FREEDOM OF INQUIRY.

Let not the freedom of inquiry be shackled. If it mutiplies contentions amongst the wise and virtuous, it exercises the charity of those who contend. If it shakes, for a time, the belief that is rested only upon prejudice, it finally settles on the broader and more solid basis of conviction. *Ladies' Book,*

(From the Journal of Christianity.)

THE CAPTIVES ARE FREE.

Praise and glory be to the God of JUSTICE! The Supreme Court of the United States has been led by his invisible hand to give its sanction to simple *justice.* The intelligence was brought by the following letter from the venerable John Quincy Adams the senior counsel in the case, addressed to a member of the committee acting on behalf of the captives of the Amistead:

"Washington, March 9th, 1841.

DEAR SIR:

The captives are free! The part of the Decree of the District Court, which placed them at the disposal of the President of the United States to be sent to Africa, is reversed. They are to be discharged from the custody of the marshal—*free.*

ERRATA.

Page: 297, for *direct* no effect, read *no direct effect:*
" " for proposition for, read preposition *for.*
Some errors in punctuation, please correct:

EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

JUNE, 1841.

VOLUME IX. NUMBER X.

ATONEMENT—*No. VII.*

To B. W. STONE.

Dear Brother Stone—My absence from home on a laborious tour of two and a half months, has interrupted the consecutive order of my replies, and has placed you on my pages one month in advance of me. The advanced stage of the present number on my arrival at home leaves not sufficient room for a full reply to your Review of my 3d Letter, or your No. VII. While I regret the very immethodical manner in which this correspondence proceeds, and the consequent unintelligibility of much of the matter introduced, I am indeed glad to hear you so fully avow in your postscript to your No. VII. that you did not designedly leave out the enumeration of the designs and uses of Christ's death, that of taking away sin. I sincerely thought you did so in not including it in your summary. But it seems you thought that in your previous essays it was fully stated. Whether or not may be disputed; but since you now admit that "*his blood cleanses, purifies and sanctifies from sin*" and that "*whatever was effected by his blood was designed,*" I gladly place it in your synopsis of the designs of his death. I do assure you again that I rejoice in this avowal, because of the conclusions which many were beginning to draw from the ambiguity thrown over the whole subject of the *scripturality* of your views on this grand and vital subject, by your omitting it in your enumeration of the designs of Christ's death.

But it will be asked, What, then, is this controversy about? What the points in discussion? Is this *design of Christ's blood* to cleanse from sin, essential to the remission of sin at all? Is it essential in some cases only, or in all cases? I do not understand you. I have said, "*The sacrificial system was indispensable to any fallen man's approach to God.*" You oppose this. You say I have not proved it. Well, still you have one door of escape open. Perhaps you intend to say *you can* prove it, but I *have not* proved it. True, indeed, I did not allege the evidence you adduce in proof of that proposition. My proof is quite of another sort. It is logically whatever proves the two following theses:—1st. *The death of Christ is the sacrificial system perfected in one sacrifice.* 2d. *That sacrifice is, was, and always will be, indispensable to any fallen man's approach to God.* The allusions to Abel, Enoch, Noah, &c. were not relied on as proofs of these theses.

If any one admit that it is or was necessary in one case, it is indispensable in every case. If God can honorably forgive one sin, and accept one sinner without sacrifice, he can do so in every case. I contend that the whole Bible teaches sacrifice, faith, and repentance as essential to forgiveness. God cannot forgive sin, any sin of any transgressor without these. If it is proved that it is necessary in any one case, it is necessary in every case; for whatever justifies God in forgiving one sinner, will justify him in forgiving every other sinner. If it be true philosophy that because heat and moisture are essential to the germination of one grain of wheat, they are essential to the germination of every other grain of wheat in the universe; so if the blood of Christ be essential to the remission of one sin, it is necessary to the remission of every other sin. I am not now attempting, nor will I hereafter attempt the proof of any of these propositions, until an issue be formed on some of them. I am specially desirous to be understood on the vital question—the necessity of the blood of Christ to the remission of sins.

Whether in the way of reprisals, or jocosely, my venerable brother, in referring to my third proposition, has said, "I am glad my brother has at length conceded the point of difference between us; for you say, when a Jew had forfeited these, one of which is temporal life, the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for them." From what motive this is alleged I judge not; I only say, I have conceded nothing in this for which I ever contended—not even the shade of a thought. When a man has forfeited his life under any law, moral, ceremonial, or judicial, that law cannot give him life. But I do not say that a sacrificial system, in prophecy or in history, may not do that for him which that violated law could not do!

But the circumstances which introduced such *concessions* (!) give quite a different version to the matter. I am contending against a theory that required blood for the remission of minor offences, and dispensed with it in great offences. This is the naked point divested of all foliage. Brother Stone admits blood and sacrifice for simple errors, but will have the great offences—such as murder and adultery—forgiven without blood or sacrifice! If I mistake you, my dear sir, it is a venal sin—a simple error of the head—and I shall be thankful to have a definite proposition or issue from your pen on this subject. Then you will comprehend my "candor in giving up an opinion"!

As I note only the main points, or notice the chief misapprehensions, I hasten to the 6th proposition. I have asserted in one sentence that "*no repentance nor amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission.*" This I re-affirm as my full conviction. My brother Stone supposes he has found a few exceptions; but so long as there was, beside the special sacrifices for special occasions, and the various trespass offerings under the law, one annual sacrifice, one great annual sin-offering, for "an EVERLASTING STATUTE TO MAKE ATONEMENT for the children of Israel"—FOR ALL THEIR SINS, once-a-year, it is illogical and inconclusive to cite a hun-

dred or a thousand sins forgiven when this atonement is not mentioned.

If I prove baptism in one or two instances to have been by authority preceded by faith and repentance, should a Paidobaptist bring up a hundred instances in which neither are noted, I say it is idle and inconclusive. That such has been established once, twice, or three times, is enough in all logic and good sense forever. So I say to my venerated father Stone: When I adduce two such broad and clear authorities as "*Without shedding of blood there is no remission*," and "*This shall be for an everlasting statute to you* [Jews] *to make an atonement for all your sins once a-year*"—could you adduce a thousand instances of remission without any allusion to these, you have done nothing at all—nothing more than the ingenious and sophistical Paidobaptist, that tells of Lydia, Cornelius, and Stephanus, with their households, in opposition to a profession of faith and repentance as prior to immersion.

The most unguarded saying you have ever heard from brother Campbell is, that "NO SIN of ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven;" but *you* have made it unguarded, not *I*, by a new version: you read it, *No ceremonial defilement*, &c. You make no difference between a sin of ceremonial defilement, and an accidental touch of a dead body! But this is not exactly trifling, though very near to it.

The radical difference (I begin to suspect) between our views on this point is sketched by yourself in an effort to neutralize my 7th proposition. You say, "Without the blood of the new institution the remission of the least sin could not be obtained, because none without that blood could be led to believe in Christ, to repent, or to be reconciled to God; and therefore none could be pardoned. Then you affirm, if I understand you, that *the blood of the new institution is necessary to pardon—only so far as it is necessary to faith and repentance!!* This being true, "atonement for sins," "expiation of sins," "reconciliation for iniquity," "purification

of sins," "redemption of transgressions," "bearing our iniquities," "becoming a sin-offering for us," a propitiatory to declare his justice that he might be just in justifying the ungodly," &c. &c. are all phrases without meaning.

To say that Christ died for our faith, is more consistent and intelligible than to say he died for our sins. He died for our repentance, is more rational than he suffered the just for the unjust. He bare our faith in his own body on the tree, is, therefore, the true version of he bore our sins in his own body, &c. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the infidelity of the world. The glorified saints then, indeed, should change their language, and sing, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, giving faith, and hast washed us from our sins in the laver of faith obtained by thy blood," &c. I will not, until I hear from you, farther expose the massacre which such an interpretation would necessarily make of a thousand passages of scripture. I trust you will prove that I have misunderstood you, and that this is not your meaning. The minor points of the present epistle will fall in my path in the sequel.

Sincerely and effectionately yours through *the blood*, not through *the faith* only, of the everlasting institution,

A. CAMPBELL.

A NOTE TO MY PATRONS.

I stated in my last No. that I should give a synopsis of the doctrine contained in the discussion between brother Campbell and myself, and advise brother Campbell to do the same; and print no more in our periodicals on this subject. From the letter of brother Campbell just printed, no other principle than what has already been discussed in our letters, is brought to view. I am perfectly willing to rest the whole of our discussion with our readers, and if they have received any profit from it, let God have the glory. We have written honestly, I hope; and if we have in any thing erred, (and who but his infallibility is exempt from error) we hope it will not be imputed to us for sin.

I verily believe, that in the manner our late letters are written, we might continue to write all our lives without any

profit to ourselves or to our readers. We should involve every subject of theology. By long observation and experience I have found that when men have exhausted their sum of knowledge in debate, they supply that want with cynical remarks, which produce strife and angry contention. Brother Campbell and myself have not advanced thus far; but we are men, subject to like passions. I am confident we love each other as cordially now, as we did when we commenced this discussion. I speak confidently of myself. We love the same God and Saviour as fervently as ever, and delight to advance his cause, and to hear of its advance on the earth.

I have declined giving a synopsis of my views, as stated in our discussion; because I view it unnecessary. I do not expect to write more on this subject in the C. Messenger. Brother Campbell must take his own course. But it is hoped he also will cease. If he should think it proper to continue his letters, I may reply in an extra Messenger hereafter; but not at the expense of my patrons. My days are nearly numbered, and I wish to spend the remnant of them in preparing myself and others for eternity. My path through life has been rough and thorny; yet have I been cheered with the hope of immortality. I am now on the bank of Jordan, awaiting the voice of our great High Priest, to move forward to the heavenly Canaan. Amen.

B. W. STONE.

THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS.

LECTURE IV.

I come to the close of this all-important subject, and will now endeavor to show some of the happy effects of Christian Union; "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe thou hast sent me." John xvii. 20, 21.

The first effect of Christian Union is, that the world will believe that the Father has sent his own Son to be the Saviour of it. The world—the whole world are all under sin, and there is salvation in no other name but in that of Jesus. He will save none but believers in him; for he that believeth not shall be damned. What means has God ordained to bring the world to believe in his Son, and be saved? I answer; the unity of believers. Tremendous thought! And shall believers nullify the divinely appointed means by living in disunion! Shall they thus be instrumental in plunging the world into eternal ruin! Shall they thus live in sin, and sing the syren song, All is well! Shall they deride and mock those servants of the Most High, who plead for Christian Union, and urge it as the command of God, and the salvation of the world! O what Egyptian darkness has covered the Christian world!

Why has not the world believed in Jesus? Or why do they not believe in him? Because the means ordained for this purpose, is withholden from them; I mean the union of Christians. Were they one, as the Father and Son are one, the world would believe, or the prayer of Jesus would be disregarded by the Father. Zion, the city of the living God, his dwelling place, is the light of the world, and the ordained instrument of converting and saving it. In Zion are deposited the oracles of God—from her is to go forth the word of salvation to the nations of the world. She must so shine that others may see her good works, and glorify our heavenly Father. To her is the command given "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee; Then shall the Gentiles see thy light and flow unto thee; O, that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments, then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea. Thy seed also had been as the sand on the sea-shore, and thy offspring like the gravel thereof." Had Zion only obeyed his commands, (among which is, let there be no divisions among you) the consequence would have been, an innumerable spiritual seed, and that seed pure, clean, smooth and beautiful as the gravel on the sea-shore.

The church of Christ is called a royal priesthood; or they

are made kings and priests to God, our Father. This is the relation they sustain to the world. They are kings—not over one another; for they are all kings, and no relation could exist among them. This interpretation would lead to anarchy and insubordination; every one would do what seemed right in his own eyes. Kings must have subjects. And who are the subjects put under the church of Christ? I answer; the whole world of mankind. To Daniel vii. 17, 27, I appeal. "These great beasts which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." "And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High." The four kings are put for the four great empires, the Assyrian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and Roman. These successively ruled the world. But these kings or empires must be possessed by and given to the people of the saints of the Most High. They shall be an empire, or the kings of the world.

As a king gives laws to his subjects, so does the church or the saints united give laws—the laws of Christ, to the world. As a king rules his subjects by his laws—so should the Church rule the world by the law of Christ. As a king conquers rebels against his government; so the Church, whose members are all kings, is to conquer the rebel world, and bring them to the obedience of the faith—to conquer, not by carnal weapons, but by those spiritual weapons afforded by the spirit of love and truth, one of which is that union, for which we plead. Shall I presume to say, the salvation of the world is committed to the Church, under the great Saviour of all? This is the work assigned her. And woe to her, if it be neglected; but glory, honor, immortality and eternal life shall be her reward, if she attend diligently to it—if she be diligent to give the laws of Christ to the world by the means within her power—if she labor to conquer the rebels by the word of truth, and reconcile them to God.

They, the believers united, are also priests to God. If

they are priests they must have somewhat to offer. They must offer their bodies as living sacrifices to God, as did the great High Priest of our profession. Whatever we offer to the Lord is no longer ours, but his. So when we offer ourselves to God, we are his, and not our own. To take, and use the offerings of the Lord to any other purpose than the Lord intends, is sacrilege; and woe to the person who presumes to do it. Therefore, to make use of ourselves and the goods we possess, to any other purpose than to glorify God, is a sin of no small magnitude. As our great High Priest, we must pray for all men—for kings and all in authority—we must make strong cries and supplications to him that is able to save—we must offer praise and thanksgiving, the calves of our lips. All our offerings must be seasoned with salt, and on a pure altar, on which the sacred fire of the spirit of burning, must continually be found, in the flames of which our offerings ascend to God with acceptance.

O, if all who profess religion were spiritually and visibly united in the one body; and were not only kings and priests to God in profession, but also in reality, how soon the poor rebel world would bow submission to their rightful Lord! Then would wars cease to the ends of the earth, and discord and strife be known no more. A brother and sister would not sigh in death, as now they do, at the leaving of their children to the cold charities of the world. They would die in the full confidence that their family would be regarded by the brethren, and all their wants supplied. Heaven would be realized on earth, and the world would be bound together, not by ties of national policy, but by the bonds of peace and love. Party names and party strifes and bickerings would be banished from the peaceful abodes of earth. But who can describe the glories and happiness of that day? Roll on you tardy hours, and bring—bring quickly the joyful day!

Brethren of every name, help on this work by every means divine. For the want of this evidence—the Union of Christians, the world in thousands are daily dying in sin. Have you no sympathy—no bowels of mercy? Would you stop them from ruin? You have the means—be one, and they will be saved.

Let every christian begin the work of Union in himself. Wait upon God, and pray for the promise of the Spirit. Rest not till you are filled with the Spirit. Then, and not till then, will you love your God and Saviour—then and not till then you will love the brethren, who bear the image of the heavenly—then you will have the spirit of Jesus to love the fallen world, and like him to sacrifice all for their salvation. The cry will then be, Who will go for us, and bear the glad tidings to dying sinners that they may be saved. Every one in this spirit would flow together, and strive together to save the world. The secret is this, the want of this spirit, the spirit of Jesus, is the grand cause of division among Christians: consequently, this spirit restored will be the grand cause of union. Let us, dear brethren, try this plan; it will injure no one. God is faithful who has promised—he has promised to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. With this spirit, partyism will die—without it anti-partyism in profession only, will become as rank partyism as any other, and probably more intolerant.

B. W. STONE.

DR. CHANNING FOR RELIGIOUS REFORM.

The learned and eloquent Channing, in one of his late works, holds forth the following language in relation to the worldly spirit of subserviency, which characterizes the current religion of the day. He says,

"As a general rule, the Christianity of this day falls fearfully short of the Christianity of the immediate followers of the Lord. Then the meaning of a Christian was, that he took the cross and followed Christ, that he counted not his life dear to him in the service of God and man, that he trod the world under his feet. Now, we ask leave of the world, how far we may follow Christ. What wrong or abuse is there, which the bulk of the people may think essential to their prosperity and may defend with outcry and menace, before which the christianity of this age will not bow? We need a new John, who, with the untamed and solemn energy of the wilderness, shall cry out among us, Repent. We need that the crucified should speak to us with a more startling voice, 'he that forsaketh not all things, and followeth me, cannot be my disciple.' We need that the all-sacrificing, all-sympathizing spirit of Christianity should cease to bow to the world.

"It is a solemn duty to speak plainly of wrongs, which good men perpetrate. It is very easy to cry out against crimes which the laws punish, and which popular opinion has branded with infamy. What is especially demanded of the Christian is, faithful, honest, generous testimony against enormities which are sanctioned by numbers, and fashion, and wealth, and especially by great and honored names, and which, thus sustained, lift up their heads to heaven, and repay rebuke with menace and indignation."

A NEW CREATURE.

Though an individual have given ear to the gospel, consented in heart to its requisitions, and has been baptized for the remission of sins according to the scriptures, there is one certain proof of acceptance with God, which *may* still be lacking. It is of the greatest importance that the baptized believer try himself in relation to this particular. The apostle Paul, when speaking to a certain church, declared to them that "If any man be *in* Christ he is a *new creature.*" Those to whom the apostle wrote were doubtless all baptized persons; but yet he gives them to understand that the certain evidence was to be found in the proof that they had become new creatures, and *that* proof might be derived from a *new life*, with "old things passed away and all things become new." Alas! how few show a new life.—*Genius of Christianity.*

THE BIBLE ALONE.

Till at last, being by sickness cast far from home, where I had no book but my Bible, I set to study the truth from thence, and so, by the blessing of God, discovered more in one week, than I had done before in seventeen years reading, hearing, and wrangling.—*Baxter.*

That man needs reforming in spirit, however correct is his theory, eloquent his tongue, or learned his pen, who holds his dissenting brother as his inferior; calls him hard names, and treats his religious sentiments with contempt and ridicule. Too much of this spirit fires the hearts of many of the reformers of the nineteenth century; and I fear the Christians are not fully free from its baneful influence. Is not a reformation in the *spirit* of our sermons and written communications, in some instances called for? do they breathe the spirit of love and mercy to those who oppose us? or have we partaken of their spirit? Remember without charity we are nothing—yes, worse than nothing in the work of reform commenced and carried on by Christ and his true servants—without his spirit we are none of his. O, for a reformation in every part of the church, in spirit, in zeal, in love, in Christian forbearance, and holy living. Let us commence the work *now.*—*Palladium.*

CAUSE OF DISUNION.

The following extract is the postscript of an editorial article in the Christian Messenger of March last, entitled "The Disunion of Christians."

"We propose to the editor of the Palladium, that he give an explicit statement of the objections he and the eastern brethren have against us as a people. These objections I will endeavor to answer in a mild and candid spirit. We are not afraid of our errors being exposed—we wish to know them before we appear before our Judge in the last day, in order that we may reform. If you will publish my answer in the Christian Palladium, I should be glad to receive your objections against us, why you cannot unite with us immediately. I wish your objections to be short and pointed. If you accord with this proposition, and proceed to its execution, I have no doubt but it will greatly conduce to the interests of christianity." B. W. S.

With pleasure I comply with what I suppose is the design of these Christian propositions. I do not think, (though the extract looks that way) that the worthy editor of the Messenger is seeking an opportunity to occupy the Palladium with disquisitions on the peculiar sentiments of the 'Disciples,' but *Christian union*, between those of the *East* and *West*, of the *Christian name*, I conclude is his worthy object. With *this* and *no* other understanding of the matter, do I comply with his requests.

Br. Stone asks why the Eastern Christians cannot unite with the Western Christians. I think my brother is laboring under a mistake relative to the cause of our disunion, if such is the state of affairs between us. The Christians of the *East*, from their rise, have ever been ready to unite with *all* Christians—they are firm on this ground yet. They, in former years, labored to form a permanent union and co-operation with their brethren of the West. Messengers for this purpose were sent among them; but our friendly visits were not returned; our conferences were opposed, and finally, our offers for *union* were rejected: this was virtually, if not officially, the case. You have *gone over* to the Disciples; have become *one* with them; they are *close communionists;* hence we are debarred from their communion. You being *one* with them we cannot of course unite with you unless we leave our *old ground*, follow your steps, and become "*Disciples*," according to the rule laid down by Mr. Campbell. This we cannot do.

Union with all the saints, is what every enlightened Christian desires and labors for; the Eastern Christians have no other test of Christian union, than purity of heart and uprightness of character; all who give evidence that "*God has received them*," are admitted into full communion. Are

our Western brethren on this ground? if so, then we are *one*, and I have no objections to offer against an "immediate" union with them.

These imperfect remarks are submitted in friendship. Will the editor of the Messenger say how he likes them, and present in short, the principles on which he thinks the divisions between the Eastern and Western Christians can be healed? I will do all in my power to effect the desirable work.—*Palladium.*

—

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

Dear Brother Marsh:—You need not fear that I am seeking an opportunity to occupy the Palladium with disquisitions on the peculiar sentiments of the "*Disciples.*" My object, as stated, is to answer your objections, why we cannot unite. Should you object as a reason of disunion, to any doctrine or sentiment we hold, in this case you would allow me to speak out, and plainly. But your fears may be allayed by what you have yourself suggested, that my object is *Christian union* between those of the *East* and *West* of the *Christian name.* Yes, my brother, this is one great object of my heart. I not only desire the union of the Christians of the East and West of the *same name*; but also with Christians of every name under heaven—the name *Christian* does not make a Christian in deed and in truth; if so, I would desire union with none who did not wear this name; but many are called Christians who are unworthy of the name; and many are called by party-names who are Christians indeed, and who are worthy of the name of their Lord.

My brother appears to wish no union with the *Disciples*, but with the *Christians* of the West, who have the same name with those in the East, viz: *Christian.* This I view as a contracted, divisive spirit. Had we in the West, with all our doctrine, character and feeling, agreed to take the name *Disciples*, you would have rejected us *in toto*; your only objection would have been the name, and this the sole cause of rejecting us. Do you for this reason reject the

Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians, because they are called by another name than *Christian?* And would you receive them into Christian Union if they would reject their party names, and be called Christians? On this principle the name, not the thing, would be the *sine qua non* of Christian Union! Such union is not desirable. If the Christians in the East reject our brethren "the Disciples," from Christian Union, and seek union with those alone in the West who are called Christians, then there is an end of the cheering hope of union between us. We are not partisans, and therefore cannot reject our brethren, the *Disciples*, with whom we are harmoniously united in Christian love; nor can we see them rejected without feeling ourselves rejected also. We are grieved that they have taken another name; yet this shall not dissolve our Christian union. It is a fact that many among us are called Disciples, whose faith differs not from yours, and many are called Christians, whose faith in some particulars differs from yours. If you were to be united with the Christians of the West, you would be in union with many who have the faith of A. Campbell; and if you were to reject the Disciples of the West, you would reject many who are of your faith.

But my brother thinks we are laboring under a mistake, relative to the cause of disunion, if it exists between us of the East and West. For he says, "the Christians of the East, from their rise, have ever been ready to unite with *all* Christians—they are firm on this ground yet." I really should rejoice to believe it true—true in the general sense of the expression. But it comes out that *all* Christians means all who wear the name. And will the Eastern Christians unite with none else? No: for they blame us, the Western Christians, for uniting with the *Disciples.* He says, "You have gone over to the Disciples; you have become one with them; they are *close communionists;* hence we are debarred from their communion." My brother's information is incorrect. We did not go over to the Disciples. We had for many years before their existence been standing on the Bible alone, and endeavoring to live up to its precepts. They came on the same foundation on which we stood, and endeavored to live according to its holy precepts. Now

what could we do? Must we endeavor to push them off, and claim the foundation exclusively to ourselves? Heaven and earth would have frowned upon our folly; and all the world would have said we were insincere in our profession —professing the Bible alone to be the only true foundation, inviting and persuading all to unite with us there, and when they came and met us on this foundation, we should demur against it, and refuse to be united with them. Now did we go over to the disciples, or did we, as brothers, meet them on the Bible, and welcome them there? This we view as among the best and most consistent acts of our lives, and posterity will not forget it as a worthy example for their imitation. This objection of my brother to uniting with us, I hope is put to rest, never to wake again.

Your second objection is, that we in the West "have become one with them." Yes, brother, we have; and so far has the prayer of Jesus been answered in us—so far have the scripture precepts of brotherly love and union been fulfilled by us—so far have we acted as Christians should act towards one another. Can this be an objection urged by the Christians of the East against us of the West? Where is consistency fled? If this objection be still urged against us, our fond hopes of Christian union must die.

Your third objection, is, that the Disciples are *close communionists*, and therefore you are debarred from their communion." My brother is not correctly informed on this subject. I know not a congregation of Disciples or Christians in my knowledge, who debar from communion any christian of any name. We tell the people, It is the Lord's table, and for the Lord's people—we act not as inquisitors on their hearts, but tell them, Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat and drink. We give no invitations, but the general one, to the Lord's people—We debar none but such as eat and drink unworthily. It is common with us that Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians commune with us, and we with them. But was my brother to examine the authority the Bible gives for this, irrespective of man's opinions, he might find himself involved in greater difficulties than he might be willing to acknowledge, and feel less inclined to blame, whom he calls close communionists. There may be *close*

communionists among us; but can my brother find a passage in Scripture to separate from such christians? and to refuse union with such as love them and are united with them?

You add, "You being *one* with them, we cannot of course unite with you, unless we leave our *old ground*, follow your steps, and become Disciples, according to the rule laid down by Mr. Campbell. This we cannot do." This extraordinary sentence demands attention. "You being *one* with them." Yes; and they being one with us. The union is mutual.—But "you being one with them, we cannot unite with you." Invert the order, They being one with us—what then?—Could you not then unite with them on this ground? But seeing we in the West are *one* with them you cannot unite with us unless you leave your *old ground*. By the *old ground* emphasised, you mean the Bible. Does my brother by this hint, suggest the idea that we left the old ground when we and the Disciples were united? Is it possible he can believe this? The fact is, we should have left the *old ground* had we refused to unite with them; for the Bible every where teaches this duty. By the old ground, you mean in reality, the *old* opinions you entertained of the Bible. Many of these opinions I have relinquished without sacrificing one Bible principle. And if our Eastern brethren were to do the same, they might experience the advantage. If you think that the *old ground* justifies the disunion of Christians for reasons assigned by you, I advise my brother to search more accurately, and examine more closely whether you are not receiving the traditions of men for the commandments of God.

You add: "But if we unite with you, being one with them—we must follow your steps, and become *Disciples* according to the rule laid down by Mr. Campbell." What steps do you mean that we took, that you must follow? Not one step off the Bible, or into any known error? True, we stept forward to welcome our brethren to the foundation of the Lord. Did we by this step become Disciples, and not Christians?—But you say, "we must become Disciples according to the rule laid down by Mr. Campbell." What rule? I am ignorant of such inuendoes. My dear sir, we are not consummate blockheads to leave the word of God

for rules laid down by brother Compbell or any other man. I am really sorry you entertain so low an opinion of our intelligence and goodness.

Your ground of Christian union I approve, viz: "Purity of heart, and uprightness of character—all who give evidence that God has been with them." You ask, "Are our Western brethren on this ground?" I answer, they are, and always have been. I know of but one point of difference between us. You, by rejecting from union the Disciples, judge them as destitute of a pure heart, uprightness of character, and of any evidence of God having received them. When you think and judge differently, the union so much desired by all Christians I hope to see effected. I am truly glad that you have not introduced opinions as tests of Christian union.

May the Lord bless his people every where with the spirit of Union and brotherly kindness! Amen.

B. W. STONE.

MINUTES of a Christian Conference at Highland, Pike county, Illinois, April 9th, 1841.

Elders, and authorized brethren present—George Alkire, B. W. Stone, J, Burbridge, D. Roberts, Wm. Strong, Wm. Gale, D. Henry, C. Bolin, J. Sweet, J. Green jr. Wm. Gilliam, and many others.

After an appropriate discourse delivered by Elder George Alkire, Wm. Gilliam was called to the chair, and B. F. Vandooser was chosen secretary.

A committee of five was chosen to arrange the business to come before the brethren: the committee were G. Alkire, J. Burbridge, Wm. Strong, Wm. Gale, and D. Henry. After a short retirement they reported as follows:

1st. What qualifies a person to become a member of the church?

2. How is a church organized?

3. Who are the proper officers of the church, and what is their duty?

4. By what name shall the church be called?

5. Does God give his spirit to his children since the apostolic age? If so, by what means?

6. Shall we, as brethren, send out one or more evangelists—and can we sustain them?

7. What co-operation should exist between the preachers and the brethren to whom they preach?

These queries were taken up in their numerical order, and discussed in a christian spirit. A greater unity of mind and spirit has rarely occurred.

The first query was answered unanimously, that faith, repentance and obedience to the Gospel, or receiving the Gospel with gladness of heart, were the necessary qualifications to become members of the church.

The 2d was with equal unanimity answered—that such humble, obedient believers, by giving themselves first to the Lord, and then to one another, to watch over each other for good, become a church, but not fully organized till they appoint for themselves elders and deacons, and have them scripturally set apart by duly authorized persons.

The 3d was answered that elders and deacons are the proper officers of the church—and that the elders duty is to attend to the spiritual concerns of the church, and the deacons to its temporal matters.

The 4th was answered unanimously—the church of God, or of Christ.

The 5th was answered in the affirmative, except in its miraculous power; and the means by which it is received, are faith and obedience.

The 6th was answered *nem. con.*, by appointing two brethren. D. Roberts, and Wm. Gale, with a determination to support them.

The 7th was answered that the preachers preach the word, and that those to whom they preach should contribute to their temporal wants, and encourage them in their work.

After much christian conference, the brethren adjourned to meet at the town of Barry, Pike county, Illinois, in November, the Thursday before 3d Sunday, 1841. They closed in all good feeling and union. WM. GILLIAM, Ch'n.

B. F. VANDOOSER, Cl'k.

The C. Palladium and C. Messenger are requested to publish these minutes.

During the days of this meeting, preaching and other divine exercises were carried on, and seven were added to the church at that place.

ED.

A BROTHERLY HINT.

The Journal of Christianity, a weekly paper printed at Jeffersonville, Ia. by N. Field, is an excellent work; and were it not that the editor sometimes descends from the high peaceful spirit of christianity, to the low, vindictive slang and sarcasm, so commonly used by heated opponents, I should esteem it a work equal to any now current. In giving the world a "Journal of Christianity" we ought to be very careful lest we introduce spurious christianity instead of that taught in the New Testament. By doing this we naturally inspire our own erring spirit into the minds of our readers, and corrupt them from the simplicity that is in Jesus. Thus what should be a blessing to the community, becomes a curse. It is the sport and food of infidels, the laugh of hell, the disgrace of christianity, the ruin of souls, and the grief of the pious. The law of Christ our Leader and Commander, is, "In meekness instructing them that oppose—Speak evil of no man—Judge not, lest ye be judged—The wisdom that cometh from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and hypocrisy," &c. This law should be ever kept before our mind when speaking and writing. In acting up to it, we adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour, and *vice versa*. My brother Field I hope is too good a man to be offended with this plain talk of an old father in the good cause. If he should be irritated, he will see his error, should he live to my age, when passion shall have yielded to judgment, and the near views of eternity shall have obliterated the lust for fame, and the desire for the plaudits of the world. Who but the aged will undertake to correct the errors of youth? What I write I design for a hint to others, who may err on the same ground; not as a censor, but as a brother, and an ardent lover of christianity I write.

In this Journal of Christianity I have read a communication, headed, "Interesting correspondence on the three salvations," by J. F. I wish he had given his name in full.—It is a letter addressed to my worthy son and brother, B. F. Hall, of Louisville, and his reply. The caption drew my

attention to the letters. I read them with interest, and feel disposed to state the result on my mind.

"The three salvations." This is definite—but three; yet there is but one Saviour. Every salvation of man counts one, whether it be a salvation from temporal calamity, sin, or death. If so, there are more than three salvations—more than three thousands, or millions. Why so much is said of "the three salvations" by our brethren, I cannot tell; unless to make the doctrine accord with a system formed according to human wisdom. There is, and has long been a strong propensity in mankind to form a system of doctrines—a body of divinity—a sum of religious doctrine—a religious formulary, &c. These discordant things have corrupted and divided the christian world, and a new system will have a similar effect. Had the Lord, the Teacher of truth, seen that a system of doctrines would be better adapted to the world, he would have given it; but he has not done it; and shall we attempt to improve upon his plan? I think brother A. Campbell has somewhere wisely said, that the scriptures were never designed to be forced into a system. There are many in the present day, who firmly believe that the book titled the " "Christian system," is the creed and confession of us as a people. Our opposers are harping upon this string, and many weak ones among us are offended. I know it never was designed to be considered so by the author; and I heartily wish that he had chosen a less imposing title; and if ever he give the world a second edition of the Book, it is hoped that he will substitute a more modest, and appropriate title, with a short apology for doing it.

Brother Hall defines "spiritual death" to mean the salvation of the soul from guilt, pollution and the dominion of sin." Against this I have no objection, if rightly understood. Does brother Hall, and his correspondent J. F., understand *guilt* to be a liability or exposure to punishment for sin?—or that remorse of conscience, experienced by the sinner on account of sin? If the latter, with them I accord; if the former, which is natural and eternal death, then the salvation, whether spiritual or natural, is one.

Both our brethren agree that the death of Christ was the procuring cause of pardon! How, brethren? Were all the

saints before the flood, and after the flood till John the Baptist—and John and his converts, baptized for the remission of sins—and were all the saints till Jesus died and rose again, pardoned and justified, or spiritually saved by the blood of Christ? When it is evident they did not believe that he would ever die, and consequently were not led to repentance by his death—and if his blood led them not to repentance, and consequent pardon, how was it the procuring cause of pardon? As his blood could have no influence on the sinner, who believed not in it, then it follows that God was the only party influenced by that blood. How, and where in the Scriptures does it appear?

Brother Hall says: "Truth first takes effect upon the heart, totally eradicating the love of sin, and producing in the mind love to God, affection for christians, and a benevolence to all mankind, bringing about a perfect reconcilation of heart to God, which is evidently a feeling of acquiescence in all the divine will, and a love to the law of God, and a delight in doing his commandments." This is spiritual salvation. Yes; truly, it is a spiritual—a complete spiritual salvation, such as will make us holy and blessed in time and eternity. For this the saints in every age have labored, and hungered and thirsted. Yet my good brother Hall admits that there is another salvation disconnected with this, which is pardon. This second salvation is to be obtained by the means of baptism: For, "Baptism, says he, is the means and evidence of pardon." This pardon he calls "a salvation from the State of sin."

My brother will bear with me in a few remarks to disabuse the public mind with regard to many doctrines, said to be propogated by us, and which the extract above will have a tendency to confirm.

1. It is said, that we deny the influences of the Spirit in the production of true, spiritual salvation in man. Any man by reading this sentence, would be confirmed in the truth of the objection. In vain might brother Hall plead, that the word or truth, is the word or truth of the Spirit, and whatever is effected by it, is effected by the Spirit indirectly. Should I preach to the world, that God has given them his word or truth—that this they must believe and obey, and

that by it alone, without any other spiritual influence, they are to experience spiritual salvation, would this be the truth? They are informed that God will do nothing more for them, but remain an inactive spectator of their work of saving themselves by the help of the word alone. Now who in this belief would ever pray to God for his Holy Spirit? Who would pray or expect that the love of God might be shed abroad in their heart by the Holy Spirit GIVEN unto them? Who lacking wisdom, would ask it of God? Who, consistent with his faith, would pray at all? This doctrine is doubtless, the death blow of christianity—of vital religion. Verily there is a God that dwelleth in Zion—a prayer hearing God—a prayer answering God—who waits to be gracious to all that come to him in his appointed ways. Now, I am persuaded that brother Hall rejects this soul-destroying doctrine, though his words, above quoted, seem so plainly to confirm it. In a recent publication of his on the influence of the Spirit, he speaks very differently. Many of his sentiments delighted me.

2. The idea of this spiritual salvation existing in us without pardon, or the second salvation, or salvation from a state of sin, is a novel invention. Salvation from the state of sin, looks like the language of Ashdod. The Scriptures never speak thus. It may subserve the cause of speculation and theory, but not of the simplicity of Christianity. We may invent a doctrine, and find scores of illustrations to make it plausible; but they cannot make it true, if false, I certainly must object to the idea of spiritual salvation existing in any man, and yet that man destitute of pardon, or the second salvation, which is to be obtained by immersion. Till then his sins are not washed away, therefore they must remain in him, or cleaving to him. Now, if in this state he dies, he dies in his sins; and Jesus said, "If you die in your sins, where God is you cannot come." Will not this exclude every unimmersed person from heaven, even those spiritually saved? Yet brother Hall admits that such shall go to heaven who have experienced the spiritual salvation. But how can they enter there in their unpardoned sins? How will God pardon them without immersion? Has he any where hinted at another plan after death? In all good feeling to my brother I have suggested these plain thoughts.

I am confident that his correspondent, J. F. has fully confuted his idea of spiritual salvation existing independently of pardon. He has used an expression, borrowed from brother Hall, which I humbly hope may never again be used or introduced into the vocabulary of religious doctrine—the word is *regimental*, in contrast with *doctrinal*. My brethren may have definite ideas attached to the words *regimental*, and *regimental corps;* but they must not blame plain readers of the Scriptures for not understanding them. Every scriptural idea can be expressed in scripture language. I am ever disposed to doubt a doctrine as true, which requires unscriptural language to explain it.

J. F. believes, and plausibly advocates the doctrine, that a person who has received the spiritual salvation, has also received the second salvation, viz: the pardon of his sins, and that baptism is the symbolical representation of it. I hope to be permitted to examine this subject without offence, in my next number. It may be the means of removing a mountain of prejudice against us.

Before I close I will state a few ideas on the subject of the Spirit's influence in forming us new creatures. The word of the Spirit comes to us confirmed to be the truth by its intrinsic evidence—evidence capable of being understood and believed by sinners. This is evident, because sinners do believe and, like the devils, tremble at the dreadful ideas of hell, judgment, and a God, who will take vengeance on the ungodly. These are revealed truths, and these are believed by the wicked to their pain and condemnation. To escape the wrath to come, they may reform from their wicked course, and engage in some religious duties. But they remain unchanged in heart. The Gospel reveals a Saviour of sinners, whose calls, invitations, and promises encourage him to hope, and this hope brings him to trust in him.—"In whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation. In whom after that ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of your inheritence until the redemption of the purchased possession to the praise of the glory of his grace." Faith leads the believer to trust in Jesus, and then is he sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise—and this is the earnest of his inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession—i. e., until the resurrection of the saints from the dead. This spirit of promise is God's seal affixed on all his people. It is the Spirit of the Father and Son dwelling in them, and is manifested by the fruits they bear—the fruits of love, joy, peace, &c. Wherever the Spirit of the Lord is not, there is no love.—The love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit given unto us," and wherever the Spirit is not, there is no divine love, no liberty, no holiness. B. W. S.

DR. A. WYLIE ON SACRIFICE.

Extract from the Equator, a valuable small weekly paper, printed in Bloomington, Ia. May 15.

"On what moral principle is the sacrifice of Christ available for our salvation? And I answer in two words: that it becomes so by its *moral worth.* There is a value in the life and death of Christ, in his teachings and in the exhibition which he has given the world of the character of God, as a Being of love and mercy, of compassion and condescension, in the example which he has set the world of a life of suffering virtue. a life spent in active and unceasing beneficence, notwithstanding the most inveterate hatred and opposition, and the most bitter and deadly persecution, and in the evidence which he furnished by his doctrine and his own resurrection, of a future state, and of the glorious and eternal rewards of the good—in all this, there is, we say, a value, (a moral worth) sufficient to make it an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savor.

"I shall next show what theory this view opposes and with what it coincides, not wishing to cast reflections on, and surely not to wound the feelings of any man or body of men. These are no private views of my own. They are the views of men wiser and more learned than I pretend to be. They are the views of the bible. There I found them and there they found them. And when developed they may not ap-

pear to differ so widely as had been thought, from the views of others, except in words."

—

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE EXTRACT.

My dear friend and brother, Doct. A. Wylie, will please me much by accepting my thanks for the friendly hint, he has given the public, of the discussion between brother A. Campbell and myself on the atonement. He calls it a "a friendly controversy;" and considers this to be *rather a strange thing in the religious world.* How true the remark! A friendly controversy in the religious world a strange thing! What a stigma on the profession! yet too plain to be denied! I am sorry to say, the remark is confirmed by the course pursued by some of the current periodicals. "Man," said Solon, "is an imitative animal." That born of the flesh is flesh, and that born of the Spirit is spirit.

Brother Wylie remarks, "I agree with neither of them. The one, I think, errs on one side, and the other on the other." In our brother's opinion we are both wrong. Now, to err on so important a doctrine is a serious thing; and it may be true that both brother Campbell and myself are in error on this point. Will brother Wylie correct our wanderings from truth; and give us the very truth itself as taught by the inspired writers? What he said in the preceding part of the article from which I have extracted, and even the extract itself, my gross mind cannot apprehend, so as to receive conviction of right or wrong. I hope my brother, for our good, and the good of the cause will be more explicit. If we are incapacitated by prepossession to receive conviction from his essays in future, our readers may be profited.

B. W. S

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Fayette, Mo. May 24, 1841.

Dear Brother:—In looking over the Christian Advocate and Journal, of a recent date, published by the Methodist

Episcopal Church, in New York, I observed a letter from Rev. Thomas Johnson, who is superintendent of the Indian missions on the western boundary of Missouri.

Mr. Johnson, it seems from the letter, is highly delighted with a new work now publishing by the church, of which he is a very worthy minister, and called "Methodist Quarterly Review." What especially contributes to his pleasure, is the third article, in the January number (1841) of the work entitled "Christianity the means of civilization." I confess to you, my dear brother, that I am delighted also with the article, and I doubt not its perusal will cheer the upright in heart, although written by Doctor Peck, the Methodist editor. What an eloquent and powerful witness is the doctor for the efficiency of the scriptures without "*substitute,*" or "*auxiliary.*" Query! Can *Barton* or *Alexander* give us heresy that will excel Doctor P.? But to the extract. It is as follows: "How slow are men to learn that for every variety of human guilt and human misery, for every form of physical, intellectual, and moral evil, with which the world is filled by reason of sin, the Father of all flesh, the God of all grace, has provided a sovereign antidote, an all-sufficient remedy! This remedy is one and indivisible, admitting of *no substitute,* and needing *no auxiliary,* and it is found in the 'glorious gospel of the blessed God,' which is adapted to every human being on the face of the whole earth, whether elevated to the highest pinnacle of human knowledge and virtue, or fallen into the lowest pit of ignorance, degradation and vice. When the God of love sent the Son of his love on a mission of love to our perishing world, he designed to provide a scheme for human recovery co-extensive with human wo, and adapted to reach fallen man in every modification and circumstance of his being, and adequate to every conceivable emergency of that being. What infinite love has prompted, and infinite wisdom has denied, infinite power has executed; and now 'where sin hath abounded, grace doth much more abound.' Hence the gospel of the grace of God, the divine institution of christianity, is the first grand and only efficient instrumentality in the recovery of the family of man, from the horrible pit into which the human race have been plunged by sin.

"That gospel is designed for 'all nations,' including all the tribes of heathenism; it is destined to be 'preached to every creature,' embracing the inhabitants of every uncivilized country, of every barbarous clime, of every savage island, where human foot hath trod. It is divinely adapted to every man, in every place, at every time, and needs no previous preparation for its reception, no preliminary qualification on the part of any human intelligence to hear, to understand, and to obey it. It comes warning every man, and teaching every man, that 'by the grace of God, Jesus Christ tasted death for every man.' Such is the gospel, the glorious gospel of the grace of God, which is declared to be 'worthy of all acceptation,' that is adapted, prepared, suitable, fitted, worthy of the acceptation of all men. It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, but also to the Greek.

"And now, what is the conclusion of the whole matter? Does not the gospel accomplish all its promises? Among every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, where the simple gospel message has been taken, is there one example of its failure? Is any nation so degraded, any people so corrupt, any heathen so untractable, as to defeat the 'power of God' *which resides in the gospel?* Is any false religion so strong, any superstition so rooted, any abomination of paganism so indomitable, that the gospel cannot overthrow it?

"And does the gospel need to be preceded by the arts of civilized life, as the wisdom of man vainly teacheth? Nay, verily, the law of the Lord is perfect; the gospel of God our Saviour admits of no human emendation, and needs no human device, either to precede or succeed it. The reception of the gospel prepares the soul and the body of man to be useful and happy, even in this present life; it is a remedy for sin, in whatever form it exists, whether in heathen or christian lands.

"The only preparation the gospel needs, the gospel makes; the only auxilaries the gospel allows, the gospel includes; and as the social and moral improvement, which is the essence of civilization, is the fruit of the gospel wherever it exists; so the gospel alone is adequate to produce it, where it is not."

The extract is before you, and it is for your readers if you have nothing better to offer them.

I conclude with the following quotation: "Truth is mighty and will prevail."

Yours, in truth and love,
H. L. BOON.

Brother Elijah Goodwin of Mill's prairie, Ia., May 31, 1841, writes, that since the last time he wrote, 31 had been added to the church—that the brethren are awaking to the subject of practical piety throughout the country.

In the neighborhood where we reside there is a good appearance. At Union four were united to the church—four at Lynnville, three or four at Jersey Prairie, as many on Coal Creek, and some in other places within two or three weeks past.

EDITOR.

Salem, Ill. June 10, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE:—I immersed five last Lord's day, and the same number two weeks ago. The truth is prevailing here to a considerable extent.

Yours in the bonds of Christian love,
WILLIAM CHAFFIN.

NOTE.—The communication from Mathetes of Springfield, Ill., I cannot print, for two reasons; one that the writer has not given his name; and the second is, that it embraces a subject I am unwilling to see revived and discussed. For these reasons I beg to be excused from publishing the essay.

EDITOR.

Brother Daniel W. Gray of Bristol, Elkhart county, Ia., April 11, 1841, writes: "We have a congregarion here of 32 members. We have in St. Joseph's county six other congregations, ranging from 10 to 25 members; but we have huge mountains of opposition against us."

Fayette, Mo., June 1, 1841.

Dear Brother Stone:—I am requested by several of the elders that labor in word and doctrine, to give notice to our friends generally, both preachers and people, that a State meeting will be held at Fayette, Howard county, Mo., commencing on Friday before the second Lord's day in September next—and it is desirable that this meeting supersede, or take the place of the annual meeting appointed to be held with the congregation and friends at Dover meeting house, in Randolph county, in the month of October, as it is ascertained that a meeting at that time would conflict with other important appointments, and divide, instead of unite us.

At the State meeting we want every teaching brother, in health, to show his face, and it is very desirable that each congregation in the State send up its messenger or representative, with a free and perfect account of its condition, numbers, &c. &c.

I am also especially charged to say, that the friends and brethren most affectionately ask the presence of brothers Stone and Campbell, and any others from a distance who can at all, make it convenient to attend, and they wish you so to publish it. Ample accommodations will be provided. If you shall visit us, and I hope you will, please enquire for my house, where all gray headed veterans will find a hearty welcome, even though they believe all things which are written in the law and the prophets, and regulate their worship accordingly.

Through the Messenger, we request all the papers in the current reformation, to give notice of the meeting herein advertised, for the information of the friends and brethren.

I have just returned from an interesting meeting in this county, made so by the number of persons present, the interest taken in the word preached, and the number who made the good confession, and obeyed the Lord.

Yours in affection, H. L. BOON.

Myself and brother J. T. Jones expect to attend the meeting above, and shall wish some Mo. brethren to return with us. Editor.

NOTICE.

Near the same time will our annual meeting be held at Jacksonville, Illinois, viz: commencing on Friday before the

fourth Lord's day of September; where we earnestly wish to see all our preachers in the State, and as many of the brethren as can come. Brethren, do come, and let us unite in promoting the good cause in our country. We wish to know the particulars of every congregation in the State. Brethren of other States are also invited. We especially invite our old Christian brethren in this State to meet with us, that the cords of union may be more closely drawn. Accommodations will be abundant for as many as will attend.

Editor.

Georgetown, Ky., May 14, 1841.

Dear Brother Stone:—The reception of your letter gave me great pleasure. I had just returned from Harrodsburg, where we had a most interesting meeting. The weather was very unfavorable for several days, and prevented many from attending, who intended being there. We gained seventeen additions up to Wednesday night, and left the the resident brethren in possession of the field, with fine prospects. We hope they will reap a rich harvest in addition to what was done.

Our Union meeting in Lexington was one of the best attended I ever witnessed. The cause of truth gained a perfect triumph. It was proved in the Athens of Kentucky, that the leaders of the sects were afraid to meet the truth. You will see an account of our meeting in the Harbinger, and the Journal of Christianity. My object you know was to advance the cause of our Redeemer, by bringing to the Bible alone, all the pure in heart, from the different denominations. Brother Campbell was full of the subject. It is one that lays near his heart; and he rose on that occasion in the estimation of all.

The sects have resolved against us, and we will have to fight the battle alone. We must be careful that we do not fall out among ourselves. Some of the leaders of the parties are endeavoring to alienate our affections from each other; but I hope they will fail. May the Lord grant us the victory. I am in fine health, and as resolved as ever to break down partyism, and build up the cause of my Master.

I have reason to be one of the most thankful men on earth. May the Lord preserve me in humility and love to all my brethren. My love to you and yours,

Most affectionately.

J. T. JOHNSON.

New Orleans, May 4, 1841.

Dear Father Stone:—Two days ago I received the Messenger for the first. I will endeavor to circulate the work here. In the last two years quite a change has taken place in relation to the disposition on the part of the people to read and examine the scriptures since I settled here. I have endeavored to meet every first day with some one congregation, to worship God. After being here some three months, I looked about and found a little band of Baptists of the liberal order, with whom I have met ever since.

On every first day we meet for public teaching, prayer, and praises. The fellowship has not been attended to since I came among them. They break the loaf once a month. I commenced speaking, "by permission," and in the course of three months, I trust we have waked up the congregation to examine the word. Generally, each hearer has his or her Bible, and follows the speaker. We have immersed seven persons, some of whom were Roman Catholics. I do believe, father Stone, if the churches would send out godly men, full of piety and scriptural knowledge, that a great harvest would be gathered for the Lord. I look around me with sorrow of heart, when I see how zealous all the sects are, and we are doing nothing, compared with them. They are sending missionaries to and fro; and we, for fear, I presume, that we cannot do just as the Bible saith, are doing nothing. The Mormons have sent missionaries to Sheffield, Manchester, Leeds, and Bristol, in England; and scarcely one year has passed away since this enterprise was commenced, and what is the result? Some hundreds have landed here, in a few months on their way to the Palestine of America; besides hundreds have landed at other places. Well, if our brethren are disposed to hoard up earthly treasures, and not aid in sending out evangelists, the cause must go neglected.

Under the labors of brothers Kendrick, Mulkey and Matthews, about eighty persons have obeyed the gospel in Mississippi in the last three months.

May the good Lord bless you, and make you a blessing to many people before you go hence.

Yours in the good hope,

JOHN R. McCALL.

CATHOLICISM IN PHILADELPHIA.

Dr. Moriarty, a distinguished Catholic preacher, has been addressing crowded houses in the "Quaker City," and is said to have converted upwards of 300 to the Romam faith. His success has roused the Rev. Mr. Chambers and others to a successful effort in converting to the protestant faith. Those who argue the necessity of sects, in order to excite an active and laudable emulation, will, we suppose, thank the Lord, for the existence of Catholicism, and especially for the labors of Mr. Moriarty, who in this instance has excited the slumbering emulation of Mr. Chambers and others.—*Christian Publisher.*

Popery in trouble.—The editor of the "Catholic Advocate," a paper printed at the West, in a prospectus recently issued for a new volume of the paper, complains that out of a body of more than thirty thousand Catholics in Kentucky, comparatively few have aided to sustain it. He adds, "that many weak brethren have proved recreant to their faith, and fallen away; that others have concealed their principles, and not dared even to whisper the awful truth that they are Catholics; that many are merely Catholics in name, and are ashamed to practice their religion."—*Baptist Banner.*

Speak evil of no man.—Bitterness of language and personal reflections, will forever fail to reclaim or correct

the wayward and erring. Convince an indivipual that you love him, and that you seek only his good; then apply strong arguments in respectful language, and you may hope to overcome him with the power of persuasion. "How forcible are right words." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from among you, with all malice," is the express injunction of the apostle. The truth as it is in Christ, can never be advanced any farther than it is done in the Spirit of its divine Author. The gospel is a system of persuasion, not of force. *Hard* arguments in *soft* words, will accomplish much more than *soft* arguments in *hard* words.—*Christian Herald.*

To the Editor of the C. Messenger:—

Permit me to suggest to the churches in the State of Illinois, the propriety of having meetings, at an early day, to confer together on the subject of making arrangements at our annual meeting in Jacksonville, to place in the field as many evangelists as possibly can be sustained. The necessity of co-operating together in this important matter is apparent to all; and to insure success, all that is necessary is, to prepare the minds of the brethren before we meet. Cannot something be done? Will the brethren remain disunted longer? We hope better things.

Another matter to which I would call their attention is, the necessity of each church preparing a statistical report of the date of her organization—the number of members at the original organization—the present number—the bishops and evangelists. If this were done in each church in the State, (which very easily can be done) and printed in the various religious periodicals, it no doubt would often invite emigration of kindred spirits—secure the labors of travelling preachers, and have a tendency to build up the brethren—save sinners and glorify the name of our blessed Redeemer. Will the brethren attend to this matter?

D. PAT. HENDERSON,
Evangelist of Morgan Co. Ill.

Jacksonville, June 19, 1841.

CONGRESS OF NATIONS.

Mr. Editor:—The following paragraphs in the Episcopal Recorder, were lately pointed out to me by a lady, who expected that I should be highly gratified with them.

"It has been whispered in various quarters, that after the settlement of the Eastern question, a great Congress of Nations will be held at London, Paris or Vienna, to devise some plan for settling future international disputes without appeals to the sword. This would be a mighty step in the way of promoting human happiness "*under the sun.*"

"Would that these *whispers* might increase, until the general sympathy with the cause of human happiness should be too strong to be repressed, and loud voices should burst from every quarter of the world, calling on nations to 'beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks.' "—*North American.*

DIFFERENT MODES OF PREACHING.

Bold manner.—The man who preaches what he feels, without fear and diffidence.

Self confident.—A man who goes by nobody's judgment but his own.

Rash.—A preacher who says what comes uppermost without any consideration.

Rambling.—A man that says all that pops into his mind, without any connexion.

Stiff.—One who pins himself down to think and speak by rule, without any deviation.

Powerful.—The man who preaches from the bottom of his heart, the truths of the gospel with energy to the consciences of his hearers.

Finical.—Minces out fine words with nothing in them.

Sober.—The man who lulls you to sleep.

Elegant.—The man who employs all his brains upon dressing words, without ever aiming at the heart.

Conceited.—Vainly aims at every thing and says nothing.

Dogmatic.—A man who goes by his own brains, right or wrong.

Peevish.—One who picks into every body's thoughts, and thinks no one right but himself.

Fanciful.—One who, instead of being led by wisdom, runs after a thousand visionary whimsies and conceits.

Self important.—Thinks nobody like himself.

Noisy.—A loud roar, and nothing in it.

Genteel.—The vain fool that is fond of dressing up words without meaning.—*Hill.*

OBITUARY.

Rachel Luckie, consort of Joseph Luckie, died in Caneridge, Ky. very recently. She was well known to me for more than forty years a living Christian, and died in the full assurance of hope.

Also: Levi F. Hall, of Missouri. I boast of having been his preceptor. He was an honor to the human family who knew him—he honored his profession as a Christian, in name and life, and recently exchanged a world of sorrow for the rest prepared for the people of God. He was an elder brother of Eld. B. F. Hall of Louisville.

Columbia, Mo., May 24, 1841.

On the second Lord's day of this month, Bros. Thomas Smith, J. P. Lancaster, and myself were in Fulton. The meeting continued four days. Four confessed the Lord Jesus. On Friday the 14th inst. we met in Columbia, in accordance with the recommendation of the President of the United States. We had a fine congregation; bro. Smith and myself each addressed them. Our meeting continued until Lord's day evening. One valuable accession was made to the good cause—a young lady of great literary and personal accomplishments, volunteered as a candidate for Heaven. On the 22d inst. I preached at the *Bonne Femme* Academy, and immersed the young sister above mentioned. Yesterday, I had a fine congregation and hearing a few miles west of Columbia. One other volunteered to confess Jesus Christ.

Your brother, T. M. A.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

JULY, 184..

VOLUME XI. NUMBER XI.

From the Christian World.

THE INCONSISTENCY OF PARTY SPIRIT WITH CHRISTIANITY.

BY REV. A. P. LIPSCOMB.

I. The character of our institutions should prevent Christians from being involved in party strife.

No form of government, with which we are acquainted, has so direct a tendency to establish union among its subjects as that under which Providence has placed us. Such is the nature of our institutions, their effect is to bind us together. All are regarded alike; we are called by the same name, we hold the same principles, we enjoy a common birthright, and stand upon the same foundation. If the rights of one are respected, so are the rights of all: if the law spreads its broad shield over one, so it does over all. The paths of knowledge, business, fame and fortune, are alike open to all.

It is by this wise arrangement that we secure the greatest amount of happiness and prosperity. What other nations do for a part, our institutions do for the whole. Society is taken as society—the country as a country; all are contemplated, honored and blest.

If, now, such be the peculiar form and design of our institutions, then they can only be maintained by means that accord therewith. United on the great principle of equal rights—pledged to respect and love each other, as brethren of the same family, we must perpetuate our mutual relations by the cultivation of kindness and love, departing from every thing that would destroy sympathy and array one portion of community against another. Do we look to physical