on him to spend the year with us as an Evangelist or *Editor*, which, we cannot say as yet. I herewith send you the names of two Elders, as readers of the Messenger; led every reader do the same *this year*, and your labours will then be more generally felt through the union, and its fruits enjoyed by the disciples.

Yours in hopes of a better life.
THOMAS M. HENLEY.

Carlisle Wednesday 29th. Jan. 1834.

Dear Brethren,

I have just returned from Mt. Sterling, where I attended the Meeting, between Eld. John Smith & Rev. Dewey Whitney. As this Meeting was long pending, many have heard of it, and much interest has been felt in relation to it. Now therefore that it has taken place, that the public may be properly informed upon the subject, I have thought it good, to draw up a brief account of the whole matter. And I do this the more readily, because I was an eye witness of the whole affair, and have a full knowledge of all the circumstances, which le to the final Meeting. These things premised, I proceed to the object before me.

Sometime in July last, Mr. Whitney came out in a sermon at Mt. Sterling, against Bro. Smith, with the broad and high charges, of misrepresentation, slanders, and lies. Brother Smith

felt himself aggrieved, and calls upon Mr. Whitney early in August to make good those charges or withdraw them before the public, where they had been made. A long correspondence ensued. Finally however, they agreed to have a meeting on the 27th. of November, with two friends each, to agree upon the preliminaries of a final meeting, in relation to the charges. At that meeting Bro. Smith's friends, on his behalf, demanded of Mr. Whitney through his friends a specification of his charges—that Bro. Smith might have some fair chance in the final meeting. This demand was rejected, by Mr. Whitney and his friends! bro. S. friends then urged (as the parties were tied and could decide nothing) that an umpire who should be a non-professor, should be called in by the parties, to say, whether or not, Mr. Whitney should make specifications! Bro. Smith however, determined to meet him, not knowing till the meeting was opened, on the 22d inst, what he had to meet—what charges Mr. Whitney would prefer against him. I am a little before my subject. At the meeting of the 27th, the parties agreed to choose each an individual, to moderate the meeting and that those two thus appointed, should have power to choose a third to act as umpire. The Moderators were to have power to keep order, to keep the speakers to the point, &c. William Chiles was chosen on the part of Mr. W., Thomas Barnes on the part of Bro. Smith and they two chose John Daniel Esq. as umpire. All the testimony was to be taken before there was to be any speaking. Two days were consumed in hearing witnesses depose, and two more in debate.

But our readers no doubt are all anxiety to know the purport of all this array of testimony—"Is it so indeed, (they are ready to say) that Smith has been guilty of wilful misrepresentation of an attempt to deceive the community? We had taken him to be a very candid man. If these things are so however, we have been very much mistaken. If they are not, Mr. Whitney is very inexcusable for such an attack upon Smiths character. To a good man, character is every thing—is dearer than gold or silver.

> "He who steal my purse steals trash,
> Twas mine—tis his, and has been slave to thousands,
> But he who filches from me my good name,
> Robs me of that, which nought enriches him,
> But makes me poor indeed."

True enough. Let me then relieve your anxiety by stating the facts of the case, that you may judge for yourselves.

On the morning of the meeting Mr. Whitney presented his charges, which were substantially as follows:—

1st. That Mr. Smith was in the habit of representing the Creed teachers as bound to preach their Creeds, in opposition to the word of God.

2nd. That said Smith has preached, that the Methodist, used to receive two-and-six-pence for sprinkling infants.

3d. That said Smith has laboured, to make the impression, that Creed teachers assume the same prerogatives with the apostles in the ministry of reconciliation, to make, and propose terms of salvation. These were the charges. Now for a summary of the testimony as I find it, upon my notes. In relation to the first charge. Several individuals were introduced by Mr. W. who testified to this effect. That they had understood Mr. Smith to say in preaching, that Creed teachers were bound to preach their creeds, and not the word of God. This presents the full strength of his testimony.

Two other witnesses were introduced by Whitney who, on this Item testified to this purpose: That teachers who adopted human Creeds were bound to preach their Creeds or not contrary to them; and that such creeds are not the gospel. In relation to this charge, Bro. Smith introduced a number of writers, who testified to this effect: That, when speaking of Creeds, and Creed Teachers, he usually expressed himself to this purpose: That the teachers of human Creeds, were bound to preach the doctrines set forth in their Creeds, or expose themselves to the censure of the church, or the charge of innovation or something of that sort. Such was the testimony, in relation to the first charge. I shall say nothing here, by way of comment. As to the 2d. charge—The two-and-six-penny charge. Mr. Whitney introduced two witnesses. But one testified in his favour. He heard Mr. Smith in Nov. and believes he said, the Methodist used to receive two-and-six-pence for sprinkling infants—Admits he heard but little of the Sermon. Bro. Smith introduced a young man who heard the same Sermon. He testified that Smith said, the Mother of the Methodists used to take two-and-six-pence for sprinkling infants, but that the Methodists themselves, were not allowed to receive any thing, for sprinkling them. Thus the matter was ballanced by these two. Bro. Smith introduced a number of witnesses who stated, they had often heard him, when upon the subject of the corruptions of christianity speak to this effect: That almost every thing that had passed under the name of Christianity, had, by the Teachers, been converted into an article of pecuniary speculation, that the Catholic Church had received two-and-six-pence for sprinkling—that he thought the Church of England, in some part of her history, had received pay for sprinkling infants—That his reason for thinking so were, that the Methodist discipline, forbids their

ministers from receiving any thing for that service. Such was the testimony on the 2d. charge.

The third charge was withdrawn— Because the Moderators decided, that not estimony of facts, that had occurred since the 27th. of November, (the time when Mr. Whitney made the charges.) justice to Mr. Whitney, requires me to say this much, as to the 3d. charge. The same justice to Brother Smith demands a further explanation.

Not long after the opening of the Meeting, Bro. Smith perceived that most of the tesimony of Mr. Whitney related to a period, months after the date of the charges. He therefore, demanded of the Moderators, whether such testimony was admissible. Not (said he) that I am afraid of any thing Mr. Whitney can prove, and I inform him that when the matters of the present meeting are determined, I will hear all he has to allege against me from any quarter. But however many lies I may have told, since the date of Mr. Whitney's charges, they certainly can never prove the truth or justice of them: as he could not, at the time he made his charges have had his eyes upon any of my subsequent words. or acts.

The moderators stated that, if the gentleman, would agree to submit the correspondence to them, and make it a part of their agreement, in connexion with the articles of the 27th: they could decide upon the question. Mr. Smith said, that was just what he wanted to do. Mr. W. refused. The Moderators therefore, decided, as they had nothing to govern them but the articles of the 27th. that any evidence anterior to that period was legitimate.

Under their decision the two witnesses, brought, forward by Mr. Whitney to sustain his 3rd. charge, were excluded.

Thus ended the matter, as to the testimony; and here for the present, I leave the subject with my readers. In my next, I will make some remarks, and state some facts, concerning the debate.

JOHN RODGERS.

P. S. Please publish the following list of appointments for Bro. Smith myself. On the 4th. Lords day of March, which will be the 23, day of the month, together with the Saturday preceeding and Monday following, Bro. Smith will be with us at Carlisle, no preventing providence.

Monday night, at early candle light, we will be at Millersburg Tuesday, usual time of day, at Caneridge; same evening at candle light, at Paris. Wednesday 11 o'clock, at Leesburg—Thursday at Sugar Ridge—Friday at Dry Run, Saturday and and 5th. Lords day at Stamping Ground at 11 o'clock each day, Monday and Monday evening at George Town, Tuesday, 1st, day of April at Union, at Light at Antioch, Wednesday at Paris.

AN APPOLOGY.

A brother from Ohio writes us to discontinue sending him the Messenger. He himself gives us the reason. As the same reason may operate on others, we have thought proper to state it, and then to examine its merits. "The Messenger (says he) is so filled up with baptism, that I wish to have nothing to do with it. I believe in baptism, as strong as ever, but the world is so much filled with the notion that baptism is all that is required of them to cleanse them from all pollutions, and take them to heaven"—He leaves the sentence to be supplied.

Now, brother, let us reason together. Did you ever read in the Messenger that baptism is all that is required to cleanse from pollution, and to take to heaven? Have you not continually read in that book that faith and repentance were indispensibly necessary to constitute any one a fit subject of baptism. Have you not read there, that it is the duty of every baptised person to be careful to obey all the laws of the king? Have you not read in that book that the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin through faith, repentance, and baptism, as the means appointed by the Saviour. Have you not read there that through baptism we receive the promise of the spirit? I know the answer of your conscience. Why then even hint that the Messenger has ever taught the doctrine, that baptism is all that is required to cleanse from pollution, and to take us to heaven?

You may reply, you did not say that the Messenger taught this doctrine, but that the world was filled with this notion.—Ah! If the world is filled with this fatal notion—this destructive error, the Messenger acts mercifully indeed in laboring incessantly to apprize them of it Would you have us to be silent, and let the world die in this delusion? Surely, not. Your believing that the world is filled with this fatal notion, should surely be the last to complain that the Messenger is incessant to put them right on baptism; and should certainly be the last man on earth to withhold your support from that book.

But, "The world is filled with the notion that baptism is all that is required to cleanse from pollutions, and to take us to heaven.—My dear brother I doubt the truth of this assertion. The Hindoos believe that by bathing in the Ganges their sins are washed away—But is the christian world filled with this notion? Not the Presbyterian part—nor the Methodist part—nor the Baptist part of the world are filled with it. They all reject it, and vehemently oppose the notion—not those called christians have this notion as far as my acquaintance extends. I never heard one—I never heard of one, that held this notion. Not those called invidiously Campbellites hold this notion, if so I am ignorant of it; and with many of them I am intimately acquainted. I never yet saw one man, saint or sinner, so consummately

ignorant, who held the notion of which you say, the world is full. I will venture farther, and almost affirm, that you yourself never saw one man or woman in Ohio, or in the world, that held this notion. No: sir, ignorant as the world is, they are better instructed. Some of the more ignorant Catholics may be an exception. You must have spoken unguardedly my brother Yet you are not alone; thousands, who should know better, impute this unfounded charge to us, than which nothing is more untrue. Some unguarded expression of a brother or some speech of an ignoramus, may have first moved the tongue of slander to charge us thus. But how unfair!—how unchristian is such conduct! You know we were once charged with denying the atonement, with believing and declaring that the blood of Christ had no more virtue than the blood of a bullock, a goat or a chicken. False as it was, it was currently reported by the priests to their people, and by the people to one another, with the sole design of checking our influence, Such is the design of the current calumny on baptism.

We grant we have frequently adverted to the subject of baptism in our journal; not because the world was filled with the notion that *it only* was required to cleanse from pollution, and to take us to heaven. No, but because the world of professed christians has almost nullified this command, or frittered it down to a mere unmeaning rite, an unessential command, that may be obeyed or disobeyed, as the person pleases. They have lost the true meaning of the command, and have substituted others not known in the scriptures. Knowing these things to be true, shall we forbear to correct the error? Would you have us to be silent? But our views of baptism may be different from yours.—Yes, they may.—and yours also may be different from ours. What then? Shall we quarrel and split apart on this ground?

You say, "you believe in baptism as strong as ever. "Well then, you believe that immersion *only* is baptism—do you not? Then you cannot believe that sprinkling, or pouring a few drops of water on a person is immersion, or baptism. You also believe that God has commanded penitent believers to be immersed—that this command is sacred. Can you then believe that a person, who has been sprinkled, or who has had a little water poured on him has obeyed the command, any more than a Quaker, who denies water baptism entirely? You cannot. Would you not receive a Quaker into the church as cordially as one of those immersed by sprinkling? In doing this, would you not nullifiy the command to be immersed? But you may say, many such are pious—Yes; and so I hope of the Quakers. But will sprinklers receive Quakers into the church? No, they must be sprinkled, or have water applied in some form, yet these sprink-

lers are reckoned to be very liberal people, though they will not acknowledge pious Quakers to be members of the kingdom; and others are condemned as illiberal for not acknowledging the pious sprinkled unimmersed professors to be members of the kingdom! I love consistency I must stop, lest you be offended that so much is said to rectify the christian world in error.

B. W. STONE, Ed.

FORGIVENESS. No. 2.

To forgive—to pardon—to remit sin, to take away sin, and to justify from sin, are tantamount expressions. This I promised, at the close of my first essay, to endeavor to prove. Much is already done to the establishment of this position in my first number; for in it, we think that to take away sin—to forgive sin—and to remit sin, are the same, being divinely expressed by the word *nasa*. That justification and forgiveness are the same, according to the scriptures, I think, will be doubted by no intelligent person. Paul, (Rom. 3d and 4th chapters) puts this matter beyond doubt. In these chapters he was proving justification by faith, and introduced David as a witness, who testified thus, "Blessed is the man, whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man, to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The Westminister confession defines justification by pardon. "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sin, and accepts us as righteous &c."

Redemption from sin and forgiveness, are also the same. Eph: 1, 7, Coll. 1, 14. In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin."—Also to forgive and to blot out sins are the same, ps: 51, 1, 9. O God, blot out my transgressions, all mine iniquities.—Acts 3, 19. Repent ye therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out." This is equivalent to "Repent and be baptised for the remission of sins." To blot out sin, to cover sin, to hide his face from sin, are, acknowledge, the same and of the same import are the expressions; to be merciful to our unrighteousness, not to remember sin—not to impute sin.

Now, to forgive, pardon, remit, take away, and blot out sin—and to justify and redeem from sin are all the acts of God. That person on whom these acts fall is as innocent, as the person who has never sinned. There is no condemnation to him—no charge can be justly laid against him; for God has justified him, his sins are taken away, and removed from him as far as the east is from the west—they are covered from the view, even of God himself, because they are represented as cast behind his back, buried in the depths of the sea, and he hides his face from beholding them, and even remembers them no more. He now has

peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. He is now purged, sanctified, and washed from sin. In a word, He is clean. To such persons God says, Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee.

It is worthy of inquiry, on whom do these acts of God pass? I answer, On the ungodly, or on sinners—"God justifies the ungodly"—That sinners are the objects on whom these acts of God pass is evident; because if they were not sinners, then they could not be the subject of pardon, forgiveness, or remission of sins, they could not be justified or redeemed from sin, their sin could not be taken away, removed or covered. This can not be disputed.

Again we inquire, On what character of sinners do these pardoning acts pass?—I answer; On believing, penitent, obedient sinners. This truth is every where in scripture confirmed. "We are justified by faith, "God justifies the ungodly that believe in Jesus"—Repentance for the remission of sins, baptised for remission &c. These are the means ordained by God himself in the New Covenant, through which he acts towards the sinner in granting pardon and remission to them We never read of an impenitent sinner receiving these favors nor of a disobedient sinner having his sins remitted, or taken away. Solemn thought! These three things, faith, repentance, and obedience are enjoined as necessary in order to the reception of these blessings.

I next inquire, What has God done in order to lead sinners to faith, repentance and obedience? I answer: To produce faith in Jesus Christ the Messiah, in the minds of the people, who lived while he was incarnate, God had long spoken to their fathers by the prophets, and give them the promise that Messiah should come at a certain time, in a certain manner, and for a certain purpose, that signs, wonders and miracles, should be performed by him in his life, that he should be killed; and rise from the dead on the third day. These were thought sufficient to produce faith in the Son of God *then*; for he marvelled at their unbelief. This he would not have done, if the evidence had been insufficient. These same signs, wonders, and miracles are written that we might believe—and believing might have life. True believers are described as those that believe through the word of the apostles, John 17. By the writings of God in the scriptures faith is produced in the sinner.

What has God done to produce repentance in the sinner? He has given us in his Son an exhibition of himself, his will, his amazing love, grace, mercy and goodness, by which believed the sinner is led to repentance, to mourn and be sorry for his sins, and to turn from them to God with a true heart determined to obey the Lord in all things.

With this spirit of obedience he is led to be baptised in the name of Jesus. I am far from saying, that every believing penitent feels it his duty to be immersed. No: Such has been the teaching of the world, that thousands have never known this to be their duty. But of one thing I am certain, that every believing penitent has the spirit of obedience; and as soon as he is convinced of his duty, he will do it, should it be at the sacrifice of all things on earth.

Yet with all this, is the pardoned sinner yet born of the spirit? Has he experienced the renewal of the Holy Spirit? Is he a new creature? Has he received the gift of the Holy Spirit? He has believed, repented, and been baptised. Is not one thing yet needful to constitute him a christian; a member of the kingdom? This shall be the subject of the next number.

B. W. STONE, Ed.

To be Continued.

James Town Ohio 27th. January 1834.

Messrs Stone and Johnson:—

Brethren, It is supposed by some, that truth will sustain itself; or at least the conduct of many would lead to that conclusion. Truth is a powerful weapon, but it must be used to gain a victory. Our Heavenly Father has furnished the weapon, and has commanded us to use it Shall we ground arms and be led captives by the enemy? If we do, I fear we shall be like unto a man, who hid his Lord's money in the earth, and when called on for settlement, he brought it just as it had been delivered to him, and his Lord commanded that he be cast out as useless, yea, worse than useless. If he would not use it himself he might have handed it over to one more industrious than himself, that it might have been used to profit. If all, who cannot use the sword which God has provided for the use of the saints, would sustain such as will fight, the conquest would be sure. If the subjects of Christs Kingdom would act as wisely, as the subjects of the kingdoms of this world, they would go on conquering, and to conquer. Where is the subject of the Government of these United States, that would not pay one dollar per annum, yea, five or ten dollars, to sustain the soldiers of the Army, who preserve our political liberty? and put to flight the enemies of our republic? Shall we, who are subjects of the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, whose government is the government of Heaven, refuse to fight, or aid those who will fight the battles of our King. He has many enemies; and glorious conquests may be made to his government; he gives a liberal bounty to such as enlist during the war; and after the war is over all the soldiers will be pensioned, and will draw their support from the government during life; and he has promised that they shall

live forever. All such, as help forward the cause, by feeding such as are engaged in the battles of the King, or clothing them, or giving them drink or ministering to them when sick, or when they may be imprisoned by his enemies, he has promised to reward, by giving them a crown of life, which will never fade away. Who would not be a subject of such a King? and who that is a subject, that would not fight? or aid and assist such as will fight, to the utmost of their ability? are there any, who are called subjects, that would not in this plentiful country, where all are helped in their basket and store, refuse to give to a soldier, whom they see wielding the sword of the King, one dollar per annum, to help him forward? If there be any such, how will they dare come into the presence of the King where he says I was hungry, and you gave me no meat &c.

Yours in the service.

M. WINANS.

Mulbery Grove Harris co. Ga. Jan. 1st. 1834.

Brother Stone & Johnson—

You have said a great deal in the Messenger, about the Apostolic plan of preaching; but it appears to me that the most essential matter has been left untouched. It does not appear to me that Christ, or the apostles, habitually took a text of a few words, and preached from it, as do our modern preachers. When the Redeemer was on earth, he preached his own gospel in all its beauty and purity, uncontaminated by the traditions of men. That gospel was recorded by the men whom he chose, and filled with the holy spirit, for the express purpose of preaching it and their acts are also recorded by them. How is it possible, that an uninspired man, can explain that which was spoken by him, who spoke as never man spake? Does it not look almost like presumption for man at the present time ,or any other time, to attempt to explain that which was spoken by the son of the eternal Jehovah? If the son of God and his apostles could not, or did not speak in language intelligible to all, how is it possible for man to make it any plainer? Does it argue any thing in favor of the divine origin of the scriptures, to have man attempting to explain them? Have not man's explanations of the scriptures been the cause of all this confusion and uproar, we find among those who call themselves christians? According to the present plan of the ministers of the Gospel, a few words are selected, which is made the foundation of a discourse, of two or three hours in length, perhaps not a dozen passages of genuine scripture quoted during the whole discourse. As long as this is the case, so long will there be confusion among christians. But how is the evil to be remedied. The plan I would suggest is this, that we meet together as we do now, or oftener, and instead

of so much text-taking, let us spend the time in reading the Bible, exhortation, prayer, and singing; (I mean that singing which is done in the spirit, and not because it is fashion) let the greatest part of the time be spent in reading the Bible. It would always read the same way and leave us but little to cavil about, for the Bible will explain itself, if there be enough of it examined. The people would by this means acquire a correct knowledge of the word of God man made scripture, would by, this means come to naught and if in exhortation a passage of scripture should be misquoted, or misrepresented, the people would be able to detect it. I think by adopting this plan there would be more union among christians, more knowledge of the word of God, more of the holy spirit among us, and there would be better times every way.

Yours in christian fellowship.
JOHN HUBBARD.

REMARKS.

Our Brother Hubbard's views of modern preaching we think are generally correct. But we believe his plan for remedying the evil is an extreme from truth. It amounts to this, the entire exclusion of preachers, or teachers from the church. On this subject we have already given our views frequently in the Messenger and need not repeat them. We may have misapprehended our brother; we would willingly admit it, if we could.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

Cincinnati Jan. 5th. 1834.

Brother B. W. Stone--

In looking over the 11th. No. of the Messenger page 326 of Vol. 7th. I see you object to the opinion of those who think Nicodemus had good reason to know what our Saviour meant when he said, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" *because*, it was the practice of the Jews to receive proselytes into their kingdom or church by immersing them; and I think your objection a good one, yet you seem to think Nicodemus might have understood the terms, born of *water* or *regenerated*, by adverting to the case of Noah passing from the old world into the new world by water &c. and finally came to the conclusion that Nicodemus, *as a ruler should* have understood the meaning of being born of water or more fully, should have known what our saviour meant by saying "except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And consequently the remark, "art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things, were intended for a reproof to him for his ignorance.

I do not consider the question one of *vital* importance, but still one seemingly *trifling* error may pave the way for a greater, and the real truth is certainly the best in all cases. Your great experience and natural judgment, compared with my youth and inexperience forbids me to say, *you are wrong* and *I am right*; yet permit me, as a son, to suggest my difficulties to a beloved Father in the Gospel.

Did Jesus open the understanding of Nicodemus, or even of his more immediate disciples, that they might understand the scriptures, until after his resurrection? (see Luke 24th chap. and 45th verse.) Was the fact, that the Jewish Church and worship were to be done away, and a new order of things introduced, so fully developed at that early period, that Nicodemus merited a reprimand for not understanding what was meant by being born of water, and of the spirit, in order to pass from the one state to the other? How could it be expected that he should refer to the circumstance of Noah passing from the old to the new world by water; or the Israelites passing from bondage, through water, into liberty, in order to understand our Lord in saying, "except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" when he was not yet aware, that the Jewish kingdom was to be abolished, and a new one set up? In short, while he did not expect the *Messiah* to set up a *new* kingdom, and give the terms of admission into it? nor even change one simple item of the laws regulating the old kingdom of which he was a member.

To me it appears impossible that he could have understood it, neither do I think our Lord expected it of him. Does it not appear more probable that Jesus intended to show him how far short the law came of making men perfect, or of fitting them for the enjoyment of God? The law, *as such*, did not require a spiritual change in order to entitle a man to membership; it stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances &c. and could not make him that did the service *perfect* as pertaining to the conscience; yet it was the best system that ever had been established among men, since the transgression; and, we doubt, not but Nicodemus with the rest of the Jews thought it *all sufficient*. In order to undeceive him, Jesus states a simple fact, requisite to fit him for *heavenly* enjoyments; Nicodemus is ignorant of it, Jesus immediately takes hold of that ignorance in order to show him the imperfection of a law that could not give life, and was only added because of transgression till the *seed* should come to whom the promise was made, and the consequent necessity of "a more excellent ministry" by which sinners might draw nigh to God; Jesus then goes on to tell him that God so loved the world that he had sent his son into the world, not to condemn it, as the law did for

every transgression, but that the world through him might be saved.

Yours in the hope of Immortality
J. P. ANDREW.

N. B. Two have lately been immersed here and I expect to immerse five or six more shortly. O Lord revive thy works, restore peace to zion, and gather to gether that which has been scattered in the dark and cloudy day.

Yours &c. J. P. ANDREW.

REMARK.

Our readers are left to judge for themselves. We cannot be positive on this subject. Editors.

James Town Ohio 2nd. Dec. 1833.

Dear Brethren—

The principal weapon now used by such as suppose they are called and sent ministers of the Gospel, to retard the reformation for which we plead, are the following.

The Campbellites, say they are a bigotted set; they will not admit that any are right but themselves, they assume infallability, they unchristianize all other sects. We do not believe any, christians can have such contracted views.

If God has more ways than the one pointed out in the scriptures to save men, then the sects may all be right, but if there be but the one way then all must be in part wrong for they differ from each other.

If any be christians who refuse to put on Christ, and be governed by his laws, then all may be christians. But if obedience to Christ's; commands be necessary to constitute christians then none are christians but those who obey him.

I am willing to admit that I would not give one cent for a religion that is fallible. I could make that sort of religion myself, or could get it ready made, by Mahomet, or the Pope, or some other dignitary, for the world is full of religion makers, religion seekers, and religion getters; some get one kind, and some another according to their tastes or educations.

But he that does the religion made by Jesus Christ is the christian, for the christian religion consists in doing what Christ directed, and the Mahometan religion consists in the doing of what Mahomet directed, and so of all other religions. Then when men are found doing things not directed by Christ they cannot be said to be christians, and even the doing of some things directed to be done by Christ, and refusing to do others, would not make them christians; for all, whether Mahometans, Idolaters, Jews or Savages, do some of the things commanded to be done by Christ. But none would say that they were all christians. So

also all do some of the same things directed by Mahomet, but who would say that (because of that) all were Mahometans.

But God has appointed means or Institutions to keep all things distinct. Woman is the appointed of God to increase the human family or family of man, and none can come into that family by any other. So all who come into the family of Jesus Christ must come in the means or Institutions appointed of God for that purpose, none can be said to be of the human family except they be born of woman and man, neither can any be said to be of Christs family, except they be born of water and the Spirit

Yes, But here lies the difficulty; one says that they can be born when babies by sprinkling, and thus all that are born of woman and man can also be born of water and spirit, and in this way all the human family may be made the family of Christ. Then all are placed on equal footing, and all have the right of petition, all being of the same family in this way all have access at the altar and throne and can obtain pardon by petition.

Another says that they cannot be born of water and spirit till they have minds to act upon, or that they cannot have faith till they can apprehend testimony. Therefore they contend that babes cannot be born of water and spirit, for they cannot be begotten of the spirit for want of apprehension, such however are called Bigots, and are every where spoken against.

Respectfully yours
M. WINANS.

OBLIGATION AND DUTY.

I. What does God require of man as he is, (a sinner,)—*something or nothing*?

2. If he requires something, what is that something? Is it spiritual and holy, or is it natural and unholy?—Or is it neither the one nor the other?

Now if any one of the preachers (*'of the day'*) who maintain that it is an impeachment of the justice of God to require sinners to repent and believe the Gospel, will make a fair issue here, he may have an opportunity of discussing the question from the pulpit or through The Cross, as he may desire. The querist is a Regular Baptist, and of course will defend the principles of Regular Baptists. He will maintain that God requires of the natural man *something*—and that this something is spiritual and holy.

The editor is authorized to give the name of the querist, to any minister who is disposed to embark in this discussion."

We are much gratified at the proposition contained in the above paragraph, which we have extracted from the "Cross." We are assured that the author's name is at the pleasure of any *min-*

ister who disputes the sentiment advanced, and who is disposed to embark in the discussion. This is as it should be. Religion never suffers by a public discussion or examination of its truths and its excellencies. The more it is rubbed, the brighter it will shine. The rigid calvinist is now called on to defend his *opinions* in open day and face to face. Should none be found fearless enough to stand forth in defence of such *opinions*, then they should never hereafter complain, or assail others when they have not the privilege of replying unless by violating the common rules and usuage of decorum. We believe, we know the man who has proposed the discussion. If so, we feel perfectly convinced that he is able to manage the subject with great ability, and to maintain his ground so long as the Bible is acknowledged of paramount authortity to the exclusion of human traditions.

The sinner is called on to do something to believe the record God has given of his Son, to repent—to obey. With all that God has done and given, can a sinner believe, repent and obey? Who says No? Come out gentlemen, defend your *opinions* or they are gone.

This is an age of investigation. We are delighted to witness the great efforts which are now making to come to a correct understanding of the Bible. A flood of light is pouring upon the public mind? and cannot much longer be withstood.

We desire to hasten that event; and as such we hail with peculiar pleasure every proposal of the sort now published.

Those who are conscious of the weakness of their cause are ever disinclined to a public investigation, because they feel certain of ruin and defeat. He who is panoplied with truth ever carries a bold and manly front, and is prepared for any opponent. Our friends are frequently, yea, incessantly charged, by some of the periodicals of the day, with perverting and wresting the scriptures. We deny the charge and stand prepared to meet any adversaries, in public discussion, whenever they shall intimate a similar disposition and readiness. This pledge is made from the fullist coviction, that none of the friends of the Bible, and the Bible alone unobscured by human dross, will prove recreant to a cause upon which are suspended the hopes and destins of millions. As long as *the Book* is true, slander and misrepresentation will go for nothing. We cannot consent to enter the lists with such. Such conduct is beneath the character of a gentleman, much more of a christian.

Let it be distinctly recollected that our friends stand pledged to sustain in public discussions, any of the *truths* of the Bible held and promulgated by them, and that our opponents shall be honored with a hearing whenever an intimation is given that they are willing or desirous for such an interview. Our opponents are in the habit of distorting our sentiments and the *truth*

to which we do hold. They have become so accustomed to patching and scrapping the word of God, that they of course, take the same liberty with our writings. We will not give a name to such conduct. The cause of reformation is advancing with rapid strides, and we may anticipate much opposition from the leaders of the sects. Let every disciple of the Lord Jesus be firm, steady and unshaken in his purpose of following the Lord: no matter what ills may befall.

J. T. JOHNSON, Ed.

We were under the impression that the constitution of the Franklin Association as exhibited and commented on in the 12th, No. of the 7th, Vol. of the Messenger, and as such embraced their sentiments and views. We have been since informed, that the powers of the committtee were limited to a mere abridgement of the existing constitution of that association. This being the fact it may be, that but few or none of the committee approve all the items contained in it.

J. T. JOHNSON, Ed.

CHRISTIAN SCHOOL.

On the first Lord's day of February the Brethren and Sisters in and near Georgetown met at their usual place of worship and determined from that time forward to commence committing to memory the oracles of Heaven. The following organization then succeeded. The sisters were divided into two classes; and to each of these classes was assigned the duty of superintending a class of girls allotted to each.

The same course was adopted in reference to the Brethren and the youth committed to their charge.

The design is, that the different classes shall during the week, commit a specified portion of the Scriptures, commencing with the Gospels, and on every Lord's day morning, prior to the regular hour of congregational worship, meet and repeat what has been committed, under the direction of one of the Brethren who was appointed to superinted the school.

The subject was brought before the Brethren and Sisters, and there was not the slightest difficulty or impediment thrown in the way. So far as our personal knowledge extends there is an order and christian zeal in this undertaking highly commendable. We are deeply sensible of the importance of this movement. We are commanded to let the word of Christ dwell in us richly, with all wisdom to teach & admonish each other in Psalms and Hymns and spiritual songs, singing with gratitude in our hearts to the Lord. We are commanded to be filled with the spirit &c. &c. When christians shall make it a business—a part of their daily avocations to be treasuring n their hearts

the word of Christ, when they become absorbed in the contemplation of the divine goodness then will christianity shine forth in all her beauty, and glory, and then there will be no place in the heart for envy, strife, malice, evil speaking and every other fruit flowing from the spirit of the world.

Brethren and Sisters; we name these things and state what has occurred at Georgetown to excite christian emulation. Will you remain behind in the heavenly race. Will you remain ignorant of the word of God? No. We hope better things of you.

Would any christian be ashamed to imitate his Lord in every action of his life? We presume not. Would not any christian be ashamed to do any thing derogatory to the character of a disciple of Jesus?. We hope so.

What then is the best course to pursue to enable us to practice the one and forbear the other course? The answer is easy. Commit to memory the history of the life, the sayings and doings of our Lord, his birth, life, miracles, benevolence, teachings, death, burial resurrection and ascension. Let these be deeply engraven on our hearts, and a corresponding love will be the result. Then we shall hear the response from every heart, we love him, because he first loved us.

The good cause of committing the oracles has commenced under the most favorable auspices. Before the year 1834 passes away we hope to have it to say that some of our sisters can repeat the New Testament from the beginning to the end.

Oh! Brethren one and all, let us march on to the good work with the sentiment engraven on our hearts, that we are not our own; that we are bought with a price, yea, the precious blood of Christ: Never weary in well doing. We are commanded to shine as luminaries in the world, holding forth the word of life as a beacon or light house to warn the sinner of the ruin which awaits him if he persists in his course. Let us redeem the time, and be able at the conclusion of this year to give a favorable answer in relation to our stewardship. We have taken the Bible as our guide, and we are determined (God being our helper,) to treasure its truths alone in our memories, being fully assured that if we pursue that way pointed out by the holy Apostles and Prophets, we shall wear the crown of life.

J. T. JOHNSON, Ed.

DIED, in Fayette co. Ky. on Wednesday night the 18th, of Dec. Mrs. Katherine Sidener consort of George P. Sidener sen. in her 54th year with the typhus fever, she bore her affliction, with Christian fortitude and fell asleep in Jesus, she has left a kind husband a large family of children and connexion to mourn her loss.

Brother John Smith of Springfield, pa. writes Jan. 7. 1834.

Since August last my labours have been confined principally to Fayette and Green counties. There are 5 churches, which number about 200, who live in peace and harmony. Many of these are intelligent, respectable, ornaments to society, and the salt of the earth. Yet notwithstanding their holy profession, we are not without our troubles. But thank God? these troubles are from without. Since last September 23 have been added to the church.

Bro. Mich. Combs, an evangelist in Ia. writes Jan. 15.

The congregations in this section of country (Crawfordsville) are awaking up to their duty to aid in the conversion of the world, by uniting their efforts to spread the truth. The work among the brethren and the people here, though moving slowly, looks more like the gospel reformation, than we have ever witnessed. But every where the public mind must be informed before success can be expected. Since last spring I have immersed about 100. Many other brethren, who do not travel, have also immersed a considerable number.

I cannot conclude my letter till I give you an account of our union meeting on White River last August. There were about 20 teaching brethren, of which 10 were of the christian brethren, and 10 of those called reformers. We continued together three days in perfect harmony, nor do I recollect of a shade of difference, in all our public teaching. We appointed three co-operating meetings, one at Greensburgh (Ia.) to begin Friday before 4th Lords day in February, one near Crawfordsville beginning 31st. of March, and one at Indianapolis Friday before the second Lords day in April.

Bro L. Byram of Paoli, (Ia.) Jan. 6. 1834.—Writes that within a few months past, the Lord has blessed them with a considerable increase, 15 or 20 have professed faith in the Lord Jesus, and have been baptised in his name. Many more seem to be inquiring to know the good and the right way. Sectarianism is so divided against itself in our part of the country that I think it cannot stand long. At a late meeting a Baptist preacher united with us, and seems to be firm in the faith of the Gospel.

Bro Bryam asks. How does Bro. Stone prove that there were 120 persons baptised with the Holy spirit on the day of Pentecost? I answer. Because the pronoun *they*, found frequently from acts 1, 15 to chap 2, 1, 4, can refer to no others. Should you suppose, as many do, that the apostles only were baptised with the Holy spirit on that day; I ask, did daughters prophecy, after they were baptised with this spirit at the same time? They were not apostles, but of the 120.

RECEIPTS.

KENTUCKY.

Stamping Ground—J. W. Sinclear for vol. 8; *Shepherdsville*, Elder. P. Hatchitt for self—Thornberry,—Smith, Carr for volume 7, and for Smizer for volume 8—*Claysville*, D. Jackson, Wm. McMillin for vol. 8—*Union*, Eld. T. M. Allen for R. Starks for 6 and 7—M. O. Sidener for 8,—T. A. Russell do. for A. Foster for 7—Jas. Hurst 8—Jac: Sidener do. Jas. Moore for 7 and 8—H. Calvin for 8.—T. Ware for 7—Robert S. Russell jun. for 8. Arnold do. *Georgetown*.—Chs. Stewart for vol. 8—H. Fisher $6,00 of which I for self for vol. 8.—for J. B. Ford do.—for M. Fisher, do.—for Diana Fisher, do.—for M. Hill do—for W. Hancock. *Paris*. B. M. Riggs for Jac. Sharer for 4 and 5,—J. G. Martin, H. Parker, and G. Williams. *Marrowbon*.—A. Smith for D. Williams for vol. 4—for R. Alexander—J. P. Monroe and Tho. Smith for 7—for Jas. Page for 7—N. B. This last name unknown on our list we wish information.—*Newcastle*. Bro. Fleming for T. Scott—Mrs. Herndon—M. Smith—L. Jenkins—G. Shivel—W. Evans—Jo. Shannon—all for vol. 8; and Tho. Yager for 6.—*Frankfort*. Wm. Woods for 8, *Versailles*, Hez. Douglas for 8.

INDIANA.

New Albany—Mrs. Woodruff for vol. 6. & 7. and 7.—Shields for vol. 8.

INDIANOPOLIS.

Wm. Morris for vol. 7. paid $13,50.

OHIO.

Troy,—S. Kyle for E. Long,—Coe,—Sparks,—B. Whaston for 8—*Greenfield*,—E. Bryam for 8

TENNESSEE.

Mt. Pleasant A. Crawford for self—Briscoe—Morrow—Gooch all for 8—and 1,00 $ more:

ILLINOIS.

Jacksonville.—Eld. H. Osborn for Calkim—J. Nevins—A. Simms—J. Huffaker—Coffman for 7—and Mrs Tilton for 8.

MARYLAND.

Baltimore,—Jas. Henshall for J. Sloan for 7.—J. Woodland for 6, and 7—J. Taylor for 7.—C. Forguhrnson for 7.

MICHIGAN.

Springarbor,—Wm. Smith for 8—$2,00.

MISSISSIPPI.

John Mitchell for 5, 6, 7, and 2,00 for 8.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 3.

EDITED BY BARTON W. STONE & J. T. JOHNSON,
Elders in the Church of Christ

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

GEORGETOWN, KY.....MARCH, 1834.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers, if paid on the reception of the first number—or $1 25 if not paid within 6 months. They who procure eight subscribers, and remit the money to the Editors, 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.

FORGIVENESS, No. 3.

In my last No. at the close, I observed, that a person may have believed, and reformed, and may have been baptized, and yet one thing was lacking to constitute him a christian—a member of the kingdom. By this one thing, I mean the Holy Spirit. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call." acts 2,38,39.

1st. It is evident that the 12 disciples had believed, and received the truth as taught by Jesus. Yet it appears; they did not understand it, till the promised Spirit of truth came; for "when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth—he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatever I have said unto you. He shall be your comforter. John 16,17,26,—15,26—16,13. This is the promise, Jesus made to his disciples, immediately before he left the world.

2nd. This promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost; and this was a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel; "It shall come to pass in the last days (saith God) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my hand maids I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy. "Act 2,17,18. This promise was not confined to the apostles; for on women the Spirit was also poured, and they also prophesied. If the apostles had not been thus filled with the Holy Spirit, they could not have preach-