T. Downton.—Js. Graves 8. *Eagle Creek.*—C. Griffith 7. *Minerva.*—S. M. Johnson $10,00 for all his subscribers for 7. 8. *Leesburgh.*—Js. Wasson 8. *Cynthiana.*—Mrs. Miller for 6.—T. Rowland for 8. *Millersburgh.*—D. Forrest.—W. Adair 8. *Carlisle.*—J. Rogers for S. Ross 8.—W. Doughty 8.—E. Howe 7.—J. Alexander 7.—J. Sanders 7.—A. Howe 7.—T. Setton 7.—J. M. Mahon 8.—J. McCane 8 *Cane-run.*—W. Z. Thompson 8. *Everetts.*—A. Henderson for J. Wilson.—Jac. Myers.—Thos. Oliver for 8. *Shelbyville.* Col. Doak 6. 7.—Doc. Carter for old vols. $2, 50. *Republican.*—L. Faulconer for H. Davis.—M. Rice.—W. Vanpelt.—R. Allen.—Jane Gatewood.—M. Wyman.—Elizh Adkinson.—Jac. Stone, all for 8.—Mrs. Lanter, 50 cts for 7. *Lexington.*—Eld. T. Smith for G. Shivery, 7. 8.—J. Card 8.—L. Benton 7.—P. Ewing $1, 00.—S. Shivel 8.—for Eld. G. Boone 7.—H. Lamb 7.—W. Gaugh 8. *Lancaster.*—Eld. T. Smith for Arnold—Best—O'Bannon for 8. *Barksville.*—Eld. W. D. Jourdan for Owsles—J. H. Young—L. Sevier—W. Allen all for 7.—E. Randolph $1, 00.

TENNESSEE.

Bagdad.—Js. Young—R. Ray for 8. *Mooreville.*—B. Moore for self—D. Bills—D. B. Bills—D. G. Bills—T. Headen—J. Halt—W. Wilkins—Js. Jackson—Lillis Bills—Eldr. Coples all for 8.—Wm. Port—Sam Barker for 8 in full for his agency $5, 00. *Columbia.*—R. Mack, 4. 5. 6. *Lynchburgh.*—Js. Kysor 8. *Sparta.*—Eld. Js. Anderson for Wm. Hill—A. McBride—C. Davis—E. Anderson—H. Lince all for 8. *Lebannon.*—Eld. E. Sweat pd. 7, 00 for vol. 7. lost by mail.

MISSOURI.

Palmyra.—Eld. H. Thomas for C. Allen $1, 00, for S. Martin $2, 00.—R. Cartney $1, 40, J. Murrel Manuel $1,00.

PENNSYLVANIA.

New Geneva.—Eld. J. T. Smith for W. Gans—Geo. Lytzenburght—Wm. Denny—Curle—J. Monroe for 8.

INDIANA.

Greensburgh.—Geo. McCoy for 7. *Carlisle.*—H. D. Palmer for J. Maxwell—R. Maxwell—P. Usrey—R. Shearmon—A. McBride for 8. *Bloomington.*—G. W. Hardin for G. W. Willsby for 7—Smoot 8—Goodnight 8—J. Slays 8—J. Porch 8. *Chrleston.* T. C. Caldwell.

ALABAMA.

Jasper.—E. Randolph for self—W. Billingsley—J. Billingsley—A. Williams—Tho: Payne—Js. Kennada—J. Sullavan all, for 7. *Pearmans Ferry.*—C. Vins for 7.

OHIO.

Greensville.—A. Scribner for W. Geraheart—E. Carnahan—D. Potter—Mary Potter—J. Carnahan, all for 8.

Charlestown.—G. L. South for 8.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 5.

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. .....MAY, 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.

Butler co. Alabama, April 7th, 1834.

STRICTURES ON SOME OF S. M. M'CORKLE'S VIEWS.

As this is an age of truth-hunting, deep research, and expositions of views, I challenge the most rigorous investigation on the topics that I may submit to a discriminating public, being fully persuaded that nothing can be lost by such a course; for if I have truth on my side, I shall at least, have the satisfaction of imparting it to others; but if I am wrong, I shall in all probability be rectified by some of the critical rectifyers of the present scribbling times. If I am at the bottom of misfortune's rugged wheel (to use a figure of Goldsmith's) let it turn which way it will, I shall indubitably be on the gaining hand. Then, critics, cool your heads, sharpen your pens, and commence, if you please, an impartial solution of a considerable difficulty, existing between one in the vale of humility, and many who with colossal strides, and gigantic efforts are marching to the splendid Temple of Fame. The difficulty is, that Editors of Religious periodicals contend that the *Apocalypse*, or revelation of Jesus Christ, was written after the destruction of Jerusalem; when there ap-

pears to be sufficient evidence to convince an *impartialist*, that it was written before Jerusalem fell by the desolating scourge of Roman arms. Will not all those, who attempt to unroll the chart of futurity, and sketch the crumbling of thrones, the subjugation of empires the demolition of kingdoms, and the felicities pertaining to the new order of things, agree with Adam Clarke in saying, if the date could be fixed, when the Revelation was written, it would be of great importance to the right interpretation of the Book? (I quote from memory but this I think is about what the learned Irishman said,) In the Millennial Harbinger Vol. 4. No. 11 pa. 559. Mr. M'Corkle a *Layman*, (sarcastic enough to be sure) has these remarkable words. "*The holy city is to be trodden under foot forty and two months. This relates to the church. For the prediction was made* LONG AFTER *the destruction of Jerusalem.*" The prediction to which Mr. M'Corkle alludes is found Rev. 11, 1, 2, &c. but from what source he has the authority to say, that it "was *long after* the destruction of Jerusalem is unknown, unless it be from what *Ireneus* asserted without a shadow of proof—but I must not anticipate. "The Holy City shall they (the Gentiles) tread under foot forty *and* two months." Now see what Jesus says Luke 21, 24. "Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfiled."—Paul said "that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in" Rom. 11, 25. But to prove that the prediction was not made *after*, but *before* the demolition of the Jewish Capitol, and the subversion of the Hebrew polity, I wish the reader (and especially Mr. M'Corkle, if this should ever meet his eye) to pay attention to the subsequent quotations from the Bible. "And their dead bodies *shall lie* in the street of the *great city* which *spiritually* is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified," Rev. 11, 8. What city was this? Rome? Babylon? or Jerusalem? Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was a prophet; and he once said "IT CANNOT BE THAT A PROPHET PERISH OUT OF JERUSALEM" Luke 13, 33, The two witnesses were to prophesy a thousand two hundred and three score days clothed in sack-cloth; their bodies were to lie in the street of the great city &c. and inasmuch as Jesus has taught us that prophets cannot perish out of Jerusalem, the conclusion is, that the great city mentioned in Rev. 11, was Jerusalem; because our Lord was crucified at the very city, in whose street the dead bodies lay three days and a half. But why called Sodom and Egypt? Isaiah, once speaking to the rulers in Jerusalem in our Saviour's time, like the Egyptian task masters of old, grievously afflicted those over whom they swayed a tyranical sceptre; and with much propriety Jerusalem spiritually was called Egypt. Those, who wish, may see why the great city was called Sodom, if they will attentively compare, Ezekiel 16 chap. with Jeremiah 3, chap. and Revelation 17—The Lord God once speaking unto Jerusalem said, "I put a jewel on the forehead, and ear rings in thine ears, and a beautiful crown upon thine head. Thus wast thou decked with gold and silver; and thy raiment was of fine linen, and silk, and broidered work, &c.

Let us now see what is said Rev. 18, 16. "Alas, alas, that great city, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls!" The woman that John saw upon the scarlet coloured beast, "was arrayed in purple, and scarlet colour, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls," and it is said Rev. 17, 18, that the woman is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth—Upon her forehead, among other significant appellations, was, "*Babylon the the great,*" "Thou hast a whore's forehead" Jeremiah 3, 3.—But what of all this, says one, accustomed to interpret prophecy on the plan, that a Newton, a Scott, a Clarke and a Croly followed in vain? In vain, did I say? perhaps I am too hasty; for many who give false interpretations, get in return a big name in the world's reckoning, and a good deal of money Rev. 18, 21. In her (the great

city) was found the blood of *Prophets*, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth. Could any expounders of prophecy, with the best glass in the world to aid his optic vision, find the blood of prophets in the wide empire of Popery? Jesus Christ said, "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem! which did kill the prophets, (how easy to understand the phrase "in her was found the blood of prophets") and stone them that were sent unto thee &c." Luke 13, 33, 34.—The Apocalyptic woman "was drunken with the blood of the saints" &c. See Matt. 23, 34–39—"Behold your house," said Jesus, "is left unto you desolate." The city was made *desolate*, of which it was said "rejoice over her, *thou* Heaven, and ye holy Apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her" When the fifth seal was opened, John saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, how long O Lord, Holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a LITTLE SEASON &c. It is thought that those, who endeavour to stretch days into years, will find some difficulty in attempting to prove that a *little season* means more than a thousand years—satan was to be loosed a *little season* Rev. 20, 3—Who now in the ranks of expositors will have the effrontery to come forward in an interrogating manner, and labour to prove that the devil is to be emancipated from the Abyss of horror for more than seventeen hundred years? From the above quotations, I conclude that the city of Jerusalem was standing when the revelation was written, and that all those who explain prophecy on a contrary hypothesis, will as certainly fail to enlighten the admirers of their writings, as he who *would contend that Josephus the Jewish historian* wrote before Moses.

C. F. R. SHEHANE.

With the permission of the Editors two or three numbers more. C. F. R. S.

We will attentively and patiently hear our young Brother. Every humble attempt to develope the Apocalypse we heartily encourage. To Bro. Shehane our columns are open. We solicit his efforts.

Editors.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM A BROTHER IN OHIO.

We are not authorised, nor forbidden by this Brother, to publish his letter in whole nor in part; yet we are sure he cannot be offended, when his name is concealed by us from the public. Believing his objections to be weighty in the minds of many of the Brethren in that section of country we give this as our apology for making them public, and of making a few strictures on them.

1st. He says, "I do contend that the doctrine (of baptism for the remission of sins,) is neither reasonable nor scriptural. If it was reasonable, it would be scriptural; for both say, that God has but one plan to convert people. We can bring 99 experienced christians, who will say, that they obtained forgiveness out of the act of baptism, where you can bring one, who can say experimentally, that he knows his sins are forgiven. But you will say, God looked on our ignorance with impunity. This was the case before the gospel came, and the name of Jesus. Moreover, that doctrine contradicts the experience of almost every christian in the world; and indeed almost all that have received that faith in this country, even some of our best ministers, have denied their former experience. Their knowledge of their sins forgiven, and the gift of the spirit, by which they labored much in the Lord, are now denied, and all their experience is like that published by John Rogers.

2nd. You must do one of two things; you must either confess that your system is wrong, or prove that the thousands that have been converted without baptism are all deceived; or prove that the age is past, in which God will convert people as he has done for years, months, weeks, and days past, for scores are converted in our country without baptism. Hence you must prove, that God has another dispensation before you can carry your point; for even your own experience contradicts what you are now teaching.

3. Your answer with regard to the house of Cornelius goes to say, with the proofs you have brought, that all they receiveed was the gift of tongues; and then you bring 1 Cor. 14, 22—and chap. 13, 1—13 to prove it. But there is nothing in these passages to prove the point. For the first, cited by you, does not prove that the gift of tongues was given to people, that had not the spirit in their hearts, but that gift was given to those who had

the spirit, to demonstrate to unbelievers that the Holy Ghost was in those who had the gift of tongues. The gift at the house of Cornelius was given to prove that the Holy Ghost was given to them. I do still contend, the same spirit of holiness was given to the house of Cornelius, as was given to the Apostles on the day of pentecost. Acts 10, 47 and 11, 15, 16, 17. Read this last verse carefully. You will see just as sure as the Apostles received the Holy Ghost with its sanctifying influence; so did the house of Cornelius—deny one, and we deny the other. The 16 verse of the last chapter proves that Peter then came to the knowledge of John's baptism—that its end was the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Then of course, when the Holy Ghost was given, that was the end of John's baptism. See Acts 1, 5.—Now, so sure as John's baptism pointed to the gift of the Holy Ghost, that was conferred on the Apostles, so sure did it point to the gift poured out on the Gentiles. Matt. 3, 11, Mark 1, 8, Luke 3, 16.

4. You state, that baptism for remission in connexion with faith and repentance, is too plain to be denied. I know that baptism was taught under John's ministry; but his baptism has not been taught authoritatively on this side of pentecost. Acts 18, 24–26. But Acts 2 is brought forward to prove the doctrine. Why not read and contend for the whole connexion? You know none were baptised but believers, "And as many as gladly received his word, were baptised. There is no proof that they were all baptised on that day; but they were added (to the church) on the same day. For it is evident from the history of the church that new converts were not baptised hastily. See Slackhouse on Acts 1, Mosh: 1, Cent:—Adam Clarke on 1 Cor. 15, 29, says, "They were properly instructed into the first principles of the doctrine of Christ—in the design of baptism, and then were baptised in perfect faith of the resurrection from the dead &c. Hence I believe that the christian baptism, is to declare our faith in the resurrection from the dead at Christ's second coming, (I think this is too plain to be denied,) and not for the remission of sins, as a first principle. Why not contend for mercy exercised to others as a first principle for the remission of sins, which is one of the first fruits of repentance. Matt. 18.—and chap. 5. This with faith in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins, is the unanimous voice of scripture.

5. I am told that you stated, when, in this state, that you, have believed the doctrine you now preach for 20 years. If you believed it, you did not preach it; and I now ask you. When I saw you in this state, whether you preached these things now coming out through the Messenger? Yours, **** ****.

REPLY.

Brother **** ****—

This day I received your communication addressed to

me, and take the liberty of making a few remarks on the doctrines contained in it. To avoid confusion I have marked your letters numerically, as 1, 2, 3 &c. I begin with 1.

1st. In your first paragraph, you say, "that the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, is neither reasonable, nor scriptural." This, my Brother, is a bold assertion to be made in the face of plain scripture. Acts 2, 28. Repent and be baptised for the remission of sins—With equal propriety you might say that the doctrine of baptism for salvation is neither reasonable, nor scriptural—and yet the great Teacher said, He that believeth, and is baptised shall be saved—and his inspired Apostle Peter said, The like figure whereunto baptism, doth now save us."—With the same propriety you might affirm that the doctrine of baptism for washing away sin, is neither reasonable nor scriptural; and yet Saul was divinely instructed to be baptised, and wash away his sin—you have acknowledged that whatever is scriptural, is reasonable—therefore as the doctrine is proved to be scriptural, it is of course reasonable; and consequently your assertion to the contrary cannot be true. But we will attend to the proof of your broad assertion, that the doctrine is neither reasonable nor scriptural. Your first argument is, that both reason, and scripture say, that God has but one plan to convert people. This is to me very doubtful, to say no more; for I humbly hope, that many poor heathens, who have not the gospel, are converted and saved, but not by the plan, by which we in christendom are converted and saved. The plan by which we are converted is the gospel of Jesus Christ. This is universally acknowledged by all christians—This plan becomes effectual to convert us by faith and obedience. But my dear sir, we are not talking about conversion, but remission of sin.—Conversion is our own act—remission of sin is God's act—conversion in an inward act of our mind, which resolves, to turn from sin to God—remission of sin, or forgiveness is an act of God without us, and not a work within us.—Here a poor criminal condemned to be hung—he repents—he resolves against sin—in heart and life he converts—while anxiously awaiting his doom, the Governor pardons or remits his sin—the reprieve is sent, and he is saved from death.—What two ideas are more distinct in meaning than conversion, and remission? God never repents, and converts for us; but pardons or remits our sins—we do not remit our own sins, but we repent and turn to God. I ask, how did the criminal, condemned to be hung, know that he was pardoned? surely by the Governor's reprieve, sealed with his seal of office. Could he have any better evidence?—Could any other give him comfort? No. Could his good feelings be an evidence of his pardon before his reprieve? How could he have good feelings before? The reprieve was the

cause of those feelings. Mankind are for sin condemned to an infinitely more awful death—The great Governor of the universe proposes to the poor criminals, that if they believe in his Son—repent—convert, and obey their king; they shall be saved, their sins shall be remitted. The poor sinner believes—he repents—he converts, or turns from sin to God—he is baptised; and now he can say, God has pardoned me. How do you know he has pardoned you? His promise is true, and sure—but I have another witness within received through my humble obedience to his command to be baptised; he has given me the gift of the Holy Spirit. Because I am a son, being born of water, or by the bath of regeneration, he hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into my heart, crying Abba, Father; and this spirit bears witness with my spirit that I am, a child of God. He is now both born of the water, and of the spirit, and now, and not before can he enter into the kingdom of God. This is the plan proposed in the gospel for salvation or remission of sin. Can any deny it? We think, none. Now, as you say, both reason and scripture say, God has but one plan—can there be another according to your own acknowledgment.

If by conversion you mean (as I think you do) a new creation in heart and life, then you and the orthodox world may dispute about the one plan—you may say, that God's one plan is the gospel believed and obeyed—The orthodox will tell you that the man must be regenerated, or made a new creature, before he can believe the gospel or obey it. Their plan is sovereign, physicial power—yours is perfectly opposite. But let us not forget, that the subject under examination is not conversion, nor regeneration, in the common sense of the term, but remission of sins I proceed to your second argument to prove that the doctrine of baptism for remission, is unreasonable and unscriptural.

2nd. "I can bring 99 experienced christians, who will say, that they obtain forgiveness out of the act of baptism, where you can bring one, who can say experimentally, that he knows his sins are forgiven." Had you brought one *thus saith the Lord* in the new institution, which says that sinners obtain forgiveness out of the act of baptism, it would have produced more certain conviction to my mind, than 10,000 fallible witnesses. I did expect that proof from scripture would alone be brought to upset a doctrine proved to be taught in the scripture in plain, unequivocal language. And is it come to this, that the truth of scripture is to be tried by fallible witnesses?—by the experience of erring men?—We have granted, that many have, and do obtain forgiveness without baptism, being ignorant of the duty. This hope charity leads us to indulge. In the time of this ignorance God winked at our failures. We believe

that God has blessed, and does bless with this grace many on dying beds, and many, who have been mistaught his will. But shall we, when rightly instructed, presume on his goodness, and be guiltless? God's instituted plan, to cleanse from pollutions under the law, was sacrifice, or offering for sin; yet he did not bind himself to this plan. Thus Hezekiah prayed, "The good Lord pardon every one, that prepareth his heart to seek God—though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." 2 Chron. 30, 18.—Though God in these instances blessed and forgave the people, not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary, did he nullify his established plan? Did he absolve the people from obligations to it? Did the people conclude there was no necessity to adhere to his plan, seeing he could forgive them without it?—Is not the instituted plan of God to forgive, faith, repentance and baptism? If he pardons a soul without baptism, being ignorant of it as a duty—or if he pardons a dying person, being unable to attend to the duty—does he therefore nullify his plan, and free us from obligation to it? Shall we conclude there is no necessity for it, seeing God can bless and pardon without it? This, indeed, looks like presuming on his goodness.

As to your best ministers having denied their former experience, I must think they have acted strangely. How can they possibly, in truth, deny what they have experienced? I suspect they have denied that their former experience is the test of truth. In this they have surely acted wisely.—You farther remark, that they have denied their knowledge of sins forgiven, and the gift of the Spirit. These people must be in the situation of those mentioned by the Apostle. "They cannot see afar off, and have forgotten that they were purged from their old sins." If such men are among you, I am sorry for it; but I am glad to say, I know of none such among us. You have referred to one in our country of this character; but that holy man stands above suspicion among those best acquainted with him. He may have expressed himself unguardedly in some respects, but he has never denied his experience, his knowledge of sin forgiven, nor the gift of the Spirit.

2. I will now attend to your second argument—you say, I must do one of two things, either to confess that my system is wrong, or prove that the thousands that have been converted without baptism are all deceived—I reply, I cannot, I dare not, in the face of plain scripture confess that baptism for remission of sins is wrong; nor can I attempt to prove the thousands, who have been converted without baptism, are deceived. The Messenger never taught the doctrine that a man cannot be converted without baptism. The contrary of this we constantly

proclaim, that a man must repent, convert, or reform, before he should be baptised. From this remark of yours, I plainly see where you have erred—you make conversion and remission of sins, the same thing; and yet there cannot be two more distinct ideas. I repeat it; conversion is our own act—remission of sins is God's act. Let my brother learn not to confound what is so plainly distinct, and he will have less cause to censure others, and good cause to correct himself.

You farther say, "your own experience contradicts what you are now teaching." This may be true. But shall we make our experience the test of truth?—Shall we try the truth of every doctrine by the standard of our experience? You well know how long and often this argument has been used against us by the *orthodox* world, and with what little effect. Their experience was; that by some physical power of the Spirit they were enlightened, convicted, regenerated, and made alive before they could, or did believe in Jesus. This was urged to prove us wrong, for teaching that sinners must believe, before these things could be experienced. Have you at length yielded to their argument, and now urge it against your brethren in the faith of Christ? If experience be made the test of truth—then every sect has the truth; for all their doctrines must agree with their experience, orthey cannot be true. Let this principle be established, and there is an end of all hope of reformation; and skepticism must be the result. Happy and right feelings are the effects of truth; but truth is not always the cause of happy feelings—often the tide of happy passion rises high, uninfluenced by the power of truth. This is the prolific source of so much distress in the churches at the present time. Will my brother still advocate the doctrine?

3. Your third argument shall next be attended to. It respects the house of Cornelius. In a private letter to you, I remarked that the gift of the Holy Spirit to Cornelius and his house was not designed to renew them, or to beget in them a holy heart. I refer you to 1 Cor 14, 22, where the Apostle expressly states the design of these gifts without limitation. "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." He plainly declares 1 Cor. 13,—that a person may have the gift of tongues, so as to speak as angels—he may have the gift of knowledge—and of faith to remove mountains, and yet be destitute of love and charity. The 120 had the same spirit poured out on them on the day of pentecost—not to renew them—not to beget in them a holy heart,—but this spirit was given to them to convince the world of sin—of righteousness, and of judgment. This is proved by fact—Peter preached to the people on pentecost, and to the house of Cornelius, that Jesus lived, died, was buried and rose again—and by the gifts

of the Holy Spirit, the Jews and Gentiles in each case believed, and were baptised. Did Paul believe or teach that these gifts ever purified the hearts of those that possessed them, or that they produced in them the spirit of holiness? If so, why did he say, "covet earnestly the best gifts, and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way"—and this way was charity or love, 1 Cor. 12, 31, and 13, 1.

You say, "The gift of the Holy Ghost was the end of John's baptism; and so sure as John's baptism pointed to the gift of the Holy Ghost, conferred on the Apostles, so sure did it point to the gift poured out on the Gentiles, Matt. 3, 11. Mark 1, 8. Luke 3, 16." I grant, the baptism of John ceased when the baptism of the Holy Spirit was introduced on pentecost—but that it pointed to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, is, what I am not so sure of—I have always thought that Christ's baptism took the place of John's, nor can I think differently till convinced of my error by Bible-testimony.—After all, I gladly receive this truth, the obedient believer *yet*, as in past ages, and in ages yet to come does receive the Holy Spirit,—"Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us." Rom. 5.

4. You make a few remarks on acts 2, 38, which we produce in proof of baptism for remission of sins. You ask, why not read, and contend for the whole connexion? I answer, we do most strenuously. Do you think we are so dishonest as not to read, nor contend for the whole? Were we in the habit of doing this we might be suspected of dishonesty, You say, none were baptised but believers, who gladly received the word—Granted; and none but such should ever be baptised—You farther say, "There is no proof that they were all baptised on that day; but they were added (to the church) on the same day." Indeed! and how did my Brother find out this? He has discovered the secret from the history of the church, as written by Stackhouse, and Doc. A. Clark, that new converts were not baptised hastily, but must first go through a course of instruction &c.—Philip needed, greatly needed these Doctors to teach him, if they are right—for Philip very hastily baptised the Eunuch—and Peter very hastily baptised the house of Cornelius—and so did Ananias hastily baptise Saul.—If you attend to these Doctors I shall expect to hear of you baptising infants. Do you seriously bring the practice of ages after the Apostles to overthrow Apostolic doctrine? I hope not. And yet, after you had quoted these Doctors, you add, "Hence I believe &c." I must have better authority for my faith, than modern Doctors.

You farther say, baptism is to declare our faith in the resurrection from the dead—and not for the remission of sins, as a first principle—The latter part of this sentence I no not under-

stand, and therefore pass it over in silence. We grant, baptism refers to the resurrection—it also refers to our union with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit—with our union with the body of Christ—with salvation, and remission of sins—with washing from sin, and introduction into the church of Christ.—Why contend for one to the rejection of the others? I receive all as the truth of God, and dare not reject any.

5. You wish to know whether I preached the same doctrine I now preach. 20 years ago, when you heard me in Ohio. I cannot recollect what I then preached when you heard me, but if I have advanced no farther in knowledge for 20 years, I must be a very dunce. Would you have me preach nothing more than what I preached 20 years ago? Must I make no improvement? If any are tremblingly afraid to leave the ground occupied 20 years ago, and to adventure into the ocean of truth, I envy not their lot;—I am determined to follow where the truth may lead me. I am confident of one thing, that the grand leading principles, advocated by me 20 years ago, I yet retain. But speculations on many points I have abandoned as useles. Farwell. B. W. STONE, Editor.

N. B. I shall pursue this subject between us no farther.

Tuppers plains, March 26th, 1834.

Dear Brethren Stone & Johnson—

I have just returned from Baltimore, I found a number of flourishing christian churches both, in going and coming. I found some brethren, who appear to be as much sectarian as any other; and some who appear to strike at the root of all good order in the work of the ministry, or a regular preached gospel. Paul beseeches the brethren, to know them who labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake—I never yet saw a people do well very long, who paid no regard to Paul's admonition in this case—It is morally impossible for a pracher to study to make himself a workman, who needs not be ashamed, if he has to study a thousand ways, how to get along with regard to his worldly affairs.

Dear Brother Stone—I had the pleasure to see the answer which you wrote in the Messenger to the few lines, which I wrote to you concerning your views of Christ's second coming &c. Dear. Brother, bear with us a little and do not think that our views are mere traditionary notions—Tradition is an oral account from age to age—If we have nothing, but that which is delivered by mouth, in support of our opinions respecting Christ's second coming; you do well to reprove us sharply for differing with your views on this subject; as for myself I never can believe any thing except I have both scripture and reason;

God is a God of reason, and he speaks to our reasonable faculties—saying, come, let us reason together. Now then, whilst I show you my reasons, why I dissent from your opinion respecting the second coming of Christ, let not our love be cooled to each other; the best of men have differed on this subject. I have truly received much satisfaction from the Messenger on many subjects, particularly on the doctrine of Christ, and baptism for the remission of sins. The ideas on which we differ with you are your views, 1st, of Christ coming in his bodily presence at the commencement of the 1000 years, or at the commencement of the millennium. 2nd, That the dead saints, or those who sleep in their graves, shall be raised, and the living changed at the commencement of the 1000 years. 3rd, That there shall be no increase of the human family during the mellenial period. 4th, That none shall be converted and none shall remain to be converted, during the whole period of the 1000 years.

Dear Broth Stone; I do not wish to enter into any contest with you on these subjects; but merely for information. If you or any other brother will, agreeably to scripture or reason, answer the following objection to the above ideas, it will be taken as a great kindness.

1st. Idea, that Jesus Christ shall come, and reign with his saints on earth 1000 years in his bodily presence.

1st, Objection, If Christ shall come from heaven in his bodily presence, then heaven shall be without him during that 1000 years 2nd, If Christ shall come in his bodily presence and reigns with the sainst 1000 years how can he be in every place at the same time. He has flesh and bones as well as we have; handle me, said he, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. Every body must occupy a certain space; if so, he cannot be at the same time in the four continents, and in the immediate presence of every saint at the same time.

2nd, Item that, at the commencement of the 1000 years, the living saints shall be changed to immortality, and those, who sleep in Jesus, at the same moment be raised to immortality.—Dear Brother Stone, I think, if you will examine the text or passage all over, you will see that this passage has a reference not to the commencement of the millennium at all, but to the general judgment—1, Thes. 4, 14–18. "For if we believe that Jesus died, and rose again, even so them also, which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him; for this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the

Lord in the air, and so shall we be ever with the Lord. Mark here; "meet the Lord," not on earth, but in the air—on his great white throne Rev. 20, 11—Dear Brother, there is a particular objection in my mind to the idea you take from the main text, on which you build this doctrine, that is, Rev. 20, 4—and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark on their forehead, nor in their hand, and they lived and reigned with Christ a 1000 years. You take this text literally whilst in my humble opinion, it is figurative all through the new testament. When it speaks of the resurrection; it is always of the body, not of the soul, therefore, when John said, that he saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and the word of God &c. They lived and reigned with Christ 1000 years. I think that it rationally may be considered, not the individual persons who suffered for the witness of Jusus; but more particularly their successors in the same spirit of fiery zeal and courage for the simple truth of the gospel, the glory of God, and the salvation of souls. These are the persons in succession, who shall live and reign with Christ, in his spiritual presence, a 1000 years, or till kings shall be thy (the church's) nursing Fathers, and Queens thy nursing Mothers, and the kingdom, be given into the hands of the saints of the Most High, and the earth be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea—It may certainly be spoken of in the style of prophecy, as though they were the same persons. Our saviour himself spoke of John the baptist as if he were Elias; because he came in the spirit and power of Elias Matt, 111, and 17, 12. Luke, 17—The restoration of Israel from their captivity is called their living and standing on their feet an exceeding great army, Eezk 37, 10. The two witnesses who, were to prophecy 1260 days or years in sack cloth, must mean a succession of witnesses for the same great cause &c.

3rd, Item of your ideas, that during the millennial period there will be no increase of the human family—you say, that, in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven. True, thus far we agree exactly—But you have not proved to my satisfaction by any scripture, or reason that the resurrection of all the righteous will be 1000 years before the resurrection of the wicked—It says, the rest of the dead lived, not again until the 1000 years were finished. It does not say, the dead out of Christ live not, &c. but the dead, righteous, and wicked; John says, I saw the dead small and great stand before God, and the books were opened and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. (Now comes the general resurrection) and the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell, or the grave, gave up the dead which were in them &c. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire. This was certainly after the 1000 years, that the dead, small and great stood before God, the books were opened—the book of life presented the righteous and the wicked judged, and those not written in the book of life cast into the lake of fire, Rev. 20, 11,—Mathew's testimony says, When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another &c. Mat. 25, 31, 32. It appears evident, that, people shall be in a national capacity, marying wives and giving in marriage, planting, building &c. when the Lord shall come with all his holy angels to judge the world.

Speaking of the latter day glory, Isiah says; And there shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled up his days; for the child shall die a hundred years old? Here it appears that at that happy time, or day of millennium, that there will be infants, but they shall not die in a few days, but shall die notwithstanding, a 100 years old. Then it speaks of both children, and death, in that period; and at least ten generations; for if the child should die in our day, when an infant, but at that day live a hundred years, there are ten times that much in one thousand years.

The 4th, and last Idea against which we contend, is, that there shall be no sinners converted, and none to convert, during the millennium period—we have proved that nations shall be in a national capacity till the general judgment, planting, buildng, marrying wives, and given in marriage; that there shall be no death of infants or youth, but at the same time death when old. Then if it is so, that people shall live in a national capacity, having children who shall die when old, they must be born again, or not get to heaven; for human nature is still the same thing, children of wrath, till they are converted. I believe as much as you do, that the people, who will be obstinate till they get down on the scorners chair, God will cut off by some signal judgment before the final commencement of the last 1000 years or millennium, lest their influence should draw away others and be a bad example to youth,

Dear Brother Stone, (I hope I shall not offend you,) your views of the millennium period are exceedingly contracted—I cannot see for my life, how the many prophecies respecting the latter day glory, could be fulfiled agreeable to your views, it is only 166 years from this present year (1834) till the last of

his dispensation, or the 2000 years under the gospel. There must be rapid work during that time (166) if all the prophecies are fulfiled respecting the church of Christ—The reign of antichrist is not quite at an end yet; party names and spirits, still rage, the holy city is still trodden down by the Gentiles. There are but few, who have overcome the beast, his image, his mark, and the number of his name; and standing on the sea of glass, mingled with fire, and singing the song of deliverance from Babylonish captivity, or the song of Moses and of the Lamd.—Solomon says Prov. 8, 30, 31, speaking of the son-ship of Christ, and creation of the world. Then I was by him as one bought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing before him, rejoicing in the habitable parts of the earth, and my delights were with the sons of men. It is evident from this passage that every part of the earth, that can be inhabited, will be inhabited before the day of judgment; for our Saviour fore-seeing the parts of the habitable earth, rejoiced and his delights were with the sons of men; as if it were actually present. There is a great part of the earth not yet inhabited, that will be inhabited, or else made in vain. But no part of the creation is useless, for after he finished the creation, he looked upon it, found that it answered the purpose for which it was made, and pronounced it good. It certainly must be in that 1000 years of peace, or millenial period, that a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation—that the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea, that they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, that nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither learn war any more. It must be at this happy time, when the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard lie down with the kid, the calf, the young lion, & the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them, the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain. Mark it well, that these passages with many more are acknowledged by all to have a reference, in particular, to the time of the millennium; and yet there are little children, sucking children, and weaned children in that period.

But Dear Brother,—your last Item, I had almost forgotten that is, when satan shall be loosed from his prison, you say, that he collects his risen hosts again from the four corners of the earth, deceives his old army once more, &c. But the Book says, when the 1000 years are expired, satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations, which are upon the four quarters of the earth, God and Magog, to gather them &c. Mark here; they are still in a national capacity—

this is the little season, and it appears that satan shall have great success in his old trade of deceiving the nations; for their numbers are as the land of the sea &c.

I hope Dear old brother Stone, that you will write again on this subject. If you do, let the people have both sides—If I am in an error, I want to know it. I am in search of truth—It will be satisfying to your readers of the Messenger to have a change of subject.

Farwell; I am your very friend.

W. CALDWELL.

TO ELDER WILLIAM CALDWELL.

Dear Brother: Yours of March 26th was in due time received. I hasten to reply.—We were glad to hear of the number of flourishing churches visited by you in your tour to and from Baltimore; but were sorry to hear of a sectarian spirit among any of them. This is the bane of christianity, and its disgrace wherever indulged. Against it in word and deed we must protest. You found others, who appeared to be aiming a deadly blow at the very root of good order in the ministry. Your remarks on this subject are in unison with our own.—We dread the results, should such a course be pursued by brethren; yet the increasing intelligence of the age forbids us to think it can prevail to any great extent, but will disappear, as the dark mists before the risen sun.

From my views of the millennium you dissent; and have in a plain and brotherly style stated your objections, and requested my attention to them. This I will cheerfully give in the same style.

1st. You object to the idea that Jesus Christ shall come and reign with his saints on earth a 1000 years, in his bodily presence.

I answer: I have proved what you yourself acknowledge, that Jesus will come at some period, personally, or "in his bodily presence." This, I think, is universally admitted, and denied by none. We only disagree as to the time of his coming. You think he will not come in person, or "bodily presence," till the close of the millennium—I think, he will come at the commencement of it. Your reasons why he will not come at the commencement of the millennium, and reign with the saints on earth a thousand years, shall now be considered.

1st: You say, "If Christ come from heaven in his bodily presence, then heaven shall be without him during that 1000 years.

What, therefore, will follow? Did he not once come down from heaven, and dwell on earth 33 years? Was not heaven without him during that period? If heaven did without him during that period, cannot the same heaven do without him for 1000? What are 1000 years to him whose measure of time

is eternity? Will not heaven do without him, on your own principles, when he shall come to judge the world? You may say, the time of his absence then will be very short. Remember, one day is with the Lord as a 1000 years, and a 1000 years as one day. Indeed, brother, I cannot see any force in your argument.

2ly. Your second reason; "If Christ come in his bodily presence, and reign with the saints a 1000 years, how can he be in every place at the same time? He has flesh and bones as we have, and therefore, must occupy a certain space. If so, he cannot be at the same time in the four continents, and in the immediate presence of every saint at the same time.

I answer: This objection runs into endless and unprofitable speculation. I would simply ask, How do we know that Jesus in person shall be in the immediate presence of every saint at the same time? Why the necessity of it? As your objection is altogether speculative, I have nothing to do with it. I have long since retired from this useless, and injurious labor.

You also object to my view, that at the commencement of the 1000 years, the living saints shall be changed into immortality, and those who sleep in Jesus, shall, at the same moment, be raised to immortality. You think the texts to which I referred had no allusion to the millennium, but to the day of judgment. Let us re-examine. You admit, nor can any one deny, that at the coming of the Lord, the dead saints shall rise, and the saints, who shall be alive on the earth, shall be changed into immortality. This is plain from 1. Thes. 4, 13–18. 1 Cor. 15, 23, 51, 52.—From these texts with the connexion, it is evident the Apostle is speaking of the resurrection of the body. In 1 Cor. 15, 21, 22, he says, since by (*en*) man came death, by (*en*) man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as by (*en*) Adam all die, even so by (*en*) Christ shall all be made alive. Here we are taught there shall be a general resurrection of all, the just, and the unjust. In the next verse he shews that the resurrection of the just and unjust is not simultaneous; for, says he, But every man (shall be raised, or made alive) in his own order: Christ, the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Surely, nothing can be plainer than this, that the righteous shall rise before the wicked, and that the righteous shall rise at the coming of Christ. In 1 Thes. 4. It is equally plain, that the resurrection of the saints only is spoken of; and that this will take place at the coming of the Lord; and it is also plain from both passages, that at the coming of Jesus, at the sound of the last trumpet, the living saints on earth shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. This resurrection of the righteous is called, the

first resurrection. Rev. 20, 4. "And I saw thrones, and they (the saints) sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God, and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

This passage confirms those before considered. Here John beheld enthroned the martyrs, and those who had not worshipped the beast nor, received his mark. This includes the whole number of the saints of God.—for all worshipped the beast, except those whose names were in the Lamb's book of life. Rev. 13, 8. These lived again, and reigned with Christ a thousand years But the rest of the dead lived not again till the 1000 years were finished. *The rest of the dead* must mean the wicked—they lived not again, were not raised from death till the 1000 years were finished. I cannot see any other plausible construction of this text—To say, as many do, and you among them, that this resurrection of the martyrs signifies nothing more than that the bold and zealous spirit or temper of the martyrs shall hereafter be revived, is, to say that true religion has been long banished from the earth, and will remain in a state of banishment, till some future period, when it will be revived. I am far from thinking that the spirit of the martyrs has at any time been banished from the church. There are many now, who would lay down their lives in defence of Christ and his cause. But read the text with your construction, and you will forever abandon your opinion—Thus; the spirit or temper of the martyrs lived, or was revived with Christ 1000 years; but the rest of the dead lived not again—what becomes of the antithesis? This reading would be as illogical as absurd.

As joyful subjects on earth go forth to meet their king on his way to his kingdom; so are the saints represented as flying up in the air to meet their descending King, and welcome him to his kingdom on earth. It does not say, they shall be ever with the Lord in the air, for on earth they are to reign with him a thousand years, and then forever be with him, wherever he may be.

As to your remark of the resurrection of the soul, you will find it of little weight, when the scriptures so often represent by it, the whole man; as "that soul shall be cut off from his people." &c.

You also object to my view, that during the millennium there will be no increase of the human family. True: I have proved that at the coming of Christ all the dead saints shall rise to immortality—that the saints living on the earth shall be changed in a moment—that the wicked shall all be cut off, and that in the resurrection there is neither marrying, or giving in marriage. If these be true, my position must be true also, as you acknowledge.

You have indeed taken new grounds—for you have the judgment set— the books opened and all judged according to their works; and then, after this, the general resurrection takes place. These events, but in the reverse of your order, I grant, will follow the 1000 years. My brother appears confused; and the reason to me is obvious; because he has not relinquished the opinion of his father, that the second coming of Christ will not be till the last day, the day of final judgment—The second coming of Christ is at the commencement of his millenial reign on earth—here on earth he will reign till the 1000 years be finished—nor will he cease to reign on earth till he has raised from death the wicked, and judged them according to their works—as to the people living in a national capacity, planting, building, marrying &c. We believe this shall be the fact at the coming of the Lord to reign on earth with his saints a 1000 years.

You introduce Isai. 65, foretelling a period when there shall no more be an infant of days. From this you strangely conclude that there shall be infants. Again Isaiah prophecies, that "the child, being a hundred years old shall die." From this you infer that in the millennium there shall be death. How do we know that these prophecies refer to the millennium? It is evident from the whole context that it is a prophecy, of a state into which the Jews are to be brought ,and had no particular referrence to the millennial reign of Messiah.

You think, that the time between this and the millennium is too short, for so many prophetic events to be accomplished. I have but one answer to this, "The Lord will cut short his work in righteousness."—With regard to the binding and loosing satan, of his collecting his army, and deceiving them again I can advance nothing new; nor has my Brother advanced one argument to disprove what I had said.

Difficulties, it is acknowledged, attach to the doctrine of the millnenium; and such that we may not be able to solve. But shall we, therefore, conclude that nothing can be certainly known respecting it? I am very far from being positive in all my positions; but of some I entertain no doubt. The Jews were very wrong in their ideas of Mesiah's first coming; so may we be of his second.—Our wisdom is to be always ready.

Farewell. B. W. STONE, Editor.

Brother Stone & Johnson:—

I have lately seen a piece written in the Cross by John S. Higgins, wherein he attempts to answer a piece written by Brother John Rogers in the Messenger Vol. 7 No. 7 page 219.

After he has exhausted his vocabulary respecting the Hanging fork Church, and old Father Helms and Wife, the said Higgins states, This was virtually the case. Also with regard to the difficulties at the Fork Church, where the huge irons, bars, and bolts, and locks, are spoken of with such emphasis; wherein the first organization of the Campbellites (so called) was with but five members out of the church containing about one hundred and sixty. A difficulty there arose in regard to the occupancy of the house, the small part separated, claiming more than their part of time. The trustees of the church took legal advice upon the subject, in which they were informed, that the party breaking off could only claim of the time in proportion to their number. Arrangements were immediately made, and written notice given to the party thus rent off, that they should enjoy the house to the extent of their right by Law. With this they were not satisfied; But proceeded to make appointments, filling one forth of the time. The trustees at first concluded that the house would be safe under a common lock, but finding that in this they were mistaken, they proceeded to put bars of iron across the doors, securing them with strong padlocks, supposing that such provision, as was lawful to keep out the most offensive characters in the Government, would certainly keep out those, who profess to be the best and most inoffensive, who could live no longer in the church, because of its corruptions, and those who set themselves up as the livers and patronizers of the ancient gospel. But they have not scrupled to break through these strong restraints. Query,—in what part of this ancient gospel can any thing be found to justify them in these things? Did our blessed Saviour or any of his Apostles, ever pursue a course of this kind? Nay, verily; if there be any justification for this, it must be sought else where than in the word of the Lord, the book of which they boast as the rule of their discipline and Government. I would to God, they were governed by that word. We should have been saved the trouble of these, strictures, and many other unpleasant things. Thus ends the first Epistle of John S. Higgins.

Now reader, you are called on to believe the above statement if you can. For my part I cannot.

I should not have attempted to open my mouth, had not our little church, and myself, have been implicated in so base a manner by what is called Orthodox. I will now give a detail of facts, and then leave my case to every unprejudiced mind, believing they will give us as much justice as John S. Higgins,

the writer in the Cross. About twelve months ago, Brother John Sacre had an appointment for preaching at the foregoing Fork Meeting house on Saturday and Sunday. The five members so much spoken of there, being in the church, whereof the said Higgins was pastor. Previous to Brother Sacre's Meeting there was a caucus held by the Orthodox party, under the name of a society-night-meeting; three of them being the trustees, whose names you may find subscribed to a certificate to the truth of John S. Higgins' statement. That night a bill of 24 pieces of iron was given, and then the respectable trustees put the same on the Meeting-house. We attended Brother Sacre's Meeting, and found the Meeting-house barred and locked against us. On that day we resolved to be free from the tradition of men; on the next day, being Lord's day, we formed ourselves into a Congregation, constituted on the old and new Testament. There were two schisms, and divisions in said congregation, one of which united with us on the same day we constituted, making our number about 10 or 15. Our number now is about 82 members, a great many from the opposition. In a short time the large iron bars were put a cross the doors of said Meeting-house. Then these honorable trustees lay concealed in an old school house, time after time, watching to see who it was, that entered said house. I cannot but remark here that on a certain day appointed for preaching one of these men came out from behind some logs, and met his own sister, who was in bad health, who had rode hard to ged out of the rain, as she supposed. She asked her Brother, to let her in the Meeting-house; he told her, she had forfeited all her right to said house, he could not let her in for she had joined the reformers. Now these are, says John Higgins, the most respectable members o the Church. The Lord pity such deluded creatures!

On the next Meeting held by John S. Higgins at the aforesaid Meeting-house, he brought forward a resolution, and preamble in the shape of an indictment. I will now give you a copy, as true a one as can be had.

Whereas James G. Bryant has been absent from Meeting, especially on Saturday, for about twelve months, contrary to a known rule of this church of long standing, that it shall be the duty of every member to attend his or her church Meeting, except providentially hindered: wherefore the church appointed Brethren for a committee, at her January Meeting, to see him and request his attendance at her February Meeting; he came, and instead of giving satisfaction, he increased the dissatisfaction, by calling upon the church for her authority to cite him to the church. And whereas Daniel O'Bannon, James G. Bryant, and John Pollard, have manifested a disregard, and, in some instances, a contempt for the discipline of the church,

while they have manifested a decided preference in favor of the doctrine, and practice of a people, commonly called Campbellites, to the great dissatisfaction of the church, who hath borne with them for a considerable time, in hopes that they, who had thus gone off out of the right way, would by time and reflection turn from the folly of their ways; But in this we are disappointed; and, whereas James G. Bryant and Daniel O'Bannon &c. have contrary to the peace and dignity of this commonwealth, and contrary to the provisions of the trustees of this church, and contrary to the peace and happiness of said church, did on last Lord's day forcibly break open the door of this house, and to secure themselves from the merited reproach of all the friends of good order, formed themselves into a church: Resolved therefore that Daniel O'Bannon, James G. Bryant, John Pollard, together with as many of the members of this church, as have associated themselves in the above supposed constitntion, have gone out from us, because they are no more of us.

The above indictment was brought forward and read to the church. Now all you, who vote for this resolution, and preamble are to be considered united Baptists. Some members would not vote, but stated, they did not understand the Question. They stated further, they did not know what the Commonwealth had to do with the church of Christ. Thus we were excluded as may see by this resolution. Now in regard to the occupancy of the house, the said Higgins states, that the trustees took legal advice, that written notice was given that we should enjoy the house to the extent of our claim by Law. Now reader, I will give you a copy of the notice, and then close, making a few remarks on the same.

March 19th, 1833.

Mr. Daniel O'Bannon—

Sir, Take Notice that you are permitted to occupy the fork Meeting-house for devotional purposes, the second Tuesday in March, April, May, June, July, August, September, November, and the second Saturday and Sunday in December, and February, and at no other times. And if you should attempt to use said Meeting-house for the purpose aforesaid, or in any other way, at any other time, without first obtaining our consent, we shall hold you to be Trespassers; and make you accountable as such.

Trustees, { RICHARD R. WEST, THORNTON K. THOMPSON, WILLIAM COLLIER.

Now, reader, at once, you may see what kind of a grant was given in the notice by said trustees. The

notice at once shews contempt on its face, and it shews with what kind of spirit it was written. Although J. S. Higgins tells us in his piece, that the trustees had taken legal advice, which advice I deny has ever been given by any counsellor on earth, unless he gave it himself, or his aids. I dare him to come forward in the presence of that man with whom the trustees had communication. I do affirm, that I read the law to some of the members, and attended meeting for some months, for the express purpose to get a division according to law. John Higgins did propose leaving the difficulty to Judge Boyl. I then went to said trustees, and told them I would leave the same to Boyl, or to any two men in the state of Kentucky. The answer they made me was, they thought Judge Boyl had a leaning; therefore, they could not do it. I then made every proposition man could make, and not one accepted. The house has been locked up from the first till lately (two days excepted) and there has never been a division in the time by law.

At their last January meeting they made arrangements for the negroes to hold meeting on the Lord's day, specified in their notice to us; and accordingly the second Sunday in February was filled by the negroes, and has continued ever since.

DANIEL O'BANNON.

March 22th, 1834.

REMARK.

We, for want of room, have omitted to insert the certificates. Indeed. we thought them of little service. We are sorry, and mortified to spread such scandals before the world. Justice did reqiure Bro. O'Bannon to reply to J. S. Higgins. We hope no more such quarrels will ever stain our columns. We must express our disapprobation equally to barring, and breaking open Meeting-houses. Editors.

QUERIES PRPOSED BY BRO. J. MILLER.

Query, 1st. Some think that the law of the kingdom does not debar them from the pursuit of worldly business to make gain on Sunday, some think the day should be spent at home in reading the scriptures—others, that we should meet together every first day, and worship together at the house of God. What is the law, with regard to this day? Is it of divine appointment? or did the Apostles set it apart as their own invention?

Query, 2. Our discipline directs not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is—now, when, and how often are we to assemble together?

Query, 3. Is it by divine appointment to have Bishops in every church, when in some churches none can be found possessed of the qualifications of a bishop?

Query, 4. Does acts 2, 42 and 46 refer to the Lord's supper?

ANSWERS BY B. W. STONE, Editor.

Query, 1. Is the religious observance of the first day of the week, a divine appointment, or an invention of the Apostles? and how is the day to be observed. This is the sum of the query.

Answer, The distinction between a divine appointment, and Apostolic invention is novel. We have thought that whatever the inspired Apostles enjoined and preached was of divine authority, and differed not from a divine appointment. But in the whole New Testament there is no express command, or appintment, to sanctify the first day of the week. But we have that which is equal to a command, the Apostolic example. The first christians assembled together on the first day of the week to worship. Acts. 20, 7. This may be an answer to the 2nd, query, when, and how often we should meet together?

To the 3rd. Query I reply, That every church should have a Bishop—if the churches had not members, qualified for the office, they ought to apply to other churches for one.

To Query 4th. I cannot give a decisive answer. The matter with me is doubtful.

One general remark I would make, that the Lord's day is not as religiously observed as it should be, even by many, who believe it of divine appointment. He that regards the day, should regard it to the Lord. To desecrate the Lord's day, would be to introduce vice and immoralities innumerable in to society. The house of God would be almost deserted, and poor slaves would not be permitted to rest from their labors. Even in a civil point of view, it is a wise ordinance to observe the day. But what christian, knowing the divine privileges of the day, would be willing to see it abolished.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Bro. A Kyes of Boone writes that three have been baptised and received lately in that church.

Bro. G. Elley of Nicholasville Ky. (April 10) writes. we closed a three days meeting here last Monday, during which 7 were added, 4 confessed the Saviour. The week previous I immersed 7.

Bro. W. Dunkeson of Hopkinsville (April 5) writes that on the last Saturdy and Lord's day, at Noah's spring four were added to the Lord; and the prospect good.

Bro. Joseph Wasson of Leesburgh Ky. (April 12) writes that 2 in that neighborhood have lately been immersed. He wishes the people generally to know that abundant provision and accommodation will be made for as many as may attend the annual meeting at that place next September.

Bro. C. McDonald of Moulton, Ala. (April 11) writes that lately he and Bro. Kindrick have baptised four—the prospect was cheering. Also, that there was an appearence of an awful explosion of the next Baptist Association in that county. Several preachers were expected to be cut off for preaching baptism for the remission of sins.

Bro. L. Purviance of Ohio, April 18, 1834, informs us that our venerable old bro. N. Worley is alive and

in good health. We had published some months back that he was dead. This information was given us by Eld. J. P. Andrew of Cincinnati. We rejoice that it was incorrect. Bro. P— also writes that our old and higly respected bro. col. Peter Fleming of Preble co. Ohio, has ceased from his long, and severe sufferings occasioned by a cancer in the breast. The cancer cut a blood vessel and he bled to death in two hours. He lived and died a christian: He was truly one of the excellent of the earth.

Died on March 27, 1834, Mrs. Nancy Longley, wife of Elder John Longley of Rush co. Ia. in the 36th, year of her age, and in the full assurance of hope. She lived, and died the death of the righteous.

Bro. M. Scott of Ill. McLean co. (April 6) writes that bro. Rhodes baptised 3 lately.

Bro. P. Robertson of Nashville, Tenn. (April 24) says, we are getting on very well here. On last Lord's day 6 were immersion in the name of the Lord—all of them persons of the first intelligence. We have but few meetings here without some persons obeying the Lord.

We have understood that within a few days past bro. T. M. Allen of Fayette co. Ky. has baptised upwards of 20 at Antioch.

Bro. Tho. Smith of Lexington has since his last communication baptised a number, we cannot learn how many.

Bro. Elijah Ward of Vigo, co. Ia. writes [April 14,] that the appearances for good not far from him, are cheering. He also informs us, that there is a great split among the Methodists in that section.

Bro. Kurkendall of Liberty, clay co. Mo. writes March 25.—That in the spring of 1833, himself, wife and three others united together as a church, upon the word of God alone. Soon after their constitution, a Baptist church in the neighborhood, excluded their minister for what they termed Campbellism. Their charges against him, were 1st. that he taught that the firm be-

lief in the word of God, and obedience to the same constituted a christian. 2 That at one of our meetings he sat near us while partaking the Lord's supper, and raised a tune for us. [Wonderful sirs!!] He with 5 of that church united with us, and now we number about 20.

In our county, Scott, there are considerable additions to the church. We are much encouraged.

Eld. Js. McVey of Mansfield Ohio, writes Feb. 25th. 1834. In March last, he formed a church of 12 members of regular baptists chiefly, who had cast off the human yoke—since that time, he had baptised about 200, who have been added to the church He. has travelled a considerable distance, and baptised in all about 370 within the last 12 months.

—

Mansfield, Ohio, April 10th, 1834.

Brother Stone & Johnson—

I received the three first Nos. of the 8 Vol. of the Christian Messenger; and as far as they have been read, the brethren are much delighted with their contents, and many are anxious to become subscribers, some thought we were alone in the reformation here, as the cause has only been advocated about thirteen months; but in reading the Messenger they were glad to hear that there are so many powerful advocates in the reformation; it causes many that are babes in the good work to be glad and take courage. Since I wrote to you about six weeks ago, there have been about seventy added to the church in this place, which makes about two hundred and seventy, which have been immersed and joined within thirteen months. I have never been in a place where the sectarian Clergy appear so much alarmed as they do here; creeds are getting out of date, many have gotten out of that old tradition, that it takes days and months before persons can get into the kingdom. There are many instances here, of hardened sinners, the first sermon they hear, obeying the gospel, and are made happy in the Lord. Many

are also coming out from their human yokes. In March I visited a Baptist Church in Knox county; and after preaching several times, I made a proposition to see how many would come under the New Testament government. About twenty organized in church order, according to the New Testament, I immersed six at the meeting. We would rejoice to see some labourers visiting this section of county. It would relieve me very much, as I feel like travelling more extensively. Through the Messenger we ardently solicit some of our travelling Brethren to visit this place. I close with subscribing myself yours in the bonds of a peaceful gospel. may God bless you Brethren! may you live long to be useful in the reformation! may your communications through the Messenger ever be soul cheering to the churches! may joy fill your hearts when about to leave the walls of zion! may it be in full hope of wearing the crown.

Farewell. JAMES McVEY.

Bro. Wm. Lambert of Washington, co. Ky. writes Feb. 10th. 1834. On Tuesday night after 3d. Lord's day of January until Lord's day following 20 were added to the church, since which time 5 more have been added—On 2nd. Lord's day of Feb. bro. C. J. Smith and myself met with the Brethren at bro. Js. Green's, a Methodist exhorter, and the Mercer co. court clerk, a Presbyterian with others came forward, and desired membership with us, making in all 30. Bless the Lord! The gospel of God's dear son is about to take that stand, that is due to the truth. I am informed by the Brethren at Harrodsburgh, that 15 have been added to the church there within the last three weeks.

—

Fayette co. Ky. May 5th. 1834.

Dear Brethren—

It is with much pleasure I make this communication, for the information of yourselves and readers generally; on the first day of April Bro. John Roger's

was with me at Antioch, at which time three made confession of their faith in Jesus; on the 3d. Lord's day he was with me at the same place, at a three days meeting which terminated on Monday. The congregations were unusually large, attentive and solemn on every day of the meeting; twelve confessed the Saviour on Monday the last day of our meeting, nearly all the congregation were in tears, and in conclusion we repaired to the water, where I immersed twelve. On the 4th Lord's day I was at Clintonville in the forenoon where I immersed one: in the afternoon I addressed a large assembly at Antioch, when six more professed faith in the Lord. On Yesterday [the first Lord's day] I again met a large congregation at Antoch, 4 professed faith and 10 were immersed; the prospects are yet cheering. On next Lord's day we expect to meet at Union; in the evening I have an appointment at Gen. Russells to address the people and immerse—Dear Brethren, cannot you and other teaching brethren visit us at Union, and Antioch? We trust our brethren will remember us. Your Bro. in hope of immortality,

TOHMAS M. ALLEN.

I have had no help at our meeting here. I have spoken for three days; that is part of the time. I baptised a Presbyterian and her husband on yesterday—another came forward to day and demanded baptism, and her father aged about eighty, confessed the Saviour.

Your Brother,

LEONARD J. FLEMING.

Lawrenceburg Ky.

DEFERRED ARTICLES.

Bro. W. D. Callaway of princeton Ky. writes Jan. 11. Bro. Davenport has just left us. During his stay he immersed 3 persons, one of whom was a student in Cumberland College.

Brother David Millard of New York has been among us for several weeks. His ministrations have been well received, and it is believed, have been blessed to the people. We are highly pleased with his visit, his person, his piety, and his public exhibitions. He has happily removed the unfavorable impressions, made on many minds, that the christians in the East were fast approximating to Sectarianism, and had settled down on former opinions, without farther examination, and investigation of revealed truth. We should rejoice at the frequent visits of *such* brethren from the East, and that *such* brethren from the West would interchange the visits. This would be a happy means of cementing a union, important to the interests of religion. Bro. Millard leaves us beloved, with our best wishes for his prosperity and hearty prayers for his success. Editors.

Bro. P. Hatchitt of Mt. Washington Ky. writes Jan. 22. 1834. Since my last to you 9 have been added to this congregation.

Bro. Jas. Nelson of Upper Alton Ill. writes Feb. 17th 1834.

Last spring a church was here constituted of 17 or 18 members; it now numbers 80 or 90.

Bro. J. T. Smith of Fayette co. Pa. writes March 19th, That 12 more have been added to the church in his bounds since he last wrote. He says, the good work is progressing where he labors.

Bro. H. Osborn of Jacksonville (Ill) writes Jan. 17th, 1834, that Bro J. Hewitt had been at Rushville about 1st of January, and constituted a church of between 20 and 30 members; that the good cause was spreading through those western plains.

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY.

Dry Creek. J. G. Ellis for A. Dicky, F. Kleet, J. McCollum for 8, v. 2, 00 for H. Books. *Newport.* Jo. Gilman for 6 and 7. *Georgetown.* Wm. Porter, Col. J. Miller, C. Parks Joel Johnson. Mahala Cartenhour, Mrs. Briscoe, Js. Gains, Js, McCleary Sol. Crumbaugh, all for 8.—Wm. Henderson for 7. *Lancaster.* Danl. Adams—L. V. Philips for 8. *Carlisle.* Wm. Caldwell sen. 8. *Leesburgh.* J. B. Fenly 7 and 8.—Coppage 8. *Great Crossing.* Wm. Poague 8. *Hopkinsville.* Elder W. Dunkeson for Geo. Perry, Geo. Siskle, A. Thompson. B. Wood, Mrs. Shipp, for 8.—Eld. W. Major for S. Woodward, for 7, A. Blue, do. W. Dickinson 8, E. Herndon do—himself for ½ of 8 & ½ of 9.-A. Blue for self-G. Dublin—W. Harelson

M. Carpenter, W. W. Woodland, 8. *Claysville.* Geo. Williams for Arch. Duncan for 7. *Hartford.* Thos. Roys for 7. 8. 2, 00. Commonwealth. *Centerville.* Eld. Gano for G. Palmer and S. Adams for 8. *Paris.* Bro. Riggs for G. W. Williams for 7.—Tho. Rule 7 8—Jac. Sink 8 Eleanor Speaks do. D. Kenneda do. W. Wainwright do. *Glasgow.* G. W. Trabue, W. Logan, J. W. Davis 8. *Sanders.* Js. Daniel and N. Grigg for 8. *Newcastle.* C. Sanford for 8. *Lexington.* J. Hull, A. Kay, R. Kay for 8. *Republican.* Jo. Faulconer, H. Jeter, N. Dunn, O. Farra, Jane Lamb, Wm. Bronaugh. *Canoridge.* C. Hall, Jo. Hibler for 8.

INDIANA.

Bloomington. G. W. Hardin for Hineman, A. Rogers, S. Hardesty, R. Hamilton for 8. *Smockville.* Sam. Maxwell for 7.

OHIO.

Georgetown. Jas. Clark for G. Barker, Sam. Jackson, O. Johnson E. Mount, R. Allen, Jef. Printy V. Crabb, W. Deniston, P. M. Devore, Jo. Nicholas for 8. *Felicity.* A. Knowles 10, 00. not known by us for what vols or persons. *New Paris.* Eld. L. Purviance for P. Harland 1, 25 for 7. J. Thompson 2 25 for do. 7 and 8. S. Walker for 8. and 50 cts. for old vol. *Steubenville.* Jo. Sidebotham for 8.—Cadiz Eld. R. Cook for E. Carson, E. Johnson, T. Carver for 8. *Jamestown.* Doc. Winans for self—O. F. Harrison, J. Syfers for 8.

VIRGINIA.

Louisa co. T. G. Meredith for self. R. Rollins, T. Noel. for 8. A. Johnson for 7. and 8.

ALABAMA.

Montgomery. Eld. Js. Davis 2, 00 & 500 on a broken bank in Maryland, returned him. *Moulton.* Eld. C. McDonald 5, 00.

TENNESSEE.

Caney Spring. H. McClellen 5, 00, and 2, 00 for M. Cannon for 2 and 3. *Nashville.* Eld. A. Adams for Seay 2, 00 for old vol. J. W. Clay, A. W. McCall, Sim. Bradford, J. Hall, A. Hall, A. B. Burgess, C. Wharton, W. P. Campbell, W. Anderson, for 8.

ILLINOIS.

Monmouth. Eld. A. Reynolds for A. Davidson, Josi. Whitman, J. Rust, W. Murphy, W. Peckenpaugh for 8.

MISSOURI.

Huntsville. Eld. Wright for self 8—S. Wright 7. 8. J. Summers 1. W. Baker do. *Independence.* Js. Lovelady for 6 $1, 25, D. Boone for 7—Sam. Johnson do. 1, 25, Tho. Jeffers for 8. Dabney Johnson for 6. *Liberty.* Js. Kurkendall for 7, and 8. Wm. Thompson for 8—John Thompson for 8.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Eld. J. S. Davis in full for 8th. $ 8, 00.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 6.

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. .....JUNE, 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.

From the Christian Herald.

MARTIN LUTHER.

He was born at Eisleben, on Nov. 10th, 1483.—He was of humble but respectable parents. "I am," said Luther "a farmer's son; my father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were real farmers." His parents were very solicitous about his education. He was sent to school at Mansfield—in his 14th year he was sent to Madeburg, and afterwards to Eisenach, and at both places he was obliged to beg his bread by public praying and singing, as was the custom of all poor children, until a pious woman boarded him at her table. God thus taught him to know what poverty was, but also permitted him to experience his wonderful providence. In his 18th year he went to the university of Erfurt. He devoted much time to the study of philosophy, and to the old Latin writers, and committed many passages to memory. Every morning he began his studies with prayer, and used to say, to have prayed fervently is more than half of study. Here in the monastery library, he first saw a Latin Bible, and a wide field was opened to his investigations after truth. "I thought," said he, "there were no other epistles and gospels than those in the manuel, but I found a Bible in the library at Erfurt