Brethren Jno. T. Jones, P. G. Young, Thos. W: Sweet, John Rigdon, H. D. Palmer, James A. Lindsay, William H. Strong, William Tichenor, and the Clerk were appointed to draft a Circular to present to the meeting, which was accordingly done and approved.

Brethren D. B. Hill, John T. Jones, and B. W. Stone were appointed to correspond with Brethren in other States, and procure assistance at our adjourned meeting.

The meeting then adjourned to meet in Jacksonsonville, on Friday before the 3d Lord's Day in Sept. 1841.

Attest, H. D. PALMER, Mod'r.
D. PAT. HENDERSON, Clerk.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

We are blessed at the present with a precious revival in Jacksonville, Ill: and the neighborhood. We have attended a meeting here for a week, and to this time, there are between 20 and 30 accessions. In Lynnville, a neighboring village, there are between 30 and 40 added to the church within a short time. In Antioch between 10 and 15.—The work seems but beginning. We hope for more glorious seasons. We greatly need preachers, gospel, spiritual preachers. Lord, grant us many of such characters!

Bro. J. T. Johnson, and J: A. Gano write cheering news from Ky, at a recent meeting in Georgetown were 27 additions—at Nicholasville 53—at Lexington 120—at Dry Run 23. Bro. J. Hawes of Eminence Ill, writes, that about 50 have been baptized in that neighborhood, by bro: Walter Bowles.

EDITOR.

GENERAL AGENTS for the Christian Messenger—Elder T. M. Allen of Columbia, and Eld Jacob Creath of Monticello, Mo. Eld. P. E. Harris of Rockville, Ia. Elder J. A. Gano of Centerville, Ky. Charles Gilliam of Jacksonville, Ill. R. Compton, p m of Mt Healthy, Ohio.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

DECEMBER, 1840.

REVIEW OF LETTERS,

FIRST AND SECOND.

DEAR BROTHER CAMPBELL—

I have finished the four Nos. on the atonement which I at first designed to publish. I now proceed to notice your objections and arguments against my views in the order in which they are written. I shall commence with our first and second letters, and shall always quote from the Messenger in order to avoid confusion.

1st. In the very commencement of your first letter to me, I was started indeed. You say, "I most cordially concur in opinion with those brethren, who have persuaded you, that your fears were groundless, or would never be realized, concerning the discussion of those points, which you called for, under date of your letter of Nov. 11, 1839, published page 21 of the current volume." Did I, brother Campbell, ever call upon you for a discussion of those points? I never seriously thought of such a thing till yourself suggested it, and publicly invited me to it. You have certainly mistaken me; for such an idea cannot be found in the letter alluded to above, as you will see by re-examining it. I wish to remove from the minds of our readers the idea of vanity and fondness for debate, as attaching to my character, now when I am on

the verge of the grave. Those things commonly attach to youth, and doatage.

2nd. On page 9—You have made a number of assertions respecting the death of Christ, which would require volumes to attempt to prove, and as many to defend. 1st "That the death of Christ is interwoven with all the designs of the universe—2d. that Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the moral dominions of God–3: That its power is the mainspring of all heavenly impulses—4, That it is itself the consummation of all wisdom and prudence—5, That the deep and high counsels of God issue in this mysterious fact, and emanate from it, as all earthly waters arise from the ocean and descend to it."

Whence my brother got all this information, I cannot conceive; certainly not from the divine revelations we have received. They are too high for my limitted intellect to grasp, and too deep to fathom. How do we know "all the designs of the universe?" Countless millions of them may exist in the infinite mind never yet developed, and may not be for endless ages to come. How then can we know that the death of Christ is interwoven with them all? How little do we know with certainty of his revealed designs in our little speck of creation! How can my brother say, that Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the moral dominions of God? Can we measure the full extent of those dominions, and know all the mysteries in them, to enable us to make the comparison? How can we know that the power of the death of Christ is the *mainspring* of all heavenly impulses? Is it the mainspring to move God to be propitious to men? Is it the mainspring that moved God to create angels and worlds? Is it the mainspring to move angels to worship their maker? Can we safely say, "that it is the consummation of all wisdom and prudence?" The *ultimatum*—the very end of wisdom, that can rise no higher, and progress

no farther? My dear brother, humility becomes us, poor, little, ignorant things. Often in your answers to my essays, you kindly apologize for me. I am bound to reciprocate the kindness. Your mind has been called to so many subjects of importance, that you have neglected to examine this old relict of your faith received by tradition of your fathers, and therefore have unguardedly expressed it. I cannot for a moment think, that you, by this speculation, designed to forestall the sentiments of our readers.

3d. On page 13—You apologize for my misapprehension and misquotation of an expression in your 'Christian System,' pages 48 and 49, which I quoted in my first No. I cannot see that I have either misapprehended or misquoted you; but am glad to hear you disavow the sentiment I apprehended from the expression. The words in your Christian System are—"In bringing many souls to glory, it sooths and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." My quotation is, "the death of Christ sooths and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." Your quotation of it is, "the death of Christ in bringing many sons to glory, sooths and delights" &c. If there be a misquotation of your Christian System, which of us are guilty? It may be, you quoted from 1st Edition; mine is from the 2nd. Yours cannot be from the second Edition. Yet I cannot conceive how you couldbe so started at my quotation, that every sin wounds the affection of our heavenly Father, and that the death of Christ sooths and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenenly Father, when you so strenuously contend that his death *propitiates* him. I can see no difference of ideas in the expressions. Your language is strange, and might lead your less informed readers to conclude, that the Father's wounds were soothed and healed by blood. Many such yet devoutly sing

"Ich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
That calmed his frowning face,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne
And turned his wrath to grace.

I know you spurn the ideas, stated in this language; yet I cannot see how you can avow expressions conveying the same idea, as that the blood of Christ propitiates.

REVIEW OF LETTER II.

4. The burden of my second letter, is, to prove that the verb *kaphar*, translated to make an atonement, sinifies to purge or cleanse, and that this was the design of sin-offering. This sentiment you do not deny nor oppose *directly;* for truly our translators, and Paul, the commentator of Moses, have set this matter beyond dispute, or fair debate, as I have shown in Letter I I.

5. I will also state another idea, which may have escaped the penetrating mind of my brother. It is this that the Hebrew word *kaphar* is an active transative verb, and according to all grammatical rules, must have an object, upon which the action passes. Now, this object cannot be God, for *kaphar* the active verb signifies to cleanse; this action of cleansing cannot pass on the object God, for he is undefiled, and needs no purification. For the same reason, the action of cleansing cannot pass on the holy law, nor on the government of God, because they are pure like their author: When, therefore, we so frequently find this expression, "He shall take a lamb, or goat, and make an atonement for his sin"--we should read it, He shall cleanse [himself [not God] for or on account of his sin; the object of the action *cleanse* being plainly understood. Until his sin be purged or cleansed the political union between the defiled sinner, and his God and the congregation

is broken; but when he is purified, the union, or at-one-ment is restored between them.

6. The same ideas hold good with respect to the word reconciliation. It is translated from the same word *kaphar*, and therefore signifies the same as at-one-ment; and the ideas just stated as attaching to at-one-ment, equally attach to reconciliation. They are one, and not that at-one-ment is the cause of reconciliation, and reconciliation the effect of at-one-ment, as my brother asserts, and thinks that in this I agree with him. I am sorry to disagree with a dear brother, but in this I am obliged to dissent. Nor can I conceive how you took up the idea of my believing that reconciliation was the effect of atonement, when throughout the 2d letter I was laboring to establish the idea that they were one. You must have gotten the idea from the quotation I made from Calmet page 15, to show that atonement meant at-one-ment--In the quotation are these words, "By whom we have received the at-one-ment, or means of reconciliation." I quoted this, not as approving the divinity, but for establishing the meaning of a word.

7. The same ideas contained in 5th and 6th items, also apply to propitiation. Its scriptural meaning is purification. With this my brother accords, page 24, when he says, "Propitiation or *purification* is also an effect of atonement. So we find it applies to God Ezek: xvi: 53. "When I am propitiated (*Exhilaskesthai* common version, pacified] to you for all that you have done, saith the Lord. So prayed the publican—"God be merciful to me a sinner." Hence we find the word *hilasmos* twice in the first epistle of John, applies to Christ's blood--*the propitiation [purification] for our sins;* Messiah, as foretold by Daniel will make propitiation [purification] for iniquity."

8, How you can make propitiation and purification the same, and to be the effect of atonement, I cannot see; and still it is more strange, that

you should say that these apply to God, and adduce Ezek. xvi 53, as proof, Upon your own definition of propitiation as meaning purification, it evidently follows that the effect of atonement is to purify God himself. I do not impute to you the idea, but to your language. My brother must know that the word *exhilaskesthai*, which you have quoted from the Septuagint, is the very word, by which uniformly they translate the Hebrew *kaphar*, and which our translators have rendered to make atonement to reconcile, and cleanse, Num. 35 33. &c. properly, to cleanse or cover, which are active transitive verbs.

9. God is represented by the Psalmist as "a Sun and a shield." The natural sun shines invariably, and unchangeably the same, and gives light, life and comfort to all creatures on earth. A dark cloud intervenes, and obstructs the enlightening, warming, and quickening rays of the sun from us. But this cloud has no effect on the sun—he still unchangeably pours forth his undiminished rays of light and heat; but the cloud obstructs them from us—they cannot penetrate it, and as long as that cloud remains we are cut off from all influence of the sun, and must be miserable. So God is a sun, and shines invariably and unchangeably the same, for the light, life and comfort of all holy beings. But our sins as a thick cloud have risen between us and our God, and obstructed the rays of light, life and comfort from flowing to us, and in this miserable situation we must remain forever, while that cloud of sin remains. Whatever removes this cloud, removes the separation between us and our God, and takes away the obstruction of his divine rays of light, life and comfort and restores them to us again. Now, where, or in whom does the obstruction exist? Not in God all must agree; but it exists entirely in man. Jesus came into the world, sent by the Father to remove this obstruction to his love, grace and mercy flowing into the sinner. This has Jesus done by

his life, death and resurection; for his blood cleanseth from all sin. By faith, repentance and obedience, we are reconciled to God, sanctified, washed and purified from all sin.

10. Suppose while the natural cloud obstructed the rays of the natural sun from faling on us, a wind should arise and dissipate the cloud. We then would say, the wind has restored to us the light and heat of the sun, and caused it to shine again for our comfort. This would not be true in philosophy, for the wind produced no effect on the sun—it only removed the obstruction of its rays to us. So the blood of Christ had no effect on God, but only removed our sin, which obstructed his divine rays from shining into us. So may we say, that God is at-one-ed, reconciled, and propitiated to us by the blood of Christ. But with whom is he at-one-ed reconciled and propitiated? Is it with the unchanged, impenitent sinner? Impossible, for the holy nature of God can never be at-one, reconciled, or propitiated to the unholy nature of man—there must be an eternal enmity between them; nor could all the blood of the universe effect such a union. But God was always and will forever be in union with his own divine nature; and when we, through the blood of Christ, become partakers of the divine nature, we become one with him, and he one with us. In this sense God may be said to be at-one, reconciled, propitiated, and pacified to us, when we are changed into his divine nature, without any change in himself. The whole change is effected in us. Is it any where in the Bible stated that God was atoned to the impenitent, irreconciled, disobedient sinner? How then does my brother so strenuously contend that the atonement which he believes is effected in God by the blood of Christ, is the *cause* of the reconciliation *made* in man?

11. My brother's criticisms and speculations on the

difference between the words atonement and reconciliation, are novel, and entirely unsatisfactory to my mind. I view them perfectly arbitrary, and unsupported by one divine writer in the Bible. Our translators have rendered the words atonement and reconciliation uniformly, if not universally, from the same Hebrew word *kaphar*. In the New Tastament they have translated the Greek word *katallagee*, atonement and reconciliation invaribly. It seems never to have entered their minds that there was a difference of meaning in the terms, or that one was the cause, and the other the effect, as you have stated; page 24: There you say, "Originally, literally and properly, atonement (*hilasmos*) is that which makes one, and reconciliation (*katallagee*) is made one. The one is the cause, and the other is the effect. If this be doubted, we have a superabundance of evidence to offer.' My dear brother, I do most sincerely doubt it, and greatly need that superabundant evidence. But I will wait patiently till you shall give it. I do hope that the evidence to be given will be more convincing than the one you have adduced as a sample, viz; "*That things which cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned,* such as the tabernacle, the altar, and their furniture. Surely my brother has forgotten that these very things are said to be reconciled, but never atoned--for the word *atoned* is not once named in the Bible. What this your argument has to do in support of your strange proposition, I cannot see.

12. I really begin to doubt whether I understand you, when you speak of so many things being the effect of atonement, as purification, or expiation; propitiation or purification, page 24. You must mean in these cases by atonment, the victim by which the atonement was made. If this be your meaning, we are agreed. I have formerly admitted that the victim for sacrifice might tbe called the atonement; but as I find it not so called in the Bible I have dropt

the idea, and advise you to do the same. If by atonement you mean the effect of sacrifice, and believe that atonement, expiation, propitiation and purification, are synonimes, how can you say that they are effects of atonement? As well might you say that atonement is the effect of atonement. Your mind appears to be a little confused, as you think mine once was.

13. On the same page 24, You say, "Do I misconcieve my brother Stone, when I interpret his views of atonement as excluding the idea of propitiating or pacifying our heavenly Father?" I answer, you have not misconceived me; as you will see in the remarks above. I do hope, brother Campbell, that I have misconceived you; for you say page 26. "Well, I am glad to be in such good company as that of brother Stone, who concludes with me, *then*, and not till *then*, of course—'*then* is God, his law and government pleased, or reconciled with the person, &c. &c." Yes *then*, and not till *then* is God, his law and government pleased or reconciled with the person," &c. This I acknowledge to be my language. In this you say, I conclude with you. I am glad of it; yet this conclusion as yours I have never seen nor known, till you have here expressed it. I had always before thought your conclusion different. Had the sentence been fully quoted, our readers would have better understood our agreement. The person of whom I was speaking, was sanctified, cleansed, and made holy—*then*, when made holy or sanctified and reconciled to God--*then*, and not till *then*; is God pleased and reconciled to him. The same idea I have fully stated on the preceding page. Does; bro. Campbell thus conclude? If so, why does he say that I must ultimately concede, that sacrifice has an effect of God? page 26. In conclusion of the present letter, I ask my dear brother Campbell, where in the scriptures is atonement, reconciliation, or pro-

pition, ever said to be directly effected in God by blood of sacrifices?

May the Lord lead us into all truth. As ever your old and loving brother.

B. W. STONE.

THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

NUMBER II.

In my former number I gave some reasons why I professed, and retained the name Christian. I will add a few more, which to me are of weight, and which have settled my mind for life. Though the doctrine of christianity has been greatly corrupted from the first age of its introduction into the world by erring men, yet the name Christian, as the family name of the church of Christ, has descended from the Apostolic age, through the primitive age of the church, down to the age of darkness—at what precise period I cannot determine; It was at the time when sects, and sectarian names, became so numerous, that the name Christian was forgotten, or so neglected, that none called themselves by the name which God had ordained. At the beginning of the present century no society in my knowledge, either in Europe or America, were called Christians, The names of Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, and hundreds more were common. About that time a few of us, convinced of the evil of sectarianism, and believing that the party creeds and names then existing, were the props of these sectarian establishments, determined to relinquish them all. We took the divine and ancient name Christian, given by divine authority, as that which must ultimately destroy all other denominations. For this we were reviled by others as assuming exclusively the name to ourselves, when it equally belonged to all. If it belongs to all, why

do not all take it? A preacher of some noteriety in Kentucky objected to taking the name Christian, because, said he, I know I am a Baptist, but I know not that whether I am a Christian.

I will now show that the name Christian, as the denominative name of Christ's followers, continued from the Apostles till the Man of sin appeared. How much longer I cannot say. From Eusebius, who flourished, in Anno Domini 300 and upwards; and from Socrates Scholasticus, who wrote a little while after, I will make a few quotations to this point. These two writers in their Ecclesiastical Histories, apply the name Christian, commonly if not universally, to the family of Christ, when speaking of them.

Eusebius, speaking of the coming of Christ, says, "that a new nation neither small nor weak,—aided continually by the divine power of God, suddenly appeared—being beautified among all men by the title and name of Christ;"—then he adds, 'Although at present we plainly appear to be upstarts, and this name of Christians of late to be notified unto all nations; yet that the life and conversation of *Christians* is neither new found, nor the invention of our own brain."

Josephus lived in the days of the Apostles, and thus writes. "There was at that time one Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, a worker of miracles, a teacher of them which embraced the truth with gladness. He drew after him many, as well of the Jews as Gentiles. This same was Christ. And though Pilate, by the judgment of the chief rulers amongst us, delivered him to be crucified; yet there wanted not those which from the beginning loved him. He appeared unto them alive the third day after his passion, as the holy prophets have foretold. Not only these but innumerable more marvelous things of him; and to this day the Christian people, which of *him borrow their names,* cease not to increase." Lib; 1. Cap. 12.

Some have thought the above to be spurious. If this be admitted, it must also be admitted, that it is very ancient, and received as true by the Fathers; therefore the early fathers believed that in the days of the Apostles, when Josephus lived, the followers of Christ were called Christians, and that they borrowed their name from him.

Ægesippus, who lived immediately after the Apostles about the year of our Lord 110, says, "Certain of the heretics accused Symeon the son of Cleopas, that he lineally descended of the stock of David, and that he was a *Christian*. He suffered martyrdom being an hundred and twenty years old, under Trajan the Emperor." This Symeon was the 2nd Bishop of Jerusalem, and suffered martyrdom Anno Domini 110. Lib. 3. Cap. 29.

Justin Martyr, lived about the same time, immediately after the Apostles, says, "In the Judaical wars, fresh before your eyes, Barchochebas, a captain of the Jewish rebellion, commanded the *Christians* to be grieviously punished, unless they renounced Christ, and blasphemed God." Again he says, "For myself, delighted with the doctrine of Plato, hearing that the *Christians* were led captives, not fearing death, neither any torments which are accounted terrible, I thought it could not be, that this kind of men was subject unto malice, and set on pleasure." Lib. 4. cap. 8.

This same Justin in his apology for the christians gives us a lengthy account of a lewd husband condemning his wife before a Centurion, for being a Christian. "He accused her that she was a christian. He had to his friend the Centurion, whom he persuaded to imprison Ptolomœus; [his wifes instructor in the christian faith] to entreat him roughly withal; and to demand of him if he were a *Christian*—afterwards being brought before Urbicius, of this only was he examined, if he were a Christian—he confessed that he had preached the true and heavenly doctrine of Christ—When Urbicius commanded that he

should be brought forth, one Lucius [that was also a christian] seeing the sentence given contrary to all reason, said to Urbicius, What reason is it [O, Urbicius] that thou shouldst condemn this man for confessing the name of Christ? Lib. 4. cap. 17

Tertullian, another early father, in his apology for the Christians, says, "Tiberius then, in whose time the *Christian name* was spread abroad in the world, when this doctrine was signified unto him out of Palestine, [where it first sprang] communicated the same unto the Senate, declaring withal that this doctrine pleased him well. The Senate rejected it, because they had not allowed the same. But he persevered in his opinion, threatening them death that would accuse the *Christians*." Lib 2. Cap. 2.

Again, Tertullian, "Although we have known the inquisition directed for us to be inhibited, it was by reason of Plinius Secundus, president of the province, which having condemned some of the Christians, doubted what was best to be done. He made the Emperor Trajan privy thereof, saying, that he found nothing in them that was impious, but that they refused the worshipping of images. Signifying this withal, that the manner of the *Christians* was, to rise before day, to celebrate Christ as God; and to the end their discipline might straitly be observed, they forbid shedding of blood, adultery, fraud, traiterous dealing and such like. For answer hereunto, Trajan wrote again, that there should be no inquisition for *Christians*, but if they were met with they should be punished." Lib. 3 Cap. 30.

Again Tertullian says, "What manner of laws are these against us? Impious, unjust, and cruel, which neither Vespasian observed—which Trajan partly frustrated, commanding the inquisitions of the *Christians* to cease." Lib. 5. Cap. 5.

Antoninus Pius; Emperor, succeeded Adrian A. D. 140. He wrote to the Commons of Asia in

behalf of the *Christians*, You, says he, during the time of your ignorance, despise other Gods, contemn the religion of the immortal God, banish the *Christians* which worship him, and persecute them unto death. Lib. 4 Cap. 13.

Polycarp was a disciple of St. John the Apostle, and Bishop of Smyrna. He suffered Martyrdom when very old. In his trial before the Proconsul, he said, "Hear freely, I am a *Christian*—the Proconsul being amazed, commanded the Bedle in the midst of the theatre, thrice to cry, Polycarpus confesseth himself a *Christian*. At which saying, the multitude both of Jews and Gentiles inhabiting Smyrna, shouted with a great rage, this is that Doctor of Asia, the father of the *Christians*." After he was dead, "Many pricked forwards Nicetes, and his brother Dalces, to move the Proconsul not to deliver unto the *Christians* his body, lest that they leaving Christ fall a worshipping of him." Lib. 4. Cap. 16.

These extracts are taken from the letter, written by the Church at Smyrna, of which Polycarp was Bishop.

Eusebius has given us a very ancient letter, written in the reign of Antonius Verus, A. D. 163, by the Church of Vienna and Lyons in France. A few extracts I will make out of it. "Vetius Epagathus of the brethren required that audience might be given him to plead for the brethren; which being denied him of the President, rejecting this just petition, and only demanding whether he was a *Christian*. He confessed it with a loud voice. And so was he received into the fellowship of the Martyrs, and called the advocate of the *Christians*." "Blandina, having her whole body rent in pieces, and the wounds open, like a noble wrestler was renewed at her confession, for as oft as she pronounced, I am a *Christian*—she was recreated, refreshed, and felt no pain." Sanctus also a holy martyr when standing before his judges, to

every question he answered in the Roman tongue, "I am a *Christian*." They also make mention of Biblis, that when she confessed herself a *Christian*, she was appointed to take her place among the martyrs."

They also give an account of Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, 90 years old, and very feeble and sickly, "being demanded of the President, who was the God of the Christians, he answered; if thou become worthy thou shall understand." Attilus also a famous man, being notably exercised in the Christian profession, was led about the theatre, with a scroll before him, wherein was written in the Roman tongue, "This is Attalus the *Christian*."

They also stated in the same letter, "That Cesar had commanded by writing, that such as confessed themselves *Christians*, should be executed." Of one Alexander, a physician, they also write that "when the President urged him, and demanded of him what he was, he answered, I am a *Christian*; for which answer the President allotted him unto the beasts, of them to be rent in pieces and devoured." "Neither did their cruelty and rage against the Christians so cease—they burned them to ashes, the ashes also they gathered, and scattered in the river Rhone to the end that there should be no further hope of the resurrection, whereof [say they] the Christians are fully persuaded. Lib. 5. Cap. 1.

Porphery, the atheist, was among the earliest writers against christianity. He labored hard to defame Origin. He represents him as the disciple of Ammonius, and then contrasts the two characters. "Ammonius [says he] being a Christian, and brought up of Christian parents, when he had grown up into ripeness of judgment—forthwith framed his trade of life conformable unto the law; but Origin being a Gentile, and brought up in the sciences of the Gentiles, degenerated and fell into that barbarous temerity

leading a life after the manner of the Christians, contrary to the law." Lib. 8, Cap. 18.

Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria under the reign of Decius the Emperor, Anno Domini 250 thus writes of the persecution. 'Some went stoutly unto the altars and affirmed boldly, that they were never Christians. There stood before the tribunal seat certain soldiers, and together with them old Theophilus, who, (when any of the Christians came to hear the sentence or judgment; and now were ready to shrink) nodded with their countenance, and beckoned with their hands, exhorting them to constancy—the which when the multitude had perceived, before that any laid hands upon them, they stept before the bar, and proclaim themselves to be Christians; so that the President and his associates were amazed, and the Christians upon whom the sentence had passed, were thereby emboldened to suffer." Lib. 7. Cap. 11.

The same Dionysius, treating of the persecution of the Christians under the Emperor Velerian, thus writes; "There was none of the Emperors before him so courteous and friendly affected towards them, no not they which openly were counted Christians." Lib. 7. Cap. 9.

Dionysius, speaking of his own persecution, "His speech was, that we should be no Christians at all, and commanded me to cease henceforth from Christianity—I made him answer, that we ought to obey God rather that men. Yea I spoke with open protestation; I worship God, neither will I cease henceforth from being a Christian." Lib. 7. Cap. 10,

Maximin the Emperor reigned A. D. 237. In his edict in behalf of the Christians, he says, "and Withal, to use this proviso that the Christians, which have forsaken the religion of their ancestors, should be brought again to the right way. And because we perceive many as yet to persist in the same madness, neither yielding worship unto the celestial Gods. neither regarding the God of the Christians,—we thought good —that the *Christians* be tolerated again." Lib. 8. Cap. 8.—If any of the Christians be found to use the religion of his own sect, you neither grieve or molest him" Lib. 9. Cap 1. In all Maximin's edicts the name Christian is very frequently used. In the edict, of Constantine and Lucinius the name christian is used ten or twelve times, as clearly designating the family of Christ, our Lord.

I might multiply quotations to this point without end, but think it unnecessary, because if the name Christian was used as a family name by the Apostles and their contemporaries; if it was used during the first, second and third centuries of the Church by the early fathers, by the Emperors, and by Philosophers, when speaking of the followers of Christ; if it was used by historians as their common name, a name derived from their leader, and spread all over the world, designating them wherever they were; then we are to conclude that it is the proper name, by which the followers of Christ should yet be called.

B. W. STONE.

The following letter from my old and beloved brother, is private; yet I have taken the liberty to publish it, because the subjects contained in it are of a public nature, and should be attended to. I hope he will excuse my presumption, and continue his communication. B. W. S.

Troy, Sept. 29, 1840.

Rev. and Dear Brother,

The Post master, at this place, gave me a line from you, the other day, in which you state that you are about to recommence the publication of the Christian Messenger. The post master, being unacquainted with your old subscribers, requested me to make such use of the paper as I thought best. With pleasure I took it, and on last Saturday, being the

day of our monthly meeting, I presented it to most of the male members present. But, my dear brother, the Church, at this place has had so much difficulty in relation to the views and sentiments held and preached by those who stile themselves Reformers, that they are unwilling to encourage the work; for it is reported and believed here that you have embraced many of the ideas held by Alexander Campbell. Tney are apprehensive that the work will tend rather to divide, than unite and build up the Church.

I have, ever since my first acquaintance with you, been ardently attached to your writings, on account of the spirit they breathe; and I have been, and still am of the opinion, that your main object is to unite all the children of God in one fold; yet while I make this frank admission with regard to your motives, I am of the opinion you have failed with regard to the plan in detail. I think that I am as anxious to see union in the Church as any one, where it can be effected on Gospel terms, this is my daily prayer. But when I see the Church attempting to unite in practice where their views are so widely different, I become discouraged. The Church at this place attempted this kind of union for several years, our preaching at length was so contradictory that we found it impossible, as we thought, to continue in fellowship with each other any longer. The doctrines preached by many of our old preachers were ridiculed and sneered at, and by others they were denounced as persecutors.

The man who was over us as our spiritual pastor and teacher scouted the idea of a person getting religion, said a man might do religion but could not get it, denied that any are called of God to preach the gospel; and some of them say that a man had no right to pray before he was immersed, &c.

It has always been my opinion that when a man

puts on the name of Christ he should show it to the world by calling on God in prayer. It has appeared to me as far as my observation has extended, that one of the effects of embracing the doctrines of the Reformers, is, to destroy the spirit of prayer, at least in a great degree. I once thought brother Kyle, in his lifetime, was inclined to embrace these ideas; he made a tour through Indiana, among some of the reformed Churches; he became satisfied that the doctrine had this tendency. I traveled, last fall through eleven counties in Ky, they were receiving and baptizing members, but it really appeared to me that there is but little of that Evangelical spirit, that was in the revival of 1800.

Now brother Stone you have more experience in this than I have. I want you to give me your opinion whether they are really the praying, devotional and humble people that the Christian Church was before it was rent by this pretended reformation? If I could believe they are I would rejoice with all my heart.

The introduction and reception of the doctrine, in the bounds of my observation has been spiritual death, and wherever the Church has been preserved from the influence of this doctrine, it appears to be in a prosperous condition. I would be highly gratified to get your Views in relation to these things privately, but if I do not, I shall see them in the Messenger.

You will please direct one No. to Troy, to the address of Joseph Coe, one the address of Joshua Peck, one to myself.

Yours in the bonds of the gospel,

ALEXANDER McCULLOUGH.

B. W. Stone.

Jacksonville, Ill. Oct. 23d 1840.

My dear Old Brother,

I thank you for your favor dated Sept. 29, 1840. You inform me of the division of the Church at Troy; this is to be deplored, because the division of Christians into contending sects is a sin of no small magnitude It is certainly in opposition to the will of God, the God of peace—to the ministry of the Prince of peace, which ministry is to reconcile the world to God, and to one another—it is contrary to the kingdom of peace, the essential nature of which is *righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost*—it is contrary to the prayer of Jesus, that all that believed in him, should be one, even as he and the Father are one, that the world might believe in him, and be saved; it is a mountain raised between the world and their salvation—in a word it extinguishes the light of Zion—makes heaven mourn, and hell rejoice—strengthens the kingdom of darkness, discourages the saints, destroys millions, unchristianizes the professors of Christianity, and disgraces the church so called,

What christian will deny these facts? What christian admitting them, will not tremble at the idea of division? The commonalty of the sin for ages back, has stript it of its odious features, and human authority has clad it with such saintly robes, that it has become honorable in the eyes of the pur blind world; its acts are even called holy, and deemed necessary to the promotion of holiness. O when shall the 1260 days come to a close! When shall the man of sin's reign cease? When shall Zion be restored? Lord hasten the time! O revive thy work!

The reasons why the Church divided among you, must surely be momentous. Let us examine them by the Book of God.

1st. You say, "Our preaching was so contradictory

that we found it impossible, as we thought, to continue in fellowship with each other any longer." And why did not you as a church, correct your servants for such contradictions? A church was once exhorted by an Apostle, to say unto Archippus to take heed unto the ministry which he had received of the Lord to fulfil it." That ministry was the ministry of reconciliation and peace, not of contention and strife, Did you as a church do your duty? Did they after your admonition persist in their divisive course? If so, your duty was to forbid them to teach among you, and to withdraw yourselves from such as walked thus disorderly, and who said they were Apostles, and were not. Must the Church divide and sin in so doing, because their servants disagreed and quarreled? This I know has been the fact from the beginning of the Apostacy; but is this a justifiable argument for its continuance? No No. Had the church been themselves living in the spirit—had they loved one another as brethren—had they loved their Lord, and his cause, and like him wept over the ruined world, and were making strong cries and supplications to him that was able to save—would you as a church have divided? Would you have marshalled yourselves under different leaders? So did the Corinthians once; but they were sharply reproved for it, and were called carnal. Carnality and Spirituality are two things very different—the first leads to division, strife, contention, the second to union, love, life and peace: Impossible for christians in the spirit to divide into contentious sects, Sectarianism and chritsianity are at antipodes: The world begins to see it, despite of all the dust and fogs raised to blind their eyes.

2ly. Your second reason for dividing is, that "the doctrines preached by many of our old preachers were ridiculed and sneered at, and by others they were denounced as persecutors." I have heard many ridiculous doctrines preached myself, and doc-

trines worthy of being sneered at, and scouted from the church, will this prove that the man who preached them was a bad man, and unworthy of my fellowship? Let this be established by the Bible, and then is established a divine warrant for all the sectarianism in the world, and for a hundred fold more. But "they were denounced as persecutors." May be, they were persecutors in word. Such I have heard very zealously persecuting their brethren, who might hold an opinion different from theirs. Ah! my brother, all in the spirit of sectarianism, are persecutors, no matter whether they be called Christians or Reformers.

3d. Another cause of your division, is, that your own pastor scouted the idea at getting religion. but chose rather the idea of doing religion." Are these expressions founded in the scriptures? And will brethren descend so low as to quarrel about words or expressions, not found in the Bible—and divide the church because of such trifles? I am truly astonished.

4ly, But your pastor denied that "any were called of God to preach the gospel." Does my brother believe that the Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist clergy are good men? They all claim to be called of God to preach the gospel—are they therefore called and sent of God? Does God send them all with different doctrines to preach to the world? Impossible; and how does my brother know that his favorite preacher is called of God? Have not all the sects equal claims to this divine call, as we have? Who shall be our umpire? Shall the Bible judge? How? I never had the assurance in my life to say I was called and sent of God; nor, if I had a revelation from heaven of the fact, could I dare to say it without I had power to confirm it by miracles. How else could I expect to be believed? Could I be convinced of any man being called and sent of God to preach, I would sit at his feet, and learn implicitly

his lessons as divine, even if called a Mormon, a sect of all others that have the least claim to it. Does the Bible authorize you to reject from your fellowship any man who denies that any are in these days, called and sent of God to preach? Where in that book can I find the idea?

5ly. "Some of the Reformers say, that a man has no right to pray before he is immersed." But all do not say so; shall we reject all for the sake of a few? They have forgotten that Saul of Tarsus prayed, and his prayers were heard; Cornelius also prayed and was heard—and this too before their baptism. A man might as well say, the Ohio river has no right to flow till it unites with the Mississippi. I like the doctrine preached by Ananias to Saul when he was praying for three days, Bro. Saul, why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus. Was he not praying? this was considered by Ananias, as tarrying—he must not tarry to pray only, but must do other duties, be baptized also—and still go on to pray always.

You think the doctrine of the reformation destroys the spirit of prayer. Did I think so, I would abandon it as the doctrine of hell. I have really thought that the great controversy about the doctrine itself has destroyed that spirit, and every good spirit with many on both sides. I have long observed that they who dispute most about the Spirit, have the least of it. The abuse of the doctrine of the reformation, has done the mischief. A few loud headed, half taught preachers seem to make the means of salvation the very agent of the work, and others almost reject the means. A man is fallen into the a deep pit—no way of salvation from it does he see, a man above throws him a coil of rope, and informs him, that it is the means of his deliverance. But says the man in the pit, the rope without an agent above, is useless.

But the man above holds one end of the rope, and throws down the coil, and tells him to take hold of the other end. He does it and is drawn up. So the word is the means of salvation--faith and obedience are the hands that apprehend, and the Spirit is the agent that draws him out or saves him. Did I believe that God sits upin the heavens, and never exerted his power in salvation, but left his word to do all, I would never pray—pray for what? To pray would be inconsistent with such a sentimeut--This soul destroying doctrine is a blow at the root of christianity, and where it may have prevailed, its devastations are clearly seen. In 1800 we had more zeal and less knowledge--now we have more knowledge, and less zeal. We are laboring to unite them, and are happily succeeding in many places.

Prayer has been awfully neglected, not only amongst us but among all of every name. Dear brother, How is it in your church? May be, you over look yourselves in looking at the failure of others. It may be that your church is no more prayerful than it should be. But this evil is fast disappearing and yielding to truth.

Your church thinks from report that I have received a great many of A. Campbell's ideas, and therefore should not be encouraged as an Editor, but abandoned by his old brethren. Report may also be, that you, my old brother, have received a great many of B. W. Stone's ideas, and he formerly, as yet is reputed as great a heretic, as A. Campbell is; would you not think it a hard case to be abandoned by your brethren on this account. A. Campbell is a great teacher; but he is not a pope infallible nor is he our pope; he is a man highly deserving the esteem of the christian world, and posterity with gratitude will make mention of his name. I acknowledge I have no inate ideas, all the little stock of knowledge, I have I received from others, and some from

A. Campbell; and no doubt, he will acknowledge the same; and that he has received some of his large stock of knowledge from his poor, humble brother, B. W. Stone. What have we that we have not received? Where is boasting.

My great object in publishing the Messenger, is to counteract the very things of which you suspect me to be guilty, and to promote those very things, peace, and unity, for which you plead, but against which you have acted in your late division. O, my dear old brother, endeavor to undo what you have done. Meet together in the spirit of your Lord--confess your sin in dividing one to another, and flow together again in love, irrespective of your erring servants, who will not unite with you on the Bible alone. O take heed of making your opinions tests of fellowship. Use Bible language, and walk in love, and wipe away the disgrace of having divided. Though you may not acknowledge me. Yet I am your old brother and servant, and hope to meet you in our common Father's house not many days hence.

B. W. STONE.

Monticello, Lewis Co. Mo. Oct. 22, 1840.

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST:

Essay, No. 1.

My text isthe whole of the second chapter of Daniel's prophesy. I request each reader to read the chapter carefully before he reads what I write; I would insert the whole chapter, but this with my observations would make the article too long for one number. To aid the reader to understand this grand and important prophesy, we offer the following preliminary observations; 1st. This prophesy was delivered six hundred and six years before the birth of Christ, and

has been most remarkably, and circumstantially fulfilled.

2d. His writings may be comprised in two parts, the historical and prophetical.

3d. The historical portion of his writings contain a record of the circumstances, which led to his elevation, and the various schemes of his enemies to effect his destruction, from the first chap. to the sixth.

4. The prophetical portions of his writings contain predictions and visions of things future, till the coming of the Messiah, and the ultimate conversion of the Jews and Gentiles to the faith of the gospel, from chaps. seventh to twelvth; extending from the first establishment of the Persian Empire upwards of 530 years before the birth of Christ, to the general resurrection, and final consummation of all things.

5. For the present, until we have more leisure and ability, we substitute the following remarks of an eloquent Catholic historian, as a summary comment on his predictions, relative to the four great Monarchies of the Chaldeans, Medo-Persians, Grecians, and the Romans. He says, "In reviewing the pages of antient history, we see three successive empires founded on the ruins of each other, subsisting during a long series of ages, and we see them at length entirely to disappear. After these, a fourth Empire arose which was that of the Romans, and which swallowed up those that preceded it, extending its conquests, and after subjecting all to its power by force of arms, is itself torn to pieces; and this, by being dismembered, made way for the establishment of almost all the Kingdoms, which now divide Europe, Asia, and Africa." Behold here a picture, on a small scale, of the duration of all ages; of the glory and power of all the empires of the world; in a word of all that is most spendid, and most capable of exciting admiration in human greatness. Every excellence is here found assembled; the fire of genius; the delicacy of taste, accompanied by solid judgment; uncommon powers of language carried to the highest degree of perfection; the glory of arms, of arts and sciences; valor in conquering; and ability in governing. In this manner we think and judge. But whilst we are in extacy and admiration of so many and shining virtues, the supreme Judge, who can alone truly estimate all things, sees nothing but littleness, meanness, vanity and pride. And whilst mankind are anxiously busied in perpetuating the power of their families, in founding kingdoms, and if that were possible, rendering them eternal, God, from his throne on high, overthrows all their projects, and makes even their ambition the means of executing his purposes, in a manner infinitely superior to our understandings. He alone knows his operations and designs. All ages are present with him. He sees from everlasting to everlasting. He has assigned to all empires their fates and durations. In all the revolutions, which come to pass in the world, nothing happens by chance. He knew that under the image of that statue which Nebuchadnezar saw, of enormous height, and terrible aspect, whose head was of gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, and the legs of iron, mixed with clay, God thought fit to represent the four great empires, uniting in them all that was splendid, grand, formidable and powerful. And what occasion has the Almighty for overturning this immense colossus? A small stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet, that were of iron and clay, and broke them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, the gold, broken to pieces together, and become like the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them. And the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. Daniel, chap 2. Of the peace and increase of this King-

dom there shall be no end. This kingdom employed the tongues and pens of the Apostles, and christian Prophets, confessors, Martyrs, or witnesses, and primitive preachers and Reformers, from the birth of its illustrious founder till now. It deserves the talents, the pens, the tongues, the eloquence, the energies, the influence, and moneys of all those great and celebrated personages whose powerful energies are now employed in commerce, in war, in politics and in ambitious enterprizes. This Kingdom is to stand forever He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever. God grant, that all nations, and all men may have a share in this Kingdom, whose law is truth, whose King is love, and whose duration is eternity. Amen, and Amen.

To be continued.

JACOB CREATH, Jr.

PROPHETIC CALCULATIONS

It is indisputable that some of the events which have transpired in the history of the Church of Christ have most accurately corresponded with the duration specified in the predictions of Daniel and John. In Booth's Critica Biblica is the ensuing curious coincidence of predicted specific periods, respecting the overthrow of the Ottoman and Mohammedan power in Turky.

"Wall observes that the Ottoman power began in 1300, or 1301. Constantinople was taken in 1453. If the date of 396 be reckoned from thence, the expiry will be in 1849.

"But Wall is in error in saying 396, instead of 391, the true prophetic period; substract, therefore, 5 years, which brings to A. D. 1844

"*Whitaker* reckons from the 29th May, 1453, when Constantinople was taken, and speaks of the expulsion of the Ottoman from thence, as being likely to

happen 391 years from that date, that is, in June, 1844

"*Thurston* gives precisely the same interpretation, and expects a revival of the Eastern Roman Empire, by the assumption of the reins of government by a Christian Power of Constantinople, in 1844.

"In confirmation of this last view, if we compute the 2300, or, according to Septuagint, 2400 days of Daniel, viii 14, from the rise of the Medo Persian empire, or from the first battle gained by Cyrus, viz, 559, B. C. it brings us down to the same year, 1844.

"*Frere* reckons 2400 years B. C., 553, being the third year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, in which year Daniel's vision was seen; in which case, they terminate in 1847"

The exact time is mentioned in Revelation ix 15—"An hour, a day, and a month, and year,!" That the year is limited to 360 days; and a month to 30 days is evident—because three years and a half, and forty two months, and 1260 days are counted as equal. Consequently, the whole space includes three hundred and ninety-one years, and fifteen days. Now admitting that the date of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks is chronologically correct, May 29, 1453. it follows, that the Mohammedan Sultan, with all his supremacy, will be expelled from Europe for ever, on the thirteenth day of June, 1844. "If any man have an ear, let him hear. Rev. xiii 9, 10. There is the patience and faith of the saints."

The above extract is a striking corroboration of the opinion announced on an article in the East, Hemisphere, lately published in the Christian Intelligencer.—*Christian Intelligencer.*

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

During the present month, (November) a great revival, as the theologians term it, has been going on

in our town. The persuasive oratory of Mr. J. N. MAFFITT has been attracting crowds from town and country for some weeks, daily and nightly, to the Methodist meeting-house. Through his labors, many of our fellow beings have been reclaimed from the error of their ways. We had the pleasure to hear several of his finest discourses.

During the same time, the Christian meeting has been crowded; and the labors of J. A. Gano, Dr. Pinkerton, A. Kendrick, R. C. Ricketts and J. T. Johnson have been attended with like success. The tone of society has been materially improved by these protracted religious exercises. We are sensible of the influence they have exerted on our own school. Some twelve or fifteen of our associates having bowed in humble obedience to the commands of our Lord Jesus Christ. What can be more lovely to behold than such a spectacle as this; to see the young and beautiful consecrating the morning of their lives to the service of the Lord? How much more consistant with the dignity of human nature, than to be wasting their freshness in the empty pleasures and fleeting vanities of the ball-room, the circus, the race course, the theatre, and other haunts of vice and folly. Some are very sensitive about young persons joining the family of the Lord. How absurd: They constitute the morning glories of the church; ere they become tainted by the vice of the world, the Sun of Righteousness shines upon them, and gathers all their fragrance to himself.

How unnatural would it be thought in our earthly parents to send their children off from them in infancy to grow up among aliens and strangers, and enemies, in the hope that they would return in their maturer years, patterns of filial and fraternal love. Yet most persons would have the Lord's children to live out of his family, serving the mammon of unrighteousness till their return can only be effected by a moral miracle. *Young Ladie's Museum.*

FROM HINTON'S HISTORY OF BAPTISM.

After the author had given the history of the origin and progress of pouring and sprinkling; he concludes by using the words of professor Stuart himself, as follows.

"We have collected facts enough to authorize us now to come to the following general conclusion, respecting the practice of the Christian church in general, with regard to the mode of baptism, viz. that from the earliest ages, of which we have any account subsequent to the apostolic age, and onward for several centuries, the churches did generally practise baptism by immersion; perhaps by immersion of the whole person; and that the only exceptions to this mode which were usually allowed were in cases of urgent sickness or other cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practised. It may also be mentioned here, that *aspersion* and *affusion*, which had, in particular cases, been now and then practised in primitive times, were gradually introduced, and became at length, quite common, and in the western church almost universal, before the Reformation." On which the Religious Herald observes.

The learned Professor's clause, "perhaps by immersion of the whole person," is a literary curiosity. In all history the candidates are described as descending into the water about up to their waists, and then their heads or upper part of the body were immersed by the administrator; the very method practised by the Baptists now. Some then as now, bowed the head forward, some leaned the body backward, but how Mr. Stuart, in either of these methods, or any other, when a person is standing in the water up to the waist, can submerge the head without the whole body being completely under water, is what neither he or any one else can tell. This "perhaps" might well have been spared.

Can any historical evidence be more complete respecting the time and the causes of the introduction of the innovation of sprinkling? May I respectfully ask the Pedobaptist who reads the volume, [Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, or Methodist,] 1. Whether he has not been kept in ignorance of these facts? 2. Whether those clergy, who withhold these facts from their flocks, do not take upon themselves an undue and dangerous responsibility? 3. Whether he will have independence enough to take any adequate means to ascertain if these statements can be denied? And finally, if they cannot be gainsayed, whether he will dare to remain *unbaptised*, and therefore, in a state of disobedience to the King of Kings?

Jefferson, Ky; Nov. 21, 1840.

Brother Field;

The Rev. N. L. Rice. Editor of the Protestant Herald, in his paper of the 12th instant, says of the Journal of Christianity that it is a *Campbellite paper*.

As the world is fast coming to the full knowledge that "names are things, and when *party names*, that they are most potent things." Will you be so kind as to let me say a few things on the subject of names? And first, can we follow Christ without being the *ite* of some man? Or can we be Christians without belonging to some one of the *isms* of the day? I am persuaded that the isms of the day are a reproach to those who adopt them, and he that gives them, when they are disclaimed, violates the express law of Christ. He speaks evil of his brother, and is accounted as a railer or reviler, and placed along with haters of God, and those who have no lot in the Kingdom of Heaven.

When we take the word of God alone for our rule of faith and practice, I do not see how we can

call ourselves or the Church of God by any *name* not found in the Bible, and it seems to me that every departure form the book would place us under the rebuke, that the Lord gave Peter in the 16th chapter and 23 verse of Matthew. Christ alone had the right to name his people and his Church. And when Christians want to please God in all things they will feel themselves as much slandered in being called by any man's name, as they would in being called a thief, a fornicator, or a drunkard. If the Editor of the P. & H. is correct in thus designating your paper, you will please strike my name from your list, for I am determined to call no man on earth my master, nor will I encourage in others what the Bible does not teach Oh, that christians would come to a pure speech and hold fast the form of sound words. Brother Field what do you say?

Yours in the hope of a blessed immortality.

JAMES POMEROY.

We perfectly agree with Brother Pomeroy in the views he has expressed in the above letter. We can see no reason why we should be called by any other name than followers of our blessed Redeemer, so long as we adopt no other creed, as our rule of faith and practice but the Bible. It is to the cause of Christ that the Journal of Christianity is devoted, and not to support the views of Alexander Campbell, or any other man, So far as he advocates the doctrine of Christ, we are with him, but we do not take him for our guide or standard. We take the Bible, and the Bible alone.

We look upon it as offering an insult to God, after having been baptized into the name of Christ, made members of his family, and received the adoption of sons, to call ourselves by any other name than his. Let others call us what they please, we shall never adopt their names; for any departure from the word

of God, is a departure from the truth and from a sound speech. When we adopt any name not found in the Bible, then others may have some excuse for calling by other names. But we have never adopted any of the names, such as Episcopalian, Covenanter, Seceder, Presbyterian, Congregationalist; Methodist, &c. because they are not found in the New Testament neither do we profess to follow Luther, Calvin, Wesley Campbell, or any other man. We have determined to follow Christ.

Before we close our remarks, we would like to ask Rev. Mr Rice one question; Is it according to the golden rule to call us by names, which we never adopted, in preference to those by which we call ourselves?

Our sectarian friends have been following the opinions and precepts of men, been called by their names so long, that they can hardly think it possible for us to adopt the pure speech, and be governed by the holy precepts and examples of the New Testament, without having mixed somewhat with the language of Ashdod, and the traditions of men.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

A letter from Eld. Duke Young, of Lafayette Co. Mo. dated Oct. 19th, 1840. In which he says, that "between 90, and 100 have been united with the churches of Christ, since last May, at the different meetings he has attended."

Bro. T. N. Gaines writes from Dover, Mo. Oct. 12 1840. "I baptized 5 in this place last meeting—yesterday I preached here and 2 made the confession I baptized 3 in Richmond last meeting. I baptized one young man in Lexington two weeks ago, who was a Methodist. I have preached 22 times in the last two weeks and taken 6 confession." Let the zeal,

and energy of this young brother, provoke many of our older preachers to greater efforts in the cause of Christ.

Bro. Thomas Smith has just arrived from Ky; He preached for the first time in Mo, at Bear-creek on last Lord's day;—4 were added to the church on that day.

On the Same day, I was at Bro. Ab'm Miller's, in Calloway co. when 2 made the good confession.

T. M. A.

Boone County, Mo. Dec. 3. 1840.

B. W. Stone.

Bro. Tho. Smith and myself started on the 4th of Nov. on a preaching campaign in the counties up the Missouri River. On Saturday the 7th, we reached Dover, in Lafayette county, and commenced our labors there, which was continued until the Thursday evening following. We had delightful weather, large congregations, and a patient hearing. Twenty confessed, and obeyed the Lord; a large portion of them interesting young men, in the morning of life: Two others were baptized who had previously confessed, and 4 more were added to the congregation, making 26 in all. Bros. T. N. Gaines, and Duke Young were with us a portion of the time; both of whom labor regularly with this large and flourishing church.

On Friday, the 13th, we commenced a meeting in Lexington; but the weather became very cold, a considerable snow fell, and we closed the meeting on Monday, without having seen any make the good confession. Bro. Palmer met us here, as also the two brethren above named.

On the 17th we accompanied bro. Palmer to his residence in Jackson county, and on the two following days we held meetings in Independence.

On the 20th Bro Smith went to Liberty in Clay county, and I to Richmond, in Ray county.

On Saturday the 21st I commenced proclaiming the word in Richmond; and continued twice a day until Monday night, when Bro. Smith arrived. We united our efforts until Tuesday night. One intelligent lady confessed Jesus, and 2 others united with the church The elements were much against us here, we had rain, snow, and cold weather, but a good hearing, and we trust much good done, Bro. Gaines was with us; he resides here.

On the 3d Lords day of Nov. Bros. Wills and Lee were in Columbia. One owned, and submitted to the Lord there. The prospects are encouraging in this country—We want efficient proclaimers very much

Your Brother, THOS. M. ALLEN.

FROM KENTUCKY

Glorious Religious news just received, but too late for this No. but shall appear in our next Bro, J. T. Johnson writes Dec. 11, that he had just closed a meeting at North Middleton, and had 23 additions—at Providence a little before 9, and at Paris 11—bro. J. Roberts of New Castle writes that he has baptized the present year about 160.

GENERAL AGENTS for the Christian Messerger—Elder T. M. Allen of Columbia, and Eld Jacob Creath of Monticello, Mo. Eld. P. E. Harris of Rockville, Ia. Elder J. A. Gano of Centerville, Ky. Charles Gilliam of Jacksonville, Ill. R. Compton, p m of Mt Healthy, Ohio.

My patrons would greatly oblige me by remitting me money for the Messenger—as I shall shortly need paper, and must delay the work till I get money—my printer also needs. Let them remember that by an ordinance of the Post Office, the Postmasters are to frank all letters conveying money for periodicals.

EDITOR.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

JANUARY, 1841.

LETTER IV.—To B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE,

My dear Sir—MAY the new year be to us both the most useful and happy year of our lives! On entering a new year it is good to reconsider the past and to amend our ways. "Lord, teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts to wisdom."

It becomes necessary for the sake of new readers and to refresh the memory of the old, to glance at the points in which we have concurred, and at the points in which we differ so far in this investigation. And first at the points in which we have concurred.

1. That to "expiate," and to "pacify," and "atone for," are scriptural ideas and expressions.

2. That sacrifice is as old as the fall of man, 2500 years older than the law, and that the legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system.

3. That the legal sacrifices were for the exclusive benefit of those who were under that dispensation, and interfered not with the nature, design, or use of sacrifice as practised by all the saints from Abel to Moses.

4. That the life and death, the blessing and the