parted in some respects from that order. He represents the church as one body, having one head, all being baptized into that body by or in one spirit, and all drinking in one spirit, that spirit dividing to each member of that body some special gift, which was of use to the body; as our hands, feet, eyes, etc., are to our natural body. He then shows them wherein they had departed from that order, reproves them for their abuse of these gifts, admonishes them to reform, and exhorts them to use these gifts for the edification of the body, for which they were specially given. The body Paul describes is the model of primitive christianity, and the ancient order of things; how shall we know when we have got back to primitive ground, without we see just such a church as Paul describes?

(*To be continued.*)

ERRATA.—On page 152, (Committee) for Kingdon read Rigdon

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY.—*Georgetown*, Eliza Moseby for vol. 9. *Elkton*, Wm. Dickerson 9. *Paris*, A. P. Hall 7, 8; J. Snell 9; Susan Beall 9; Susan Bledsoe 9; D. Canada 9; H. Parker 9. INDIANA.—*Swanksville*, Wm. Dugger 9; J. Baker 9; Pet. Shuck 9; J. H. Burgess 9; Wm Wilson 9. *Rodman's*, Nich. Hightshue 9. *Milton*, J. Crum, A. Crum, C. Roberson 9.—*Jacksonburgh*, F. Graham, R. L. Leason 9. OHIO.—*Stillwells*, Isaac Lindley for 8 nos. of 7, 8, 9. *Eaton*, M. H. Hill, J. Quinn 9; and H. Monfort 25 cents for 9. ILLINOIS.—*Jacksonville*, G. Ritchie, S. Ritchie 9; Scott Riggs $7 00 in full for 9; S. Vanpelt, M. Hewit, William Gillam, J. Huffaker, I. Barton, Col. Dunlap for self and father 9. *Clio*, Laughlin and Rollins 9. *Quincy*, H. Kemp, S. Boothe, H. Bowles, J. Bowles for 9. *Rushville*, S. Tadlock, E. Doyle, A. McHatton for 9. *Apple Creek*, R. Grant 9. *Berlin*, A. Martin 9. *Centreville*, J. Pool $5 00 for 9. *Eagle Point*, J. Nifong, G. Sims 9. *Manchester*, Doctor Spear 8, 9. *Monmouth*, I. Murphey, J. Murphey sen., P. R. Haley, A. Moore, J. Tipton, J. M. Dodge, E. Ground, J. Rust for 9. *Carrollton*, Col. Caldwell 8, 9. *Sangamon*, J. C. Kelly 9. *Montezuma*, T. Williams, N. Coffee, G. Luster, T. Tucker, for 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. AUGUST, 1835. [No. 8.

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.

Spadra Bluff, Johnson co. A. T. April 19, 1835.

(*Continued from page* 168.)

The church is described as being in the wilderness, and coming up out of the wilderness leaning on her beloved; looking forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners. The church is now in the wilderness; the inquiring world is looking for a christian church, but they look in vain; comparing her with the description in the scriptures they cannot recognize her. But she shall be visible, rising in the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible to her enemies as an army with banners.

What will make her thus visible, beautiful and terrible, unless she fill the model given in the scriptures in every respect; In faith, in unity, in power, by obeying every command in the New Testament, and relying on every promise with assurance, and receiving an answer to every prayer they put up to the Father in the name of Jesus, if consistent with the word? Paul to the Ephe. iv. 12, 13, says of the spiritual gifts, they were, "For the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind

of doctrine, by the slight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, etc."

This passage has been brought to prove, that what is commonly called miraculous gifts should cease, as soon as the church arrived at the perfection described. But it might be asked, when she did arrive at perfection? And until this be attained, it cannot prove the point? If the mystery of iniquity had already gone to work, and the church in some things to backslide, and had not yet come to that state, when did she? Are the saints perfected? Is there no more use for a ministry? Has the church no more need of edification? Have we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the son of God? Are we no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by the slight of men, and their cunning craftiness? If we have arrived to this perfection, perhaps this passage may be applicable.

I am not, however, established on this point; but the above with many other difficulties of equal weight, have been insurmountable difficulties in my way of receiving the popular, faithless, and scrapping theory of giving such commands and promises all away, as would clearly distinguish christianity from other religions; or as do not comport with our unholly and faithless lives. I think it our indispensable duty to try to know the truth on this subject, as it has an important bearing on the present reformation; for if these gifts be a part of the features that will distinguish the true from the apostate church, if we remain in unbelief of it, we shall not arrive at that distinction ourselves, and will be likely to reject and persecute others, if they should arrive nearer the point than ourselves. And on the other hand, if God intended them to die with the first christians, it is important that we know when to tell our hearers to stop, lest we get beyond the holy land, and seek for things contrary to the will of God.

Brother Stone, it is with diffidence I submit these remarks to you, with the request, that if you think them worthy a place in the Messenger, and a serious reply, you will please to notice them.

Yours in search of truth.

THOMAS WOOD.

Maury county Tenn., April 27, 1835.

To Brother S. M. McCorkle,

Although your strictures on mine exhibit more of the

wasp than of the *dove*, I have concluded to reply in order to correct misrepresentations, and to exculpate myself from unfounded imputations. It is more than probable that you never read all my strictures; for, if you had when you wrote against me, you could not have said, "I find but two quotations" seeing that there are at least four quotations from your writings in one piece. (See Oct. number Mess. 1834)

You say, "*my essay may suffer as the Holy Book often does, from scrap expositors; taken in detached parcels, and turned into a meaning never designed by the author.*" Do you here insinuate that I have tortured any part of your views into a meaning which you never designed? If you do, I deny the charge, and call upon you to point me to the place. After making a quotation from my humble efforts, you say "*the mind of our author must have* LABORED *prodigiously when he was* DELIVERED *of such a group of unintelligibles.*" Now my dear friend I will just inform yon that my *mind never labored prodigiously* at any time, and least of all, *when the labor is accomplished;* rest succeeds labor you know; but probably you meant to say, that the mind of our author labored prodigiously when he was delivering the group; however it is not a new thing under the sun for an old author to say one thing and mean another. You appear to have been somewhat exasperated, because a man cannot find out from two quotations what your views on the prophecies are. It was not to be expected that a young hand should, in a few hours scribbling, give all the views, which it took an old expositor more than twelve months to write out. This you very well know, at least you ought to know it. You say, "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 rediculos." By taking the *converse* of this, am I to undeastand that *old authors* should simply tell what they do *not* know, and simply express what they do *not* feel, and that they (forgetting the little step between the sublime and the rediculous?) should jumble them together.

But for your gratification, if it wil be any, I will attempt for once, to tell *what* I know, and to express simply *what* I feel at present. I *know* that your communication contains six *et caeteras*, and I also know that the phrases "*our young expositor*," "*our young divine*" and the stale "*mountain in labor*" will never pass with me for three arguments. Now for what I feel. I feel a consolation in my bosom, because I esteem the immutable truth of Jehovah higher, a thousand times higher than the evanescent things of "*this dim spot, which men call earth.*" I also feel that some old authors write with as much virulence, as if their pens were dipped

in the fountain of bitterness, which their own hearts contain. "*Omnia vincit amor; et nos cedams amori.*" You suppose I had better hold my unanswerable arguments still in *store.* Yes, better for your system of interpretation, for you having coupled *the harvest* of Matt. xiii. with *the harvest* of Rev. xiv. accordihg to your own concession, I by proving that the prases *sunteleia tou aionos* "*refers to the end of the Jewish state,*" and not to the conclusion of the christian dispensation (as you and Begg contend,) should shake your foundation, and make you tremble like Belshazzar. But I shall make no elaborate search in the cloudy mazes of mysticism for the furnace of fire into which you say the tares will be cast at the close of the present dispensation; but shall now only request you to turn your attention to Ezekiel xxii. 17—32.

Does it appear to you that the furnace is in London, or Jerusalem? Notwithstanding the unintelligibility of some places in my remarks, I perceive that you have been able to find out the difference existing between us; you state these questions:

"1 The Apocalypse, was it written *before or after* the destruction of Jerusalem?

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

"3. Whether the promise made to the disciples Luke xxii. 30, be in the future or the past." You then exclaim "*a mountain in labor.*" I am right willing that the readers of the Messenger shall look on until they see who proves to be the *mouse* slipping out of it. Let every one have his true character, whether fox or mouse.

You suppose it incompatible with the spirit of prophecy to make a prediction in *symbolical language* after having made it in a plain style, and you add that God has never done so. It is only necessary for me to adduce examples *where God has done so,* in order to overthrow your most plausible argument. Isaiah (xiii. xiv.) and Jeremiah (l. li.,) who both wrote before Daniel, plainly predicted the subsersion of the Babylonian empire and king, and yet the last mentioned prophet (chap. iv.) under the similitude of a tree predicts the same thing. This you will say was explained. Admitted, but it was not explained until some time after the king had seen the figurative vision. Should you deem this example not to the point, you will please to attend to the following: In Jeremiah xxv., is a plain prediction of the Babylonian captivity; it is in plain language, and Ezekiel who wrote after him speaks of it under the parable of a vine "plucked up in fury" chap. xix. also in chap. xx. 45—49, it is shown under the similitude of a fire kindled in a forest. Again chap. xxiv. 3—14, it is predicted in the parable of a boiling pot filled with choice bones.—Indeed I am of the persuasion, that on close examination, you will find that it is not an uncommon thing for apreduction to be exhibited in unfigurative language, and then to have the drapery of highly wrought eastern phraseology thrown around it. The crucifixion or death of Jesus was plainly foretold before he was born, yet he himself spoke of it *in a figurative manner;* John ii. 19. "*Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.*" It appears that the Jews thought he spake of Solomon's temple; but he spake of the temple of his body.

If these examples be insufficient to convince a *common sense* man, just let me know, and I will, when circumstances permit, attempt to produce others, that no reasonable being can either get over, slip under, nor go round. You say "*I will now take notice to his* UNPARDONABLE *blunders about the holy city.*" If quoting the scriptures correctly be "*unpardonable blunders*" you will please to inform me, what you denominate a *pardonable* blunder. Should yon say, to quote *incorrectly* is pardonable, then you may be pardoned, for of such conduct you are guilty; but whether you ought to be forgiven before you repent is a question which I shall not determine, and therefore leave it *sub judice.* You ask "Why did Matthew call Jerusalem *the holy city*? You answer, "*Just because custom had made the term familiar.*" I ask, was this custom founded on the language of inspiration or on ignorance? You moreover say, "For a very different reson does John, speaking of signs in the future, by inspiration say, *holy city.*" Now be it known to the lovers of truth, that John does not say *holy city,* without the definite article; John says THE *holy city,* not *a holy city,* and I have proved beyond all contradiction that Jerusalem, the very metropolis over which Jesus wept, was called *the holy city.*"

You ask, "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*?" I answer, he did weep over "*Jerusalem, the holy city,*" but did not call it "a den of thieves." It was the *temple,* not the holy city, which Jesus called a den of robbers.

But, my sheet is too small to follow you through all your sophistical *twistifications,* and I will therefore only notice a place or two more, before I advance another argument in favor of my hypothesis. On one page you speak of the

Apocalypse, being "*delivered in metaphors the most dark and mysterious, in figures which neither Jews nor Gentiles have been able to understand, or decypher for* 1800 *years.*" On another you say, "*taken as a book of metaphors, and not otherwise, it is* SOLVABLE." Well, now, does not this reflect great honor on the *Literati* of two nations? The learned of the Jews, and of the Gentliles have not been able to *understand* or *decypher* in 1800 years, *what?* nothing but *a solvable book!!* You ask me a number of questions about the two witnesses.—Stop if you please, do not be so fast, let us get the foundation laid, before we attempt to rear the superstructure.

Rev. i. 1. The very title of the book, and the 1.vs. show to common sence, that the *time at hand* could not mean 1800 years to come. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to show unto his servants (*ha dei genesthai en tachei*) THE THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY BE DONE "OR COME TO PASS." This is repeated chap. xxii. 6. "The Lord God of the Holy Prophets sent his Angel to show unto his servants (*ha dei genesthai en tachei*) THE THINGS WHICH MUST SHORTLY BE DONE." This is easy to be understood on she supposition that the book was written BEFORE the destruction of Jerusalem; but to say that it was written *long after* that event, throws you, and all on your side into a great difficulty, unless you can prove that the *en tachei* (*shortly*) means a long time, which I suspect will be a laborious task, but you can make the trial when it suits you, and I shall like to see your argument, if it should happen to come in the language of love; but ——— you may guess at the contrary. The following extract is from A. Clark's "*introduction to the Revelation*" p. p. 981—2. "The reasoning of Dr. Lardner relative to the *date* of this book, is by no means satisfactory to many other critics; who consider it to have been written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem; and in this opinion they are supported by *the most respectable testimonies among the ancients*, though the contrary was the more general opinion, *Ephiphanius* says, that John was banished to Patmos by *Claudius Caesar*; this would bring back the date to about A. D. 50. *Andreas* (bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, about A. D. 500) in his comment on this book chap. vi. 16, says, John received this Revelation under the reign of *Vespasian*. This date also might place it before the final overthrow of the Jewish state, though *Vespasian* reigned to A. D. 79. The *inscription* to this book in the *Syriac Version* first published by *De Dieu* 1627 and afterwards in the London Polyglott, is the following: The Revelation which God made to John the Evangelist, in the island of Patmos to which he was banished by *Nero Caesar*. This places it *before* the year of our Lord 69; and consequently before the destruction of Jerusalem. *Of this opinion are many eminent writers*, and among them, *Hentenius*, *Harduin*, *Grotius*, Lightfoot, *Hammond*, *Sir Isaac Newton*, *Bishop Newton*, *Wetstein*, and others. To this bright constellation of literary stars I add one more; *Professor Stuart of Andover;* These are his words, "The Apocalypse, as I believe, was written *before* the fall of Jerusalem. The main reason lies in chap. xi. (the catastrophe of chaps. v.—xi.) where the fall of Jerusalem, the place where our Lord was crucified, is so specific, that I see no way of avoiding the conclusion. There are other reasons; but this is the turning point." Dr. Clark was of the same opinion as you may see by consulting his comment on Rev. vi. he says, "if this book was written *before* the destruction of Jerusalem AS IS MOST LIKELY, etc." See him on chap. i. 7. These observations will show that I am not alone in contending that the Apocalyse was not written *long after*, but *before* the scourge of Roman armies broke down the Jewish nation. Three sides of my sheet are full, and here I'll pause.

C. F. R. SHEHANE.

REMARK.

It is earnestly requested, that if these brethren write more for the Messenger, that they confine themselves to argument, and omit personalities, and vituperation. I cannot consent to publish any thing more unless written in a christian spirit. Editor.

THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Acts ii. 38, 39. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even asmany as the Lord our God shall call."

The inquiry naturally arises,

1. Does the *gift of the Holy Spirit* mean, the Holy Spirit itself, or the peculiar gifts bestowed by the Holy Spirit?

2. Can we in these last days claim this promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit? These are important subjects, worthy of investigation We have thought that the christian

world has feared to approach them, and have been rather inclined to accommodate them to the existing state of the church.

1. Does the gift of the Holy Spirit mean, the Holy Spirit itself given, or the peculiar gifts bestowed by the Holy Spirit?

Just before our Lord left this world, he promised his apostles that he would send them another comforter, even the Holy Spirit. John xiv. 26. xvi. 7. When he was exalted by the right of God, he received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, and shed forth that which they then saw and heard, Acts ii. 2, 3. They saw the cloven tongues as of fire; and they heard the sound as of a mighty rushing wind. "Behold, I send the promise of the Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke xxiv. 49. This promise of the Father was the Holy Spirit, Acts i. 4, 5. This promise of the Holy Spirit by the Father was made long before, through the prophet Joel, as quoted by Peter in Acts ii. 17. Gal. iii. 14. "That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." "Sealed with the spirit of promise." Eph. i. 13. From these and similar texts, it is evident that the promise of the Spirit, is, the Spirit itself promised, and the gift of the Holy Spirit given. So we read of the *city of Jerusalem* as meaning Jerusalem itself. Luke xxix. 19, compared with Acts xiv. So the gift of righteousness, or justification, is, justification given. Rom. v. 17. This phraseology is common.

Sometimes the gift, or gifts of the Holy Spirit, signifies those peculiar gifts bestowed on us by the Holy Spirit.—"There is a diversity of gifts, but the same Spirit." 1 Cor. xii. 4, etc. The fact appears to be this; the gifts of the Spirit presupposed the Spirit given; none destitute of the Spirit, possessed the gifts of the Spirit. Thus when the Spirit on Moses, was put upon the seventy, they immediately prophesied. This gift was not possessed by the seventy, till they had received the spirit. Num. xi. 17—25. These two ideas of the *gift of the Spirit* must be carefully marked, or we shall certainly err.

2. Can we in these last days claim this promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit? I answer unhesitatingly yes. "For the promise (of the Holy Spirit, or the gift of the Holy Spirit,) is to you, (Jews) and to your children, and to all that are afar off, (the Gentiles, Eph. ii. 17) even as many as the Lord our God shall call," (all those to whom the word of God shall be proclaimed.) If we cannot claim this promise, which in the whole book of God, can we claim? Surely,

none can be more definite, unless it, be Luke xi. 13. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father, give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

If we understand *the gift* of the Holy Spirit in Acts ii. 39 as some do, that it means the miraculous gifts only bestowed on them by the Holy Spirit; then the promise of these gifts is yet good to all; to whom the gospel is preached. This promise of the Spirit was made by the Father through the prophet Joel to all flesh, Gentile as well as Jew; their sons and daughters should prophesy, their young men should see visions, and the old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants, and on my hand-maidens, I will pour out in those days, my spirit; and they shall prophesy, saith the Lord.—The promise of God by Joel and Peter is to *all flesh;* and these words are always used, both in the New and Old Testament, to include all men without limitation. Gen. vi. 13. vii. 21· ix. 11—15. Num. xvi. 22. xxvii. 16. Job xxxiv. 15. Ps. cxxxvi. 25. Isai xxxx. 5, 6. 1 Pet. i. 24. Isai xxxxix. 26. Ezk. xxi. 5. Isai lxvi. 16—23. Jer. xxxii. 27. xxxxv. 5. Ezek. xx. 48. Zech. ii. 13. Luke iii. 6. comp. Isai lii. 10. These are abundantly sufficient to establish the point, that the promise is to all mankind without exception. But let it be well underssood, that this promise, as well as every other, is given to them that believe and obey. Gal. iii. and Acts v.

Obj. If this be fact, then the promise of God has failed; for miracles have long since ceased in the church.

Ans. "Is God unfaithful, who has promised? Shall their unbelief make the faithfulness of God without effect? God forbid; yea let God be true, and every man a liar."—Of old Jesus in a certain place could do no mighty works because of the unbelief of the people. May not the unbelief of the people now be the cause, why such works are not done? "According to your faith, so be it unto you." Is there no danger in attempting to accommodate the scriptures to our apostate state? May not this yet be done in this particular case?

Obj. 2. The scriptures are abundantly confirmed, and need not the aid of more miracles to establish their truth.

Ans. The scriptures of the Old Testament were abundantly confirmed by miracles by Moses and the prophets; yet they were continued in Israel till the Lord took them away for their sin. Isai iii. 1, 2. The prophets under the Old Testament never introduced a new law, nor attempted to confirm any such law by miracles. They prophesied, and wrought miracles to arrest, and fix the attention of the peo-

ple to those laws already given by Moses, and confirmed.—So we should expect no gifts in order to confirm new revelations, but to arrest, and fix the attention of the world to that given by Christ and his apostles. Was there ever a day, in which such gifts were more needed than the present? The wicked world are asleep on the very eve of a tremendous revolution; the christian world, divided into contentious sects, which are busily engaged to establish themselves, and their dogmas, and to fight against, and destroy each other. Their conduct has hardened the wicked world, and driven them in thousands to infidelity, and skepticism: what can we do for them? How quickly would miracles arrest their attention! But you may say, The world is to be converted by the unity of believers. Granted; but the present race of believers must be converted themselves, before they will unite. It is as hard to convert the present race of sectarian believers to truth, and unity, as to convert a sinner from the error of his ways. If Paul *incognito* were present, and should preach the ancient gospel to the different sects; he would be opposed by all. Should he reason with them, and tell them, that they were carnal, and walked as men, because of their divisions; that they must be united, that there must be no divisions among them, he would be treated with contempt. But should he work miracles before them, such as he wrought on earth, they would yield; and nothing else seems able to effect this much desired object.

Obj. 3. These gifts were designed to continue no longer than the time when the saints should all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledg of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. iv. 8—13.

Ans. Is the church come to this state yet? Who will dare affirm it? Never was there a time when she was more distant from it. She had not arrived at this happy state in the days of the apostles; for the several gifts enumerated by Paul were then extant, as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, miracles, etc. and such were exhorted by him (Rom. xii.) to be diligent in their several callings: If in the days of the apostles the church had not arrived at this perfect state, so as to have no more need of these gifts when, or at what period did she arrive at it? When had she no teachers, pastors, nor evangelists, nor any need of them? I answer without fear of contradiction; at no period from that day to the present. Yet she needs these gifts, and, therefore, is not perfect. From this passage some may have concluded, that there is no more need of preachers, or teachers, or evangelists; and, therefore, they ought not to be countenanced as such. Their argument is good, provided they prove that the church is perfect, and united: Till this be done it is light as air.

Obj. 4. But Paul says, miracles shall cease; "But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. But charity never failed." 1. Cor. xiii 8.

Ans. I ask, When shall these miracles cease? The apostles answers, "When that which is perfect is come." When that period shall come, there will be no necessity for them. But we have seen, that time has never yet come; nor can we expect it in this state of mortality.

Obj. 5. Impostors always pretend to work miracles to confirm their impositions.

Ans. Counterfeits cannot nullify that which is genuine, though they may excite suspicion. EDITOR.

Communicated: by Elder J. Baker.

THE Ohio Salt creek Christian Conference met May 30th 1835. A long list of ministers, deacons, and church elders is given, which, it is deemed unnecessary to publish.

The Conference agreed, hereafter to be called, The Ohio Salt Creek Christian Conference.

A query was proposed, How shall we receive members? Whether by the right hand of fellowship given previous to their baptism, or after their baptism? After deliberately investigating the subject, they came to this result. That repentance and baptism was the ordinary way; but lest the wheat should be plucked up with the tares, it was agreed that if any unbaptized person would profess to obey the gospel, according to the best of his knowledge and ability, he might be received and admonished to duty.

Between 250 and 300 have united with us since our last, and the prospect is yet good. There are above 900 in this section of country. The brethren here, like true yoke fellows, all speak the same thing.

There are some teachers occasionally passing through our churches, who are straining at gnats, and swallowing camels. Some of them are pleading for union with those, whom they acknowledge in great error; but they refuse fellowship with others who believe in repentance and baptism for remission of sins. While others, on the other extreme, refuse felloship to any not immersed.

REMARKS.

The scriptures will never keep together in union, and fellowship members not in the spirit of the scriptures, which spirit is love, peace, unity, forbearance, and cheerful obedience. This is the spirit of the great Head of the body. I blush for my fellows, who hold up the Bible as the bond of union yet make their opinions of it tests of fellowship; who plead for union of all christians; yet refuse fellowship with sueh as dissent from their notions. Vain men! Their zeal is not according to knowledge, nor is their spirit that of Christ. There is a day not far ahead which will declare it. Such antisectarian-sectarians are doing more mischief to the cause, and advancement of truth, the unity of christians, and the salvation of the world, than all the skeptics in the world. In fact, they make skeptics. Editor.

A query by Elder Joseph Baker of Ohio.

Godly sorrow has become one of the topics of the day, and is applied to regeneration. The proof for this sentiment is, 2. Cor. vii. 10. "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death." Now, I ask, Whether this verse is applied to the sinner or the church?

Ans. The references adduced by brother Baker plainly prove that the verse quoted by him, applies to the church. 1. Cor. v. 2. "And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you." 2. Cor. ii. 2. "For if I make you sorry, who is he that maketh me glad?" 2. Cor. vii. 8. "For though I made you sorry with a letter, I do not repent, though I did repent."—vs. 9. "Now I rejoice not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance; for ye were made sorry after a godly manner."

I agree with brother Baker that every genuine christian feels this sorrow, when the good cause is injured. Many other references might be made to establish the position, that the verse refered to in the query, is applied to the church, and not to the sinner. The church or temple of God at Corinth was defiled by an incestuous person, who was permitted to abide in it with all his filthiness, and was not put away from among them. When the apostle heard of this fact, he wrote the Corinthians a letter, in which he reproved them sharply for not putting this transgressor

from among them; for the temple of God was defiled by such conduct. By this letter, the church was brought to repentance, godly sorrow, and reformation.

In the old temple made by hands under the law, how particularly was it enjoined on the Priests, and Levites to keep it pure, and clean; not to let it be defiled by the entrance of any unclean person, or thing into it. If they acted up to the law, God dwelt there; but if they permitted the temple to be polluted, he forsook it. That temple was typical of the temple of God now, constituted and built up with living stones. If this temple be kept pure, God will dwell in it, and work in it; but if it be defiled by iniquity, he will forsake it. How careful should we be to purify, and keep pure, the church of the living God! Upon this depends the success of truth.

I have no doubt that similar repentance, and godly sorrow, which work reformation, are experienced by every sinner who is saved: for similar causes will produce similar effects. Editor.

[*From the Christian Herald.*]

FACTS ARE STUBERN THINGS.

Brother Badger,—The duty I owe to the cause of my redeemer, prompts me to lay before the public this communication. Perhaps I have neglected it too long. But I did not wish to be hasty in my conclusions. I have been interrogated frequently relative to my views on what I am about to communicate, but have refused giving them in any other way than through the medium of the *press*. The subject to which I refer is the doctrine of *baptism for the remission of sins*, as taught by *Mr. Campbell*.

This doctrine has its captivating charms, especially to the young unguarded mind; that is, when it is presented, (which is uniformily the case with its advocates,) *detached* or *separate* from the more glaring, or *absurd* doctrines peculiar to Mr. Campbell's theory. But on a careful examination, to me unanswerable objections arise against the doctrine of *baptism* for the remission of sins, as taught by Mr. Campbell when taken either as an *abstract* sentiment, or connected with the peculiar doctrines with which it should always be associated.

The following are a *few* of the *many* objections which arise against the doctrine, that *water baptism* is the only

instituted duty of God, in which the *sinner* can find remission of sins.

1. *It makes the ways of God unequal.* For if there is *no other* way in which God remits sins but in *baptism*, *He* has made it possible for some to be saved, while with *others* it is *literally impossible.* Some, yes, I may say *many* an humble penitent has been so situated, that it was utterly impossible for him to have the ordinance of baptism administered, and has *died without* being *baptized.* And hence, according to this strange sentiment, must be *lost!!* *This* objection, so far as I am acquainted, has never been obviated by the advocates of *water baptism* for the remission of sins.

2. *It stamps as spurious*, the many ten thousand experiences of all orders, and no orders of christians, who have lived and now live in our world, who *were not baptized for the remission of sins!!* And more than this, it *ridicules* and *tauntingly jeers* at *all christian experience*, except what is obtained in baptism. Hence, the *holy* of all sects are *unchristianized* by this modern system of salvation!! But should it be said that the *experience* of the virtuous of all orders is *genuine*, this would at once *destroy* the idea that baptism is the *only* means for the remission of sins. For if God has, since the day of Pentecost, ever remitted the sins of the *unregenerated* heart in any *other* way than in baptism, then it must follow that *baptism* was *not* instituted for the remission of sins.

3. *It makes baptism the door into the church*, and admits to christian fellowship those, and *none* but those who have been *baptized.* Therefore, according to this theory, a *more holy*, and higher estimate is placed on the *character* of that person who, but an *hour or two before* he was *baptized*, was one of the *vilest* of the *vile*, than on the character of one who has *long* been strictly pious and fully devoted to the cause of his Redeemer, but was never *baptized.* The *first* is owned as a *good brother* in the Lord; while the *second* is considered to be *in his sins*, because he has *not* been *baptized*, and must be baptized for the remission of his sins *before* he can be admitted to the table of the Lord!!

4. This doctrine represents *God*, *Christ*, and the *Holy Spirit*, as exercising no *power*, *influence* or *agency* whatever in the salvation of the sinner, only what is produced by *the word.* Yes, *the word* is *all* that reproves, enlightens and *forgives* the *sinner.* Finally, according to *this* theory, *the word*, or economy of grace, is nothing more nor less than a piece of *divine machinery*, which is worked at option, *solely* and *exclusively*, by *human* hands!! And the effect which it produces is always the same. The sinner must *believe*, *reform*, and submit to *baptism*, and all can be performed within *five* minutes, and he comes out not only a good *disciple*, but fully qualified to administer all the ordinances of the house of God.

5. The doctrine that baptism was instituted for the remission of sins, superceded the necessity of *prayer before* the forgiveness of sins. The *sinner* is not only taught the *old fashioned*, spiritual, deep and pungent conviction for sin, is all a delusion, but is told that he must not, like the publican, *pray* God to be merciful to him a sinner, *before his sins are forgiven!!* And of course, *after* his sins *are* remitted, *this* and all similar prayers are useless. Hence the numerous *precepts* and *examples* for the sinner to pray *before* his sins are remitted, are all set aside as useless, under this *new* theory of redemption!!

6. This doctrine makes the confirming or *glaring evidence* of the remission of sins to consist in the *act* of the *creature*, not in the pardoning mercy of *Him* who alone can forgive sins. Say for instance, that a sinner wishes to be freed from his sins, what must he do? This doctrine tells him that the forgiving ordinance is *baptism*; he must, therefore, be baptized for the remission of sins, and he shall be saved. The sinner is baptized, and calls for the *evidence* that his sins *are forgiven*, and what is the evidence this doctrine presents that this most sacred and important work is accomplished? It is *baptism!!* Hence in the great work of redemption from sin, *baptism* is the *all in all.* It is not only said that *baptism* is an ordinance *through* which sins are remitted, but *it is* called the *new birth*, or being *born again*, *regeneration* and *conversion*, and as we have before said, the *sealing evidence* that the *divine* work of forgiveness is wrought on the heart! The following interrogations, and their answers, will place this doctrine in its true light.—First, what must the sinner do to be saved? Be *baptized.* What are we to understand by the *new birth*, or being born again? *Baptism.* What is *regeneration* and *conversion?* *Baptism.* How shall one know that his sins are remitted, that he is born again, regenerated or converted? *By baptism.*

J. MARSH.

Milan, Dutches co. N. Y. Feb. 19, 1835.

REPLY.

BROTHER J. MARSH,—From my personal acquaintance with you, I am assured, you will not be offended with me

for making a few strictures on what you call your "stubborn facts." I do this to prevent disunion among brethren, who should be one, and to promote brotherly love. If I have any other object in view, or if my mind is influenced by any other motive, or if my pen moves for any other object, I am deceived. Not Mr. Campbell's doctrine, nor the doctrine of any uninspired man, do I presume to defend. To the doctrine of Christ, and of his apostles and prophets alone as divine, do I bow submission; and their doctrine will I hold, and defend, though it be received by a name more odious than *christian*.

My dear brother, you either do not understand brother Campbell's doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins; or you have given us a caricature of it. You represent him as saying, "that *water-baptism* is the only instituted duty of God, in which the sinner can find remission of sins. *Instituted duty of God.* By this expression I must understand you as using an ellipsis, and that you mean *the only instituted duty of man required by God.* Is this, my dear sir, brother Campbell's doctrine? I boldly and fearlessly say, no. This is a "stubborn fact." Does he not every where insist upon faith and repentence or reformation as indispensible to remission, and even to baptism itself? Has he, or any other in the same faith, ever asserted in public or private, by word, or writing, that 'water baptism is the ONLY instituted duty (required) of God, in which the sinner can find remission of sins?" You, my brother, are mistaken, and ought to disabuse the public mind by an honest confession, made as public as the charge. I would ask you, Is faith the *only* instituted duty required for the remission of sins? Is repentance the *only* instituted duty for remission? Or is prayer the *only* instituted duty required by God for remission? You will answer, no: they are all required. So we say, and with the plain scripture, we add, baptism.—Against the doctrine that "water *baptism* is the *only* instituted duty (required) of God for remission," you may well say, you have "unanswerable objections." I could add to your list scores of others equally unanswerable. If these are the views entertained in the east of brother Campbell's doctrine, I cease to wonder at the violent opposition against him there by those, whose labors are professedly devoted to the unity of christians. Were I in the same views, I should raise in the west my warning voice, though enfeebled by years, and zealously protest against the error.

1. Your first unanswerable objection is, that *it makes the ways of God unequal:* for if there is no other way, in which God remits sin, but baptism, he has made it *possible* for some to be saved, while with others, it is literally impossible, etc."

None of us ever plead that God cannot, and will not forgive the penitent sinner, who may be ignorant of his duty, or be in a situation where it would he impossible to do it. We indulge for these the best hope. All we contend for, is, that God has required faith, repentance, and baptism, in order to the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Now, I ask my brother, what other plan has the Lord instituted for remission under the Christian dispensation? Do you know of another? Have you among all your "unanswerable objections" given us one, taken from the New Testament dispensation? Can you find one there? Will you plead for faith *alone* as God's plan? The Saviors last commission to his disciples will frown on the doctrine; Peter on penticost, and James in his epistle, will contradict you. Paul condemns the idea of another gospel. Will you plead repentance *alone* as God's plan? or prayer alone? I am sure your intelligence will not permit you. What plan, then besides that we preach, have you received, and by what authority have you received it? The plainest truth in God's word has been objected to; and to a person, who [redacted] received for truth unscriptural dogmas, the objection will appear unanswerable; Why? because his objections flow not from the scriptures, but from preconceived opinions. I have no doubt that some advocates for baptism for remission, through ignorance, or misguided zeal, have exposed this doctrine to contempt, and rejection; and what truth has escaped similar treatment?

2. Your second *unanswerable objection*, is, that "*It stamps as spurious* the many ten thousand experiences of all orders of christians; who were not baptized for the remission of sins!!"

This we grant, on the supposition that baptism is the *only* instituted duty (required) by God for remission, without faith, repentance, and prayer. But none pleads this doctrine. You seem to be opposing an image of straw, made by yourself.

You farther say, "If God has since the day of penticost, ever remitted the sins of the *unregenerated* heart in any other way, than in baptism, then it must follow that baptism was not instituted for the remission of sins."

Your argument is very illogical. Had your conclusion been, *then it must follow that baptism is not the only way for the remission of sins*, it would have passed as good reasoning, the conclusion being included fairly in the premises. But this would not have answered your purpose. But can you,

my brother, from scripture, prove, that the sins of any *unregenerated heart* were ever remitted in any other way than by baptism since pentecost? You may believe it; but faith, in these days, is not always founded on scripture evidence. You may hope it; and so do we. We indulge as much charity for the unimmersed, as you can. We refer them to the mercy of a good God, who can wink at the errors of the ignorant; yet we honestly endeavor to convince them of their duty, not daring to preach another gospel, or plan, which he has not revealed.

3. Your third *unanswerable objection*, is, that "It makes baptism the door into the church, and admits to christian fellowship those and none but those, who have been baptized, and, therefore, etc."

Do, my brother, tell me what text of scripture contradicts this practice? What sect of Christians (the Quakers excepted) contradicts it? They all in their creeds teach baptism, or what they call baptism, to be the door into the church: they all, in their creeds deny fellowship to unbaptized persons; the greater part of them go beyond us in this matter; for they admit thousands into their church without faith, repentance, or prayer; I mean helpless infants. Why not make your unanswerable objection against all, for it is equally against us all; and had it been taken from the scriptures, it would truly have been as appalling as unanswerable. But no reference is made to that book by you; it wants its sanction, and, like the two former objections, with me is as light as air. I fear my brother has become so alarmed at the doctrine of baptism for remission, that you are on the eve of nullifying the ordinance, and of rejecting it as a useless institution, or of observing, or not observing it, as may suit the conveniency or inclination of the people. To obey God has always been unpopular, and to follow his word implicitly is displeasing to a sectarian spirit. If you admit into the church; and, into fellowship the unbaptized, where is your authority? If you find none in the scriptures, the act is null and void. Your works may be burnt, and your reward lost.

4. I proceed to your fourth *unanswerable objection*, "The doctrine represents God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, as exercising no *power*, *influence*, or *agency* whatever in the salvation of the sinner, only what is produced by the word. Yes, the word is all that reproves, enlightens, and *forgives* the sinner."

What! Does baptism for remission exclude all *agency* of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in forgiving a sinner!! Does the *word* forgive!!! It must be an awful doctrine,

of which these are the legitimate consequences. Never did I hear or think before of the word forgiving any, thus assuming the place of God, who alone forgives. But this your objection is probably against what you term, "The more glaring or *absurd* doctrines peculiar to Mr. Campbell's theory." If what you state be his doctrine, I pretend not to defend it. With equal abhorence with yourself I reject it. Some in their great zeal for the work of the spirit in salvation, keep the word in the back grounds as a dead letter, or useless lumber; others in their zeal to rescue the word from this degradation, raise it so high as to supersede the work of the spirit in salvation entirely. Each are extremes from the truth. You my brother appear to be falling back into the *orthodox* ranks, when you deny that the word can reprove or enlighten the sinner; this agency you attribute to the spirit. The conviction and enlightening of the sinner are then the agency of the spirit; and if this be not extended equally to every sinner, there must be divine partiality; and this is the foundation of Calvinism.—The scripture doctrine is, that we receive the spirit through faith.

You farther state the *absurd theory* of brother Campbell. "The sinner must *believe*, *reform*, and submit to baptism; and all can be performed within *five* minutes, and he comes out not only a good disciple, but fully qualified to administer all the ordinances of the house of God."

Brother Marsh, do you not believe with brother Campbell that "the sinner must *believe*, *reform*, and submit to baptism?" I know you do. But you and brother Campbell differ with regard to the length of time, which it takes in order to believe, reform, and be baptized. I ask you how long do you say it takes? Is it a year, a month, a week, a day, an hour, or half an hour? How long do the scriptures say, it takes? Not a year, not a month, not a week, not a day, as pentecost declares; the jailor; the eunuch etc.; the precise number of hours or minutes is not stated; I ask you again, when you have stated the terms of salvation to sinners, how long a time do you allow them to believe, reform, and be baptized? Will you allow them a month, or a day, or an hour? If you do, and death should intervene the next half hour, what is the end of that sinner? and who is accessary to his damnation? I would not give them as many as *five* minutes; but with holy, inspired Paul, say, "NOW is the accepted time." I am not ashamed of this gospel, though called by you *absurd*. To what a length from truth, will prejudice drive even a good man!—What follows in the last quotation I pretend not to defend. *Judæus appella credat, non ego.*

6. Your sixth unanswerable objection is too lengthy for quotation, the reader is refered to it in your piece. Your remarks in this objection have been already principally considered, as representing the remission of sins in the act of the creature in being baptized, and not in the pardoning mercy of him, who alone forgives sins; baptism the forgiving ordinance; is the evidence of his sins forgiven (without any internal evidence I suppose you mean.) "In the great work of redemption from sin, *baptism* is the *all in all*." In all this you mean baptism alone, without faith, without repentance, without the blood of Christ, is with brother Campbell *the all in all* in the redemption from sin!! Indeed, brother Marsh, you have weakened your cause by imputing such absurdities to a man, or set of men, so incredible, so unheard of, and (if it did not sound harsh in the ears of a brother I would say) so *absurd*. I assure you, what you have said in the conclusion I view as speculations, unprofitable, and injurious. I receive them not, nor do I condemn those as unworthy of fellowship who do receive them. May the Lord direct our minds into the truth as it is in Jesus; and may we always be filled with the spirit!

Editor.

Queries proposed by brother D. B. Bills of Tennessee.

1. WHAT is the sin of the world the Lamb of God takes away?

Ans. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from *all sin*;" He was made an offering for *sin*, not *sins*. The word *sin*, like *righteousness*, has often a plural signification.

2. Does not a christian, in marrying an infidel wife, either bring her into the church with himself, or put himself out by such conduct? For, "He that is joined to a harlot is one body." 1 Cor. vi. 16.

Ans. The union of husband, and wife is not of that nature as to induct either of them into the church, or to exclude from it. As of old, so yet, many infidel husband have faithful believing wives, and *vice versa*. We have no account in the New Testament of one rejected for the infidelity of the other; or of one received for the righteousness of the other. The scriptures certainly oppose such an amalgamation of believers with unbelievers.

3. Who is the owner of the two witnesses, Rev. 11.?

Ans. The query appears to be more curious than profitable. I will say, that whoever may be the person, to whom the pronoun *my* refers, is, in the language of the querist, the *owner*.

4. What are we to understand by a person's washing his garment in the blood of the Lamb? Rev. vi.

Ans. The robes of the saints are the garments of salvation, and praise, and of righteousness, and humility. Isai lxxi. 10. These robes are emphatically called "The righteousness of saints. "Rev. xix. 8. To wash these robes in the blood of the Lamb, is a highly figurative expression, meaning nothing more, than that obedient believers are washed from sin; and sanctified by the blood of Christ, and being humble and holy, they are represented as clothed with humility, salvation, righteousness, and praise. These graces are represented by white robes, made so by the blood of the Lamb.

5. If the robes washed were the imputed righteousness of Christ, would not the idea be held forth, that Christ's righteousness had to be washed to make it white?

Ans. Yes.

6. If immersion be regeneration, and the washing mentioned in Tit. iii. 5, be immersion, where would be the impropriety of saying, that God saves by the immersion of immersion, or by the regeneration of regeneration?

Ans. Immersion is no where in the Bible called regeneration. I consider it an unhappy phraseology, taken from the fathers of the early ages. As it is an unscriptural phrase, offensive to many brethren, ought it not to be abandoned, especially by those, who profess to use a pure speech, and glory in the language of the Holy Spirit in the scriptures? The impropriety of this expression appears from the latter part of the query.

7. Is there no difference between the washing of regeneration, and regeneration itself? Please be pointed.

Ans. This query is answered by defining, according to scripture, the two expressions. *The washing of regeneration*, is, literally, the bath (*loutron*) of regeneration. A *loutron* or bath, is a vessel or basin to wash in, whether it be natural or artificial. It is an observation of the learned, that almost all Greek nouns ending in *tron*, denote instruments. See Park: on the word *loutron*. Josephus, in one place, represents the water contained in the basin by the word *loutron*. Speaking of the hot and cold springs of water near the castle of Macherus, which being mixed, says he, make a most agreeable bath (*loutron*. See Park. in verbo.) Whether we take the word *loutron* to denote a vessel or basin, or whether the water contained in it, it is plain, it does not signify washing, but simply, a place to wash or

bathe in. The same word occurs Eph. v. 25. "That he might sanctify, and cleanse it with the (*loutron*) of water by the word." The observations above are here applicable. The word *loutron*, is derived from *louo*, "Which, says Doc. Parkhurst, is derived from the Hebrew *luotz* to absord, as the water doth what is *plunged* into it." He farther says, that grammarians remark a difference between *louein*, and *niptein*, translated to wash; that *louein* is spoken of the *whole body*, *plunein* of *garments* and *clothes*, and *niptein* of the hands. If this be correct, then the bath, or the water in the bath, is that into which the whole body is plunged, through which simple means God has ordained that the penitent believer shall be sanctified, cleansed, saved, regenerated, and made partaker of the Holy Spirit. See Eph. v. 26. Tit. iii. 5. John iii. 5. Acts ii. 38, 39 xxii. 16, etc.

I will now endeavor to define regeneration, (*peliggenesia.*) It signifies *to be born again.* The word occurs but twice in the New Testament. Matt. xix. 28. Tit. iii. 5.—That in Matthew is, "And Jesus said, Verily I say unto you That ye who have followed me, in the *regeneration*, when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Here are several particulars worthy of attention. To whom did the Savior speak? To the twelve apostles, who had followed him. What did he promise them? That they should sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. They were appointed to be kings under Christ the kng of kings. Luke xxii. 29, 30 "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table (this is the high privilege and honor of sub-kings, and rulers, to eat and drink at the table of their emperor, or great king) and sit upon thrones, (as kings) judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The word *judging*, from *krino*, signifies when followed by an accusative, to rule, or regulate. The connexion confirms this idea; for it is evident, they were kings, sitting on thrones, and therefore were to rule, govern, and regulate the whole kingdom or church of God, represented by the twelve tribes of Israel, by giving them laws, received by inspiration from the king of kings. The judges in Israel were of old called, governors and rulers. But when shall this promise be fulfilled to the apostles? It is answered, "In the regeneration, or, when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory. Then, at this period of time, the promise to the apostles shallbe fulfilled.

Let us now inquire, when did this time commence. It

was when Christ was raised from the dead. Acts ii. 29, 30, 31. "Therefore being a prophet (i. e. David) and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh; he would *raise up* Christ to set on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ.—Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." After God had raised up his son from the dead, then the son sat down on his throne; then he was made, and crowned Lord of all.—Then a new era commenced, called the *regeneration;* so called, because the great work of regenerating, the world under Messiah had commenced; the old Jewish world or age had passed away, with its covenant, priesthood, and liturgy. All things had become new, and if any man be in Christ, he himself is a new creature.

Tit. iii. 5, shall next employ our attention, in defining regeneration. "Not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." I have already shewn, that the bath of regeneration denotes the means through which we receive the promise of the Spirit; through which we receive the promise of the remission of our sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, or the renewing of the Holy Spirit.

Now we are prepared to give a direct answer to the query, "Is there no difference between the washing (*bath*) fo regeneration, and regeneration itself?"—Yes: There is the same difference, as there is between the means, and the end.

Editor.

Jacksonville, July 11, 1835.

BROTHER STONE, Please publish in the next Messenger the following notice:

Received and for sale at the Clerk's office, Jacksonville, Ill., a supply of Hymn books, *newest selection;* New Testaments, *new version;* Christianity Restored, a new work designed to put every christian in possession of "The principles and rules" by which the the Living Oracles may be intelligibly and certainly interpreted; and Begg on the prophecies. Those wishing to have them would do well to call soon.—Apply to D. P. HENDERSON, at the Clerks office, or to me.

H. A. CYSUS.

NOTICE.

POSTMASTERS wil greatly oblige me by returning to me all the 2nd and 7th numbers of the present vol. of C. Messenger, which have been sent to subscribers, but not taken out of post offices by them. I lack these numbers, and greatly need them. Editor.

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY.—*Leesburgh*, J. Wasson, B. Coppage, R. Colburn, S. Linginfelter, Doc. Thornton for vol. 9. *Millersburg*, Eld. J. Irwin $5,00 for 9. *Dry Creek*, J. G. Ellis for self, A. Dickey, A. Culberson, W. G. Ellis, I. Terrill of Petersburgh, W. Masters, J. Masters, S. Masters, P. Masters, J. B. Trowbridge of Florence, for 9. *Newcastle*, M. Smith $1 25, Maj. Brinker, Mrs. Herndon 9, and P. M. $1 75 for 9.
INDIANA.—*Bloomington*, T. Nesbit, C. Kearn, J. & J. Mather, D. Batterton, S. Seall for 9; M. Hall, Doc. Roach for 9; N. Byers $1 25 for 8; W. Moberly, 75 cents for 8; R. Hamilton and another for vol. 5! *West Lebanon*, E. Purviance, W. Pugh, D. Hall, L. Cranckhite, W. Wyland, for 9.
OHIO.—*Chillicothe*, Elder J. Baker 8, 9. *Troy*, C. Ohlevine, B. Wharton, J. Harter, J. Peck, Eliza Byram for 9; *Greenfield*, E. Byram for 9; *Cincinnati*, N. Stewart, D. Trowbridge by J. G. Ellis for 9.
TENNESSEE.—*Isoms Store*, G. Cathey $5 00 in full for 9.
MASSACHUSETTS.—*Boston*, Brother Vimes for 8 and 9.
ILLENOIS.—*Jacksonville*, J. Morton, J. Huffaker, Sen. B. Humphrey, J. Conover, M. Huffaker, J. Jones, P. Hedenburgh, R. Sappington all for 9. *Rochester*, G. Baker, J. Baker, A. Richards, E. Williams, J. Williams for 9. *Montebello*, A. H. Holden 9. *Winchester*, I. Rowan 7, 8, 9; Mr. Minor 9; Mr. Clark 9; L. Harlan for self & J. McLaughlin 9.
PENSYLVANIA.—*Waterford*, A. Smith for vol. 6.
MISSOURI.—*Columbia*, M. P. Wills, A. Stone, W. Hughs, T. Conyers, R. Graham, S. Bedford, W. S. Burch, for 9.—*Springfield*, C. Allen, W. Crisp, J. N. Sloan, Mr. Bullock, Mr. Hendricks for 9. *Friuts*, J. Love 8, 9. *Whetstone* J. T. Dillard, B. Collins, I. Peyton 9. *Millersburgh*, A. Miller, S. Bruner, W. O. Turley 9. *Jones' Tanyard*, W. Mosby 9. *Union*, J. K. Rule for W. Rogers E. C. Rule, J. McIntyer, P. Hawn, C. S. Jeffros, T. Buckner, J. North, F. Pearl, P. Miller, P. Walls, all for 9. *Palmyra*, E. Ballenger for self, B. Bayle, F. Suddath, W. C. Darr, G. Banks, F. Turpin, W. J. Jones, J. Allen, G. Parker, N. Marksberry for 9.

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. SEPTEMBER, 1835 [No. 9.

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.

For the Christian Messenger.

PRACTICAL REFORMATION, No. 6.

IN military tacticks, those who aspire to victory, always guard well the most vulnerable points. Just so must the christian soldier do, if ever he conquer those evils which must be subdued before he can be an inhabitant of heaven. To be apprised of those points, and guard them well, should be the constant concern of those who fight under the captain of salvation; for in so doing only will victory be certain, and salvation sure.

I will now occupy a little space in attempting to show the danger of sinning through the use of the tongue. This little member must be subject to a severe discipline or sin against God, and submission to the devil will be the necessary consequence. "If any man among you" says James, "seems to be religious, and bridles not his tongue, but deceives his own heart, this man's religion is vain." The same Apostle says "If any man offend not in word (by speaking) the same is a perfect man & able also to bridle the whole body." Here we are informed, that if one avoid evil speaking the same is a perfect man, the very consumation of all the benign operations of christianity upon the human soul, and gains strength to bridle the whole body, bringing

R