weep and deplore his loss, But the Editor, his intimate companion and fellow laborer, for nearly 30 years, more sensibly feels the loss in a religious view. Last September, he was at my house in Kentucky, a few days before I moved to this state. We were delighted at the prospect of spending the evening of our days together, and of extensively co-operating in the gospel throughout the west. But on his journey home, he sickened, reached home, lingered in pain, and died in peace at the age (I think) of fifty-six years.

EDITOR.

A SHORT NOTE.

Were I able to bear the tax, I should gladly give hundreds, for letters from my friends. But though their communications be ever so pleasant, I am obliged, for the want of funds, to deny myself of the gratification of receiving them, unless they come free of postage. If my agents have communications to make to me, let them pay the postage out of my money, if they have it; if not, let it come, if adjudged by them of importance or interest to me. EDITOR.

NOTICE

Disappointment in getting paper in time has prevented me from sending the "Messenger" to my patrons. I have had to suffer much trouble and loss in getting enough for this number. Paper procured in Ky. has not yet arrived, owing to uncommon low water. This may retard the second No.

RECEIPTS FOR THE MESSENGER IN ILLINOIS.

Sangamon P. O. J. Hodgen vol. 7, 8. *Jacksonville*, R. Cassel for 8; J. Nevins 8; P. Coffman 8, 9; Jac. Haffaker 8; M. Hafiaker 8; Eld. J. Green 9; B. Cassel 7, 8; A. Simms 8; S. Brockman 7; (two last paid agent not yet me.) Wm. S. Tilton 9; G. W. Happy paid 50 cents; Doc. Morrison 9; J. Major 9; J. Thompson 9. *Monmouth*, A. C. Jameson 8; J. C. Davidson 8. *Knoxville*, Isaac Clark 8. *Rushville*, H. Johnson 8. *Carrollton*, E. Baker 8; D. Kennet 7, 8. *Quincy*, Holman Bowles 7, 8. *Athens*, Henry Boyers 8. *Palestine*, Wm. Mitchell 8; John Eaton 8.

MISSOURI.——9 *mile Prairie*, J. Moseby 8, 9. *Louisiana*, Thomas Burbridge 8; R. Burbridge 8. *Paynesville*, J. Jeans 8. *Clarksville*, B. Barton 8. *Huntsville*, Richard Summer $1 25 for 8; *Chariton*, Marton Winn $1 25 for 8.

TENNESSEE,——*Columbia*, Judge R. Mack 7, 8, 9, all lost by mail.

OHIO.——*Sidney*, James E. Sparling 9, and paid in Ky. 8.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. IX.] JACKSONVILLE, ILL. FEB. 1835. [No. 2.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

Is published monthly, in Jacksonville, Illinois, at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for twelve numbers, if paid on the reception of the second number—or ONE DOLLAR AND TWENTY-FIVE cts. if not paid within six months. Persons procuring eight subscribers, and remitting the money to the editor, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage is 1½ cents a number under one hundred miles, and 2½ cents over one hundred miles.

THE conference in *Terra Confusa* continued, on the subject of christian union among brethren of different names, and opinions, who by previous agreement met together at ——, Jan. 1, 1835.—Continued from vol. 5, page 175.

Members present were the same as attended the former conferences, the minutes, and debates of which, are recorded in vol. 5 of the Christian Messenger, viz: Doc. P——, Bp. M——, B——, R——, C——, E——, and U——. After prayer and praise offered to the Almighty God, Bp. M. rose, and thus addressed the conference:

Bp. M——. I rejoice to see you again collected after a lapse of more than three years. I rejoice to see so many assembled here to hear our deliberations on the great, and important topic, which fills every mind—*Christian union*. Four years ago we were collected together in several successive conferences on the same subject. At our first conference we were unanimous in the sentiment that the disunion of christians, as then, and yet existing, was wrong, and prevented the salvation of the world. Our object was to devise some plan by which this evil might be removed, and the union of christians effected. The majority of us agreed to examine carefully, and critically every article of our various confessions; to reject what should be found unscriptural, and to retain what should be considered by us all to be the truth. Doc. P——'s creed being considered the oldest, he was invited to read his, beginning with the first article; and after an examination of this, to proceed to the

others in order. We soon found that in this course we should not succeed; for on the very first article we differed very widely, and saw plainly the division line through all our creeds. To retain our different creeds, and be united, we saw impossible. It was determined in our second conference to appoint a committee of five to draft a summary of doctrines deemed essential, to which we should subscribe, and reject all other creeds, and confessions drawn up by men. At our third conference, we found our committee could not agree among themselves in drafting a summary; each person had his own. The committee agreed to lay their different summaries before the conference, and let them select the best. In this we failed. We could not agree on any summary proposed. After much debating in the christian spirit on several interesting doctrines in our fourth and fifth conferences, without coming to an agreement, it was proposed by brother R——, that as we could never agree in any system of doctrine formed by men, we should abandon the idea as vain, and be contented with the book of God as delivered to us, rejecting all creeds of human mould, and adopt the word of God alone as our directory; that we bear with each others opinions, where they do not affect the holy life of those that hold them. This was proposed; we agreed to meet again at some future period on this subject. By the kind providence of God we are here, and the prayer of my heart is, that the Lord may be in the midst of us, and direct and lead us into all the truth as it is in Jesus. The question before us is, how shall we dispose of our creeds? Shall we retain, or reject them?

Doc. P——. Our brother M——, has given us a correct, and succint history of our former conferences. Since I have had the happiness of meeting with you, my mind has been strongly agitated on the subjects of our former friendly debates. I have since that time almost solely confined myself to the reading, and study of the Bible. I plainly discovered from those debates, not only the discrepancy of our peculiar systems with each other, but also that there was in them all, an evident disagreement with the doctrine of the Bible. Before our former conferences closed, my mind was so far convinced of the impropriety and insufficiency of human authoritative creeds, and formalaries to effect the union of christians, that I was on the eve of relinquishing them forever. Since then, by careful, and prayerful attention to the Bible, my mind is fixed. I am now prepared to enter into the question before us, proposed by brother M——. How shall we dispose of our creeds? Shall we retain, or reject them? "My sentence is" that we cast them all to the moles,

and to the bats, and trouble not them, who are turned to the Lord, any longer with them. My reason for this sentiment I will now state.

1. Authoritative creeds of human form are unauthorized by the Scriptures.

2. Such creeds have a manifest tendency to make men slaves and hypocrites, and to banish the lovers of liberty, and truth from christian society. A creed is formed, and made authoritative, that is, it is enforced by pains, forfeitures, and penalties. If the creed be supported by civil authority, as formerly, and yet in some states of Europe, the unhappy unbeliever in the creed is compelled to be a slave and a hypocrite by an open profession that he believes the creed, when he really does not. The fear of penalty persecution or death, prostrates his liberty and drives him into base hypocrisy. If he be too honest, and free to submit to such degradation, he is banished from society, and persecuted in name, reputation, and person. If the creed be not supported by civil power; but by ecclesiastical authority alone, still the case is not altered; the unbeliever in the creed suffers the pain of being excluded from the society of his heart; forfeits the privileges of the church, and must bear the shame and reproach of a heretic. These things he must suffer, or submit to slavery, and become a base hypocrite.

3. The church of Christ in her best days had no such creed. The Bible alone was her directory.

4. The introduction of such a creed first divided, and distracted the church, such has been the effect of authoritative creeds ever since, as is evident from ecclesiastical history. Within our knowledge the same thing is realized. From the beginning of the present century, the Presbyterians have experienced three divisions on account of their confession; the Cumberland Presbyterians; the Christians, and the New School Presbyterians. True the latter are not yet severed, but are only held together by a rope of sand. The creed condemns them; but they are the majority, and therefore cannot be excluded. They cannot remain connected long. Since the beginning of the present century, the Methodists have split upon their directory; the Baptists too are broken into pieces on the same rock.—Who can deny the baleful effects of such creeds with these facts in view?

5. Such creeds not only divide christians, but are also the very supporters of their division. Is it possible for Methodists, and Presbyterians to be in the same body, or church, each having and enforcing their authoritative creeds and remain together in peace? Would not the Methodist

creed condemn, and exclude the Presbyterians?—and *vice versa*. If these creeds be not authoritative, and enforced, they are as harmless as useless, and unworthy of notice, much less of contending for. But so long as authoritative human creeds exist, so long will sectarianism exist. They will die together, and that death cannot be far distant.—Men have too high notions of liberty ever to submit voluntarily to the shackles of men.

6. Such creeds assume the place of the Bible, and are paramount to its authority. By the creeds, not by the Bible, are *heretics* tried.

7. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, said the Savior; the law of Moses was a yoke, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear; it was called a yoke, because it bound and united Israel together, as yokes do cattle. They all moved the same way at the word of Moses their guide. So the law or gospel of Christ is his yoke, designed to bind, and unite all christians together, so that they move together, learning the word of command from Jesus their leader, and humbly obeying it. Now every sect has a yoke made and put upon the necks of their disciples; they walk not the same way, but are ever striving against each other. These sectarian yokes are their creeds. Can we hope for better days while such creeds exist? No: sectarianism will have a coeval existance; and while this exists, infidelity, and scepticism will grow, and rankle in this prolific soil; the world will not believe, and be saved. Such a creed is a paper pope, equally infallible and sacred, as his holiness at Rome; it is the vicar of the Bible; it frowns horribly upon every dissentient from its doctrine, and would coerce submission by the hands of its votaries, if it had the power of the sword at command. Similar causes produce similar effects. What has been, may be again.

Mr. B——. I must confess that through life I have been a stickler for authoritative creeds, nor did I see how a church could exist without one. But from the friendly debates of our former conferences, and from recent facts which have transpired in the Baptist church especially, I have come to the same conclusion with the brother last up. I now view such creeds not only useless, but mischievous in fact; instead of uniting the Baptist churches, they have divided, and broken them into pieces. I am decidedly in favor of casting off all such yokes, and of taking the Bible alone as our creed; our standard of faith and practice.

Bp. M——. This is my sentiment; and yet I am discouraged at what I have lately seen myself, and at what I have heard from good authority. I have seen, and heard of churches, which have acted on this plan, of rejecting all creeds of human make and taking the Bible alone for their only rule of faith and practice, angrily divide, and remain in factious sects! Such conduct has not only discouraged me, but has almost driven me back to my old authoritative creed. Such conduct is doing more effectually the work of death to reformation, and to the salvation of the world, than all the powers of infidelity, and skepticism combined. I am well acquainted with a church, which agreed to unite upon the Bible alone, having rejected all human creeds, and confessions. Soon after, a few began to conclude, they ought to attend to the Lord's supper every Lord's day; it was proposed, but being a new subject, the majority of the church, did not think it was sufficiently clear and express in scripture to authorize them to act on it. The few without the advice of their bishop, or of the church, withdrew, ordained for themselves officers, and proceeded to a separate house and worshiped. I have heard of other churches, which have acted on the same principles. I know another church, which from conviction had taken the Bible alone for the rule of their faith, and practice. This church had been originally Presbyterian, and indoctrinated in that faith. They lived in peace and unity for many years, and their numbers were greatly multiplied. All but a few had submitted to be immersed. These few were not convinced that it was their duty to be immersed, and without this conviction would not submit. They were considered by the majority as not in the kingdom, because not immersed; that their sins were not remitted; that they had no right to any of the peculiar privileges of the kingdom or church; and they were therefore excluded. This argument is taken from fact. What shall we do? United christians must be, or God must be disobeyed; his gospel slighted, and the world lost. Christians cannot be one, I plainly see, while these creeds exist. The Bible alone can unite, and bind christians together; on this foundation alone can Zion rest, and shine to the conviction, and conversion of a sinful world. This is my unwavering faith, and has been for a little time back, though vacillating before from seeing division in the ranks of those, who had united on the Bible.

Mr. R——. I rejoice exceedingly in the progress of reform. The sentiments, so powerfully expressed by all the brethren, who have spoken, have long lain deeply in my heart. To the same result I have come some years ago, and have been for years laboring to impress this truth upon the minds of my fellow creatures, and to arouse them to consider seriously the subject. I feel thankful that my labors

have not been in vain. When I take a view of the millions of my fellow creatures, on whom the light of the gospel has never shone; who have never heard the name of Jesus; who worship the work of their own hands; who groan in wretchedness, doubtful of their future destiny; when I view the means used by christians to enlighten them, and teach them the path to heaven; when I view these christians preaching peace to them afar off, and living in discord, strife, and contention at home; when I see them sending, and supporting their own party to these poor pagans, distributing their party tracts, and teaching their party creeds. When I view these things, my heart sickens at the sight. Are they not sowing the seeds of strife among the heathen nations; those seeds which have produced so much unchristian conduct among ourselves? Is this the way to convert the world to the faith and obedience of the gospel? I cannot believe it is. It may convert them to names and parties; to hatred and strife, but not to love, peace, and unity. The truth of this, stubborn facts declare. But the question again occurs, What shall we do?

We all agree that christians must first be united before the world can believe in Jesus, and be saved. We are agreed in this, that whatever divides christians, and perpetuates that division, is not of God. This no intelligent person will deny. For the Bible, the simple facts stated in the Bible, all believe, all receive. These have never divided christians, but the discrepant opinions, formed by men on these simple truths or facts in the Bible, have been the cause of all the mischief. Yet these opinions would be harmless, unless they be substituted for the truth, and unless they lead to impiety, and demoralization. Whenever opinions of truth be made the test or standard of christian fellowship, then division follows. Whether these opinions be embodied in a creed book or not, the effect is the same, they will divide christians. A person, or a church may renounce all such creeds, and books, and boast in the Bible alone as his only creed; yet that very church, through weakness, may attach such importance to their opinions, as to condemn all who dissent from them unworthy of christian fellowship. The Bible is not to be blamed for such unhallowed deeds. Every good has been abused; shall the Bible, therefore, be called an evil, and rejected? Opinions of truth, substituted for the truth itself, and made tests of fellowship, must be denounced as mischievous and wicked.

Opinions too, whose tendency is to demoralize, should be frowned upon as opposite to truth. A brother of high respectability not long ago gave me the following information. A Universalist preacher of the modern stamp had preached to a large audience, and endeavored to prove that there would be no future judgment; no hell; no punishment after death, and labored to sneer, and scout the idea of a devil, out of existence. That every one of the human family at death, went strait to heaven. An intelligent Dutchman was one of his audience, and became a convert to the doctrine; invited the preacher home with him, and kindly treated him. Well, says the Dutchman to the preacher, I do *pelieve* your doctrine; but I peseech you do not tell my prother John this, for he did steal some of my sheep, and if he gets to pelieve there is no judgment, nor punishment, nor hell hereafter, and that all will go straight to heaven when they die, pesure he will steal some more of them. The Dutchman rightly judged that the doctrine was demoralizing.

Mr. C—— rose and spoke. I accord fully with the sentiments, expressed by my brother last up, and indeed, I can say the same of the sentiments of all who have spoken.—Never did I see more unanimity in so large an assembly of those of different names. In this I do rejoice, and do exult in the prospect of better days. Brother R. has given us a plain and lucid dissertation on opinions, and has well shewn their mischievous effects, when made the test of fellowship. As he has made no direct remarks on the two cases mentioned by Bp. M—— in reference to certain churches having divided on two points, the Lord's supper and baptism, permit me to suggest a few thoughts on this subject. One church divided on the following doctrine; a part contended that the Lord's supper should be attended to every Lord's day, and strenuously insisted upon its being observed. The other part could not see sufficient authority in the Bible to oblige them to the performance of it every first day. The other church divided, because a part considered immersion only to be baptism, and ordained for the remission of sins the other part could not accord in those views. That those churches were wrong in dividing I entertain no doubt, and my reasons are as follows.

(*To be continued.*)

Park co. Indiana.

Strictures on C. F. R. Shehane's Strictures. See Christian Messenger, vol. 8. nos. 5 and 9.

BY S. M. M'CORKLE.

It is harder to understand some expositors, than that which they expose. Our friend S. is one of this kind: and anxious to have an opponent.

In his first number he proposes "strictures on some of S. M. McCorkle's views". His first quotation is in the following 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."

His second quotation, (for I find but two,) reads thus: "In Luke 22, there is a prediction which no one can prove to have had an accomplishment; if in the future, it must correspond with and strengthen our views." The prediction alluded to is as follows: "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Now reader, can any man in christendom, or out of it, tell from the above quotations, what S. M. McCorkle's views are.

My essays may suffer as the holy book often does, from scrap expositors; taken in detached parcels, and tortured into a meaning never designed by the author.

I defy any man on earth, learned or unlearned; to ascertain from the quotations, or arguments of our young expositor, the monstrous heresy contained in my views of the prophecies; but after conjuring up some chimera of his own brain; some hydra or "*Jack Lantern*;" and after running it through the *gauntlet* he exultingly cries out, "*Hallelujah*, how can a kingdom which cannot be moved; be shaken by the loud thunders of Babylonian CANNONS!"

Babylonian Cannons!! About which I confess ignorance; except the above sentence; the following jargon, or tornado of words and the like, should prove to be the called for artillery.

He breaks out in the following ebullition, challenging his opponents, "to come forward and shew themselves like men, clad in the panoply of God; but if they cannot, let them acknowledge the fact, and cease to array predictions to terrify the credulous that have been accomplished, worse than a dark thunder cloud streaked with ten thousand lightnings, borne on the wings of a whirlwind, does the sinners who gaze upon the sublimity of nature, and tremble at the lightning's flash and "thunder's roll upon the banners of the air."

The mind of our author must have labored prodigiously, when he was delivered of such a group of unintelligibles.—If the printer has done him justice, it is an outrage on common sense.

Young authors should simply tell what they know, and simply express what they feel; should learn that there is but one little step between the sublime and the ridiculous.

Before taking up his arguments, I will notice another passage; his concluding paragraph. "If what I have said (says he) be insufficient to prove the position which I have taken, I have arguments yet in store that no man in his sense can either get round or over." Here our author has taken the advantage of his opponent, by passing sentence of "non compus," aforehand on him, if perchance, he may get "round or over" his unanswerable arguments "yet in store." Perhaps he had better hold them still in *store*; for should they fall any thing short of demonstration; men of sense may get round or over them, and by the by may *reverse sentence*.

Mr. S. has taken much pains to prove, that which I believe as firmly as he does himself, viz: that Christ has a kingdom on earth. Had he none previous to the day of pentecost? Was there no truth in it? Why did it not abide forever? Was the kingdom exterminated, or did it only change hands? Is the moral kingdom never to change hands again? Christ said to the Jews: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." The Jews like friend S. believed the kingdom was to abide with them forever. Such changes have taken place, therefore, may again, when the same cause exists. I will now take up the points at issue, between Mr. S. and myself, and as near as I can gather from his quotations, and arguments they are—

1. The Apocalypse; was it written before, or after the destruction of Jerusalem?

2. The great city; holy city, etc. Rev. 11. was it relative to the christian dispensation, the church, or does it relate to Jerusalem?

3. Whether the promise made to the disciples, Luke 22, 30, be in the future or the past?

"A mountain in labour."

Luke was quoted to strengthen my views about a first resurrection of the Apostles, Martyrs, etc. their personal reign with the Savior during the Millenium.

Perhaps Mr. S. alludes to this when charging me with arraying "predictions to terrify the credulous."

Who are these credulous: pious or impious?

Has piety any thing to fear! Can the lovers of the master dread his return, or a resurrection of his Martyred followers? He is to be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel." Our author may say

this is to take place at the close of time: then, and in that case the son of perdition is to be destroyed with the brightness of his coming, at the close of time!

It would be a happy thing indeed if our expositors could fix the accomplishment of all the alarming prophecies at the close of time; fix the date of the apocalypse prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, and accomplish all its terrible metaphors on the devoted Jews. Happy ridance.

Independent of history, or what Ireneus has said about the time of John's banishment, I have some plain common sense reasons for believing the book called Revelation, was written long after the fall of Jerusalem, and can have had no allusions to the event.

In vain have our expositors and Protestant divines, been lavishing opprobrious epithets on the Catholic church, calling it "Babylon the great the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth," when according to the theory of Mr. S. this was spoken relative to Jerusalem *a holy city*.

The first part of the apocalypse was addressed to the seven churches of Asia; not to the Jews at all. In the churches of Smyrna, and Philadelphia, Jews are spoken of. The word Jerusalem, if my recilection serves me right, does not occur in the book without a prefix *new*, to it,

The commonly received opinion about the date of the book is, that it was within about the year 95 or 6; setting this aside my arguments are; that prophecies relative to the destruction of Jerusalem had been made aforehand by the Savior, as plain as language could make them. See Matthew 24, "there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Mark uses the same words, see Luke 19. "And when he came near, he beheld the city and wept over it, for the day shall come upon thee that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round and keep the in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground and thy children within thee: and thay shall not leave in thee one stone upon another."— "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." A plainer prediction was never made, was never fulfilled. Matthew wrote, say 30 years before the dreadful event, Mark and Luke about six. Now after such plain predictions which could not be made much plainer, would it not have been useless, aye, worse than useless, a consummate folly, to have delivered the prophecies over again in metaphors, the most dark and mysterious, in figures which neither Jews nor Gentiles have been able to understand or decipher, for 1800 years. Who after such a plain

prediction as is recorded by Luke, would ever dream of searching John in the Revelation, for the sake of arriving at a more perfect knowledge of the event. A prophecy after it is given in plain and intelligible language, should never be dark, or delivered in enigmas.

So has God never done

It would be an absurdity; pernaps our author can solve the difficulty by proving the apocalypse to have been written previous to the history of Matthew, Mark, or Luke, or even before Christ's prophecy on the Mount. This would be, full as hard to do, as it would be for him to prove the assersion of Ireneus false, relative to the time of John's banishment. Our author must call in question, several other respectable historians on the subject, who lived more than one thousand years before he was born, whose names are to live on the page of history, when the ephemeral porductions of our meteorick scribblers will go down to oblivion.

I will now take notice to his unpardonable blunders about the holy city. No place in the New Testament is Jerusalem called *a holy* city by inspiration. Matthew as a historian calls it the holy city. It was a favorite place, relative to the Jewish metropolis. So it is a common thing in a certain church, to call a certain class of men *holy fathers*. The apocalypse, after the third chapter is unquestionably prophecy; not a history of the past, but of the future. Does it require inspiration to write a history of the past. Why did Matthew call Jerusalem *the holy* city? Just because custom had made the term familiar. For a very different reason does John, speaking of signs in the future, by inspiration say, *holy city*.

Would Christ weep over a *holy city*, charge it with the blood of the prophets; calling the Temple worship, and its appendages "a den of thieves."

Did Christ call it a den of thieves because it was holy, or unholy? Now, after such allegations against Jerusalem, who would expect it to be called by inspiration, *holy city*.— Another consideration which should have some weight with those who have not closed their eyes to reason and common sense altogether. The book called Revelation is considered by all expositors, in all ages, a book of metaphors, figures, etc. Now is the words *holy city*, etc. to be taken as a figure, or literally? If as a figure, the whole system goes overboard at once. If literal our friend must furnish us with a literal object for the two witnesses, the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the whole earth." I see nothing but difficulties before our young expositor. The two passages which he would identify, as relative to the same object are,

"Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

"And the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months." Can these passages have the same objects in view? If so Jerusalem at the expiration of the forty and two months, should have been reinhabited by the Jews. To say it is to be trodden under foot forty and two months, is indirectly to say, at the expiration of the term, it is not to be trodden under foot. We have general acceptions, and A. Clark, for saying the forty and two months does embrace 1260 years. This length of time is the city to be trodden under foot and no longer, suppose we apply this to the Jewish city; the 1260 years would have run out 500 years ago.

What has taken place since? Jerusalem is still trodden under foot, and still like to be.

Is there any dependence on such prophecy or such fulfillments? If this does not prove that Jerusalem cannot be the object of the prophecy, there is but little proof in argument, but little certainty in the application of prophecy to events, past, present, or to come. The book called Revelation, taken literally, is nothing but a bundle of absurdities without an object in heaven, earth, or hades.

Taken as a book of metaphors, and not otherwise, it is solvable. The temple, the altar, the holy city, the two witnesses, the forty and two months, the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks; to common sense can be nothing else than figures; respecting something to which they may be compared. If they be figures, and what else can they be; to what can they apply the city, but the church? Is not the church called a city, and its members a temple? With much propriety our young divine might arraign Paul for saying: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, etc." "for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are."

Notorious fact says, that the most holy, pious, spiritual associations of christians, have been most persecuted, or trodden under foot, since the son of perdition came to the throne, in the religious world.

I could name some denominations, who while they were spiritual and holy associations; were persecuted, and trodden under foot, but since they have lost their spirituality, have ceased to be persecuted, have ceased to be the *holy city*.

It would require an adept indeed in the art of spiritualizing, and reconciling incongruities, to make out; "Mistery Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth." Babylon the great "the habitation of devils, the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean, and hateful bird." "The apocalyptic woman." "Drunken with the blood of the saints." "The great city, which is spiritually called Sodom, and Egypt. Where also our Lord was crucified."

To be the holy city alluded to, Rev. 11!! Cannot Christ be crucified in his people? Paul says something about Christ being crucified afresh, and about filling up the measure of his sufferings.

The same city, ruleth over the kings of the earth. For 500 years previous to the date of the apocalypse, the kings of the earth had been ruling over Jerusalem with a rod of iron. And still worse; "a mighty Angel took up a stone like a great mill stone, and cast it into the sea, saying, thus with violence shall the great city Babylon, be thrown down and shall no more be found at all." Now according to prophecy, according to the promise of the Lord Almighty, and the unconquerable expectation of the Jews; Jerusalem by the son of Abraham is to be *again*, "safely inhabited:" See Zechariah 14.

But farther, according to our expositor, the two witnesses were martyred in Jerusalem; the two olive trees standing before the God of the whole earth." Who are they? Were they men? History is silent on the subject. We ask the records of antiquity for their names in vain. What beast made war on them? According to our friend's theory, it must have been a literal *brute beast*.

What, "people, and kindred, and tongues, and nations," saw "their dead bodies" lie unburied three days and a half? What event did ever take place in Jerusalem, to which we may affix their resurrection? When did a tenth part of the city fall?

When Mr. S. has answered these questions to the satisfaction of common sense, we will place a few difficulties in his way, about the quotation on which he places such reliance. "It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." This is quoted to prove the great city Babylon in the Revelation to be Jerusalem!! Because in Babylon was found "the blood of prophets!" The passage was certainly never intended for a prophecy, but a reproof, reproaching, and charging the Jews with the blood of the prophets. Now, are there no prophets called for in christian dispensation? Paul says: "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets," etc. Is there no prophecy in the New Testament? Can there be prophecy without prophets? It would be hard to prove Paul, and Peter were not prophets, and much harder to prove, that they did not *perish out of Jerusalem!*

If I have not tired my readers, I am growing weary myself, of noticing a publication so replete with blunders, and bombast.

D

To James Fishback, D. D.

DEAR SIR:—Frequently since I left Kentucky, I have heard that you are reiterating the stale, and oft refuted charge against me, that I deny the atonement. My dear sir, I did hope better things of you. I did not expect you to join in the ranks of those, who malevolently persecute a wo-beaten woman, and unite in the hue, and cry against me, now on the verge of eternity. Had you labored in the spirit of a christian to convince me of this soul destroying error, you would have laid me under obligations to esteem you more highly. Opportunities abundant you have had for more than twenty years to do this christian act; but those opportunities were never improved by you. Now, when I am in the "Far West," you assail me publicly, and privately when I am not there to defend myself.

You say, I deny the atonement. It may be, I deny your views of it, if any definite views you have had, you said this, I should not have blamed you. It may be true, that I have denied the views of the *evangelic orthodox*; but sir, you have long since learned, that many of their views are insustainable; and, therefore, you cannot urge them as a correct rule by which to measure any doctrine. Many of your own doctrines would be tekelized, if weighed in the balances of their sanctuary. My greatest opposers; I should have said, my most intelligent, and honest opposers, do not say; dare not say, that I have denied the atonement; they acknowledge, that as far as I have gone in the doctrine, I am correct; but they blame me for not going farther into it. I am not ashamed to confess, that I have gone as far as the book of God has led me, as far as my limited mind could understand. Farther than this would be, "to be wise above what is written." Others have adventured beyond into the inexplorable field of speculation, and have wandered so far, and so long from the Bible, that they are completely lost, and it is feared, will never be reclaimed to the simple faith of Christ. The christian world have long been busily engaged in building up and establishing Babel-systems, of materials partly iron, and partly clay; or of speculation, and truth, which can never agree.

I have written much, and often on the subject of atonement, yet many of my readers have not seen any of those essays. I will give the outlines of the doctrine, as I have before written, and taught, for their information.

I have denied the word *atone* to signify to *at-one*, or to reconcile; and *atonement* to be *at-one-ment*, or reconcileation. This I have proved from the etymology of the Hebrew word *keper*, and the Greek word *katallagee*, which words

our translators have rendered reconciliation very frequently, as well as atonement. I have proved the definition correct from the most learned Lexicographers, and writers, as Baily, John Brown of Haddington, Shakspeare, etc. The word atonement, we have granted, is sometimes used metonimically, as the cause for effect. Thus the victim for sacrifice is sometimes called the atonement, because by this, the atonement or reconciliation was effected.. So Christ may be called the atonement; his blood may be called the blood of atonement; because by this, the reconciliation or atonement is effected.

The effects of the blood of Christ I have repeatedly stated; as that it was shed for the remission of sins; to purge us from sin; to purify, and cleanse us from all sin; to wash us from sin; to take away sin; to reconcile us to God; to sanctify us from sin, to justify us, etc. Now, sir, you well know that these truths I have zealously taught, and maintained for more than a quarter of a century. These, I am persuaded, will stand or fall with the Bible; nor will you presume to deny them, nor will any man, who believes the scriptures.

I have also mentioned that the blood of Christ will never effect these things in us, until we believe, and obey the gospel. Will his blood justify, remit, wash, cleanse, or sanctify an unbeliever? Will it reconcile or at-one us to God till believed? Will it produce any good effect in the impenitent, disobedient unbeliever? Not one will affirm it. In this truth we must be agreed. I have stated the application of the doctrine to be this. Holy Adam was sweetly united with the Holy God; this blissful union would have forever existed, if man had continued holy; but sin broke the union; "your iniquities have separated between you, and your God." Jesus was sent from heaven to restore the union between man, and his God, or to make an at-one-ment.—This at-one-ment, or union cannot be effected, till sin, the separating cause, be removed, and the holy spirit of God restored. This is done through faith in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. When our sin is remitted, and the holy spirit received, then we are holy, as God is holy; righteous even as he is righteous, and pure even as he is pure.—Then, and not till then, is the reconciliation, or at-one-ment effected between God and man. Righteousness has no fellowship with unrighteousness.

This, sir, is the doctrine of atonement, which I have for so long a time taught; and if I have ever written or spoken a sentiment in opposition to it, I am unconscious of it, and would willingly retract it, could I be convinced of it. But nothing less that scripture testimony can do this.

Your definition of atonement, as you have written in your 6th essay, page 104, is this: "The word *atonement*, in its original sense always denotes some amends or satisfaction, for the neglect of some duty, or the commission of some faults or crime." This definition is humbly denied to be correct, and not one text quoted by you from our Bible gives any learning to such a definition. What fault or crime had the woman to make amends or satisfaction for in bearing children in lawful wed-lock? Yet she had to make an atonement. What fault, or crime was it for the man to have the leprosy? Yet for this he must make an atonement. So the man with a running issue, etc. Do, sir, read the following texts, and in your next edition correct your error. Lev. 12, 6—8. 15, 15—30. 14, 18—31. 5. 6. Num. 6. 11, and many others. You will by consulting the Bible, and the sentiments of the learned that the original sense of the Hebrew *keper* (which is translated atonement,) is, to cleanse or purify. This is the primary effect of the blood of sacrifices. "For almost all things under the law were purged with blood"—for nothing unpurged or impure could be at-one, or reconciled with a pure, and holy God. The Greek word *katallagee* translated atonement once, and but once in the New Testament, never in one instance signifies what you have stated. It constantly means reconciliation, and is so generally translated.

On page 105, you explain your views of atonement thus: "When, therefore, I say, that *Christ in his sufferings* was our SUBSTITUTE, or, *by them he made an* EXPIATORY OFFERING *for us*, I mean, *that God did appoint, and accept the sufferings of Christ, instead of the punishment due to us, as sinners against his law; and that in consequence of this appointment, and of these sufferings, he communicated to us, spiritual gospel light, gives us faith and repentance, and forgives us our sins, and receives us to his favor.*"

Here are as many assertions as there are sentences, unsupported by any higher authority than Proff. Stewart of Andover. His authority is not equal to the Bible, and therefore must fail in producing conviction in minds, which try every doctrine by that holy book. Where does the Bible teach, that in consequence of the sufferings of Christ, gospel light, or the gospel itself is communicated to us?—and that in consequence of these sufferings, faith, and repentance were given unto us? Where is it said in the Bible that God accepted the sufferings of Christ, instead of the punishment due to us? Where in that book shall we find the emphatized words, *substitute*, and *expiatory offering*? It is not my design to deny or affirm any thing you have written

in this last paragraph. It is in substance the same that has been said a thousand times by others, though not so darkly expressed as by you.

Had you drawn your divinity from the Bible, and not from men you would have been a little more charitable to those, who cannot receive your unscriptural dogmas; you would not have nullified all their claims to christianity, and prejudged them to perdition. You attend too much to the dead, and the living, speaking to you from many volumes all around you. Amidst the din of confusion, you do not attend to the voice of the inspired, who speak in the Bible; their still small voice is hardly heard, only through your poor fallible interpreters.

As I have always said, that I am a fallible creature, and may have erred in many things: and on this very doctrine of the atonement I may have indulged in vain speculation. I wish none to receive any thing I may have written, unless expressed in the language of inspiration.

My dear sir, you and I are verging on eternity. It becomes us to set an example of moderation, and piety to the rising generation. Let us adopt the sentiment of the pious poet,

"Clamor, and wrath, and war begone,
Envy, and spite forever cease;
Let bitter words no more be known,
Among the saints, the sons of peace."

May the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, bless you with the Heavenly blessings. Amen. EDITOR.

P. S. Not to controvert with you have I written, but to defend myself from undeserved imputations. With you the subject is dropt, nor will it ever be resumed, or attended to with regard to you, unless necessity be laid upon me. ED.

Boston, January 16, 1835.

DEAR FATHER IN THE GOSPEL—I take the liberty to address you this letter, on two subjects, in which I feel a deep interest. Although I am personally a stranger to you, I have often heard of you, and from you with delight.

The first thing relates to the *Christians* in the west. Perhaps the following enquiries embrace the information you would need in order to give me the knowledge of them I desire.

1. Have the *christians* given up the old ground, or, that on which they first came out in *doctrine*, and *practice*, thirty years ago?

2. Are they now amalgamated with the *reformers*, or *disciples*, so as to make of both parties *one body*, or do the christians, retain a distinct standing, and adhere to the NAME, and the *divine unity*, etc. as formerly?

3. Or have the *reformers* united with the *christians*, in part, or fully.

The second thing relates to the *Indiana Unity, at New Albany*. We have heard of it, by one MR. BENNET; but we are in the dark about *him*, and the *Unity*. He was received in the east as a good man, but has since been advertised in the Millenial Harbinger. Any information you can give me on the subject will be very greatfully received.

I trust you will pardon me for obtruding myself upon your notice at this time, when I inform you, that much anxiety is felt on the above subjects in the east. Also, that I judged you to be the most proper person, to give answer to the first questions, if not the last.

In conclusion, I will most affectionately invite you, to visit New England. I will assure you that thousands will bid you a hearty welcome.

I will be one of your subscribers the ensuing year.

Yours with respect, J. V. HIMES.

ANSWER TO THE ABOVE LETTER.

BROTHER HIMES:—The "liberty" you have taken is entirely agreeable to me. I should rejoice to have correspondence with many brethren in the east, and would certainly possess that joy, were it not for the heavy tax of postage. To your queries I will attend; and as you say, "that much anxiety is felt on the above subjects (queries) in the east," I will publish the answer for their information.

Query 1. Have the *Christians* given up the old ground, or that on which they first came out, in doctrine, and practice, thirty years ago?

Ans. No, they have not. The ground, on which we then stood, was the Bible alone, as the only rule of our faith, and practice. This ground we yet occupy, to the exclusion of all creeds of human mould, and device, as authoritative.—It is true, by attention to the Bible we have corrected many mistaken notions; as infant sprinkling; as pouring, and sprinkling meaning baptism, or immersion, etc. Several such traditions many of us brought with us from our former

associations; but they were soon relinquished. The leading doctrine we then believed, and taught, we believe, and teach still; nor am I conscious of having given up one. But we have learned, that controversy, and speculation on trinity, divine unity, and many kindred doctrines, bewilder rather than edify; deaden, rather than enliven; and please, rather than profit any. We have, therefore, endeavored to speak of these things in the language of scripture, If all would do the same, then all would speak the same things, and controversy would die. The controversy on these subjects has been kept up for fifteen centuries with unchristian zeal, and what good has been effected? rather, what evils have been the result? Our ceasing to controvert on these points has led some to think we have abandoned our former views. We believe in one God, the Father; that Jesus Christ is the son of God, and that the Holy Spirit is the spirit of God. This is our faith, and, we believe, it is the faith of all christians; I am sure it is the faith of all those with whom I am immediately connected.

Query 2. "Are they (the Christians) now amalgamated with the *Reformers* or *Disciples*, so as to make of both parties one body? Or do the Christians maintain a different standing, and adhere to the *name*, and the *divine unity*, etc. as formerly?

Ans. This query includes several particulars, to which I will attend. In Georgetown, (Ky.) and its vicinity, there was a large church of *Christians* to whom I was minister.—In the neighborhood was also a church of those, called *Reformers*. Of which church John T. Johnson was the minister. We worshipped separately for some time, till we became better acquainted. We then found that we stood on the same foundation, the Bible alone, and were aiming at the same end, the salvation of our souls, and of the souls of others. They had imbibed the popular prejudices against us, and we had indulged in the same against them. We began to worship together; this produced love; love destroyed our prejudices; and union was the result. They did not join us, nor did we join them; but we mutually agreed to meet on the Bible alone; great, and glorious were the effects. It was like an electric shock to the wicked part of the community. Our meeting houses were filled to overflowing; crowds were pressing into the kingdom, and the saints were filled with joy. Neither side gave up any sentiment, or opinion, nor were they requested to do it.

Many other churches in the south, and west, seeing, and hearing of the divine effects of this union, have done likwise. We have never changed our name. The *Reformers* (so cal-

led) will not own any other name than *christian*, and contend for this name alone. As might have been expected, the union in some churches is not perfect; there are some jarring materials, which stickle for their old dogmas, and must have a uniformity of faith in certain opinions, which are received as essential to true religion. Some have jarred about baptism for remission; some could not so plainly see the duty of weekly communion, and have caused unhappy excitements in some places. What a pity, that christians should wrangle, and divide about such things! O! for the grace of forbearance with each others ignorance, and weakness. In many places there are large christian churches, where there are no Reformers; they of course retain a distict standing, though generally they approved of the union. I have been astonished, and grieved at the inconsistence of some among us. Union with all christians they have long, and zealously pleaded; but when we begin to practice what they plead for, they oppose. Is it nothing more nor less than a sectarian spirit.

Query 3. Or, have the Reformers united with the Christians in part, or fully?

Ans. This is answered already. I wish my brother to know, that we have had no general council on this subject. Churches have acted in their private capacity.

The second particular, concerning which you wish information, relates to the "Indiana University at New Albany." This University is merely ideal, conceived in the brain of Mr. Bennet. With it I had no connexion, I never heard that such a thing was in agitation, until I saw the account printed in the New Albany Gazette, Mr. Bennet wrote to us afterwards a pompous letter, and wished us to print in favor of the scheme. We paid no attention to it. He dragged our names with those of brother Campbell, Scott, and others before the public gaze. This was a subject of ridicule to our opposers, and of mortification to us. We were constrained to disavow publicly our ignorance of the whole gigantic aircastle. Soon after this Mr. Bennett disappeared; nor have I since scarcely heard his name, or any mention of his University, only as I saw the advertisement in the Harbinger respecting him. With respect to his character, I can say nothing from my own knowledge. I had but a very partial acquaintance with him, never having had but one short interview with him.

I thank you for your patronage of the Christian Messenger. May grace, mercy, and peace be with you.

B. W. STONE.

On the Scriptural manner of ordaining or setting apart men for the service of the church.

It admits of no doubt, that Jesus ordained the twelve Apostles: John xv. 16. "I have chosen you, and ordained you that ye should go, etc."

In the ordination of Matthias to fill the place of Judas, the three existing congregations of 120 were required by the Apostle Peter to select from among themselves a person qualified to fill the office. They appointed two, Joseph and Matthias; but Matthias alone was ordained: Acts first chapter. In these two cases the manner of ordaining is not named; but here is a marked distinction between ordaining to an office, and of choosing, and appointing to an office. Joseph, though appointed to be an apostle by the church, was not acknowledged as such; Why? Because he was not ordained. From this we are taught, that a congregation, may choose, and appoint men to certain offices; but those offices they cannot fill, untill they are ordained.

The next case of setting apart men for the service of the church is found in Acts vi. Seven men were chosen and *appointed* by the church to fill a certain office. But after the choice, and appointment were made, the Apostles laid there hands on them. Till this act was performed by the Apostles those seven were not allowed to officiate in the office to which they were chosen, and appointed by the church. It cannot be presumed that the only baseness of these men was to serve tables; two of them are particular named as preachers, or evangelists, Stephen and Philip.—The word *Diakonos* translated *deacon* but commonly, *minister* is very frequently applied to those who minister in the word as well as in other matters. Reap the following texts where the word *diakon's*, (*deacon*) is translated *minister*, and you will find it applied to Christ himself; to his Apostles, to preachers; and even to civil magistrates. Rom. xiii. 4. 1. Cor. iii. 5. 2. Cor. iii. 6. vi. 4. xi. 15. Gal. ii. 17. Eph. iii. 7. vi. 21. Col. i. 7—23—47. 1. Tim. iv. 6.

In Acts 13, we have an account of certain prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch, setting apart, or separating, Saul, and Barnabas for a scertain work. The manner of doing this is particularly described; "And when they (the prophets and teachers) had fasted, and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." The work to which they were separated, was, to preach the gospel, to confirm it by miracles; to confirm the souls of the disciples, and to ordain elders in every church. Paul had been previously appointed, separated, and ordained to preach the

gospel, and so, it is presumed, was Barnabus. Yet now sent forth as evangelists, they are re-ordained to the work, or are thus solemnly re-commended to the grace of God for the work, by fasting, prayer, and lying on of the hands of the prophets and teachers in Antioch. In the same manner Saul, and Barnabas acted in every church whither they came.—They ordained elders in every church by prayer, and fasting, and commending them to the Lord. Acts xiv. 23. The original word for ordaining is *Cheirotoneesantes*, the literal meaning of which word is *to stretch out the hand.* This Saul, and Barnabus did, when they laid their hands on them.—Hence the meaning of the word, when followed by an accusative, is, *to constitute to an office.* Park, on the word.

The ordination of Timothy comes next in review. 1. Tim. iv. 14. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." 1. Tim. v. 22. and ii. Tim. i. 6. "Wherefore, I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands."—When Christ ascended upon high, he received gifts for men; these gifts are found Rom. xii. 6. Eph. iv. 8, 10, 11, etc. "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy; or ministry; or teaching; or exhorting, etc. From this it is plain, that the gift conferred on Timothy, was that of prophecy, or of ministering, or of preaching the word; and that this gift was given by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, or eldership.

Paul cautions Timothy, "to lay hands suddenly on no man." 1. Tim. v. 22. Be not hasty in ordaining any man to the ministry of the word; let not the gifts be rashly conferred on any man, who does not possess the qualifications, pointed out in chapter iii.

Titus was left by Paul in Crete to ordain elders in every city. The manner of ordaining these elders is not named; but, undoubtely, it was the same as was practiced by the Apostles and teachers at that time.

From these premises we conclude, that ordination to the work of the ministry was performed by the imposite on of the hands of the elders in the New Testament church.—Not one instance to the contrary is found on record.—Therefore it appears that no person can be legally induced into the ministry without this act. Many may smile at this idea, and may think such ordination merely a *rite*, or a mere unessential thing. Yet these same people will contend, that immersion is essential in the right performance of baptism, and that none but the immersed can be members of the church. (*To be continued.*)

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Not long since, a Presbyterian preacher, not one hundred miles from Jacksonville, Ill. immersed a person for the remission of sins. This we have learned from undoubted authority. Also Bishop Smith, the learned, and pious Episcopalian Doctor, immersed a person of this place also for the remission of sins.

This is the pressage of better times. Indeed, the doctrine preached by us, and the New School, or reformed Presbyterians, is distinguished by only a few light shades of difference. We joyfully anticipate the day, when they will cease to contend for their orthodoxy according to their old confession of faith; when they will not fear to exchange the name Presbyterian for Chaistian; when they shall be willing to be denounced as heretics for Christ's sake, and to suffer the loss of all things, in order to promote the truth, and save the world, lying in ruins. I have not heard that this preacher was ever censured by his brethren for thus immersing for remission. Inded, such of them as has read Prof. Stewart's dissention on baptism, must justify his course for immersing; and baptism for remission, we doubt not, will, not long hence, be universally received by all christians.

EDITOR.

Jan. 15, 1835. Brother G. W. Lester, of Pike co. Ill. informs us that reformation is spreading in that section of country: for the two last Sunday's six on each day, were added to the church.

Feb. 1, 1835. Brother John M. Harris of Russelville, Ia. immersed 5 at Sand creek.

Brother Joel Hughes, of Springfield Ill. writes Dec. 31, 1834, that at a meeting in the Buffalo-heart grove, a few days ago three professed faith in the Lord; the prospects there is good.

AN APOLOGY.

An Apology is due to my patrons for the course paper, on which this number appears. I had engaged good paper in Kentucky, previous to my removal here, and expected it

in time to print the first number: but for reasons yet unknown to me that paper has never arrived, and never been heard of since it was sent to be transported to Meredosia, Illinois. Disappointed in getting that, I sent to St. Louis, for medium paper, but instead of this, they sent me imperial, at $5 50 a ream. It was too large, and one fourth had to be trimmed off. For the second or present number, I sent by a friend for medium paper No. 2. Instead of which you have the sample in the No. before you. It came too late for me to get better now. This is the last of February, and the present No. should have been finished, and sent off three weeks ago. I hope my patrons will accept the apology, seeing I had to give fully the price of good medium paper for this, i. e. $3 50 per ream.

The christian conference met on Loughery creek, Ripley co. Ia. Oct. 20. 1834. The brethren appointed some general meetings, to which they wish publicity to be given through the Messenger. 1st. At Delhi in Ohio, to commence on the Friday before the 2d Lord's day in June 1835. 2d At brother Daniel Whitakers on South Hogan, Dearborn co. Ia. commencing on Friday before the 2d Lord's day in September. 3d. At brother Daniel Roberts' at Manchester, commencing on Friday before the 2d Lord's day of October. 4th At brother Vincent Roberts in Jackson township, on Friday before the 1st Lord's day in September, the conference will meet on Loughery, Ripley co. Ia.

At the last conference five were added to the church.

Report of the yearly meeting held at Milton, Ia. Sept. 1834, of the number of churches in that section. 1st Milton, 48 members. 2d Liberty, 24. 3d Loughery, 34. 4th White run, 7. 5th. Bethlehem 55. 6th Palmyra Ky. 126. Next union meeting to be holden at Palmyra, Henry co. Ky. on the second Friday of September, 1835.

Many—a great many of our old patrons are yet in arrears, some have not yet paid a cent for eight volumes. Can they expect justice? We once more entreat them to remember us, and send us what is due, always informing us the particular volumes for which they pay. Let them write to I. T. Johnson, P. M. at Georgetown, Ky. or to me in Jacksonville, Ill. if more convenient.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. IX.] JACKSONVILLE, ILL. MARCH, 1835. [No. 3.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

Is published monthly, in Jacksonville, Illinois, at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for twelve numbers, if paid on the reception of the second number—or ONE DOLLAR AND TWENTY-FIVE cts. if not paid within six months. Persons procuring eight subscribers, and remitting the money to the editor, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage is 1¼ cents a number under one hundred miles, and 2½ cents over one hundred miles.

On the Scriptural manner of ordaining or setting apart men for the service of the church.

(*Coucluded from page* 46.)

They will not be satisfied by being told that baptism is a mere rite, and unessential: Why? Because, it is a divine ordinance. And is not the imposition of the hands of the eldership in ordination also a divine ordinance? and therefore essential? Let us cleave to the book of God, which we have professed to take for the standard of our practice as well as of our faith.

But, says one, the imposition of the Apostles' hands was the sign of confering the Holy Spirit. The day of miracles is past. It is folly for us to retain the sign, without the power of confering the thing signified. I answer: Baptism is also instituted as that, through which we receive the Holy Spirit. And does not God confer this gift through this simple act? Who will then say, that God will not confer his Holy Spirit through the simple act of laying on of hands? Did he not do it to the Samaritans, Acts viii.? Did he not do it at Ephesus, Acts xix.? I am afraid, that many by vain philosophy, are for confining the divine gift and operations of the spirit to Apostolic days, and never dream that it is the privilege of christians in these latter days to