number, or $1 25, at the end of five months, and if not paid then, $1 50 will be required. None will be permitted to discontinue, unless at the discretion of the editor, until arrearages be paid. Let each subscriber be particular in naming the office to which he wishes the paper sent. Any person obtaining five subscribers and becoming responsible for the same, shall have one copy for so doing.

☞ Postage on this work will be one cent per number under 100 miles; one and a half over that distance.

All letters must be post-paid, addressed to

C. F. R. SHEHANE, *Jefferson, Jackson co. Ga.*

September 5, 1835.

RECEIPTS FROM LAST NUMBER TO JULY 30th.

KENTUCKY.—*Maysville,* R. Rickett for Wm. Corwine, Wm. Holton, Wm. Rowsee, S. January, J. Funk for vol. 9. *Graysville,* J. Boone for J. Grubbs 9; Mary Meriwether for 9 and 10; for J. Rothwell of Clarksville Tenn. 9, Mrs. Shipp of Hopkinsville 9. *Cerulean Spring,* Wm. Wilkinson for A Thompson 9. *Brownsboro'* B. Allen 9.

OHIO.—*Greenfield,* E. Byram 9. *Mayfield,* N. Francis 9.

ALABAMA.—*Montgomery,* J. Davis in full for 9, $7 00.—*Flintmills,* J. Randolph 9. *Brownsboro'* J. Lewis, J. Kiser, Wm. Daniel, T. Griffin 9. *Springfield,* A. Lea, H. Lea, Alf. Lea, Job Kea 9. *Walker C. H.,* E. Randolph for Wm. Billingslys Jeptha Billingsly, J. Williams, A. H. Rackley, D. Murphey for 9, J. Billingsly 8, 9, E. Randolph 75 cts. for 9.

ILLINOIS.—*Springfield,* A. Meacham and J. Johnson 9.—*Berlin,* P. Poindexter 9, Wm. Grant 6, 7, 8. *Rushville,* Bro. Cyrus for H. Johnson; A. Smith, John Doyle 9. *Bennington,* Joel Decamp 9. *Naples,* J. Shelly. *Franklin* Wm. Woods, *Jacksonville,* E. Mallory, J. McIntyre 9.

MISSOURI.—*Liberty,* J. Kurkandall for J. Thompson, W. Thompson J. Everett, G. Wills 9. *Lexington,* J. Bounds for self R. Bett, T. Mulky, Wm. Fine for 9, D. Young, 7, 8, 9, G. Marquis 7, 8, 9. *Palmyra,* Bro. Cyrus for W. Lewis, P. Alverson for 9. *Hannibal,* D. Dunlap, W. Darr, Doc. McCoy 9 Jos. Conway, Js. R. Garnet each for 6 nos. of 9.—*Quincy,* Bro. Riggs for A. Chase $2 25 for 8, 9. *Lawrenceville,* S. Lemons 9. *Bloomington,* G. & R. Carlock for 8, 9, Wm. Major 9, and $1 00 for 9 one not named, J. Benson for Gospel Advocate.

MICHIGAN.—*Springarbor,* Wm. Smith $2 00 for 9, Eld. J. Wolworth 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. OCTOBER, 1835. [No. 10.

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.

MAURY COUNTY, TENN. June 30th, 1835.

BROTHER STONE:—For four or five years past, I have read your writings: and from them have received much instruction. The manner in which the Messenger is conducted, and the spirit in which you write, is calculated to gain the esteem of any person, that is not shrouded in midnight darkness, or blinded by sectarian bigotry. But notwithstanding I have derived so much information from your paper, yet on one subject you have always left me in the dark, (viz:) on Baptism for the remission of sins. I have had it in contemplation to write you on that subject; but my want of education, and my obscure situation, have hitherto prevented me. But the more I think on the subject, the more my difficulties increase; therefore I am determined to open my mind to you, hoping at the same time that you will not pass me unnoticed.

You appear to me to be as able an advocate for New Testament principles, as any person I have read, particularly, on the doctrine of faith, repentance, and baptism, as taught by Peter, on the day of Pentecost. Though for this you are much opposed, and persecuted by what is called orthodoxy. Every quibble and false criticism, is made use of by them, in order to invalidate these heavenly truths; yet

like a faithful sentinel, you are always at your post, and ready to defend the cause of your Redeemer. When they say a man, is justified by faith alone, you arise with an arm as powerful as Sampson, and tell them it is an unauthorized supplement that they are adding to the words of the Holy Spirit. When they say baptism is legally and lawfully administered either by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, you are prepared, by your knowledge of the original Greek, to show the world the fallacy of such an argument; and also to show that baptism means immersion alone. When it is said by your opponents that immersion is a nonessential, you are qualified by your knowledge of the Oracles of God, to refute the opinion; and you do in a masterly manner, show to them, and to the world what the scripture says on the subject, that in connection with faith, and reformation, it is for the remission of sins—it is for salvation—it is for the answer of a good conscience, and that in this way the obedient receive the spirit of God.

But your opponent says to you, you make baptism essential to salvation, and that, no person can be saved without baptism. From this sentiment you revolt, and say I never taught any such a thing, for, says brother Stone, if I never enjoyed christian experience, and remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit before baptism, I have never enjoyed them at all; and you further say, I should be shut up in desperation. I must acknowledge that this is a dark place—how baptism can be for remission to others, and not to you, seems to me, to be one of the mysteries of the present age. You are frequently writing against the disunion, and division of professors of christianity, and urge the necessity of union and fellowship among the followers of Jesus; and as an argument in favor of this idea, you bring forward the prayer of our Savior recorded in the 17th chapter of John—you bring forward St. Paul's argument in favor of union, viz: One Lord, one faith, and one baptism. But if the blessings of remission, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, can be enjoyed without baptism, by you or any other person, then it seems to me that all your exhortations to obedience, all your arguments in favor of baptism, are useless; and that baptism is truly a nonessential; for if you have enjoyed the blessings, you say you have enjoyed, God being no respecter of persons, for my life I cannot see, why other people cannot obtain remission and the gift of the Spirit without baptism as well as brother Stone. If I understand you, you do not believe that baptism for remission was for the Jews, and that the Gentiles were justified by faith alone; but that the gospel is the power of God unto

salvation to all them that believe, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. You believe that Jesus Christ is a Prince and a Savior to Jew and Gentile, that by one spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have all been made to drink into one spirit. If so I cannot see by what authority you, or any other person under the expanse of heaven, have any right to dispense with any of the commandments of Jesus Christ; or by what authority you can attach more efficacy to one of the commandments of Jesus, than to another.

You say that there are two salvations to be enjoyed, one in this life, the other in the world to come, and that by faith, repentance, and baptism, the obedient receives or enjoys the present salvation; now I will ask, is not the present salvation essential in order to the enjoyment of the future salvation? If not, then I will say, religion is a whim, a mere notion, a dream. You say that baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience, (the seeking of a good conscience,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This I believe as firmly as I believe any proposition contained in the scripture. Now if immersion be baptism, as you have proven in the most incontestible manner, how can a person have a good conscience without submitting to immersion? and how can a person enjoy the future salvation without a good conscience? I am very much surprised to hear a man of your knowledge in religious matters, say, you would be shut up in despair, if you did not believe you were a christian, before you were baptized. Does not this say at once, that a man may be a christian without a good conscience? which I think you do not believe.

I sometimes try to teach people the way to heaven and eternal life. I tell them that Jesus said "He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved;" and, in the language of Peter say: repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. But then I am met with your argument by the people, they say to me, I have made a profession of religion many years ago, and have received the remission of my sins, and the Holy Spirit without baptism; therefore, it is nonessential. Now brother, I must acknowledge that they are more consistent than you. You say it is essential; yet that remission may be had without it. Suppose I was to say, remission can be obtained without faith, or without repentance, you would charge me with an unwarrantable assumption, and I should be guilty too; but I have as much right to do so, as any person to dispense with baptism. I

am bound to believe the scripture, to the exclusion of every notion of man. I cannot compromise away the laws of heaven, I cannot, I dare not, whittle down the gospel of Jesus to suit the notions, and whims of rebellious man.—Jesus Christ, did not do it, his Apostles did not do it. The gospel of Jesus is the foundation of my religion, and if the foundation be destroyed, what will the righteous do? In consequence of obedience to the gospel I have become a son of God, and have received the spirit of his Son in my heart, yes, the spirit of adoption, whereby I am enabled to cry abba Father; and if a son, then an heir, an heir of God, and a joint [heir] with the Lord Jesus Christ, in consequence of my faith and obedience to the Son of God. I expect a blessed immortality beyond this vale of tears—I expect to participate in the felicities of a never ending eternity. Say that a man may enjoy these privileges without obedience, and all my hopes are blasted; I am like a man standing upon a pillar of smoke; I find no resting place for the weary pilgrim, but in the promises of my Savior: and these are as firm and as unshaken as the pillars of heaven.

Dear Brother, I want you to answer these lines, though badly written, and if you think them worthy of a place in the Messenger, you are at liberty to publish them, being subject to correction by you. I can assure you that these lines are not written to you out of any vain curiosity, but to satisfy one, whose mind is ardently engaged in the pursuit of truth.

I am your brother in hope of eternal life,

WILL. S. GOOCH.

REPLY TO BROTHER GOOCH.

Dear Brother:—On the subject of baptism we have been induced to write so often, and so much to satisfy enquirers, that I deem it unnecessary to reiterate the arguments already used. But well knowing that many in the "Far West" and South, have not enjoyed the same privileges as others, I will again endeavor to satisfy you and them, on the particular topics introduced by you in your letter to me.

We are agreed on the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins, and for the gift of the Holy Spirit. That this is the plan of heaven we all admit. We all agree that when a penitent, reforming believer is baptized, he does receive the remission of his sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, For God is faithful who has promised.

Your *Opinion*, deduced from this truth, is, that no unimmersed person, however penitent or believing, can be saved, or have his sins remitted, or can receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. You deny present and future salvation to all that have not been immersed; for you say: "How can a person have a good conscience without submitting to immersion? and how can a person enjoy the future salvation without a good conscience?" You farther remark: "Say that a man may enjoy these privileges without obedience (immersion) and all my hopes are blasted. I am like a man standing on a pillar of smoke."

These are your opinions—*opinions* I call them, and am happy in the thought, that they are not Bible-truth. You have indeed carried this doctrine to the extreme, as far as any of our bitterest opposers have ever imputed to us, and farther than the most zealous among us have ever dared. Though we agree in the doctrine of baptism for remission, I dissent from your opinion. Did I believe as you do, then I must of necessity conclude that my former experience was a delusion—That I never was pardoned, or had my sins remitted—that I had never received the Spirit—that I never loved God, his service, nor his people. Were I convinced of this, I should be shut up in desperation, for I have received nothing new in experimental religion since I was immersed, unless it be the satisfaction received since I complied with what I was convinced was my duty. For this expression you, with others have blamed me. To exculpate myself I will now fully state my reasons.

1st. Before I was immersed, I saw myself a sinner, and that the very seat of sin was in my heart. In my great distress I honestly sought the Lord, endeavored to reform, and obey, as far as I was instructed by my teachers. After a long struggle against corruption, I found myself unable to conquer it. I a helpless sinner, submitted to the Lord, believing that he alone could save me—in him I trusted, and by him was sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise—I was as conscious of love to God, and to his people, and to his ways, as I was of my own existence; and this not as a blazing meteor, but of growing continuance. It was by this Spirit I believed I was a son of God. I knew I loved God, *because* I loved the brethren—and I knew I loved the brethren, *because* I loved God, and this love of God led me to keep all his commandments. Had I then known that it was the will of God I should be immersed, I would with all readiness, and humility of soul have submitted.—Now, if it be proved that this is not christian experience—that a person may have all this, and yet not have the

Spirit, have not remission of sin, neither present, nor future salvation—that it is all delusion—prove this from scriptures, and then scepticism and despair must succeed.

I, with the millions of the fairest christian characters on earth, would be doomed to hell forever; why? Because we had not been immersed; and *this* we did not have done, because we were ignorant of it as a duty! Had I such views of God's character, I could not serve him with cordial love.

To soften the hard features of this most uncharitable opinion, some say, They do not deny that such shall be eternally saved and enjoy eternal life; but that they are not saved, or do not receive remission of sins in time, till they are immersed. This you condemd as well as myself; but on different principles. Jesus says, that, "If you die in your sins, where God is you cannot come." Now as all the unimmersed have never been washed from their sins, or have never received remission, or present salvation, then it follows, they never can enter heaven hereafter, where God is. Purgatory will not do—for they must die before they go there; and if they die in their sins, their fate is forever fixed.

2d. Another reason why I dissent from your opinion, is, that you leave no room for mercy to those, who do not know, understand, and perform every command required by God. On this principle you would condemn the Apostles themselves. God commanded them to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. They did not understand the command, and for ten years they did not obey it —that is, they did not preach the gospel to the Gentiles till Peter was expressly sent to Cornelius. Were they guilty? Had any one of them died before the command was understood, and obeyed, would he have been excluded from heaven? Their prejudice prevented them from understanding it. Yet did not God bless them abundantly with his Holy Spirit, and fellowship, while they were living in disobedience every day—every hour? How many pious, holy people are there who are ignorant of the command, "Be immersed," and consequently do not understand, nor obey it. Shall we say, God will not bless them—that he cannot do it, because they live in disobedience? Then say, He could not bless the Apostles in their disobedience; and thus contradict a matter of fact. Had the Apostles understood the command, and then have neglected to obey it, they would have been guilty, nor would God have blessed them. So, if any understand the command of God to be immersed, and yet disobey, they are guilty, nor will they be blessed by Him.

For "he that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Similar cases I might introduce; but this is deemed sufficient.

3d. Another reason for rejecting your opinion, is, because they who profess this doctrine are no better than those condemned by them. We see no more fruits of the Spirit in them—no more holiness in their lives—no more humility, and self denial. If all others besides themselves are deceived, are yet in their sins, surely we should expect they would shine pre-eminently bright, and conspicuous as lights in the world. But alas! is this true? Do we not see as much conformity to the world manifested—as much pride—as much injustice—as much avarice? In spite of us the retort will be made; "Physician heal thyself." Talk no more of being washed from your sins by immersion, when we see you living in sin; and many of you living on the gains of oppressing the poor African. O for true and universal reformation in heart and in life among all the professors of christianity! And when we are reformed, let us then labor to reform our brethren; till this be done we labor in vain. This want we impute not to precious truth we believe and teach.

4th. Another reason why I dissent from your opinion, is, that it has produced a flood of opposition against this precious truth, which we labor to teach the world, and has steeled the breasts of our brethren of all denominations against us. Had we taught the truth in the meekness of wisdom, a hundred fold more would have received it; but by teaching for this doctrine our uncharitable opinions of theirs, has driven them off. By zeal not tempered with meekness, knowledge, and charity, the mischief has been done; and if persisted in the mischief will be increased.

The young and unexperienced are generally foremost, and seem to concentrate religion in immersion and weekly communion—christian experience is nothing without these —if it should be regarded at all. Yet without it, religion is not worth a straw. Experience is a scriptural test of true religion. "Hereby we know that we love God, because we love the brethren, and hereby we know that we love the brethren, because we love God and keep his commandments." This is the current idea of the scriptures. Let this truth be overlooked, and death must be the consequence.

I might introduce other reasons of my dissent, but desist. I have written plainly, if not convincingly. The whole matter is submittted to you, and the public. If it shall

produce the effect of softening your censure of my course, I shall be glad; if not sorrow must be my lot. Your old brother, and fellow laborer in the gospel,

EDITOR.

P. S. I have just received a letter on this subject from our pious, and worthy brother, and fellow laborer in the gospel, Richard Blythe McCorkle, brother of Saml. Montgomery McCorkle, whose numerous essays are seen in the "Millennial Harbinger." I do not agree with him in all the sentiments he has advanced; but on some of his ideas we are unanimous. I will subjoin the letter, in the hope, that it may be profitable in relieving your mind and the mind of others from difficulty. To the queries in his letter I will attend, if not anticipated by others.

P. S. The letter and queries shall appear in the next number. Editor.

LIBERTY, IA. July 21st, 1835.

BROTHER STONE:—We are glad to hear from you through your paper. I wish you still to wield that mighty weapon Truth—gospel Truth, fearless of Calvinism, or Arminianism, or Campbellism, Newlightism, or any other *ism*, that raises its impious head. O Father Stone I wish you great strength and grace in your declining years, that you may triumphantly declare with the Apostle, previous to your departure, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, and kept the faith," etc.

Your brethren in this country are living in love, and are standing fast in the Lord. We, who proclaim the word are endeavoring to do it honestly, and in the love of it. Sectarians are beginning to tolerate us; they say, they think us good men, but under the influence of error. We are striving to live in peace with all men.

Some of our brethren, a little east of this, are very warm in their opposition to what they call Campbellism; they are, we think, doing the christian cause an injury. Where they are thus warmly opposing, sectarians say, thus we knew it would be with them, having no creed to govern, they must come to nought. Some of our elder brethren are thus engaged. O brother Stone, try once more to make peace through the medium of the Messenger. These brethren taught us the doctrine, (when we were children,) which we now teach. They now oppose it, and are certainly engaged

to build again the things, which they destroyed, which is Calvinism, Arminianism, etc. Some of the brethren who call themselves disciples we belive are also wrong; they are too independent. I have thought from their preaching, that some of them feel themselves independent of God or man. They breathe the very spirit of war, and they succeed so far that they get a great many people to hate them, (and it is indeed hard for even a good man to love them,) and they call it opposition to the truth. But I believe it is a good deal like we hate tigers and rattle snakes, because they are so ill natured—they love nobody, and nobody loves them. I believe that by a real manifestation of love, and good will, mingled with gospel truth, we can be instrumental in doing more good in the cause of the Lord, (if we are not so methodical,) than by all the systematical crossness that the ingenuity of man can invent.

We have comfortable seasons here, with a little ingathering. A few are turning to the Lord. We have concluded not to quarrel, but to try and live in love and peace with all the children of our Father. I would to God all our brethren would do likewise, then we should be better prepared to glorify our Father in Heaven.

Brother Stone, there is one thing which we wish to enquire of you, and wish an answer through the Messenger—it is in relation to a little hymn book that has made its appearance among us, entitled "The Disciples' Hymn Book," bearing the name of "B. W. Stone, A. Campbell, Walter Scott, and J. T. Johnson." What we object to, is, the title of the book. By this some think that A. Campbell wishes to affix the name Disciple to the great body of christians in the west; and to be assisted by you. We believe here that the name christian is the only appropriate name for the members of Christ's church. Brother Stone we want an answer, we shall expect one. We believe your goodness, and candor will not suffer you silently to neglect us, as did brother Badger your letters to him.

I close this communication by wishing you and yours health and prosperity. May we so live that we may meet in our Father's kingdom above, where sorrow and affliction are known no more.

Your Brother in hope of immortality,

THOMAS CARR.

TO BARTON W. STONE.

ANSWER TO BRO. THOMAS CARR'S LETTER.

My Dear Brother: For your kind wishes I feel thankful, and do heartily respond amen to them. I am glad to hear that in your section my brethren are living in love, and standing fast in the Lord. How greatly should I rejoice to receive such intelligence from every church! In this the glory of religion appears—this disarms opposition—this conquers rebellion. This is evident from the effects among you; for you say, that opposing sects begin to tolerate you, and think you are good men.

I have lamented, and do lament the state of some of our old brethren a little to the east of you, who have become so very warm in their opposition to what they call Campbellism. I really fear they are more warm and zealous in this, than they are against sin, and more engaged to destroy Campbellites than to save sinners. Do they, like the Savior, weep over sinners, and make strong cries and supplication to Him that is able to save? Do you hear of the fruits of their labors against Campbellism, that many sinners are turning to the Lord, and that Campbellites are returning from the error of their ways? Are not sinners hardened against the truth by such procedure? By it, are they not driven to the awful gulph of infidelity and scepticism? And are Campbellites themselves profited? Are they not rather disgusted, and offended; and if in error, become more confirmed in it? No wonder sectarians deride our profession, and tauntingly jeer us for want of a human creed. But have their creeds kept them in peace and unity? Let facts answer the question. Have not their creeds broken and divided them ever since their introduction? And have not the human creeds of the brethren a little east of you, broken the peace, and caused the division of the churches there? Creeds!—Creeds!—we have no creed but the Bible, they will tell you. And will the Bible break the peace of christians, and cause divisions? Who will dare to say it, and thus blaspheme the book designed by its author to promote peace, love and unity among christians? For years we have labored to convince the world that the Bible is the only foundation of the church, and not human creeds, which are only opinions of bible truth systematized. These brethren have through mistake substituted their opinions of bible-truth, (which are their creeds,) for the truth itself. Thus they are building up what they once destroyed, and by their creeds, and opinions, measuring the orthodoxy, and religion of their brethren. But do the Campbellites differ from them

more widely than do the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists? No. Why then do they not equally exert themselves against these sects? Shall the persecuted become persecutors? The history of ages to the present time, answers, yes.

You say, "Some of the brethren, who call themselves *Disciples*, we believe are also wrong." Of this I entertain no doubt. I fear, while some of them are zealously opposing a sectarian spirit, they suspect not themselves of being in the same spirit—while they are thundering against creeds, they may have formed a theory of notions, which they may consider infallible truth, and by which they may measure the religion of others, and denounce them as anti-christians, and Babylonians. Would to God, we could feel, and see others feel, more of the bowels of Christ, to weep over sinners, and such as were in error. This temper would banish that spirit of war, and harshness, of which you complain, and which is too prevalent in the world.—This spirit would beget love, and not hatred. The same argument delivered by two men may produce contrary effects—one man delivers it in meekness and love; it produces a good effect—the other delivers it in harshness and war, and the effect is bad.

You entreat me to try to make peace. This I have labored to do; and will still labor, while there remains any hope. But it is hard to convince men of error, who are determined to abide in it.

You insist upon an answer from me respecting a Hymn Book, entitled "The Disciples' Hymn Book," having my name, with those of Campbell, Scott, and Johnson, affixed to it. I will explain the matter. It had been agreed among us all to print a Hymn book in conjunction, in order to consolidate the union happily begun among us. It was proposed that we should meet together at some central point to prepare the book. While brother Johnson and myself were waiting in readiness to attend when informed *where*, and *when*, brother Scott having gone to Virginia, met with brother Campbell there; and they agreed to make the selection of Hymns themselves alone, and print them, and send us the proof-sheets into Kentucky for our correction. The first form was sent, having the title, "The Disciples' Hymn Book," with all our names affixed. As soon as bro. Johnson and myself saw the title of the book, and the prefaces, we determined to have nothing to do with it, and immediately wrote to brother Campbell our determination. We received from him an answer that the first form of 6,000 sheets were printed off, and that it could not be eas-

ly altered. Brother Johnson and myself prevailed on brother Fleming to go to brother Campbell's in Virginia, and to bear our instructions to him, that if he would erase the title, and substitute another; and if he would remove the prefaces, and insert certain hymns in our former Hymn book, our names might stand. Brother Campbell said it would spoil the book to remove the prefaces, but that he would alter the title. It was agreed that he should go on with the printing of the book. He did alter the title of those issued from his office, except what had been previously sent to brother Scott in Ohio. Brother Scott issued his without alteration; his reason for doing so I have not learned. But the last editions have excluded that title. In that book I never had any pecuniary interest, nor have I yet any interest in it, except the pleasure, in common with my brethren, derived from its use. My reason for having no pecuniary interest in it, is, because I had met with considerable losses, and was unable to bear my part of the expense. I have been thus particular in order to satisfy your mind, and the mind of many others respecting this matter. Among us there is a perfect good understanding.

I am sorry that dear brethren among us seem to prefer the names *Disciple*, and *Reformer*, to the name *Christian*.—I am confident, it will do us an injury. It keeps up a distinction which ought not to exist among us.

Grace, mercy, and peace be with you,

EDITOR.

From the Cumberland Presbyterian.

Is it right for the clergy to engage in secular pursuits?—To this question the conduct of the ministry in this state gives an affirmative answer—the church being nigh swallowed up of the world, sanctions the practice, and unless some friendly voice from a distance shall warn our clergy of their fatal error (as I conceive it to be) I fear that the time is not far distant when there will not be left in Mississippi a single individual *wholly* given to the work of the ministry.

Be assured, Sir, that by engagement in secular concerns here—I allude particularly to planting—is totally different from what you have been accustomed to in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri. Here, a young man, without any capital, with the assistance of his friend's name, buys a plantation with from 20 to 50 hands, and calculates to make the property pay for itself: of course such hard driving as

is necessary to effect this object, leaves but little time for preaching the gospel. Here in every thing, we do a driving business. We go in for making a fortune in a few years. And when our ministers engage in the business of the world it is not a *living* they are after—that they know they can easily obtain from the people to whom they preach. No! they must have a *fortune* and that *soon*. And then, Oh! what an amount of good they are going to do with it! How many copies of the Bible shall be multiplied!—sabbath schools established!—tracts distributed!—foreign missions supported!—and even the *poor* shall have the gospel preached to them. But the fortune is to be made first, and then

"How excellent that life *they ne'er will lead.*"

And in making this fortune many of them find a grave in company with multitudes of their fellow mortals to whom they ought to have preached the gospel. And in many cases the wealth which some of the fortunate (shall I not say unfortunate?) have acquired is scattered to the wind.

Were I now upon my dying bed, and the question was put to me "What in this solemn moment, do you consider to be the greatest hindrance to the progress of vital piety in the Mississippi." I should unhesitatingly answer A SECULAR CLERGY! And had I but one moment left to breathe a prayer for the prosperity of Zion, that prayer should be couched in the following words. Oh Lord! in infinite mercy to thy feeble and scattered churches in this state, be pleased speedily to remove from among us—every secular Minister—every individual, who, while professing to be a minister of Christ, makes the accumulation of property his principal object.

ATONEMENT.

Extract from an essay on this subject by the Rev. Edward B. Hall.

There is a connection, not only between the death of Christ and man, but likewise and much more, between the death of Christ and God. They believe that this death had an influence upon God, a relation to the nature of his attributes, or the principles and measures of his moral government, totally distinct and different from the influence or relation of any other event that has ever taken place, or any other truth or feature of christianity. This we consider as involving the chief, if not the only point, now at issue;

and we intend to keep it distinctly in view. There is no dispute as to the necessity of Christ's death, none as to the fact of his dying for sin, none as to the exceeding importance ascribed to the fact in the scriptures. none as to its vital influence on the salvation of man. These we all believe, and our brethren are uninformed or unjust when they accuse us of rejecting or slighting them. There is no division of Christians into those who believe and those who do not believe in the atonement. The division is into those on the one hand, who believe this sacrifice was necessary *to make God able or willing to forgive man*, and those on the other hand, who believe it was necessary *to make man fit to be forgiven*. This is the distinction, and this the controversy. We may not have expressed it in language to which all will assent. Perhaps that cannot be done in a single sentence, but we will endeavor to explain it impartially, if we may be indulged in some repetition. It is worth some pains to make it clear and fair, for we believe, that multitudes do not understand what the actual question is; and that if they did understand it, they would see that scripture and reason are not altogether on what is now the popular side. While we mean to charge nothing upon others, which they do not believe, we mean, if we can, to place what they do believe in a light that will show its true character and tendency.

And here it is proper to define a few terms which we have just used, and may have occasion to use often. The term *satisfaction* refers to a supposed demand, on the part of God, of the *full* and exact penalty annexed to transgression. His justice must be satisfied, and can only be satisfied by the sufferings of the transgressor or a substitute. That this satisfaction may be rendered, that the transgressor, if penitent, may be released from this penalty and all his sins remitted, a substitute is provided and accepted in the person of Jesus Christ, who suffers and dies *in the place* of sinners,—and that is *substitution* or *vicarious* suffering. By many this substitution has been regarded as literal and full; denoting the true *imputation* of our sins to Christ, and the imputation of his righteousness to us. All the benefits of this satisfaction, substitution and imputation, were formerly restricted to the *elect*, by most of those who held them at all; and that is called the *limited* atonement. This doctrine has probably very few adherents at present, the blessings purchased by Christ's death being now considered as universal, and the limited scheme designated often, by Calvinists themselves, as the *commercial* atonement, implying a literal bargain, debt and transfer. These terms

mark the different systems that have been raised on this doctine. We do not stop to examine those systems, because the terms themselves, as we have said, are seldom used now because their literal application is expressly disowned, and because the most important principle which they involve will be fully considered as we proceed. That principle is the same which we have just defined; viz, the necessity of the atonement to affect *God*, and enable him to forgive the penitent. While other peculiarities in the systems referred to, have been renounced or greatly softened, this is retained, and it is all-important that it be understood.

We are now prepared to state the precise difference between what is called the orthodox doctrine of atonement and what we regard as the scriptural doctrine.

The common doctrine is the following. God has promulgated laws, with the penalty of death to the transgressor. Man transgresses those laws. He must suffer the penalty. He must die, or another whom God accepts, must die in his stead, or the majesty of divine government is prostrated. The transgressor may repent. But his repentance cannot wipe out the sins of the past. To remit them on repentance alone, would make God's laws impotent, and his justice a mockery; it would 'fill the earth with anarchy, and turn it into a hell." Here, therefore, there is an obstacle to the free pardon of sin, in the very nature of God and his laws. That obstacle can be removed only by an infinite expiation or sacrifice for sin. Christ, an infinite being offers himself as this sacrifice, and is accepted. He dies in the place of sinners, and through his blood, and that alone, they may be forgiven and saved. He gives himself "as a propitiation, or as that which renders it consistent with justice, that God should be propitious to sinners." Through the merits of Christ's death. mercy is offered to the sinner. He must repent and obey, but repentance and obedience are in no sense the ground of his justification. Nothing but such a sin offering could make it just or safe to pardon the sinner, whatever his subsequent disposition or present character. Christ died not merely to convince and convert men, but to render it *consistent* and *safe* to forgive men when they are convinced and converted. This constituted its necessity, this is its efficacy and glory.

Such is the generally received doctrine of atonement. We will next give our own view of the true doctrine.

We believe sin to be the great and only obstacle to forgiveness and salvation. That obstacle is insurmountable

so long as it exists. It can be removed only by its own destruction. Christ lived and died to destroy it. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." "He came to save his people from their *sins*." "God sent him to bless us, in turning away every one of us from his *iniquities*." This is the design of the gospel dispensation,—of the mission, teaching, examples, miracles, sufferings, death, ressurrection and ascension of Christ,—to bring men into a state of *reconciliation* with God. Atonement is reconciliation. And a state of reconciliation is a state of submission, faith, repentance and obedience. This state, this spiritual condition, all God's threatenings and promises, all his revelations and dealings, especially his free gift of a Savior, are designed to produce. If they do produce it in any soul, if they bring a sinner to obey God, the purpose for which Christ came is answered upon that man, for he is saved from sin; he is forgiven through the grace of God in Jesus Christ. If he is not brought into submission and obedience, but continues in sin, he is not forgiven, and no grace or sacrifice will avail him anything; if he is not saved from sin he is not saved at all, Sin, we repeat, is the only obstacle, and the necessity and purpose of the mediation of Christ is to save man from sin. We do not declare, that it can have no other purpose or efficacy. But there is nothing to embolden us to say it *must* have some other efficacy. The only efficacy of which we are confident, is a moral efficacy. We see nothing in the character or laws of God, nothing in the interests of his kingdom, nothing in reason, nature or scripture, to prevent his forgiving sin, when sin is repented of and forsaken. If there be any one thing, for which the truth and justice, as well as mercy of God, are pledged, it is the forgiveness of the penitent and submissive. We are sure, therefore, that whenever and by whatever means the death of Christ humbles and converts the soul, or *saves from sin*, its design is answered. The existence of sin constituted its necessity, the removal of sin constitutes its glory. "Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us *from all iniquity*, and purify to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." (Titus ii. 14.)

These we believe to be the views of the two parties to this controversy. To show them in a single sentence; It is believed, on the one hand, that God could not forgive sin freely on repentance, and that the death of Christ was necessary to enable him to do so consistently with the honor of his character and the safety of his kingdom. It is believed on the other hand, that God can forgive sin on repentance, that he has promised always to do so, and that the death of Christ was necessary to bring men to repentance, that they might be forgiven.

Remarks on the above article.

We think the writer of the above remarks on atonement has shewn clearly the two systems on that doctrine as now received by all christians. It is plain there is no difference among them on the influence of the death of Christ on man. In this they all agree, being plainly taught by the scriptures. But when any teach, that God was influenced by the death of Christ to forgive and save the sinner, others oppose this as not taught in the scripture. This is the point of contest and division among christians.

In order to remove this unprofitable and injurious controversy, I would propose, that we all teach this doctrine, and speak of it in the language of scripture, none affirming that God was influenced by Christ's death to forgive and save the sinner, and none denying it. To affirm it we cannot be clearly supported by scripture; to deny it we cannot be positive.

Till this course be pursued by us all, the controversy can never cease. Editor.

From the 'Christian Advocate and Journal' the leading paper of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

INTOLERANCE.

A spirit of intolerance is incompatible with the spirit of Christianity. Nothing but sin should excite the abhorrence of the Christian; and hence an excellent authority has said, "Be ashamed of nothing but sin." He who would proscribe another, or denounce him as unchristian, because he differs from him in opinion, or practises different from him in matters of indifference, is guilty of intolerance. He abridges him, as far as he can, of his inalienable rights and evinces the same spirit of persecution which kindled the fires and invented the tortures of martyrdom. Give him the power, and he will exhibit all the atributes of a tyrant—a pope—a persecutor. In regard to all these things, we mean mere matters of opinion or usages of an indifferent character as it respects their morality or im-

morality, the man who says, "*I will*—and *you shall*," evinces the veriest essence of the tyrant—and shows that if he had his adversary in his power, he would crush him by any means.

This is the spirit of intolerance against which Christianity so strongly remonstrates. And therefore he who makes mere matters of opinion a bar to Christian fellowship, evinces the spirit of persecution, betrays a want of the very religion for which he contends with so much zeal, and gives evidence of a weak judgment, or a wicked heart, or both. What! shall we who live in the nineteenth century undertake to revive the spirit of the sixteenth, and utter the anathemas of Heaven against all those who exercise the right of thinking and acting for themselves on mere matters of an indifferent character?—Is *this* zeal of *God?* Is this *Christian* zeal? No indeed! It is the fire of purgatory. And however much we may flatter ourselves that we are "doing God service" by employing this sort of zeal in behalf of little, nonessential things, we do but deceive our own hearts, and manifest the same spirit of proscription which first burned in the pagan's heart against Christianity, and then distinguished and disgraced a fallen Church in her conduct towards those who would reform her.

* * * * * * *

We care not where this spirit of intolerance exhibits itself, whether among the several sectarists towards each other, or among the several members of any one sect, or yet among all the sectarists toward Jews, Mahommedans, and Infidels--it is alike diabolical and anti christian—itnever yet converted one sinner to God—never saved one erratic brother from his wanderings—nor reclaimed a heretic "from the error of his ways." On the contrary it has filled the Church with darkness and confusion, built racks and gibbets, and kindled fires for heretics, drove many a sceptic into open infidelity, and peopled the regions of despair with reprobates.

It is an exhibition of unsanctified human nature wherever it is found, whether among pagans, Jews, or professing Christians—whether among Catholics or Protestants; or whether among the several sects of Protestants in their conduct towards each other—or lastly, among members of the same sect in regard to minor matters in which they may happen to dissent from each other. It *sanctions coercion.* It deprives another, as far as it can, of his imprescriptible rights. It is dictatorial in its tones. Its language is, "I *will,* and you *shall.*" It is, in a word, the intolerance of the dark ages, whitewashed and refined, so as

to make it chime with the improvements of the times—limited indeed in its operations by that impotency which arises from legal impediments and the restraints of public opinion.

It follows most inevitably that in the same proportion as this spirit of intolerance prevails is the spirit of true religion circumscribed; and also that the heart which feels its influence is not guided and prompted by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, but is exposed to the withering rebuke which he addressed to his erring disciples when they wanted to call *down fire from heaven to consume their adversaries.* "Ye know not what spirit ye are of." How many are there even now to whom such a rebuke might be appropriately applied?

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

We are truly glad to copy such an article from such a high and respectable paper as the Advocate. Such principles should fill a part of every religious periodical on earth. The results would be glorious. May the Methodists attend to this instruction of their organ at New York!

EDITOR.

PERIODICAL RELIGION.—There is a religion which is too sincere for hypocricy, but too transient to be profitable; too superficial to reach the heart, too unproductive to proceed from it. It is slight, but not false. It has discernment enough to distinguish sin, but not firmness enough to oppose it; compunction sufficient to soften the heart, but not vigor sufficient to reform it. It laments when it does wrong, and performs all the functions of repentance of sin, except forsaking it. It has every thing of devotion except the stability, and gives every thing to Religion except the heart. This is a religion of times, events and circumstances; it is brought into play by accidents, and dwindles away with the occasion which called it out. Festivals and fasts, which occur but seldom, are much observed—and it is to be feared, *because* they occur but seldom; while the great festival which comes every week, comes too often to be so respectfully treated. The piety of these poeple comes out much in sickness, but is apt to retreat again as recovery approaches. If they die, they are placed by their admirers in the saint's calender; if they recover, they go back into the world they have renounced, and again suspend their amendments as often as death suspends his blows.—*Hannah More.*

THE SUPPORT OF THE MINISTRY.

To the Elders, Preachers, and private Brethren of the Christian Society.

BRETHREN:—Will you permit one, who is your friend—who wishes you success in your labors of love—who watches your course with interest—and is desirous of seeing you all that your name imports, to address a few words of counsel and advice to you. The writer has seen many years, he has taken an active part in England and America, in the spread of what he deems to be the truth; and though now nearly laid aside from all exertion, by reason of age and manifold infirmities; yet he has not lost his love for truth, nor his desire that it should win its way in the world till all nations are brought to feel its power, rejoice in its blessings, and adore its great Author.

As an observer of the conduct of christians, I think I discover an error in principle and practice, in almost all societies. It is this—That it is the duty of Elders and Preachers *alone* to use exertions for the diffusion of the Gospel in the world. This arises from the too prevalent distinction of the church *into Clergy and Laity*.—From the beginning it was not so. One consequence of this notion, is, that the great body of christians esteem it *their* duty to *hear* Gospel, and the duty of the *Clergy to preach it*. And if they are able to do any thing towards the support of the Clergyman, *without particular inconvenience to themselves*, they admit its propriety; if otherwise, they do not feel it necessary to make any great sacrifice on this account; as the preaching etc. will go on without their aid.

Now this I consider is a radical mistake; and it has contributed in no small degree to check the progress of the Gospel, and to mar the affection and harmony which ought to subsist in the churches of Christ.

If the New Testament is to be our guide, we shall find that churches were instituted by Christ, as the depositories of his Gospel—for the confirmation and edification of his disciples—and for the conversion of sinners. Mark, *the churches* of Christ, not *the ministers* of Christ. The duty belongs to *the churches; ministers* are the *agents* whom *they employ*. Let my readers look into the New Testament and examine whether this remark is just. To whom did the Apostles address their Epistles, to *the Elders* of the churches, or to the *churches themselves?* With the exception of one or two letters, addressed to *extraordinary* persons, they are all directed to churches. See an address to the church of Rome, (Rom. xii. 1—8.) in which you will find

that all the members are addressed *as one body*, and are called upon to exert the talents they possess for the good of the whole. But the churches of Christ, if imbued with the spirit of their master, cannot be indifferent to those who are ignorant of, and neglect the Gospel. Hence they are directed, (Phil. ii. 15, 16,) "to be blameless and harmless, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation," and to "*shine as lights in the world; holding forth the word of life.*" How are they to do this?—Not merely by exemplifying its spirit and precepts; but by proclaiming *the word of life* to others. Mark, it is *the church* that is to do this; through the *agents* whom God appoints. Again, when addressing the church of the Thessalonians, the Apostle says, (i. 8,) "For from *you* sounded out *the word of the Lord*, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad." So we see that what in modern times is considered as the duty of ministers, was in Apostolic times the duty of the churches. But it will be asked "are all christians to become preachers—have all talents capable of edifying the church or of arresting the ungodly?" Certainly not. But there are always *some* among the churches of the saints, to whom God has given talents for both these objects, These talents ought to be called into exercise by the church. But if *they employ* any of their number to officiate for *their* edification, or for the conversion of the world; *they will feel it to be* THEIR *duty to support them in this office.* For as Paul says, "who goeth a warfare at his own charges! Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? Or, who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock. After some other strong remarks on the support of preachers, he concludes in these words, "*Even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.*" (1 Cor. ix. 7--14.) This ordination of the Lord is expressed in these words. "For the laborer is worthy of his hire. Luke x. 7. Again, Paul says, "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, *their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things.*" Rom. xv. 27. Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." Gal vi. 6. Again, "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, (very liberal support,) especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." 1 Tim. v. 17. What conclusions, brethren, follow from these remarks? 1. That it is the duty of the church of Christ to promote the spread of the Gospel. 2. That for this purpose they should call out as many of their brethren as are qualified by the great head of the church for this object, and are willing to devote themselves to this

service. 3. That those whom they thus employ, they should support; not on the smallest pittance possible, but in the same liberal, comfortable and respectable manner as they themselves wish to be supported. 4. That if any sacrifices are to be made, they must be made by the church as a body, not exclusively by the individual whom they appoint to this office. 5. That if any chris ian brother refuses to give according to his ability, and the nesessities of those who labor among them; he is acting inconsistently not only with his duty as a christian, but with the principles of moral honesty and justice; for who thinks of calling in a physician, or employing a lawyer, without compensating them for their services?

But I need say no more; for I am persuaded that the manner in which the Elders and Preachers of the Christian Society have been neglected, and suffered to make almost the whole of the sacrifice necessary for the spread the Gospel, has arisen, more from a want of consideration, than from a covetous disposition.

In the hope that these hints will be read with attention and candor, I subscribe myself, brethren your friend,

PRESBUTEROS.

January 17, 1835.

ALWAYS AFTER THE TIME.—There is a large class of persons to whom this applies. to all such we commend the following sensible remarks from the Christian Observer:

"What right have I to cause a number of men whom I have engaged to meet at a particular hour, not only to waste their time, but to become impatient and fretful by my delay? I rob them of what I never can restore—the precious hours thus worse than wasted—I set a pernicious example—I betray an important trust—I tantalize with the sensibilities of those whom I am bound to respect, and cut off a portion of their usefulness. In an Individual case, the loss which I have occasioned may be small, but in the aggregate amount exceeds belief."

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

On the first Lord's day of August, 7 were added to the church at Lick Creek, Morgan county, Ill. On the same day 2 were added to the church in Jersey Prairie—and 2 at Middle Fork of Mauvaisterre, and on South Mauvais-

terre 4 more. On the 2nd Lord's day at Riggsville 6 were baptized, and on Lord's day following at Cleary's grove 3 more.

TO THE AGENTS AND PATRONS OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER:

To many of you, who have in good time remitted to me money due for the Messenger, are tendered my sincere and cordial thanks. I am sorry that I cannot do the same to all. I impute the failure to *another time will do as well.* and not to want of moral honesty. Let the cause be what it may, the failure has involved me in serious difficulties. I have for some time past, almost been determined to desist from the work of publishing the Messenger any longer, and to spend the few years I may yet have to live, in some other way to promote the good cause so happily begun among us. I would slowly move among the churches in the west, and persuade them to continue in the grace of God, and exhort the ungodly to turn to God and live. But this I well know cannot be done in the present state of things. So rivetted are the prejudices of the people generally among us against supporting preachers by pecuniary aid, that they are obliged to engage in some secular employment to support themselves and families. My age would appear to dissuade from such a course, but the trouble and fatigue would be willingly borne.—I am physically unable to labor on a farm for a living. Yet this must be the only alternative if I desist from publishing the Messenger, for which I have gotten a little aid, but not a sufficiency to remunerate my labor.

I have come to the determination to continue the work longer, provided my patrons and friends shall encourage it. If they shall will that it live, and continue its monthly courses as for years past, they will signify it by obtaining for it a liberal subscription, and send it on to me at Jacksonville, Ill. on or before the first of December—that I may have time to prepare materials for the work. In many of the states, no bill under 5 dollars is current; it is therefore impracticable to transmit us money under that amount. To many post offices we have sent but one or two numbers in a packet to a subscriber. For this payment cannot be made. We request such subscribers to increase the number to five at least, and then we can send in hope.

We earnestly request our old patrons, who may discontinue at the end of the year, to signify it to us as soon as they can, at farthest against 15th of December. Let this

be done without cost to me. Their post masters will do it. I humbly and earnestly request all who are delinquent to remit me their dues as soon as practicable. The terms for the Messenger are as usual. B. W. Stone.

RECEIPTS FROM LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY. *Everetts*, A Henderson for M Boyd, John Wilson, Thomas Oliver, G F Hendrickson for vol. 9, and A Thompson for 7. *Paris*, Hugh Brent for 9.
INDIANA. *Bloomington*, by G W Hardin for T Nisbit, C Kean, J and J Mathers, D Batterton, S Seall, M Hall, Doc. Roach, Wm. Shields 1.25 and B R Byers for 9, N Byers 1.25 for 8, R Hamilton for 6, Wm. Moberly 75 cts. for 8. Ben. Kenton 75 cts. balance for 8, H Armstrong for 4, and one not named 6th. *West Lebanon*, E Purviance, W Pugh, D Hall, L Crankite, W Ryland for 9. *Liberty*, T Carr, J Mulford, J Plummer for 9. *Jacksonburgh*, Elder Samuel Boyd for 7, 8, and 9. *Mt. Vernon*, Aaron Baker 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 vols. in full.
OHIO. *Mansfield*, Elder J McVey 2 copies of 8, for Mr. Pearce 8. *Greenville*, J Carnahan, E Carnahan, Mary Potter, A Scribner, Wm. Earhart for 9, David Potter for 9. *New Paris*, L Purviance for D Purviance, J Adams, Johnson and Fleming, W Jameson, J G Jomeson, J McCown, J Whitman, J Thomson, Mr. Pauley, L Davis 9th. *Lebanon*, J Foote for Sibbitt 4, 5, Js. Dunham, John Dunham, Joshua Dunham for 9, John Maple 8.
TENNESSEE, A Kindrick 8, 9. *Purdy*, Jo. Matthews 9.
MISSOURI, *Montecello*, E Ballenger for S Reddish, R Reddish, S Coffman, N Richardson, Thos. Moore for 9. *Florida*, H Thomas for S Stice, R Cave, G W Moberly, and for *Paris*, G M Buckner, S H Smith.
ILLINOIS. *Manchester*, Mrs. McEver for volume 9. *Jacksonville*, C Smedley, A Foreman 9, A Foreman for Gos. Ad. 1.25, Newman York, Thos. Taylor for 9, Js. Green 7, 8, 9 vols.
Rushville, J Toncray, J Tyers 9, John Brown, agent, 5.00, Thos. Haydon for vol. 9. *Lewistown*, Samuel Boughman 9. *Salt Creek*, Hughs Bowles, M Hall, D Hall, A Hall, H Hall, A Bowles, Jo. Bowles, W Bowles, Lucy Shugart, H Dotson for 9. *Springfield*, T Constant, J Constant, A Groves, J Reddin, Thos. Jones, W P Grimsley.
MISSISSIPPI. *Port Gibson*, Bro. Williams for 9.
MARYLAND. *Hyattstown*, Josi Wolf 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. NOVM., 1835. [No. 11.

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.

FROM THE BOSTON RECORDER.

PREACHING.

Preach—the Preaching that I bid thee.—JONAH, 3: 2.

What business had he to preach any thing else? Certainly, if a man of veracity, he could not preach any thing else *as a message from God.*

But might he not add his own opinions, in his own name? Certainly he could, without being guilty of falsehood.—But how would it have sounded? What impression would the mixture have made? Suppose him to have gone to Nineveh, and preached, "Thus saith the Lord, yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be destroyed—and *I think*—so and so." Give ear, O ye people of Nineveh, to the Lord and me. The Lord saith that in forty days this city shall be destroyed; and I can prove, on philosophical principles, that there is no impossibility in it."—"Thus saith the Lord: yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be destroyed. And thus saith Jonah: The message which the Lord has sent by me is not incredible; for there are numerous and warlike nations within forty days' march of Nineveh, who may come upon the city with one consent, and pull down its walls, and burn its palaces with fire. Whether your destruction will be effected in this way, is a matter of opinion. It may be