Eld. W. Dunkeson for J. Hay, R. Barfield—W. Williams—W. D. Callaway,—J. Barnard for 8 *Leesburgh.* B. Coppage, R. Coalbirn 8. *Newcastle.* By Eld. L. Marshall, $2, 00 for 8. *Shepherdsville.* Jas. McAcron for 4 5 6. *Maysville,* Wm. Corwine 8.

MARYLAND.

Little Gun Powder. B. Osborn for self Jo. Taylor, H. Lukins,—B. Stockdale, Jsa. Knight, for 8. *Baltimore.* Js. Henshall for W. P. Lemmons 8. Wm. Ford, 6 7 8. John Woodland 8. *Fredericksburgh.* L. Ramsburgh 8.

OHIO.

New Paris. By L. Purviance for D. Purviance—J. Adams, McCown and Whitman 8. *Milfield.* B. Sanders for self,—B. Batchelor and J. Pugsley for 8. *Cincinnati.* D Burnett 8. *Carthage.* W. Scott $5, 00. *Mansfield.* Js. McVey for S. Taylor, D. Spitler,—J. Beans, E Neil,—L. Pearce, for 8. *Ripley.* Thos. Dickens 7 8.—Doct. Campbell. 7 8. *Higginsport.* Daniel Holden 8. *Decatur.* Tho. Pickerel 8,—Sam. Pickerel . sen. *Georgetown.* H. Lindsay for T. Lindsay—John Hill—Abm. Rambley and J. D. White, 8. *Bethel.* Jac. Chatterton 8—Charity Beek 7 8. *Felicity.* Tho. Mullen, 8,—W. Patterson for Boyce, 8,—Js. Kellan 7. J. Powel for 6.

INDIANA.

Rushville. J. Longley for W. Lockridge—P. Luney;—J. Cartmel for 8—Tho. Logan 6, 7,—Jac. Dobbenspeck $1, 25 for 7—Js. Watson 1, 25 for 7,—W. Legg 1, 25 for 7,—J. Talmage 1, 25 for 7. *Busron Mills.* H. D. Palmer for R. Morgan—J. Rinearson for 8. *Greensburgh.* Geo. McCoy for self —Js. Edward,—G. King for 8. *Bloomington.* G. W. Hardin for Js. Mathers,—Tho. Nisbit—J. B. Berry for 8, and Wm. Shields, 25 cts. ballance for 7. *Rising Sun.* J. B. Craft 8.

TENNESSEE.

Van Buren. Eld. H. Thompson 7 8. *Gallatin.* Crockett for his agency in full for vol. 8. $5, 00.

ILLINOIS.

Lawrenceville. H. D. Palmer for Sam. Lemmon, Wm. Howard,—E. Mills for 8.

MISSOURI.

Columbia. M. Wills for Asa Stone,—Burch,—Conyers,—Hughs and S. Bedford for 8. *Lexington.* Js. Bounds for M. Warren for vol. 5,—for Wm. Fine for 6,—Duke Young for 6,—Rich'd. Belt for 7 and 8.

NEW YORK.

Bethany. Stafford 8.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Bloodgrun. Eld. Wm. Caldwell, for 6 7 8,—John Pendergrass for Vols. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, $5, 00.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 7.

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. .....JULY, 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 1¼ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

"THAT WORTHY NAME."

There is, perhaps, no adage now in use, so destitute of truth, as this, "*names are nothing,*" The reverse is indeed with many unfortunately too true. Could we imagine a name or word without signification, representing or designating no object, person or idea, then might we with truth assert, that for all the purposes, for which words, or names are designed, such a one was nothing. Propriety in the use of language requires, that we should call every object by its appropriate name. Were we to examine one by one, the several names, by which the various sects in Christendom, are by mutual consent distinguished, we should find that, notwithstanding their unscripturality, the common sense of mankind had at least, so far disproven the adage alluded to, as to select for each, such a name, as was most expressive of some peculiar trait, principle, or practice, belonging to the party, this however, by no means, authorized on the part of those named, the acknowledgement of names, not given by the Almighty, but given of uninspired men to suit their ambitious or sectarian purpose, and calculated to divide, distract and disturb the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. Not invidiously, but rather to establish the truth, let us look around us for examples. The name Episcopalian, derived from *Episcopos* a Bishop, signifies one who proposes that form of Government in the church, in which the superiority of the bishops is maintained; rejecting the high pretensions, of his holiness at Rome, they are nevertheless willing to award to another, (called Bishop) authority and power equally unscriptural. The name Methodist, signifies one, attached to that peculiar method adopted by that society

in discipline and worship; a method strongly resembling the Episcopalian, so far as the superior powers in Government, are concerned, but unlike it in many singular forms and practices pertaining to their assemblies in worship and discipline. The name Presbyterian, derived from *presbuteros*, an elder or senior, signifies one, who maintains the superiority, authority and power of presbyters or elders in the church. The name Baptist is applied to those, who by their strict adherence to one of the commemorative institutions of the Saviour baptism or immersion, have thus distinguished themselves, and derive their name from the institution; however commendable their zeal in behalf of this much neglected and abused institution, we cannot approve of their name, because we do not find in the Heavenly volume authority for it.

And now, in reference to the few examples produced, permit me to repeat some important inquiries. Do not these names with the very production of them severally array before the mind, not only the peculiarities already mentioned, but alas, many other discordant peculiarities of opinion and theory, upon which too much stress has been laid for ages past? Do they not thus arouse selfish, partisan and conflicting emotions, where the Spirit of heaven, a Spirit of benevolence unbounded, love undissembled and peace uninterrupted, should prevail? If so, can they be names authorized or approved of God? Can one sentence be produced, from the oracles of truth, in which the Almighty, or any of his inspired servants, even used or sanctioned them, in reference to the followers of Christ? Not one. It may with some, who have not examined this subject, be doubted whether God has ever given to the followers of his Son, a peculiar, appropriate, and distinguishing name. Of such we respectfully request the candid consideration of the few remarks we shall now present. When the Almighty designed separating to himself the posterity of Abraham, and for important purposes intended to distinguish them; before the Jewish nation was brought into existence, we find He had selected for them a name; To the Father of the faithful (whose name had been previously changed from Abram to Abraham) Jehovah thus addressed himself, "Let it not be grievous in thy sight, because of the lad, and because of thy bond woman, in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice, for in Isaac shall thy seed be called." Gen. 12 chap. 12 vrs. Connect with this the language of God to Jacob the son of Isaac, "Thy name is Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name; and he called his name Israel." Gen. 35 chapt. 10 vs. By inspired authority we find this distinguished name applied to the children of Abraham after Israel's day. They were called Israelites, being the great family of Israel—A name thus given by divine authority to that peculiar and highly favored people,

might have been worn with honor to themselves and their posterity, had they continued obedient and faithful to the Lord; but owing to their disobedience rebellion and obstinacy, that which had often been foretold by the prophets, of the most High came to pass. "Then will I cut off Israel, out of the land which I have given them, and this house, which I have hallowed for my name, will I cast out of my sight; and Israel shall be a proverb and a bye-word among the people." 1 Kings, 9 chap. 7 vs. Read likewise to the same purport, Deut 21 chap. 37 vs. and Jer. 24 chap. 9 vs.

I believe it will be generally admitted by the intelligent that the Jewish dispensation was only designed to continue for a time; it was only introduced to prepare the way for the Christian age, accordingly we find under that economy, not only a *new* and more glorious one spoken of, but with it a *new name* for the subjects; there was to be a change of name as well of covenant. God has been to the disciples of Christ equally as kind as to the disciples of Moses, having selected for these a name, he has not left those without one: or each individual, to adopt such a name, as may suit his taste, fancy or interest best—just as certainly as that Israel was rejected, or cut off; as that the church of Moses is not the church of Christ; just so certainly has the mouth of the Lord named upon his people a new name.

Isaiah filled with prophetic inspiration thus speaks in rapture of Israel, redeemed, restored and saved—"The Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory, and thou shalt be called by a *new name*, which the mouth of the Lord shall name" Isa. 62 chap. 2 vrs. And to the obedient he saith, "unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls, a place and a name, better than of sons and daughters, I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off" Isa. 56 capt. 5. vrs. see likewise Isa. 65 chap. 15 vrs. Let us now endeavor to ascertain with precision, when and where the new name was named by the mouth of the Lord. The calling of the Jewish nation, their peculiarities, and privileges appear to have engendered among them, a spirit of haughtiness, pride and arrogance, under a misconception of Jehova's designs towards them, and a forgetfulness of his true character: the indulgence of this towards their neighbors ultimately aroused the hatred of the Gentiles, and those very peculiarities of the Jew thus became disgusting to the nations round; a mutual enmity existed between them. The name Jew was odious to the Gentile, nor was the name Gentile less odious to the Jew. During the existence of this state of things a new order was introduced. The great Pacificator of the world was born and christianity with its heavenly principles came to reconcile man to his God and to his fellow men, to check the tide of human passion, and say to the troubled sea of social life,

"peace be still"—As the Apostle, most beautifully expresses it, in speaking of the union, effected under the Gospel between Jews and Gentiles,—"For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down, the middle wall of partition between us: having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments, contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain (of two) one new man, so making peace." Read Ephesians second chapter throughout.

In looking into the gospel, as a system, intended for the world, and calculated to effect this great end, a cordial union of heart and hand, we may reasonably expect to find every thing admirably adapted by an alwise Creator to the condition of society, as best calculated to produce this glorious result. It would be strange indeed while every thing else connected with it tended to produce "peace on earth and good will among men," Such a name was selected, or so little attention had to the selection of any as to leave here a fruitful cause, or source of disunion and discord.

By reference however to a few facts connected with the early history of the Christian Church, it will appear evident that a name was given. The first annunciation of the gospel by divine authority after the resurrection was to the Jews. In accordance with their commission, we find the Apostles "beginning at Jerusalem" Luke 24 chap. 47 vs. In delivering their testimony, they carefully conformed to the order of procedure as pointed out by the Saviour—"In Jerusalem and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth," Having tarried at Jerusalem until they received power from on high, we find them on the day of pentecost, proclaiming, for the first time, a salvation to an immense concourse of Jews, only. Though assembled from various countries round to worship at Jerusalem, a church is there planted, composed of Jewish believers alone, no difference in name existed, consequently, no animosity was likely to arise there from this cause.

Passing by the circumstances, attending the planting of a church in Samaria, exclusively Samaritan, and one at the house of Cornelius purely Gentile, to which the same remarks would apply, and with equal pertinency as to the one at Jerusalem; we come to the city of Antioch, the capitol of Syria; a place of distinction, and importance; under what circumstances was the gospel introduced here and of whom was the church, here planted, composed? In the 11 chap. 19 vs. of Acts we are informed, that, "they who were scattered abroad, upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyrene, and Antioch, preaching the word to none, but unto the *Jews* only—And some of them were men of Cypos and Cyrener, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the *Grecians*,

preaching, the Lord Jesus, and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." and again in the 26th verse, speaking of Baruabas and Saul "And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church and taught much people. And the *disciples* were *divinely* called *christians* first in Antioch." From these facts it is evident that the first church, composed of Jewish and Gentile believers, was at Antioch, the first in which those who were formerly hateful and hating one another, were united in one body. And now their previous names, so well calculated, to arouse old prejudices and animosities, are laid aside for the *new name*, which the mouth of the Lord named. Accordingly we find the *disciples* called *Christians* first in Antioch. Prophesy was then fulfilled, and a name of Love, a family name was given. "There was, now, neither Jew nor Greek, neither bound nor free, neither male nor female, but all one in Christ Jesus."

In reading the 26 vs. of the 11 chap. of Acts, as I have done above, the insertion of the word "*divinely*" is by no means forced or arbitrary, the word *chematisai* translated by some, *called*, is generally admitted by the learned to imply something more. Dr. Adam Clark says, it signifies. "called or named by divine direction," agreeing with Dr. Benson, Dr. Doddridge, and others. By refering to other places, in the New Testament in which the word occurs it evidently signifies, named or called by divine authority. On this point more fully see "Christian Messenger" vol. 5 pages 185 and 183. From the text now under consideration we learn, that the name *disciple* was to give place to a superior, and more comprehensive, and definite name, *Christian*; that the change was actually made, and those who were formerly termed scholars, or disciples are now honoured with a name derived from their Master. The followers of Christ are called his children, as in Heb 2 chap. 13 vs. "Behold I, and the *children*, which God hath given me." They constitute his family, he being their head—Is he called Christ, or anointed? They are called Christians, anointed ones. Under this view we conceive the Apostle thus expresses himself," For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the *whole family* in heaven (among Jews) and earth (among Gentiles) is named." I shall barely advert here, to the very familiar but forcible argument, drawn from the figurative application of the terms bridegroom, husband, head &c. to the Saviour, as connected with believers, both individually and collectively. None we presume would dare call in question the propriety of these figures, so often used by the inspired penmen. Are obedient believers, then, married to the Lord? Is he their head, their husband? If so, then wear his name and confess the heavenly relation. To wear the name of another, would be

to prove unfaithful, to disown the name of Christ, and to prefer another to him.

One great excellency in the character of the saints in Pergamos and Philadelphia, was, that they held fast the christian name, some suffered martyrdom, rather than deny it and live see Rev. 2 chapt. 13 vs. and 3 chap. 8 vs. And, indeed the exhortation of the Apostle Peter seems well calculated to inspire all, who believingly read it, with the same heavenly courage. "If ye be *reproached* for the name of Christ, happy are ye, for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you, on their part he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified" 1 Pet. 4 chapter 14 verse; and again 16 vrs. "If any man suffer as a *Christian*, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf." And Matt. 10 chap. 22 vrs. "And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake." Here permit me to inquire whether all history, having any allusion to the subject before us, does not plainly attest, that in the severe persecutions, the primitive churches underwent the greatest. The specific charge, brought by the cruel persecutors against any follower of the Saviour, whether butchered, burnt or tortured, was this he or she is a Christian; To confess the charge, was to embrace death and glory; To deny it, was to prefer life and ignomny; Their enemies were ignorant of their principles, their faith and indeed almost every thing, save the precious, yet detested name they wore; their unholy purpose appears to have been simply, the extermination of all who bore the name *Christian*: with this historic fact before the mind, how intelligible the text last quoted, as also Luke 6 chapter 22 vs. "Blessed are *ye* when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your *name* as evil for the Son of man sake." Here observe, the saviour addresses his disciples in the plural, and speaks of their name in the singular. Now what other general name has ever been cast out as evil, by the enemies of christianity, like the name first given by the Almighty at Antioch. In further confirmation of this truth see James 2 chapt. 7 vs. "Do not they blaspheme *that worthy name*, by which ye are called." From this it appears, that the name by which the saints were then called, was a *worthy* name; Could the same be said of the various names, by which they are distinguished, in our day? By no means. For example, let us omit the many, so palpably absurd, and try a few of those seemingly the most plausible. The name Methodist, implies neither worth, nor the want of it; it is as, easy, to conceive of a bad method as a good one; the worst men on earth, as well as the best, have each their peculiar method. This, therefore cannot be "that worthy name" of which James wrote. The name Baptist, in itself (for we are not here including the ideas, which association or particular use

may have attached to these names) merely signifies an immerser; he may be worthy or unworthy; the name does not determine this; it merely points to a single act, it does not determine whether it was a Jewish, a Grecian, an ordinary, or a christian immersion. This therefore cannot be "that worthy name." The name *disciple* simply means a learner or scholar—one may be a learner of wickedness, as well as of goodness; he may be a disciple or scholar of Socrates, Plato, or Aristotle, of Calvin, Arminius or Wesley, of Balingbroke, Paine or Owen, of Moses John or Jesus—The name *disciple* is neither worthy nor unworthy, and cannot therefore be the one alluded to by the inspired writer.

It may be said, that by attaching the name Christian to either of them, settles the difficulty; so far from this being true, the difficulty is only increased; We should then have not a name but names, not one, but two; thus, *Methodist Christian*; such an addition would likewise comparatively prove, what has just been asserted, that the name alone was insufficient, and indeterminate. Some difficulty might also arise with reference to the proper position of the "worthy name" as, whether it would be more honored as a given, or surname; whether it should come first or last. Our ultimate conclusion, therefore, that it is best to be satisfied with, "that worthy name," given by divine authority; it is the most significant and proper for the family of Christ to wear; it continually reminds us of our high relation, and thus stimulates us forward in the path of humble obedience. Such an idea, as a wicked, unworthy or bad christian, had no more been thought of, than, dark-light, or cold-heat had it not been for the shameful perversion of christianity; the adoption of unscriptural, unauthorized names, and the consequent inattention to church order, and government.

It may be proper here to remark, that the term *disciple*, is a scriptural term, and often applies to the saints of Christ, but not as we find it applied in our day. Where within the lids of the Bible, do we ever find it used or written, as a peculiarly distinguishing or proper name? No where: As soon should we expect to find there, the terms, saint, believer, follower, citizen or child, written with a capital letter, as the term *disciple*. The fact is, these names merely express some particular relation or quality, while the name Christian includes them all. These terms, never are capitalized, neither in the original, nor in translation, while the name *Christian* is invariably in both see Acts. 11 chap. 26 vs. also 26 chapt. 28 vs. and Pet. 4 chap. 16 vs. Having knowledge of this, how much have we been surprized, and grieved to see in some of the most useful periodicals of the day, edited by brethren of known worth, talents and erudition, the term *disciple*, used with great frequency, and set forth with a capital at the head—why this effort thus to distinguish a

once harmless and useful word, at this late period of christianity? Why not treat with equal respect and attention the words, *saint*, *believer*, *child*, &c? Is not the variety of proper names, improperly made and used in Zion (so called) already sufficiently great? Yes, far more than sufficient. To illustrate fully our idea of the proper use, of the two scriptural terms. *Disciple* and *Christian*; let us suppose, a resident from England to arrive in the United States, he is asked, with reference to his country, what he is, he replies, a *citizen*; how vague the answer! would it not be impossible to determine from it, his place of residence? But had he replied, I am an Englishman, his answer had been most satisfactory. Just so in the use of those terms--Every christian is of necessity a disciple, but every disciple, is not of necessity a christian.

Having quoted the 26 chap. 28 vs. of Acts, permit me to adduce an argument here, from the language of Agrippa to Paul--"Almost thou persuadest me to be a christian." The high station of Agrippa, his general intelligence and impartiality, induced us to expect from him, when referring to the followers of Christ, or rather their name, to use that name, by which they were most properly and generally known; and in direct proof that he did so, we might refer to many, very many, writers and historians of that age—In Paley's evidences chapt. 2 see condensed quotations from Tacitus, Suetonius, the younger Pliny, and Marcus Aurelius; in all which express mention is made as "the Christians." But why multiply references on this point, when we presume, that none will deny this to have been the peculiar, appropriate, and distinguishing name, worn by the followers of Christ during the Apostolic age, and indeed longer?

And now having in part, dispassionately examined this interesting subject, in order to advance the harmony of God's people, let me assure you, that it is the firm conviction of my mind, that the only name, under which all the children of God, can or will ever unite under which all speculations will all die away, the church become purified and harmony and love prevail, is, the name given by the Lord at Antioch. Oh let us then, who wear it, unitedly endeavor to recommend the religion and the name of the Saviour, to all around us, by a holy walk and godly conversation; let it be our anxious desire "to live worthy of the calling by which we are called;" then shall we never disgrace ourselves, expose to censure "that worthy name," and most of all, never incur the disapprobation of our Heavenly Father.

We may be told, that we have assumed the name, ***Christian*** Be this our ample consolation, that whatever the Almighty has freely bestowed on his people, cannot be assumed; 'tis our blessed privilege to receive it. Is it published to the world, that some have acted a sectarian part, who professed to wear

that heavenly name? Let us in deep humilitation deplore the weakness or wickedness of men, and learn how easy it is, to forfeit that name, which alone refuses even to become sectarian, farther, than, the love, joy and peace, peculiar to christians, may render them a body, separate from the world at large, like the primitive saints, we may become *the christian sect*, every where spoken against, but *a sect of christians*, we never can become, without another name, another Bible.

Yours in hope of eternal life.

JOHN ALLEN GANO.

June 1834.

Brother Stone; I have long expected a reply from you to the often and repeated charges made against you, on account of your views of the atonement, or the blood of Christ for the remission of sins, by Doct. Jas. Fishback. Your silence upon the subject has somewhat induced me to believe, that you had either not been informed of the particulars of the charges, or that you had determined not to take any notice of them. The desire is so great upon the part of your friends, and indeed, of many others in the neighborhood of Mount Vernon, to know your sentiments, is my reason for this communication to you. I therefore wish it to be distinctly understood that for the information and satisfaction of the Mount Vernon members, and its neighbours, and to give you an opportunity of clearing yourself of the charges, that is, if they are not true, I am induced to write this letter to you. The Doctor has not only made insinuations so plain against you, that all understood to whom he alluded, but he did on the fourth Lord's day of March, as well as I now recollect, say before a large audience, that Elder Stone denied the blood of Christ for the remission of sins, or the atonement; and that Paul's blood was as good, or as efficacious as the blood of Christ. To prove it he scrapt your last August number, by reading some two or three lines in the middle, and about the same number in the last part of it. Now Brother Stone, for your sake, for the sake of religion, and for the information of all around Mount Vernon, you should give us your views candidly, plainly, and fully, on this subject, that there may be in future no misunderstanding of the matter.

Since I professed the religion of Christ, and indeed long before, I thought you held the precious blood of Christ in as high estimation, and viewed it of as much importance to the happiness of our souls, in the everlasting kingdom, as any other body of Christians in all our country; and I must say, I think so yet. Being a believer, and I trust, a follower of Christ and the Apostles; I therefore cannot be the friend of any man, that is in a religious point of view, that will deny that the blood of Christ

is the prime cause, the whole cause, and the foundation cause, of the remission of the sins of all those that love and obey God. Brother Stone, these are and always have been my views fully, and these were as I thought your views; but if they are not, I have been mistaken in you, and must withdraw my religious confidence from you; for I cannot, and will not go with any man, longer than he goes with the doctrine as taught by Christ and the Apostles, to the exclusion of all creeds, covenants and confessions, made by man. I will go a little farther Brother Stone, by saying, that to do away the blood of Christ, you destroy the whole system, and our faith and hopes are all vain and useless, and as Paul says, of all men we would be the most miserable One reason why I have given my views so fully; and I trust, so plainly, is, that at one of the times, the Doctor made a public attack against you, he made an attack also against me, by saying, a Presbyterian friend of mine had told him, I held strange views about the blood of Christ, or about the atonement. I immdiately demanded of him his author, which he refused to give up, and never has given up to me yet. I must now tell the Doctor what I ought to have told him then, that I shall look upon him as the Presbyterian, until he gives up the name of some known Presbyterian friend of mine, who will acknowledge himself to me to be the author.

One or two more remarks, and I shall have done for the present. All the Doctor's influence and opposition seem now to be directed against what he calls the Stoneites. I would be glad, Brother Stone, if you can give us the real cause of the Doctor's opposition to those People. Has there been any personal difference between you and him? and has there been any, that you know of, between him and Brother Rogers, Palmer, or Fleming? If not, how do you account for his opposition, when but a few months ago he invited those Brethren to Mount Vernon? You all did come, and did preach to us. The Doctor was invited to Bethel, he went and preached and communed with you too, which many will testify: did he not go to the Republican where Brother Thos. Smith is the Teacher? did he not eulogise the Christian body, as he then called them, for their great harmony, and love one for another? I have not pretended to give the Doctor's very words, I have I think given the substance of his charges, and remarks about the Stoneites, as he calls them. Far be it from me to do the Doctor, or any man upon earth any injustice at this time, or at any other time, and if I have done him the smallest injustice, and he will make it appear, I hold myself religiously bound to make him a public acknowledgement of it, notwithstanding his withholding the name of that Presbyterian friend of mine, and his strong insinuations, and bitter remarks, he has in the last two or three months made against me,

JOHN CURD.

REPLY TO BRO. JOHN CURD.

Dear Brother—Yours of June has been received. I hasten to reply. You think it strange that I have not replied to the repeated charges made against me by Dr. James Fishback, on account of my views of the atonement, or of the blood of Christ for the remission of sins. You have guessed the true reasons of my silence i. e. my ignorance of the particulars of the charges, and therefore, that I had determined to take no notice of them. Fame as often false as true, had rumored in my neighborhood, that Dr. Fishback was seriously charging me in the public with denying the blood of Christ for the remission of sins; but the particulars I never learned till I received your letter. The charge now appears in a tangible form. The same charge has been made against me a thousand times for more than a quarter of a century—Some have said, I denied the blood of Christ, which is equivalent to denying that he died at all, others that I held his blood to be of no more value, than the blood of a goat, a bullock, a chicken, a squirrel, a toad &c.—others, that they had heard me preach these things, or had read them in my writings—some that they had the book which contained these things; others that they had seen the book; but that I had collected all of that impression and burnt them. To rebut such stuff I have stated my views repeatedly to the public from the press and from the pulpit; yet but few could be brought to feel any other interest in the subject, than to condemn.

My charity has found an apology for those, who have stated, that I held the blood of Christ to be of no more value than the blood of a goat, bullock &c. I have no doubt that they, measuring my doctrine by the standard of human orthodoxy, and not doubting the correctness of that standard, have concluded honestly, that I had denied the efficacy of his blood *in toto*. This apology I have also tried to find for my quondam friend and brother Doc. Fishback; whose talents I respect, whose piety I acknowledge; and am only sorry, that I cannot admire

his stability, his undeviating firmness, and his unvacillating course in the doctrine of Christ. These physical imperfections are often found in good men, and should excite our piety, rather than harsh censure. The Doctor nor any one else shall ever hear or see any thing from me or from my pen, inimical, or severe against him. If I treat his opinions with a little severity, his person shall be sacred.

At the request of yourself, and the brethren of Mt. Vernon, I will endeavor to answer the charges, which are as follow.

"On the 4th Lord's day of March, before a large audience, Dr. James Fishback stated that Elder Stone denied the blood of Christ for the remission of sins, or the atonement: and that Paul's blood was as good, or as efficacious as the blood of Christ. In proof of which charges he scrapt your last August number (of the C. Messenger) by reading two or three lines in the middle, and about the same number in the last part." These are serious and weighty charges; if true, the Doctor, and all Christians are justifiable in levelling and fireing all the artillery of the Bible against my errors while they pity the man and labor for his reclamation from the righteous judgment of God.

I will insert the two paragraphs from the August No. upon a few lines of which these serious—awfully serious charges are founded.

"Bro: Worcester excepts against the terms *vicar* and *substitute*; and so do all who love the use of Bible terms; for these are not found in that book. You do not plead for the terms, but for the ideas attached to them. You say, "that he either suffered deservedly on his own account, or on account of others, to redeem them from suffering: for he assures us himself he ought to have suffered (Luke. 24, 26,")—We grant, he did not suffer deservedly on his own account, but on account of others to redeem them from suffering—My brother, has forgotten how grieveously the Apostles suffered, not deservedly on their own account, but on the account of

others—Were they vicars or substitutes? Have not you, and thousands of others suffered great privations and distresses in your ministery; not deservedly on your own account, but on account of others? Are you therefore a vicar or substitute? And did you not suffer all this to redeem sinners from suffering the torments of hell? You certainly did, as did the Apostles before you, and as did the great Redeemer of sinners. But you quote Luke 24, 27, to show that "Christ *ought* to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory."—Certainly, "He *ought*—But why, Because his sufferings and death were predicted by inspired prophets—But how then shall the scriptures be fulfiled, that thus it must be? (Matt. 26, 54,) Read the connexion—I ask for the same reason, Ought not the Apostles—the little ones of Jesus, have suffered? This was also predicted and must be fulfilled. If you call Christ's sufferings *on account* of others, vicarious, I object not to the idea—but your idea is that he suffered the wrath of God—the just punishment due to us for our iniquities, that the Father was the sole author of all his sufferings. This is the doctrine of the boasted evangelical churches, found in their creeds, but not found in ours, the Bible. If it is, I am unhappily deceived, and humbly hope I may live to see it there."

From the first paragraph, can any thing be fairly drawn to prove, that I have denied the blood of Christ for remission of sins? that I have denied the atonement? that I hold the blood of Paul as efficacious as the blood of Christ? Judge you.

My good, old bro. T. Campbell, to prove that Christ was vicar or substitute for us, had said, "That he (Christ) either suffered deservedly on his own account, or on account of others, to redeem them from suffering." This argument for substitution I considered of no force; and in order to show its weakness, I remarked, that the Apostles grievously suffered, not deservedly on their own account (for they were not transgressors) but on account of others. I then asked, if this proved them

to be substitutes or vicars? To enable you to form a correct judgment on this subject I refer you to my address to the Christian Churches 2nd, Edit. page 79—81.

The 2nd paragraph of the August No. on which the Doctor has founded his charges, that I deny the atonement or the efficacy of the blood of Christ, is before you. Is there any thing in this that can possible admit of this construction? Do examine again. Does the Doctor deny that Faith in Jesus who lived, died, and rose again, produces a moral effect or influence on the mind, to reconcile us to God—to lead us to repentance—and consequently to remission of sins? This is the first part of that paragraph. On this he cannot, surely, found such a serious charge. It must be then on the second part of the paragraph, in these words, "If the blood of Christ has any effect on God, or on his government in the pardon of our sins, I know it not, and, as Bp. McGee says, I am not concerned to know it. Because if God has not revealed it, he saw it unnecessary for us to know it." Now is ignorance of a thing the denial of it? This is the offensive clause; and this sentiment is the point on which we and the *orthodox* world divide. To this point we invite your most serious attention.

There are but two ideas of the efficacy of the blood of Christ in the Christian world, or all their ideas are reducible to these two—the first is, that the whole efficacy of his blood passed on God, his law and his government, so as to make God placable, or to reconcile him to sinful man—to satisfy the just demands of his law against the sinner—and so to effect his government, that mercy may be shewn to the sinner without infringing on the claims of justice, or without dishonoring his government. The other idea is, that the whole efficacy of his blood passes on man, to reconcile him to God—to lead him to repentance and remission of sin, to justify him—to sanctify him—to cleane him from sin—to wash him from sin—to purge him from sin—to take away his sin—

to save him from sin—to redeem from the curse of the law—to raise him up at the last day. With these and similar expressions the scriptures abound; But in what one text do they say, that his blood reconciled, or pacified God?—satisfied the demands of his law? or secured the honors of his government? I have been often answered, the scriptures are full of this doctrine. If so, I have, said, it will be an easy matter to find one text at least to prove it. Yet: not one has ever been produced, nor can be produced that plainly teaches this doctrine. Speculation is substituted, and anathemas against the man, who dares speak differently.

I will now endeavor to give a representation of each doctrine, as stated by the *orthodox*, and by us. In that Court-house stand two poor criminals at the bar of justice. Before a judge and jury they are tried, and found guilty. The judge pronounces the sentence of death. One of these criminals is a weeping penitent—the other, a hardened villain. The judge in pronouncing the sentence, says, You have broken the laws of your country, and death is the punishment—law and justice demand your death—if you are pardoned, the law is dishonored, and the reins of government weakened—others will, from the example of your pardon, take licence to sin—if mercy be granted you, it must be at the expence of justice—therefore you must die. What, says the penitent criminal, is your government founded on inflexible justice without mercy? Is there no mercy in the government?—Yes, says the judge. If you will find a substitute, who is not for crime liable to death himself; if he will consent to die in your stead—the government will shew you mercy in setting you free—Nay, says the penitent criminal; in this case, there would be no mercy in the government; mercy would only be found in my substitute, who consented to die in my stead—nothing but stern justice do I see in the government and Governor—neither justice nor mercy do I see in this case—for can a just law—can a righteous government admit the innocent to die in the stead of the guilty as a substi-

tute? I ask you, my judge, again, is there no principle of mercy in our government to remit my sin? If to shew mercy be at the expence of justice, then surely, is it not at the expence of mercy to take justice upon me?--Are there two principles in our government, justice and mercy, one of which can never be exercised but in opposition to, and at the expense of the other. No: The government has lodged mercy in the governor, who by law is authorized to remit fines, forfeitures and penaltites. He will grant it to the penitent transgressor--and this can be done without infringing on the rights or honors of law, justice or the government; for these all combined to vest the Governor with mercy to excercise in such cases.--In the Governor's exercising mercy in remitting the punishment of this penitent offender, and in withholding it from the impenitent, the law, justice, mercy and the government are well pleased.

From this representation, it is easy to see that the system of boasted orthodoxy, makes the government of God to be founded on inflexible justice without mercy--the sinner must die, or his substitute--And who can see mercy on this principle in the Governor or government? Who can see in this any grace or favor in the Governor, or Executive of the universe? The substitute, and he for whom the substitute dies, are one in law--the sinner then had paid all the demands of law *fully, properly*, and *really*, and has *fully discharged* the debt--Is there any grace or mercy in this remission of his sin? Is it forgiveness at all? Are we to forgive as God does? Then we must never forgive till the debt is paid!!

It is said, The grace of God, the Governor of all, appears in this, that he gave his Son to die in order to satisfy the demands of law and justice in our stead. Was not the very act of giving his Son, an act of mercy to the sinful world? And was not this done before the death of Christ took place? Is not this salvo a contradiction of the whole orthodox system? But who in the government of God takes vengence on transgressors?

or who executes his divine laws and decress? Who, but God the great Executor himself, or those appointed by him? Hence we are taught by the *orthodox* that God himself poured out his fury, the vials of his wrath and indignation upon his own Son on the cross, till his vengence was fully appeased, and his fury satisfied towards the elect of mankind. If this be so, why were the Jews charged with the crime of killing the prince of life?

I will for your information state a few bible propositions, on which my faith stands.

1st. That mercy belongeth to the Lord—he is merciful, gracious, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and who will by no means clear the impenitent. Mercy, grace and forgiveness are attributes of God's nature from everlasting to everlasting; therefore I have concluded that the blood of Christ never made God placable, or reconciled him to sinners. This would be to effect in him a great change.

2nd. The scriptures universally declare that the penitent sinner only is the object of forgiveness; therefore, I have concluded, that the blood of Christ never remits the sin of an impenitent unbeliever.

3rd. The reason why sinners from the beginning were not all forgiven, is, not because God's merciful, forgiving nature opposed it, not because any thing in his law or government opposed; but because they repented not of their evil deeds, and therefore, were out of the sphere of forgiveness.

4th. What sinners needed from the beginning, in order to the remission of their sins, was repentance.

5th. One great end of Christ's coming into the world his living, dying rising from the dead, and ascending to heaven, was, to give repentance and remission of sins; for this end was he exalted—his ministry was the ministry of reconciliation; and reconciliation and repentance are inseparable.

6th, One great moving cause of repentance in the

government of God, is, the exhibition of his love, grace and goodness to lost sinners. "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance." We are to be imitators of God, as dear children; and are therefore directed, "If our enemy hunger, feed him—if he thirst, give him drink, in thus acting we are to over come evil with good. If we thus love our enemy, we shall be children of our heavenly father—having his very Spirit and temper: for thus he loves sinners, his enemies; causing his sun to shine on the unjust as well as the just, causing rain equally to fall on both, and in giving his Son to be the Saviour of the world.

7th, This grace, love, goodness and mercy of God, are seen in his works of creation and providence; but most, eminently in his Son, in his coming living, dying, rising and ascending, in the glorious gospel. To illustrate this, I will utter a parable.

In the early settlement of Kentucky there lived two neighbors in the wilderness—one was a perfect character, kind, benevolent, good; he had an only son, the very image of himself in every virtue. The other neighbor was the reverse of this character, malicious, malevolent, and wicked—he hated this good man and his son, and did all in his power to annoy, and injure them in their character, persons and property. On a certain day this wicked man was apprehended by a band of savage Indians, who hurried him off into the wilderness in order to feast their eyes, and ears with his burning body, and dying shrieks. The good man hears of the wretched condition of his enemy—calls his son—informs him of the fate of his neighbor, his pity and purpose of relieving him. He proposes to his son to go, and effect his deliverance at the risk, or loss of his own life—the son in the same spirit of pity and love consents to go—he finds the trace, pursues with speed—comes up—sees the poor victim tied fast to a tree, and the fire ready to be put into the pile of wood around. He rushes forward—cuts the cords and sets him free—the wicked wretch escapes, but the son is taken, and burnt at the

pile from which he had rescued his poor neighbor. The wicked man returns home—thinks of the unmerited love of the good father in rescuing him by the death of his son—he thinks of his wicked conduct towards these good neighbors—his heart relents—his eyes pour forth penitent sorrows—he must go, and confess his sins to his good neighbor—he goes—confesses, and is freely forgiven.—Now what brought this man to repentance? The love and goodness of this father and son—In what does their goodness appear? In the death of his son.—Whence did he obtain forgiveness? From the death of his son, by which he was brought to repentance. How was he justified, sanctified, cleansed &c. (for he now hates his former ways?) By the death of his Son. The application is easy.

This is only a faint illustration; yet it is in accordance with scripture. Rom. 5. 6. 7. For when we were without strength in due time Christ died for (*huper*) the ungodly. For scarcely for (*huper*) a righteous man will one die, yet, peradventure, for (*huper*) a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love towards us, because when we were yet sinners (and enemies vs. 10) Christ died for us." In the same sense that one died for a good man, so did Christ die for sinners: for the death of Christ, and the death of one for another, are in the same relation, and expressed by the same word, *huper*, for, or on account of. A good man, a perfect character beloved of all, was seen in the last Indian war, struggling for life against a band of savage foes, without help he must fall—his benevolent neighbor sees the unequal combat, and the imminent danger of his friend; he flies to his relief—rescues him, but falls a victim himself. Did he not die for, or on account of this good man?—And did not Jesus see a helpless world sinking to endless ruin by the powers of sin, death, and hell? Did he not fly to our relief? and, in the mighty combat, died for us, and by his death conquered our foes, and made a way for our escape? Again 1 John 3, 16, "Hereby perceive we the love, because he laid down his life for

(*huper*) us; and we ought to lay down our lives for (*huper*) the brethren." The same relation is here discoverable. being expressed by the same word *huper*. Instances of this nature are innumerable; and, therefore, it is deemed, unnecessary to quote more. If from these, and similar expressions it be argued that Christ died as a substitute; then, if there be meaning in language, men die as substitutes for another.

I am fully persuaded that Doctor Fishback himself rejects the doctrine of substitution. I have heard him myself publicly and privately speak against it, calling it the seven-and-six-pence plan, which is equivalent to the orthodox term *quid pro quo*. I know not what his doctrine is; or rather I do not understand it. He often speaks of a *governmental transaction* when he treats on the atonement. I have never yet conversed with a man, who understood him. The doctrine must be obscure—it may be not a subterfuge from pressing light. However, it is that which stands in opposition to my views; for my views, when measured by his standard, are found to be entirely wrong; that is, that the blood of Jesus has a moral tendency to lead us to repentance, and remission of sins—to obedience and love. This sentiment is mine; yet it must be wrong, being contradicted by his plan, *a governmental transaction*.

Dear brother; I must defer an answer to the remainder of your letter for the next No. of the Messenger. In the mean time I recommend to your perusal my Address to the Churches of Christ in the West, and my letters to Doc. Blythe on this subject.

B. W. STONE, Editor.

To be continued.

The Senior Editor had given the following article into the hands of the Printer to be inserted in the June No. It was crowded out by other matter. It now appears as then written.

A THOUGHT OR TWO.

***Abram* was called *Abraham* by divine appointment. Would he not have dishonored his God, and been disobedient, had he still chosen to be called by the name God had rejected, and had he rejected the name God had given him? Old *Sarai* was by the same authority called *Sarah*; Would she not have been guilty of the same offence, had she retained willingly the name God had rejected. So *Jacob* by the same authority was called Israel—So the *disciples* were by the same divine authority, called *Christians*—Is it right that they retain the name rejected, and reject the one given by such sacred authority? Is there nothing in this dishonorary to our God? Is there nothing like disobedience? The name *Christian* is a proper name, and is always written in the Greek and English scriptures with a capital initial C:—but the words believers, disciples are not proper names; are Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Roman Catholics or *Reformers* once found in the Bible as names given to the followers of Christ. Beware of unscriptural names. There is a magic influence attaching to them; they have been, and always will be a powerful cause and support of sectarianism.**

B. W. STONE, Editor

The Junior Editor had given in for the same purpose the following extract from Doc. A. Clarke, and which for the same reason did not appear in the June No.

EXTRACT FROM DR. A. CLARKE.

"It appears that Christians was the first general appelative of the followers of our blessed Lord and there is presumptive evidence that it was given by divine appointment. How very few of those who profess this religion are satisfied with this title? That very church, that arrogates all to itself has totally abandoned this title, and its members call themselves Roman Catholics, which is absurd; because the adjective and substantive include opposite ideas; Catholic signifies universal and Roman signifies of, or belonging to Rome. If it be merely Roman, it cannot be Catholic, if it be Catholic, it cannot be confined to Rome; but it is not Catholic, nor universal, because it contains but a small part of the people who profess Christianity. The term protestant has more common sense in it, but not much more religion—Almost all sects and parties proceed in the same line.

But a Christian is a title *seldom* heard of, and the Spirit and practice of Christianity but rarely occur. When all return to the Spirit of the gospel they will probably resume the appellative of *Christians*.

REPLY TO BRO. WM. RAWLINGS.

Dear Brother:—According to your request I submit a few remarks on your communication above. You say, some teach

that we are to receive the gift (the Holy Spirit;) through prayer Why then, you ask, are reformation, and immersion required as prerequisites? Where has an Apostle called upon an alien to seek this gift by prayer? and for any man to ask for it, argues that he does not possess it.—I do seriously doubt the truth of any doctrine that discourages prayer in the saint or sinner. Did I believe this to be a legitimate consequence of the doctrine we teach, I should abandon it as not of God. I hope I have misunderstood you, when you disapprove of the sentiment, "that some teach that we are to receive the Holy Spirit through prayer. Does not the divine Saviour teach, that God will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?—Does not Paul say, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved? Does this include obedient believers only, who are already saved? Does it not particularly include sinners who are not saved?—Cornelius prayed *always* before he was baptised, and his prayers were heard—Saul of Tarsus prayed three days before he was baptized, and his prayers were attended to. James says, If any man (saint or sinner) lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering—Is. 1, 5. 6—If, a man ask wisdom, does it not imply that he has it not? Can such a man have the Spirit that teacheth him all things? As you say, if a man ask for the Spirit, does it not imply that he has it not? This reasoning, my brother, will not do. I must have misunderstood you. We receive the Spirit through faith—through prayer—through repentance—through baptism. Some insist upon faith alone as the mean through which we receive the Spirit—some insist upon repentance—others on baptism. I insist upon all, as means of God's appointment, to the neglect of none. Yet I am not authorized to say, that God will not give his Holy Spirit to none but such as are immersed. Many, charity hopes, and experience proves, have received this Spirit without immersion. Many on beds of death have received it—many, not knowing it was their duty to be immersed, have received it; among this class I acknowledge myself to have been one.—If ever I received the Spirit, it was through faith, repentance and prayer, without immersion.—If I did not then receive it, I have been always deceived; and if I now should be convinced of this as fact, I with thousands of others, should sink into skeptical despair.—I find none among us, however rigid in their doctrine of receiving the Spirit through baptism, but acknowledge this. Yet too many wish to conceal this acknowledgement, fearing it may be taken as a plea for disobedience. Honesty is the best policy. Had we all from the beginning made this acknowledgement publickly, we should have gained access to many hearts, which are now bolted with the bolts of prejudice

against us.—Would to God, that we, who plead so hard for the reception of the Spirit through baptism, were filled with that Spirit. Then with more confidence and boldness we might speak.

I insist upon the sinner not to delay the duty of believing in the Lord Jesus—not to delay repentance—not to delay prayer—and not to delay baptism for remission of sin, and for the gift of the Holy Spirit.—Let all those duties be begun and performed *now*. For *now* is the accepted time, and *now* is the day of salvation. Where the truth is plainly taught, ignorance can no longer be plead. Some have been bold enough to affirm it wrong to pray for sinners. I have wondered at such temerity. We hear our great leader and pattern, when hanging on the cross, pray, "Father, forgive them (my murderers) they know not what they do." Many of us profess to be great enemies to theorizing; yet how many are endeavoring to press every thing into a theory of preconceived opinions, to the destruction of piety. I impute not this to my brother. I write for the public.

You have followed the new translation in adopting the word *Advocate* instead of *Comforter* in John 16. I have no objection to the translation: it is indeed the most literal that can be given: The original word *parakletos* is derived from the verb *parakaleo*, which literally signifies to call to, or to call near to. The Latins translate the word *advocate* from *advoco*, which literally signifies, one that calls to. Our English word *advocate* is from the Latin *advocator*, and therefore literally signifies, one that calls to, or near to. Though this be the literal signification of the word, yet the verb is almost universally, in the septuagint and in the New Testament, translated to comfort. So the noun *parakelesis is*, I believe, universally translated comfort, or consolation. It is a pity that *parakletos* had not been as universally translated, a comforter, and not advocate. If it had, the gross and absurd idea, that Christ is a lawyer in the court of heaven, pleading the cause of sinners at the bar of God the Father, would never have disgraced the religion of heaven.

John 2, 1, 2. "My little children, sin not; but if any man sin, we have an advocate *parakletos* with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous. Let us state a case for illustration. A father has a family of children—he is about leaving home—he calls his children to him, gives them particular instructions respecting their good conduct during his absence—and what they must not do. During his absence one of his sons commit the crime his father had forbidden:—guilty and alarmed, like our guilty father Adam, he flies from the approaching presence of his father, and conceals himself in the wilderness, exposed to want and danger, and death.—The father returns—His

children with joy, mingled with grief, run to meet him—one is missing, where is your brother? With sobs and tears they give the sad information; O father, he has transgressed your orders, and fearing he has lost your love, and will be severely chastised, he has with a sorrowful heart gone away into the wilderness, and we are afraid will die for want, or be devoured by the wild beasts, or be lost forever.—The father feels the bowels of compassion for his offending child—Go, Thomas, call your brother to come to his father—to come near to his father—tell him in my name, if he will confess his sin, his father will forgive him.—Thomas is an advocate, one that calls near to—he is a comforter by promising pardon. Such is Jesus. If any man sin, let him not foolishly fly from his God in despair, as Adam—as did this offending child—Let him hear the voice of the Advocate, the Comforter—return, come near to your Father, if you confess your sins, God is faithful and just to forgive you your sins.

You ask, Why did Paul circumcise Timothy, and teach the reverse? I answer. Paul did it not in obedience to the law, but to soften the prejudices of the Jews in order for their good, Had he done it in obedience to law, he would have done wrong. He therefore forbade Christians to circumcise as an act of obedience to law. Paul when a Christian might for comfort and health bathe himself in water; but if he had done this, because the law enjoined it, he would have been a transgressor.

You ask again. How do you understand the saying, So shall the son of man be three days, and three nights in the heart of the earth. I answer, according to the Jewish computation of time, they began the day with the evening. From Thursday evening till Friday night, there was one day and night—from Friday evening till Saturday night, there was another day and night—This added to the former makes two days and nights—from Saturday evening to Lord's day morning, there is another day and night—which added make three days and nights. So the Jews computed time, and according to this computation the Evangelist wrote.

Your brother, B. W. STONE, Editor.

Stilesville Henderick co. June 10th. 1834.

EDITORS OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Christian Brethren—

It is said in the Christian oracles, "if any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." The 'Medium' through which this 'Spirit' is received, has been the subject of much disputation, the fruitful source of speculation and enthusiasm. That the Spirit of Christ the Holy Spirit, was promised, is true; that it was received, is equally true; and that there is a means

of divine appointment, through which it is, or anciently was received, must of necessity be true. In many of your essays you have spoken more or less on this subject. To what you have said I do not object, no, not at all. But concerning this "unspeakable gift" the very life of the Christian religion, I wish to offer a few thoughts, and Apostolic sayings, partly by way of inquiry, to elicit further information. It is to the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ and of God, for there is but '*one Spirit*,' and not its gifts or influences, that I design confining my remarks. First the means by which this gift is received. Secondly, the nature of the gift (not of the thing given for it is the Holy Spirit. Thirdly, of its withdrawal or departure, and the consequences.

To whom is the Holy Spirit given? Let the Apostle Peter answer. "And we are witnesses of these things, and the Holy Spirit also, whom God has given to them who obey him." But what particular acts of obedience, are required before the gift is bestowed? Hear Peter again; he addressed believers, Reform and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" not the gifts of the Holy Spirit, not its influences, but the Holy Spirit itself. Hear Paul ask the Gallatians a question. "Did you receive the Spirit by works of law, or by obedience of faith?

We see that this gift is, or was bestowed through certain specified acts of obedience. This you have, made abundantly plain in your paper. But some teach that we are to receive this gift through prayer; why then are reformation and immersion prerequisites? Where has an Apostle called upon an alien to seek this gift by prayer? and for any man to ask for it argues that he does not possess it. To hear men, (as I sometimes do) who profess to be Christians, ask God two or three times over in one prayer for this Spirit. argues that they have it not, themselves being judges; and, consequently, if any one has had it, let them look at what Paul says concerning an Apostate.

But what is the nature of this gift? It is the best, of gifts an unspeakable gift. There in one body and one Spirit, this one Spirit is the Holy Spirit, and pervades this body, dwells in the members, of which this one body is composed. Paul says to the Gallatians now you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit; because the Spirit of God dwells in you. How expressive this language how consolatory too! By the appointed means we receive this Heavenly gift, it dwells in us and its fruit is love, joy, peace, &c. Where we see this Heavenly cluster grow we know this Spirit, dwells. Again Paul says, Do you not know that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwells among you? if any one destroy the temple of God, him will God destroy; for the

temple of God is holy, which temple you are. He that defiles the temple of God, his own body, after it has become God's temple, and he cannot defile God's temple in his own body, until it becomas such, that person God will destroy. Again 1 Cor. 6 19. 'He says Do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have from God? And in his second letter he says, 13 chap. 6 vs. "know you not yourselves, that Jesus Christ is in you, unless you are disapproved."

Again the Captain of our salvation says, "If you love me, keep my commandments; and he says, I will pray the Father, and he will give you another advocate, to continue with you forever. This Advocate is called the Spirit of truth, Holy Spirit, in the same connection, and doubtless the same gift spoken of in the passages that I have selected from the Epistles on this point. From the above premises, the following conclusions seem irrestible. First that the above gift was received through the obedience of faith or immersion in a proper subject; that it (the Advocate or Holy Spirit) was to continue forever, or until the temple, into which it was received, was destroyed; and that the person who defiled, or destroyed the temple of the Holy Spirit, God would destroy.

As this brings to view the last Item proposed for the present, the withdrawal, or departure of the Holy Spirit, I will attend to it a little further. Paul to the Ephesians says, grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you are sealed till the day of redemption. That they could do this very act, the injunction itself informs us; and to prevent it, he continues to exhort them. To the Hebrews he says; If we sin wilfully, after having received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins; but a dreadful expectation of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall destroy the adversaries. Any one who disregarded the law of Moses died without mercy, by two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, think you shall he be counted worthy, who has trampled under foot the Son of God, and reckoned the blood of the institution by which he was sanctified, a common thing, and has insulted the Spirit of favor &c. He adds it is a dreadful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God! Dreadful indeed! when nothing but a dreadful expectation of judgment and fiery indination can be looked for. "For it is impossible to renew again to reformation those who have been enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and yet have fallen away, crucifying again to themselves the Son of God, and exposing him to contempt. It is impossible to renew them to reformation for lack of motives; for all has been

presented; for lack of sacrifice, for Christ dies no more. They are nigh a curse. Their dreadful! dreadful end, is to be burned. O how necessary to keep ourselves in the love of God. To treasure in our hearts the precepts and warhings of heaven, for there is a sin unto death, for which there is no intercession on earth, no Advocate in Heaven. I submit the above outline of this subject to your examination. A few words to the wise, enable them to understand, but much plainness of speech, and many plain words and arguments, are necessary to enable the present generation to understand us on this or any other subject of the Christian religion. To close: If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; This Spirit, (not its gifts, for they have ceased) is received by the obedience of faith; reformation and immersion. The Spirit that dwells in us *influences* us; if it be the Spirit of Christ, it will, (through its testimony) influence to Christian acts; and so of other Spirits. We can discern them by their fruits. When the Spirit of righteousness is received, the Spirit of wickedness retires. When this lovely guest is insulted by acts of wilful disobedience it retires, and the wicked returns, and the last state of that made is worse than the first.

Why did Paul circumcise Timothy and, teach the reverse? and how do you understand this saying in reference to the fact, "So shall the son of man be three days and nights in the heart of the earth." A lucid response to those matters may be of some benefit.

You brother in the King's service,
WM. RAWLINGS.

Beloved Brethren—

It is very evident that the practice of Christianity does not keep pace with religious knowledge. It is high time that we should awake from our slumbers and put on the armor of light. The day is far spent and the time is at hand, when the most interesting and grand and sublime scenes will pass in review before us. Warning upon warning has been given by many faithful soldiers of the Cross; and we most ardently beseech you all to engage in this work, so far as you have been blessed with the means and gifts by our Divine Father.—It has been decreed by our Captain that if you combat the good combat you shall achieve the victory. Do you not pant for the victory that you may be glorified? Do you not seek most ardently to wear a crown that never fades away? Do you not aspire to have that crown gilt with gold and decked with stars! and every star representing a son or daughter, or a soul saved through your instrumentality? Or are you so careless or indifferent as not to regard the honor and happiness that flows from

the consciousness of having been instrumental in saving immortal beings? O! That we may be, one and all, aroused to a sense of our duties and privileges!

Many of you are prepared to reply—Our sphere of action is very limited. Our neighbors are either nearly all converted or so prejudiced that they are beyond the reach of our influence—And we have not the gift of speech or talents to go forth upon the public theatre. All this may be very true, and the means in your power, if properly applied, would result in just what you desire and we are aiming at. We all desire the conversion of sinners—and no Christian is so callous as not to aspire to the honor of assisting in so noble an enterprise, so far as the Lord has given him the means.

If we are not blessed with eloquent tongues, we may possibly enjoy ample fortunes—and your fortunes may, by the employment of other tongues, achieve conquests for you more brilliant in the eternal world than all the fading honor of the kings of the earth. Are we making use of all the means placed within our power for the conversion of the world? An end so magnificent—so desirable—should prompt to the noblest deeds—and prove to the world that we are not living for ourselves. Many may be so covetous as to shrink from our remarks and take refuge in some unhallowed retreat; but the noble and generous and heavenly-minded Christian will hail our effort as an indication of better and happier times. In primitive times the Apostles went forth with their lives in their hands. They did not hesitate to declare that the laborer is worthy of his hire. This is the Heavenly law an should be attended to. I write not for myself in this matter—I write for the cause of bleeding Christianity and for others who have command of their time; and whose labors would redound to the glory of God and the everlasting welfare of sinners.

The design of these remarks is to enlist the Brethren in the noble work of engaging as many Evangelists as their ample means will allow, to convert sinners to God. In this age of light and knowledge, we presume none will be found so blind as to object to such a movement or to question its divine sanction and injunction.

The necessity of the labors of more than we can engage, exists to an alarming extent. This, however, should not dishearten us in the good work. We have many illustrious examples to stimulate us to enter most zealously, upon this field of labor.

We would suggest the immediate adoption of some plan of operations. The difficulties attending a large meeting, (although we do not disapprove, but would recommend,) the delay in convening brethren from different parts of the country, &c. induces us to lay before the Brethren a course of action well calculated to produce beneficial results. Let each congregation ascertain

the *highest* amount they can raise by voluntary subscription for the above purpose of employing Evangelists. Let the congregations adjacent to each other confer together—and, so soon as they have received the requisite amount, let them consult and agree upon the field of labor—the plan of operations—and engage a well qualified Evangelist, who when set apart for the work, shall enter upon the labors set before him. Some of the congregations have already commenced the work and ascertained what they can do. The large and wealthy congregations will be in the rear in this noble enterprise, if they are not diligent.

We not only desire to continue those who are at present laboring, and have labored to glorious effect, but to engage as many more as our *means* will allow. The labors of each Evangelist should be, in part, limited to a certain sphere of action, so as not to conflict with each other, and occasionally they should interchange labors. In the course of the year they might make arrangements to have four protracted and general meetings in different sections of their field of operations. Heretofore we have had but two regular Evangelists, and the country occupied by them requires three times as many to effecs the most desirable results and satisfy the brethren. Let each congregation make an effort to ascertain how much (and not how little) she can and will do. And if a system of general action is considered best, let them meet as soon as possible at some central point to consummate the plan of operations. We ask, whose duty is it to engage and maintain Evangelists, and give direction to their labors? The congregations. We have found the Sectarian systems wholly inadequate to the *union* of Christians and the conversion the *world*. The pure Gospel, as delivered by the Apostles, can effect these objects. We have returned to primitive principles. Now let us put them in practice and not live for ourselves. Then we shall reap the harvest. And when we shall be gathered home, it shall be said—Come ye blessed of my Father inherit the kingdom prepared for you. When I was hungry you fed me—naked, you clothed me—sick and in prison, you visited me.

Then shall anthems of praise be sung to him that sitteth upon the throne, and the Lamb who redeemed us by his blood out of every tribe and tongue and kindred & people—Glory to God in the highest heaven—on earth peace—Good will amongst men.

J. T. JOHNSON, Ed.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

The junior Editor of the Messenger and Bro. B. F. Hall attended a three days meeting at the Stamping Ground, in this county, on the 3rd Saturday in June. Bro. Hall delivered several most interesting and powerful discourses. Six intelligent and respectable females confessed our Lord and Master and

were immersed in his name. We left the Saints rejoicing and many sinners almost persuaded to be *Christians*.

At a subsequent meeting, at the same place, an intelligent and respectable young man of the Baptist denomination marched into the reformation. And two ladies were immersed the day before above Georgetown. J. T. J. Ed.

On the 1st Lord's day in this month, several of the brethren, (to-wit: Jno. Smith, B. F. Hall, F. Palmer, and J. T. Johnson,) attended a three day's meeting at Mt. Vernon. Four persons confessed their Lord and Master, and 8 or 10 others, who had previously been buried with him by baptism, came forward and united with the congregation. This congregation, just brought into existence, numbers about forty-five, and is in a most flourishing condition. J. T. J, Ed.

Bro. Tho. Smith of Lexington, writes, July 8, That in Garrard Co. recently he baptized three, and three more confessed their faith in Jesns, and were received for baptism. Immediately after three more were received at the Craborchard, two of which he immersed the same evening. The week before, he received 1 in Shelbyville, and baptized three in Clear-creek.

Bro. A. Kendrick, of Brownsville, Tenn. writes July 1st, that nine were immersed lately near Paris, and five in Brownsville; The prospects good.

Bro. John Longley, an Evangelist in Ia. writes May 29th, that within two weeks, twelve had been immersed—that opposition was strong, yet truth was stronger.

The Senior Editor attended a three days meeting at Georgetown Ohio, the 4th. Lord's day of May. Multitudes seriously attended; but five were added to the church by baptism. The church there, and the churches in that county, (Brown,) are not united as they should be. The cause of this I impute to the want of Christian operation among the preachers. I am more confirmed that meekness, humility, and brotherly love, can only unite Christians. A harsh, overbearing Spirit will not do.

Brethren D. R. Chaney and Wm. Chaffin of Marion co. Il. write May 29. At almost every meeting through the winte we have had additions to the church. About the last of March we took a tour of preaching for ten days, and enlisted 11, in the south of Jefferson co. In April, in the west of Jefferson, we enlisted 12 more, chiefly Methodists. Near Mt. Vernon we had a meeting appointed at a Methodist meeting house. We

came, but were forbidden to preach in the house. We repaired to the woods, and addressed a large and attentive congregation with good effect. We had a refreshing season. Three came forward, two of whom were immersed—At candle light we met again: two more were immersed. During the meeting 7 were added 5 of whom were methodists.

Bro. L. J. Fleming writes from Charlestown, Ia. May 21. Last night 5 made the good confession. I am sorry to leave this place; but must go to other appointments.

The same writes June 2. On yesterday I closed a two days meeting at Republican, during which meeting 2, who had been immersed united, and 7 made the good confession, 5 of whom were immersed.

Tippecanoe, Ind. April 20 1834.

Brother Stone and Johnson:—

There have been 40 or more persons immersed into Jesus Christ, in this section of country. We have been favoured by the labors of brethren D. Comer, and M. Combs, and some others. Brother Combs immersed 5 when he was here last.

I remain your brother in Christ,

ROBT. COCHRAN.

Paynesville, Mo. March 10, 1834.

Dear Brethren:—

In many places the gospel of the Redeemer appears to be gaining ground, though powerfully opposed by the self styled Orthodox. The doctrine preached by Peter and Paul, is frequently styled Stoneism, Campbellism, and by some develism. Amidst the strife, there are a few who march boldly on, having renounced the doctrines, and commandments of men. With undaunted firmness they stand for the truth. May the Lord increase their number. Since my last, I have immersed three.

Yours respectfully,

J. H. HUGHES.

Bro. Allen Kendrick, of Waterloo, Ala. has lately baptized 12 or 14, in that place or vicinity. Bro. L. D. Collins of that place wishes us to give our views with regard to the faith of the subjects, and of the administrator, of baptism. We still plead that the subjects of baptism should have an operative faith, such as will lead them to repentance and obedience; and that the administrator perform the act of immersing with an unwavering faith that it is a divine appointment. EDITORS.

A number of valuable communications—Some pieces of our own, and the receipts unavoidably postponed to the next number. Editors.

We have understood that some of the enemies of Bro. G. W. Elley recently industriously circulated some injurious charges against his character. We have seen documents containing a triumphant vindication of Bro. Elley in the face of open day. EDITORS.

OBITUARY.

Died—May 14, 1834, Andrew Henderson, of Lewis county, Ky. aged 76 years. He was among the first members of the Church of Christ in the West. His life was holy and exemplary and his death triumphantly glorious.

Happy soul, thy days are ended,
All thy suffering days below;
Go, by angel guards attended—
To the arms of Jesus go.

On May 31, 1834, the amiable, the accomplished, and pious companion of John M. January, of Cynthiana, Ky. She had for years been a member of the Church of Christ in Cynthiana. Never did we see more pious resignation to the will of God—no doubts disturbed her breast—no cloud covered her mind. In full and confident assurance she yielded up her spirit into the hands of her Lord. Never was the loss of a friend more deeply lamented by her brethren and neighbors.

May 24, 1834, the pious and agreeable Polly Chinn, daughter of John Chinn, and wife of Alexander Chinn, She had long been a member of the Christian Church, and adorned her profession. Unappalled she met death, and through the grace of our Lord Jesus, she fell a conqueror. We should be pleased to state the Holy exercises of her happy spirit for weeks before her end; but we have only room to say, she left behind her a bright evidence of the truth and power of Christianity.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

VOL. VIII.—NO. 8.

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. .....AUGUST, 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 1 cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

An apology is due to our readers, for the appearance of a letter, in the Christian Messenger, so scurrilous as that of Dr. Sleigh which follows. Viewing him as a gentleman, I agreed to meet him on the question discussed by us, at Cincinnati. Had I known him then, as well as I do now I should not have met him as an honorable opponent. His boisterous, boasting and angry manner at the close of the debate; and his ungentlemanly demeanor since, has placed him beyond the association of those who have any regard for Christian deportment and character.

It is well enough for the public to see what kind of characters oppose us in this reformation. Dr. Sleigh has received the countenance of our opponents in this matter, and they seem to be identified in faith and feeling. Now let them come out and defend him and his sentiments as those who are not afraid of the light: or let them abandon him.

Any person on reading the letter of Dr. Sleigh would suppose that he designed to await my reply before he took any farther step in the business. But not so. The Dr. was too ardent in the pursuit of game.

On Tuesday, while his letter was in the mail, on the way to Georgetown, he by previous notice was haranguing the people of Cincinnati and slandering and misrepresenting those whom he chose to denominate Campbellites—And he was *good enough;* we are informed to pronounce several of us liars.

In part of his speech he basely and rudely assailed some of the dying remarks of the daughter of Bro. A. Campbell. She died in the *triumphs* of *faith* and had borne her protracted illness with the most signal fortitude, yet this miscreant attempted to cast a shade over the death of this accomplished Christian. We are in