

17 Schurlock's (wood)	Do.	1822	60
18 Union (wood)	Whitly		74
19 Poplar creek (wood)	Do.		18
THE FOLLOWING IS FROM ELDER WM. D. JONEDAN.			
Barksville	Cumberia'd	1829	14
Cumberland meeting-house	Do.	1828	68
Crocs creek	Do.		20
Overton	O'rton Ten	1830	22
Total			742

Reformation is still advancing, and opposition increasing amongst the sectarians.

Yours, &c.

JOHN JONES, jr.

RECEIPTS FROM JUNE 1ST TO AUGUST 1ST.

Shelbyville Ky.—By C. C. Scott agent \$5, of which for Wm. McDonald 1, for Ward McDonald 2, for A. Long 1, for Doc. Carter 1. *Maxville Ky.*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 2; 1 for T. Smith, and 1 for Wm. Short. *Danville Ky.*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 1, for J. Mahon. *Harrodsburg Ky.*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 2, of which for Js. Debond 1, and for A. Maury 1. *Versailles Ky.*—By Elder L. J. Flemming 1 for J. Mitchum. *Crawfordsville Ia.*—By Wm. Fisher 2, for S. Fisher. *Georgetown O.*—By Js. Clark agent 5; 1 for J. Stewart, 1 for H. Oakwood, 1 for P. M. Devore, 1 for G. Baker, 1 for H. Lindsey. *Cheshire O.*—By Elder Wm. Caldwell agent 3. *Hartford Ky.*—By Tho. Ross 3. *Union Ky.*—Js. Hurst 1, J. W. Moore 1, Elder T. M. Allen for Js. Hildreth 1. *Cynthiana Ky.*—Tho. Ware 1. *Fulton Mo.*—Elder M. P. Wills 3; of which 2 for Dr. Hobson, 1 for Wm. Nash. *Dayton O.*—By L. Bruen 5. *New Burlington O.*—By Elder G. Adams for Js. Carnahan agent, 650. *Greenville O.*—By Elder G. Adams, 7; of which 1 for L. D. Roll, 1 for A. Scribner, 4 for H. Lauramore, 1 for Job Westfall. *Malcolm Miss.*—By John Mitchell 2. *Gallatin Ten.*—By Geo. Crocket agent 5; of which 1 for J. Wallace, 1 for Sam Moore, 1 for S. Gourley, 1 for Wm. Bell, 1 for R. Winham. *Liberty Ky.*—By Elder J. Jones agent, 5; of which 1 for Jac. Huffaker, 1 for C. Huffaker, 1 for J. Hardwick, 1 for C. Hardwick, 1 for J. Ballenger. *Millsford O.*—By Walter Marsh 5; of which, 1 for Elder Jas. Bailey of N. Y. 1 for J. Washburn, of Pa. 1 for Sam. Kelly, of Erie Pa. 2 for himself. *Newtown Ky.*—By T. Brockman for Anderson 1. *Paris Ky.*—By W. Wilson agent, for Reht. Ayres 2, Elder Wm. Parker 1. *Cambridge Ky.*—By Js. Houston agent 6; of which 1 for bro. Laughlin, 1 for L. Houston, 1 for J. Barnett, 1 for C. Colcord, 1 for Wm. Henderson, 1 for Wes. Jamison. *Millersburg Ky.*—By Elder Josh. Irwin for Ab. Moore 2. *Cincinnati O.*—By J. D. Garrard agent 3; of which 2 for S. Messup, 1 for Isaac Sparks. *Union Ky.*—Elder T. M. Allen for R. C. Wilmott 1. *Isom's Store.*—G. Cathey 5. *Liberty Ky.*—Elder J. Jones 5. *Georgetown Ky.*—John Strickler 1. *Dover O.*—Sam. Holliday 8.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

By BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. SEPTEMBER 1831. [No. 9.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

From the *Millennial Harbinger*.

REPLY TO ARCHIPPUS—No. IV.

A letter received from James Fishback, D. D., of Lexington, Ky. assures us that he is the writer in the "Christian Messenger," signed "Archippus." Having been favored with the missing Nos. of the C. Messenger, by the kindness of its Editor, we lay before our readers the 2nd No. already replied to in our April number. Before we can in propriety publish any thing more from the pen of Dr. Fishback, we must review what he has written on this subject. Had he wished to discuss the subject in due form, he would have sent us one argument or essay, and waited our reply; but as he selected the Christian Messenger, and continued his numbers till he had delivered himself fully, (to which course we had no objections,) he cannot expect us to hear or answer any thing from him until we have examined what he has already made public property. When we have finished our review, if he feel disposed farther to discuss the question, the main question, we will hear him through the pages in which he commenced, and thus, if agreeable to brother Stone, all his readers will hear the Doctor as well as mine. I must, however, inform my readers that he has complained in the June No. of the Messenger, and in a letter to me, of some injustice done him in representing him as contending for a baptism peculiar to the Gentiles which he called "Gentile baptism."

Before seeing this complaint in the Messenger, I expected to have seen him either alone for the unfairness complained of in our first No. or make an attempt to sustain his references to the history of the Novatians. But as he only complains in turn, it is presumed he wishes to balance the charge of injustice by a credit of so much injustice received in return. Thus is my prediction already more than verified. In April last we predicted (page 164) that "before many moons he will surrender either his Jew's baptism or his Gentile baptism in the esti-

mation of all men of sense and intelligence, and among these I include himself." And in June, he not only abandons his Gentile baptism as distinct from the Jew's baptism, but considers it injustice to be represented as contending for a baptism peculiar to the Gentiles; or, in other words, that baptism means more or less to a Gentile than to a Jew. This more than verifies my conjectures.

But is it possible that we shall have to prove that no injustice has been done him in representing him as pleading that baptism, to a Gentile, meant not exactly what it meant to a Jew! When no less than *fourteen* questions are asked, (see pages 157, 158, c. this volume) to indicate the differences between the state of the Jews and Gentiles, with a reference, too, to the proposition—"That God justifies the GENTILES by faith alone;" and "that baptism has no more to do in procuring remission of sins, than any other work of faith has"—"but," adds he, "you perceive that I limit my observations on the subject of baptism to the Gentiles." Yet it is an act of injustice in us to "perceive" this, or that the question of Jew or Gentile has any thing to do in this matter of remission!!

But I did him injustice in heading the article "Gentile baptism," notwithstanding he limits his observations on the subject of baptism to the Gentiles!! How can this be, when he selects the cases of Gentile baptism, designates them exclusively as the subject of examination, and attempts to prove from these cases that baptism to the Gentiles is not for remission of sins? If he intended to show that we had misunderstood baptism, and misapplied the scriptures on this subject, why not meet us on the whole New Testament premises—why select the Gentiles, and confine himself to them and to the scriptures referring to them!! But I see no necessity to prove a matter which is now before the reader in Nos. 1 & 2, from the pen of Archippus himself. The coming Nos. as far as we have read them, are as full to the point.

The preceding article we have laid before our readers for reasons already assigned. They will recollect that we have already replied to it in the May and June numbers. We stated the contents of it from memory, and see nothing affecting the main question ~~not~~ ~~but~~ or overlooked, and shall not repeat our reply to it. ~~As this~~, indeed, was not formally alluded to in our reply, ~~which we~~ discover in the preceding essay is much relied on by ~~some~~ Fishback. Peter, he avers, did not, "when telling the Gentiles (mark—the Gentiles) all things that were commanded him of God to tell them, and even the words by which they should be saved, tell them that they were to be baptized for the remission of their sins, or in order to obtain their remission."

And, candid reader, will you ask our friend what did Peter tell them to do for the remission of their sins? Did he say, "Believe for the remission of your sins?" for remission comes

"by faith alone," as he has decided!! It is evident, then, that our friend is too sanguine here. He might as well, yes as reasonably argue, that the Gentiles are saved without either *repentance or reformation*; for Peter never once said to the Gentiles repent or reform, in telling them "words by which they were to be saved." This would be every way as scriptural and as reasonable a distinction between Jews and Gentiles, and as good a proof that reformation is not as necessary to Gentiles as it was to the Jews, as is his position and his proofs for Gentile baptism after remission. Nay, he might as well array Peter and Paul against each other, as Peter against himself in Jerusalem and Cesarea. For Paul says to the Athenians "that God commands all men, every where, to reform;" but Peter gave no such commandment to the Gentiles!

But, replies our worthy friend, faith implies repentance and reformation. Well, grant it—and what then? The name of the Lord implies immersion—for it was *through the name* of the Lord that Peter told the Gentiles remission came.

But what did Peter say to these Gentiles? Did he command them to believe, repent, or be baptized for remission? Not directly, Archippus himself will say. Did he mention grace, blood, or the renewal of the Holy Spirit before they received the Holy Spirit? No. I cannot tell what Archippus might not prove from all these facts, if he were to try. But let us hear Peter speak the last sentence preceding the marvellous gifts of the Spirit—

[New version] "To him bear all the prophets witness that every one who believes on him shall receive remission of sins by his name."—[Common version] "To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." The Vulgate, as translated by Father Simon, reads: "All the prophets bare witness of him, that all those who shall believe in him shall receive remission of sins through his name." Here is no command for remission; but the fact is declared, that the prophets affirm that "remission of sins was to come through the name of Jesus to all believers." It is not *en to onomati*, by the authority, but *dia tou onomatos*, through the name. Now if our friend would ask how remission comes through the name, he would find that Peter preached remission to the Gentiles as he did to the Jews on Pentecost. Men were by the authority of the Lord immersed into the name of the Lord; and if our learned and ingenious friend would ask when remission comes through his name to a believer, unless when it is put upon him and he is immersed into it, he might be constrained to see that Peter does not preach one gospel on Pentecost, and another in Cesarea. And is it not a little remarkable, that our ingenious brother should not have noticed that immediately after the interruption of Peter's discourse was ended, he forthwith commanded immersion in water. The name of the Lord, and water, with faith in

Jesus, were, it appears, preached to the Gentiles, when Peter told them the words by which they were to be saved!!

His not placing the words in the same order, or using identically the same words he used on Pentecost, is nothing to this question more than his changing of his phrases in the discourse in Solomon's Portico, Acts iii. To these Jews he said, "Be converted that your sins may be blotted out." I wonder why some ingenious brother has not noticed that not a word was said about immersion in Peter's second discourse. One might say from it that Peter only preached faith and baptism to certain classes of sinners: to the more sedate he preached faith for remission; and to the more flagitious, baptism for remission!

EDITOR.

"GREAT IS THE POWER OF TRUTH, AND SHALL PREVAIL."

We rejoice at the glorious and rapid march of truth. Thousands are enlisting under her triumphant banners, willing to sacrifice all for her sake. Human creeds, doctrines of men, and sectarian establishments are tottering, and falling before her. She has found able advocates in the ranks of the mighty. Some of them I take pleasure in announcing to my readers, by introducing a few extracts from their late essays. In the "Calvinistic Magazine," a presbyterian periodical, edited in Tennessee by Dr. Nelson, Messrs. Gallaher and Ross, is a lengthy essay written by Mr. Ross, headed, "Faith according to common sense." In this essay is ably taught the same doctrine we taught 30 years ago, and for which our Presbytery & Synod were so highly incensed against us, that we could not remain in their body. Now it seems the doctrine is fearlessly advocated by some, and tolerated by all; for we have not understood that Mr. Ross has been cited to appear before their judicial tribunals to answer for his heresy. The few extracts from the work are taken from the Christian Examiner of Louisville.

EDITOR.

FAITH ACCORDING TO COMMON SENSE.

PART I.

Faith is the condition of salvation. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) The condition could not be expressed plainer, and we would think the offer of God could be misunderstood by no man, if the fact to the contrary was not before us. Yet the subject of salvation through faith is a mystery to many who attempt to explain Theology. This acknowledgment is truly a humiliating one for Divines to make; but they must make it, and find their consolation in the circumstance, that humbler sinners have less difficulty than they in comprehending God. And why should there be difficulty in any mind? Why should it be harder to know what God means when he says, he that

believeth my word shall be saved, than when an earthly parent offers blessings to his son upon condition of his yielding faith to his promise? God certainly can speak as intelligibly as man; and surely he has used language which he believed was plain enough for the mind of every one.

To suppose otherwise would impeach his wisdom, and his goodness. How has it happened then that theologians have found so much difficulty in explaining the gift of life through faith? I believe much of the embarrassment has arisen from the various systems of mental philosophy. It is vain to deny that every man's view of the Bible will be modified by his ideas of the nature and the operation of the mind. Plain uneducated men, knowing nothing of systems of mental philosophy, have little trouble in receiving the word of salvation as it stands. Not so the learned man. When the plain sense of the Bible does not harmonize with his system, he is tempted to turn that plain language into something else—a something else that varies with his changing theory, and different from the views of other studious men, as his opinions of the mind are variant from theirs.

I once asked an esteemed brother in the ministry, a man of talents, and extensive theological attainments, "what was faith?" He answered, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for." (Heb. xi.) And then in explanation told me he considered faith to be a *spiritual substance*, imparted to the soul by the Holy Spirit; and that *belief*, which he viewed as a distinct thing from faith, was the act of man arising out of this spiritual substance. Now faith, and belief, are words used in the Bible to convey the same idea, when the subject to be exhibited is the way of justification before God; and this brother would never have conceived them to be different things had it not been for his view of mental philosophy. He knew that belief was the act of man; but how it was at the same time the gift of God, he did not see. He therefore viewed faith as the gift of God, that is, an infused *spiritual substance*; and belief as the consequent act of the creature. This distinction between faith and belief, as it was expressed to me, is the same with that difference so often made between regeneration and conversion; and is a distinction made under the influence of a difficulty thrown in the way by certain views of mental philosophy. The difficulty is this: How to reconcile what *God effects*, with what *man does*, when the change of heart takes place. This has always constituted the Gordian knot in theology. Some have attempted to cut it by making God the efficient cause of every thought and affection. Others have told us of this *spiritual substance* implanted by the Holy Ghost to be the cause of right conduct in the soul. Thus they have thrown around the subject of salvation through faith, a kind of metaphysical fog, which plain honest inquirers after truth could not see through, and sensible men of the world have too often been compelled to look upon with contempt.

I believe the offer of eternal life through faith, is, in fact, as it was intended to be by the Father of Mercies, level to the common sense of every man. And without farther introduction will in the plainest manner I am master of, show and illustrate the view which has so appeared to me. The prominent truth I wish to exhibit is this:

THE FIRST BELIEF OF THE GOSPEL WITH THE HEART, IS THE CHANGE OF HEART, OR THE REGENERATION OF MAN.

This position I will maintain by answering the following questions: 1. What is the nature of that state of mind called saving faith? 2. Is faith the gift of God? 3. Is faith the act of man? 4. Is faith regeneration or the change of heart? 5. What is the Truth embraced by the heart in the moment of its change, or regeneration?

He then proceeds to prove that *faith* and *belief* are synonymous terms. The last passage of scripture quoted is—

“But how shall they call on him in whom they have not *believed*, and how shall they *believe* in him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher? So then *faith* cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”—(Rom. x.) These texts, I deem it, are sufficient to evince that the words *faith*, and *belief*, are used in the scriptures, to express the same state of mind in man.—

What then is the nature of gospel faith? I answer:

It is in its NATURE the same state of soul with that faith, or belief, we give every day to any other subject WHICH REACHES OUR HEART. The following facts, supplied by the Bible, will support this position.

1. Christ and his apostles, when they required men to believe, uniformly spoke in such a manner, as to shew that they knew the requirement was *understood* by their hearers.

2. Christ marvelled at the *unbelief* of those to whom he preached.

3. The hearers of Jesus did in fact perfectly *understand* what was meant by faith or unbelief.

If then Christ and his apostles expected to be *understood* when they required men to believe—if the unbelief of men was a matter of *astonishment* even to Jesus, and if all to whom the offer of life was made *did perfectly know* what condition of mind was required of them, then surely, faith as to its nature is no mystery. It is simply what I have said—viz: a state of the soul not different from belief in any other subject affecting the heart. Take one of the commonest facts to illustrate this. Every youth properly nurtured *believes* in his father's love. He is then, (after you have explained to him the fatherly character of God) perfectly prepared to *understand* you when you tell him he ought to *believe* that God loves him. Why is he thus prepared? Answer. He knows what that state of mind termed belief, or faith is.—It is in truth the most common condition of his heart, and any attempt to explain its nature would only perplex and confound him.

If this view of the subject be correct, how useless, and worse than useless, is much that has been written to tell the *peculiar nature* of evangelical faith. All the information the sinner wants is to be told the *truths* he ought to believe—the *object* of faith he needs to know; not what faith is as an *intellectual condition of soul*. His language should be that of the man restored to sight, Who is the Son of God that I may believe on him?

3. *Is faith the act of man?* I have said it is the same thing in nature with our belief in any other subject *reaching the heart*. Such belief we know to be *our act*. Is the belief of a son in the kind word of his father his act? Surely. His heart is in it; from the very nature of such a belief, this makes it a voluntary act. So it is in the faith which lays hold upon the promise of God. “With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” (Rom. x.) It is no *spiritual substance*, but just the act of man.

Again; faith is the act of man, because God requires him to believe his word under the penalty of eternal death. Faith is the *condition* which man is required to meet. If he obeys the requirement he lives. If he refuses he dies. Is this not true? How then can faith be any thing else than the act of man?

The sum of what I believe is, then, briefly this—God through grace *inclines* man, by his Spirit—MAN when thus *persuaded* receives the gospel. The instrument by which the spirit accomplishes his work is the *truth*.

Regeneration is often represented as a “*something*” which the Divine Spirit effects in the soul by his *naked influence*.—This something has various names applied to it. It is with one, that *spiritual substance*, before mentioned. Others term it a relish or taste for Divine things. It is with this class of theologians, the *new holy nature* or *new heart*. This something is supposed to be infused, or implanted, or wrought, or created, (for these, and other similar phrases are used) in the soul while it is in a *passive* state. It is said to be a something totally distinct from, and previous to, any act of will; and not only so, but entirely different from any state the soul was before adapted or fitted to manifest.

This representation of regeneration I am constrained to reject for the following reasons:

1. Because it supposes that this something is an *addition* to the soul. It is clearly manifest, that, if the *new heart* is not a moral act, in other words a *new direction* which the soul takes by an act of will, then it is in truth an *infused* SOMETHING. And such an *infused* SOMETHING can be nothing less than an *addition* to the elementary properties of the soul. It is some *new essential nature*.

But the soul is an intelligent essence, ever the same in its constitutional nature. To suppose an addition to it is to deny it to be a soul, and to imagine it like a material structure. If one new thing could be infused, we might suppose a thousand; and thus, would be constrained to think the soul had no pecu-

liar constitution at all, but was an existence whose nature could be made any thing by additions from without.

2. I discard this idea of regeneration because it requires us to believe, that *another something* is taken from the soul. We are told, by those whose scheme I am considering, that the depraved nature in man is not his *moral act*, but a *spiritual substance*—a *something* that is part of the essence of the soul, totally distinct from, and previous to, moral choice, which something man had no agency in causing to exist, and which he can, in no sense whatever, put away from him. Yet, it exists in him, and constitutes him a sinner *before* he thinks, or acts, and *causes* his acts of sin by *positive necessity*. This something is supposed to be taken away in part, in regeneration. This scheme aims to be consistent with itself, for if the old heart of sin is an *infused* depravity in the essence of the soul, regeneration would of course be the taking of it away, and the *infusion* of a different elementary nature. But as I believe the soul is one, and indivisible, I dismiss this view of its moral change.

3. I cannot adopt this explanation of regeneration, for according to it the *heart* is *not* changed. The scheme, I said, aims to be consistent with itself; but it is not. For it represents the depraved nature just described, to be the *heart* of the sinner. Of course this heart ought to be taken away in regeneration. But it is not taken away. It is admitted by all the advocates of this scheme that this *heart* is not eradicated.—They are obliged to confess this, for the best of reasons—viz: the fact that men sin after they are regenerated. What then has taken place? Why, the depraved nature or old heart, is taken away *in part*! and in the place of that *part* thus taken away, this other something called a new and holy nature is infused. The soul then is not regenerated, by just so much as there is *left* of the old heart, for there is just that much lacking of a new one. The man, in truth, either has no heart, or he has a heart, part depraved, and part holy, or he has two hearts. It is impossible to avoid this conclusion if we admit the position that the *sinner's heart* is a depraved *something* existing in the elementary nature of the soul, previously to, and distinct from, moral choice—and that the *regenerated heart* is its counterpart, a *holy something* created in the soul, and like its opposite, distinct from, and antecedent to any act of will. Adopt this notion and it cannot be shewn that man is regenerated at all—the old heart is not taken away—and consequently he cannot have a new heart. But God says, 'I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.'

4. I cannot adopt this exposition of regeneration, for it exhibits God as requiring man to perform an impossibility. God says to every man, "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed, and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die?" (Ezek. xviii.) Here

we have the duty imposed, and the consequence of not doing it—death. And in the next verse God declares his feeling of compassion towards sinners. "For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves and live." (Ezek. xviii.) Language has no meaning, if God in this call does not teach us that sinners have, in some sense, *POWER* to turn themselves, and make them new hearts. But the view of regeneration I reject, shows that man can in no sense whatever comply with his duty. It teaches, in the first place, that his *old sinful heart* is not his moral act, but is a something which is part of the very essence of his soul, which he did not cause to exist—which he can in no way change. And such is the irresistible influence of this something, that it is as impossible for man to go to God to take it away, as it is impossible for him to cast it away himself. It imposes on him, therefore, an absolute, natural, irresistible necessity of continuing a sinner forever. In the second place this view of regeneration instructs us that the *new heart* is another something totally distinct from moral choice; created in the very elementary constitution of the soul, without any agency of man whatever. A something which he can in no sense make, and which God is in no sense obligated to give him. Man then is required by his Maker, upon this notion, to do an impossibility. I am obliged to decline receiving this explanation of regeneration.

5. I cannot receive this view of regeneration, because it has no support from the Scriptures. It represents the Holy Ghost to act upon the soul by his *naked influence*, and thus to impart this new nature we have been considering. But the word of God does not instruct us to believe that the spirit operates upon the soul by his simple efficiency: and from the manner in which we are told he does influence the mind, we shall clearly see that no such infused nature is, or can be, the result.

Regeneration, or the change of heart, is, in the Bible, represented as the result of the excitement of the Holy Ghost, acting upon the mind *through the truth*.

Here, to prevent cavelling, Mr. Ross introduces all objections to these views, which he answers by showing that God performs all his work, of begetting, purifying, &c. through the truth. He further adds—

I may safely say there is not a sentence to sustain the notion that the Spirit ever divests himself of his armour of truth and attacks the sinner in his naked efficiency.

If then the Holy Ghost accomplishes his work with the truth, we ask in the next place, *How* he causes it to influence the mind! Here too we have satisfactory information. The Bible authorises us to believe that God causes truth to act upon the mind according to its *natural laws*. Observe, the very fact that he renews the heart through the truth, tells us that he employs it in its usual nature, unless we are given to understand that he does not so employ it. But there is not a syllable

ble authorising us to think truth is applied in any other way. There is not a word to support the idea, that God operates without the truth, and not one to justify the thought that he uses truth in a supernatural manner. Again, God is said to *entreat*, to *beseech*, to *pray*, to *persuade* men to be reconciled to him, and when sinners, as in the case of Agrippa, are *almost persuaded*, they are besought to be *altogether* persuaded:—Hence, when God renews the heart thro' the truth, and we become not only *almost* but *altogether* christians, what is it but the *persuasion* of truth brought to the desired result? Again, sinners are declared inexcusable, because they will not suffer the truth to enter their minds. Of course, when it does prevail, it enters *just in that way* in which they ought to have received it. Again, christians are conscious that Divine truth has influenced them according to the ordinary laws of truth, and in no other way. Man then is regenerated through the *truth*, applied by the Divine Spirit, in the *way* of moral suasion.

Charges Exhibited against Mr. Barnes, minister of the first presbyterian church in Philadelphia, with a few extracts from Mr. Barnes' answer.

From the Christian Register.

1. He makes no mention of the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith.
2. He contemptuously rejects the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin.
3. He intimates that the first moral taint of the creature is coincident with his first moral action.
4. He denies that Christ sustained the penalty of the law, and employs language on the subject highly derogatory to the character of Christ.
5. He boldly affirms that the atonement of Christ had no specific reference to individuals.
6. He declares that the atonement, in itself, secured the salvation of no man, and possessed only a conditional efficacy.
7. He maintains that the entire inability of the sinner for holy actions consisted in indispotion of the will; and finally, he declares his independence of all formularies of doctrine, notwithstanding his professed adherence to them.

The atonement secured the salvation of no one, except as God has promised his Son that he should see of the travail of his soul, and except on the condition of repentance and faith.

I assume the free and full offer of the gospel to all men, to be one of those cardinal points of the system by which I gauge all my other views of truth.—I hold no doctrines—and by the grace of God never can hold any—which will be in my view inconsistent with the free and full offer of the gospel to all men; or which will bind my hands, or palsy my tongue, or freeze my heart, when I stand before sinners to tell them of a dying Saviour.

It is supposed that it is an evident reflection on the Deity of a most serious nature, to say that he has required under the penalty of eternal vengeance, that of man, which he has in no sense power to do.

The great principle on which the author supposes the truths of religion are to be preached, and on which he endeavors to act, is, that the Bible is to be interpreted by all the honest helps within the reach of the preacher; and then proclaimed *as it is*—let it lead where it will, *within* or *without* the circumference of any arrangement of doctrine. He is supposed to be responsible not at all for its impinging on any theological system; nor is he to be cramped by any frame-work of faith that has been reared around the Bible.

It must be acknowledged that the Presbytery had some reason for alarm at the avowal of such a doctrine as that advanced in this last extract. A preacher to interpret the Bible by all the honest helps within his reach, lead where it will; and not be cramped by any frame-work of faith! The "Confession" was in danger. The authority of Presbyterians and Synods, and "The General Assembly," was presumptuously questioned.—No wonder Mr. Barnes was assailed and condemned. He however found friends. The decision of the Presbytery was carried up to the Synod, and thence to the General Assembly, which disposed of the matter by a sort of compromise, as stated in a late Register. The division is not healed. It had spread far and wide. Dr. Ely, the editor of the Philadelphian, having supported Mr. Barnes, a new paper was established under the name of the Presbyterian; the two papers may be considered the representatives of the two parties in the Presbyterian Church, and whenever occasion shall be given to renew the strife, there can be no doubt that they will speak in tones that will shake the walls of a union, which policy far more than a common faith has cemented. G.

Dr. Taylor's Orthodoxy in respect to Human Depravity

Of all the changes in this changing world the changes of orthodoxy sometimes seem the most remarkable. It is perpetually varying with times, places, persons, and circumstances. Take for instance the doctrine of human depravity. Dr. Taylor, one of the Professors of Yale College, in his sermon on this subject, entitled 'Concio ad Clerum,' says, p. 26: "So far as the views of the orthodox are understood, it would seem that we are reduced to the alternative of *renouncing orthodoxy* on this subject in every *supposable* form of it,—or of adopting one of the following forms; either that *Adam's posterity* are one and the same being with Adam, and so guilty of his first sin by *sinning in him*, or that *God creates in us a sinful nature* or something else, which deserves his wrath; or that *at the very moment of birth we sin with the knowledge of duty*, and as voluntary trans-

gressors of known law; or that we sin without the knowledge of right and wrong even in the lowest degree; or that as free moral agents, we sin knowingly and voluntarily when we become capable of thus sinning. "Those who reject all these specific forms of the doctrine of depravity, must relinquish even the pretence to orthodoxy on this topic, and those who reject the last form of it, and adopt either of the preceding forms, will it is hoped, favor the world with some better arguments on the subject than have hitherto been furnished."

"Some better arguments." So we say. And yet in some of these preceding forms, now in one of them and now in another, here in this and there in that, has the doctrine of depravity been commonly held in the orthodox churches. Nevertheless, Dr. Taylor ventures to reject all four.

Of the first form he says; "To believe that I am one and the same being with another who existed thousands of years before I was born, and that by virtue of this identity I truly acted in his act, and am therefore as truly guilty of his sin as himself,—to believe this, I must renounce the reason which my Maker has given me; I must believe it also, in face of the oath of God to its falsehood, entered upon the record, Ezek. xviii. 3, 4."

Of the second form he says; "The moral depravity of mankind does not consist in any essential attribute or property of the soul—not in any thing created in man by his Maker. On this point, I need only ask,—does God create in men a sinful nature, and damn them for the very nature he creates? Believe this who can."

Of the third form he remarks: "Do you say that infants begin to sin at their birth! But some knowledge of duty is requisite for sin, and we know, for the historian has told us of some children who had 'no knowledge between good and evil.' Do you say, the language of the Scriptures is universal, and that all have sinned? The language too is universal, that we are to 'preach the gospel to every creature.' Of course, if your mode of interpretation is right, we are to preach the gospel to infants,—and to animals also!—to every creature."

Of the fourth form he says: "Do you ask, when a human being will begin to sin? I answer, I do not know. Some knowledge of duty is requisite to sin; and we know, for the inspired historian has told us, of some children who had no knowledge between good and evil."

Now we should like to know what of Calvinism any body can discover in the theory of human depravity which excludes the above-mentioned four forms of it! Nor does the fifth form, which Dr. Taylor adopts, bear the least resemblance to Calvinism, if we take it as he states it in the quotation we have already made, viz. "as free moral agents we sin knowingly and voluntarily, when we become capable of thus sinning."

C. Register.

EXTRACT FROM DR. WM. WALTERS.

PENDLETON CO. KY. July 5, 1831.

BRO. STONE:—Not long since I was at a Baptist meeting at P—. The preacher J— D— commented on the 3 of John's testimony. He stated that Nicodemus came to Christ with a lie in his mouth to tempt him; for, said he, How could Nicodemus, being an unconverted man, know that Jesus came from God! After he had closed his discourse, they entered upon the business of the church; the preacher rose and said, that G— M— believed in false doctrine, such as I preached, (designating me by name.) G— M— was then asked two questions; 1st. Did he believe we were born sinners? He answered, No. 2nd. Was faith the gift of God? He answered; faith is the act of the creature on testimony. The preacher then stated, that if every member of the church would fellowship G— M— he could not; and that every one that did not hold up his hand, should by him be considered opposed to the truth. Some of the church stated that if they entered into doctrinal points, they should not vote, as they also might be implicated. But Mr. G— M— who was their Clerk, was excluded for the *heresy* above stated. The preacher then observed, that the doctrine, preached by me, A. Campbell and others, had damned thousands, and split up the Baptist churches—that God did not like it—that the Devil did not like it, and that he would oppose it. The same day I found that a number of the church believed as Mr. G— M— did.

REMARKS.

When I first read this specimen of modern orthodoxy, and clerical despotism, I thought it unworthy of a notice in the Messenger. But upon mature deliberation I determined to give it a place, for two reasons; the first, that our cotemporaries might blush at, and avoid such a course; and secondly, that posterity may be thankful, that they are happily delivered from such clouds of ignorance. I admire the simplicity and honesty of the preacher, who acted up to his professed system, irrespective of its glaring contrariety to the scriptures, especially on the doctrine of faith. But I must express my full disapprobation of the course of that part of the church, who, believing as the accused did, were so gagged with servile fear, that they remained silent in his defence.

EDITOR.

OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE SPIRIT IN SALVATION FROM SIN.

This has long been, and yet is, the subject of controversy among the religious. It does not yet appear to approximate to an end, but continues to be an unhappy cause of iteration. All do certainly believe that Divine operations are absolutely and indispensably necessary for salvation from sin. They differ

as to the way or mode of these operations—Some believe that the Spirit operates on the soul *immediately*, or without means—Others that he operates *mediately* or by means of the gospel believed—Some believe that his operations are *direct*; others that they are *indirect*—Some believe that his operations are physical; others, that they are moral. I have long since thought that the disputants have run to extremes from truth. They appear to labor under an ignorance of the terms used in the controversy, and therefore attribute ideas to them not acknowledged by the opposite parties. In order to avoid confusion, I have presented the subject without those technical terms in the following manner.

1. Suppose God should extend his arm from heaven, and give to me, a poor sinner, the Bible; and should thus address me, 'Take this book—in it are all things necessary for you to know, believe and do—but you cannot know, believe, nor do them, till I, in my sovereign time and way, give my Holy Spirit to enlighten and renew your minds. On this plan, it would be consummate folly in me to attempt to know, believe, or do any thing contained in the book. To be consistent, I should lie inactive and wait for that sovereign power and time, if, *perhaps*, they may ever come. As well might the Bible be given in a language unknown, and unknowable to the world. What folly would it be to make a sacrifice of so much labor, money, and human life in printing and sending the Bible to the Heathen nations! What a heartless work to preach it to sinners in the land of Bibles? Can it be consistent with infinite goodness, that God should require a sinner to know and believe what is unknowable? and to do what is impossible? What should we think of a father, who should require of his little son, born blind, to read a book, and should unmercifully abuse him for not doing it? Or should he call his little child, born deaf, to come to him; and because the child did not hear and obey he should be sorely chastised? Or should he require his little son to do an impossible work, and beat it to death for not performing it? Would not all execrate the merciless, unreasonable monster? Could we conceive of a character more hateful? Will any apply this to God without trembling? If it be not blasphemy, I know not by what name to call it. This represents the theory of *immediate* operations of the Spirit in the salvation of the soul.

2. Suppose God should hand me, a poor sinner, the Bible, and should thus address me.—Take this book—in it are all things necessary for you to know, believe and do—there is nothing in it, but can be known, believed and done by you—by this book regenerate, quicken and save yourself—expect no other power, help or aid from me

This is the extreme from the former plan, and appears to me equidistant from truth, and equally dangerous to the souls of men. On this plan it would be folly, if not presumption, to

pray to God for his Spirit, or for any help or blessing. To be consistent, is not to pray at all, but to labor incessantly to save our souls by the means of the word. The former plan has no use for the word; it is nothing—it is entirely kept in the back grounds out of view—the latter makes the word every thing; and attributes too much to it; it seems to put it in the place of God himself, and makes it the agent, rather than the means. This plan is philosophy christianized. It may make a moralist; but not a spiritual christian. Some have represented this scheme by the physical or natural world. God has given to the natural world certain laws, as cohesion, attraction, gravitation &c. By these laws, or means, he causes the world to revolve and continue in order, without any direct or immediate operation. So has he given to the moral world certain laws, as in the New Testament, which laws received and obeyed by the moral world, or by mankind, will put them right and keep them right, without any immediate or direct operation of God. The idea is captivating, and may have captivated some. It may suit the perfect and sinless angels, or sinless beings; but, it is believed, for the depraved sinful world, the system will be found defective. The plan is completely sophistical. In the natural world the laws are divinely infixed, by which it revolves and continues in order, but in the moral world, the laws, once divinely infixed or written on their hearts, have been deranged and effaced, and the laws now given in the New Testament are *without* them, or not reinfixed, and cannot be, till God writes them there, according to the covenant of promise.

3. Suppose God should from heaven, hand me, a poor sinner, the Bible, and should thus address me: Take this book—in it are all things necessary for you to know, believe and do—it is intelligible, and credible, and suited to your capacity—in it are exceedingly great and precious promises to the obedient believer—believe and obey what is there written, and I will give you the Holy Spirit, a new heart, a right spirit; I will give you every promise of the New Covenant for time and eternity. On this plan I should be encouraged to activity and obedience, in the confident expectation of the divine aid, and the fulfilment of every promise.

To illustrate the subject I will introduce a case. A diseased woman had spent her living with physicians to no good effect. She was at a certain time where Jesus was preaching, and performing miracles. She believed he could heal, if she were only to touch the hem of his garment. She approached, touched, and was instantly healed. The Saviour inquired, who touched him—The poor woman expecting a reprimand, confessed. Jesus said, "I felt virtue go out of me," which virtue healed the woman. He said to the woman, Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace. Did her faith really save her? or was it the virtue that flowed from Jesus? Her faith only led her to.

act in going to Jesus, and touching the hem of his garment—through this means the virtue, or power, or Spirit of Jesus flowed from him *directly* to her salvation. So by the word of God we believe in Jesus—that he is able and willing to save us—believing we come to him, and his Spirit, power, or virtue flows from him to save us from sin, its power and dominion. The woman's faith saved her only as a means; so when we are said to be saved by faith, by the gospel &c. we view them only as the means by which the work of salvation is effected—by which we receive power to become the sons of God.

I fear that they who view the Bible as the agent, rather than the means of salvation, will, by acting on their theory awhile, and finding it defective, become discouraged; and having lost confidence in the scriptures as able to do the work of salvation, will either fly back to mysticism, or forward to scepticism. I fear, some of our brethren have been decoyed to step from the rock of salvation into the deep waters, and are now struggling for life. Poor brother, or sister, remember sinking Peter, "Lord, save I perish." Jesus is near you, and yet able and willing to save you, if you call upon him. "If any man among you, lack wisdom, let him ask it of God, who giveth liberally unto men, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him."—Paul prayed for those, who could not hear his prayers, and asked such to pray for him—He believed God could, and would answer those prayers uttered in faith. So does the

EDITOR.

The Western Luminary of Aug. 3, has ushered to the public view a production of Thomas Cleland D. D. in which he not only assails the character of Elder Thomas M. Allen with great rudeness, but also disgorges some of his sectarian venom at us. We cannot notice this man, for reasons we have stated long since, but not for those stated by the Doctor; therefore we offer nothing in reply to his remarks about "the external costume—internal furniture—or editorial complexion of the Messenger." It is to an impartial public we look for patronage, and for an expression of opinion in reference to the character, and standing of our paper; and not to devotees to sectarianism and bigotry. We are sorry that a lady of high respectability, both with respect to her character and parentage, should be also dragged by him to the gaze of the public, as "a lady of rather singular habits." These habits are undefined, and left to conjecture; every one as a Yankee may guess. And why is she thus noticed? Because she preferred the church of Christ to the Presbyterian.

EDITOR.

Extract from Elder T. M. ALLEN to the Editor, dated }
Aug. 9, 1831. }

On the first Lord's day of this month, and on Friday and Saturday before, I preached in Cynthiana and its vicinity. My

congregations were generally large and very attentive. On Lord's day three professed faith in Christ, and united with the church; these I immersed with one more, who had with two others united the Sunday before, at which time brother Gano preached there. From my extreme debility of body I was compelled to leave the meeting on Sunday, under very encouraging prospects of considerable additions to the church. I have recently immersed five others in other congregations.

I am requested by the friends in Cynthiana and its neighborhood, to inform our brethren and friends abroad, that ample provisions will be made for the accommodation of all, who may attend our annual meeting (Conference) on the 3d Sunday of Sept. beginning on Friday before.

Extract of a letter from bro. Tho. Carr to the Editor, dated,

LIBERTY, Ia. July 21, 1831.

BRO. STONE;—A Christian church was constituted here by bro. N. Worley the last of May of 25 members, 10 more have since been added. We have refreshing seasons—many appear to be anxiously seeking the Lord. Bigotted sectarians are grumbling against us. The cause is the Lord's and must prevail. We have a brick meeting house under contract, and expect shortly to have it inclosed. We wish preaching brethren to visit us. The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few."

Elder C. SINE of Timber Ridge Va. writes that he had just returned from Baltimore—that truth in that city is triumphing, and the prospects of liberal christianity are brightening. In his own neighborhood about 20 had united with the church within a year. Bro. Sine proposes a few queries to be answered.

1. If Baptism is the "*sine qua non*, without which nothing can be done acceptably," Why did Paul thank God that he had baptized none of the Corinthians, but Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas? Is it not strange that if baptism be the ancient gospel, that Paul was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel?

2. If baptism be regeneration, or the regenerating act, or the converting act, or the act through which we have our sins remitted, so that it is not proper to have Christian fellowship with any not baptized, Why did Ananias call Saul his brother before he was baptized? and is likely that Ananias would have called him brother a few days before, when breathing out threatnings and slaughters against the disciples?

Ans.—This latter query may be answered by asking another question, Why did Paul and other apostles call the persecuting Jews brethren? as Acts iii. 17. vi. 2. xiii. 26 &c. The first query, it is hoped, will be answered in another number by some qualified correspondent.

EDITOR.

The Union Christian Conference met at Flower creek Pendleton co. Ky. Aug. 5, 1831.

Elders present, George Fisher, John G. Ellis, Daniel Roberts, John Douty, and Wm. Walters. Daniel Roberts was chosen Moderator, and Wm. Walters Secretary. Letters and reports received from the following congregations, viz: From Republican, Campbell co. Ky. No. of members 25—Regular meetings 1st Lord's day of each month. From Flower creek Pendleton co. Ky. No. of members 53—Regular meetings 2nd Lord's day of each month. From Francis McHenry's Pendleton co. Ky. No. of members 30—Regular meetings 4th Lord's day in each month. Report by bro. Cooper from Union, Boone co. Ky. No. of members 40—Regular meetings 2nd Lord's day of each month. Report by bro. D. Roberts from Manchester and Hogan, Dearborn co. Ia. Manchester 40 members—Regular meetings 4th Lord's day in each month; and Hogan 40 members—Regular meetings 2nd Lord's day in each month. Agreed that our next conference be held at Republican meeting house, Campbell co. Ky. commencing the Friday before the first Lord's day in Sept. 1832. Agreed that bro. B. W. Stone be requested to publish the proceedings of this Conference in the *C. Messenger*.

DANIEL ROBERTS, *Mod.*

WILLIAM WALTERS, *Sec.*

DRY CREEK KY. Aug. 11, 1831.

BRO. STONE—I feel truly gratified to have it in my power to inform you, that our Conference was brought to a close with the good feelings of brotherly love, and Christian fellowship. Our regret was mostly on account of not having it in our power to see and be with yourself, and some of our preaching brethren in the upper counties of this state (Ky.) at our Conference. Permit me here to state to you, and our preaching brethren in your section of country, that it is the special request of our brethren in the bounds of our Conference, that as many of you as can visit us at our next conference, do so. Although I have not the pleasure of announcing a great revival amongst us, yet I have great reason to thank our Heavenly Father, that he has been pleased to add believing souls to our numbers, since our conference of 1830; which you may discover by comparing our present report with that of 1830.

At our conference the gospel of Jesus, the great head of the church, was preached in its native simplicity and purity, to the consolation of christians, and to the convincing of sinners; and on Lord's day a large number of christians recorded the love of Jesus in surrounding his table. May God prosper his cause and kingdom to earth's remotest bounds.

I am yours in the Lord,

J. G. ELLIS.

From the Christian Register.

SENTIMENTS OF DR. TUCKER OF NEWBURY IN 1768.

Human uninspired compositions, such as catechisms and confessions of faith, and those larger writings called bodies of divinity, may, I apprehend, be of good use among Christians, as they are supposed to represent, with some considerable justness, and in an orderly and connected view, the main principles and duties of religion. I think, an unjustifiable and ill use is made of these writings, whenever they become tests of orthodoxy, and are improved against any, under that character.

The sacred scriptures contain the revelations of God; and Protestants, from their very principles, as such, are obliged to acknowledge these to be the only rule or standard, by which the truth of religious opinions and doctrines is to be tried and judged of.

All these human, uninspired composures therefore; all bodies of divinity, whether greater or less; all confessions of faith, whether Scotch or English; and all catechisms, whether longer or shorter; these are all, just like our common sermons (upon a level with which they all stand,) to be received as the truth, only so far as they appear to agree with the word of God, and to express the sense of the sacred oracles; and every man must judge for himself how far they do this.

The question then arises—Who has a right or authority to make these the standard of religious opinions, and doctrines? Who has a right to require others to consent to them as the truth, and authority to censure them as heretical, if they will not? No one, I imagine, can, with any color of reason pretend to this authority, but he who can assume to himself the power of infallibility; because no other can be sure that he does not require a consent to error and falsehood instead of truth; nor could any other, I think, challenge a right to see and judge for his neighbor.

But, it must be observed, that all have an equal claim to infallibility; every one therefore has an equal right and authority, to require others to consent to what human writing he shall think proper, as the truth; a plain consequence from which I conceive, is this that no man, nor any number of men, have any right or outhority at all to do this. For to suppose a man has authority to impose his confession upon his neighbor; and, at the same time, to suppose his neighbor has the same authority over him, i. e. that they have authority to impose confessions upon each other, and yet are obliged to submit to each other, is a very palpable absurdity.

If they who are required to consent, are to make these exceptions, they may, doubtless, except against as much as they think proper, and against the whole of such human composure; if they judge it not agreeable to the word of God; and if they have a right to do this, their doing it ought to be no offence;

for a man's doing what he has an acknowledged right to do, certainly ought not to offend any body. And this is reducing these human compositions exactly to their proper state, *i. e.* to nothing at all as a standard of revealed truth.

Let these human writings be kept in their proper rank and place, and be made use of for their proper ends, *i. e.* as general schemes and summaries of religion, drawn up by fallible men; not to be imposed upon any, as necessary articles of faith, but to be examined by the word of God, and received, or not received for truth, according to every one's understanding and judgment. Thus they may be, not only harmless, but instructive and useful things among Christians. But to demand any one's explicit consent to them, by subscription or otherwise, as a necessary qualification to any office or privilege in the kingdom of Christ, appears to me arbitrary and tyrannical; inconsistent with the liberty of private judgment, and destructive of the sacred rights of conscience; and much better calculated to make men hypocritical and corrupt, than to prove their sincerity and soundness in the faith.

[Extract from Letter xii of Dr. Worcester's Letters to Christians.]

FALSE STANDARDS OCCASION FALSE ESTIMATES.

Mankind in their commercial dealings are often defrauded by the use of false balances, weights, and measures. In the concerns of religion, standards are used for estimating the characters and actions of men. Here, as well as in commerce, there may be false standards by which men may deceive, and be deceived. By adopting a false standard, the people of one sect may overrate their own worth, and undervalue the worth of people of other sects. It hence becomes a serious question whether false standards are not in use at the present day? and whether these are not the occasion of much censorious judging, as well as of self-deception?

Ever since christians were divided into sects, creeds or confessions of faith have been set up as standards of character, or tests of moral worth. That many of these standards have been false may be obvious from the following considerations—

1. In all the creed-making sects, each sect has a standard of its own, which is different, and in some particulars often directly opposite to that of another sect. Of course, there must be a false standard with one or the other, and perhaps with both of the two clashing sects.

2. It is a known fact, that the creed of a sect may become so changed in a course of years, that what was once deemed essential, is afterwards deemed erroneous; still the sect may retain its distinctive name.

3. All party standards are formed by substituting the inferences or explanations of fallible men for the language of the inspired writers: and these tests, formed in the words of man's

wisdom, are preferred to the language of the Bible, and are passed as a substitute for the word of God, as bank-bills are made a substitute for silver and gold. Is there nothing in this of too near an approach to self-sufficiency and self-exaltation?

4. "The poor have the gospel preached to them"—was a circumstance mentioned by our Lord, as a proof that the gospel day had commenced; because it had been predicted that such should be the case in the days of the Messiah, and that the way of holiness should be so plain as to be easily understood by the illiterate and the way-faring man. But what advantage can the gospel be to the illiterate and to children, if they are to be measured by such standards as have been adopted by many of the creed-making sects? How great a portion of those who give their assent to such creeds, are totally incapable of judging of their truth or correctness. Suppose I should subscribe to a creed in a foreign language with which I am unacquainted, to obtain christian privileges; what would be thought of me? and what should be thought of those who require such a subscription?

5. So far as articles of faith are made a test of character in the New Testament, they are the following:

That Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of the living God: and That God raised him from the dead.

A belief in the first of these articles was the test of discipleship during the ministry of Christ. After his crucifixion, a belief in his resurrection became necessary to a belief that he was the Messiah. Hence a belief in the second article was required, as added by the apostles. Accordingly Paul in stating the faith required said, "That is the word of faith which we preach—that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." John, in stating the object for which he wrote his gospel, said, "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." To persuade people to believe the two articles which have been named, was the great object of the sermons recorded in the Acts of the apostles. These, if I mistake not, are the only articles of faith, a belief of which is spoken of in the New Testament as necessary to the christian character, or as connected with regeneration, pardon, or eternal life.

A cordial belief in these articles naturally led to obedience to the precepts of Christ, and these are the appointed standard or test of moral character. Avowing a belief in Jesus as the Messiah, appears to have given such satisfaction to the apostles, that, on such a profession, 3000 persons were admitted as converts or believers on the day of Pentecost, the very day on which their profession was made. To be a disciple of Christ then, meant to be a pupil or learner in his school. For admission to this school, or the church of Christ, no articles of

faith were proposed as terms, but the two which have been mentioned. We are not, however, to suppose that nothing was required of disciples but a belief in these articles, nor that Christ instituted no other test of moral character. As the followers of Jesus were then a persecuted people; to acknowledge him as the Messiah under such circumstances, afforded much evidence of integrity of heart; and when a person made this profession, he implicitly professed a desire to come under the guidance of Christ, and a willingness to conform to his precepts and example. Henceforth the precepts of Christ were to be regarded by him as the rule of duty, and the test of christian character. That this is a correct view of the subject may appear from the following passages:—

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth the will of my Father* who is in heaven." Mat. vii. 21. "Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and *doeth them*, I will liken him to a wise man who built his house upon a rock"—v. 27. "And whosoever does not bear his cross and come after me cannot be my disciple." Luke xiv. 27. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me."—John xiv. 21. "If ye keep my commandments ye shall abide in my love." John xv. 10. "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you"—v. 12. "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you"—v. 14. "Hereby do we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments is a liar, and the truth is not in him." 1 John ii. 3, 4.

Besides these plain declarations, as to the proper standard of christian character, we are assured both by Christ and his apostles, that works of obedience will be rewarded at the final account, and that works of disobedience will be punished.—But where shall we find in the Bible, the least evidence, that any man will be rewarded or accepted on account of his belief of such doctrines as are, at this day, made the test of christian character? I know not; and I suspect that, after due examination, every honest man will be able to say the same.

RUTLAND, AUG. 4, 1831.

BRO. STONE:—I am well through mercy, though in great haste, and can only state that I have just returned from an extensive tour to the west, in which I saw clearly displayed much of the power of God, in the awakening of sinners, and in the comforting of the saints.

I am to start very soon to the east, and have only time to ask you to lay before the public the following notice.

B. H. MILES.

Elder Barsillia H. Miles, having left his former residence in Holland Ohio, and become itinerant; has resigned the office of Postmaster at that place; and wishes all communications, relative to the office, to be addressed to Saml. T. Paine present P. M.

THE INJUNCTIONS AND EXAMPLE OF CHRIST.

In Dr. Worcester's "Letters to Christians," recently published, we find the following pertinent remarks on the practice of censorious judging so prevalent among the different sects of Christians.

C. Register.

Among the numerous injunctions of the Saviour there is perhaps not one which has been treated with less respect or more frequently violated than the following:

"Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again." Matt. vii. 1, 2.

Luke has expressed the injunction differently:

"Judge not and ye shall not be judged. Condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned." Luke vi. 37.

How very little are these injunctions regarded by different sects of Christians in their treatment of one another! It will be pleaded that no one can suppose that Christ meant to prohibit all kinds and instances of judging. He could not mean to prohibit judicial decisions in courts of justice, and probably nothing was prohibited by these injunctions but what may properly be called rash and censorious judging or condemning one another. Be it even so. What then is rash and censorious judging? If I judge and condemn my brother as a wicked man merely because he dissents from my opinion respecting some important texts which we both admit to be genuine Scripture, am I not chargeable with rash and censorious judging? Or if I say that it is owing to the wickedness of his heart that he dissents from me, is not this rash and censorious? How often has the censorious accuser been the one in error? Was not Jesus in the right, as to his opinion of what it was lawful to do on the Sabbath? Yet on account of his healing on that day, the Pharisees ventured to say, 'We know that this man is a sinner.' Why then may I not be liable to a similar error when I thus judge my dissenting brother? If I am not inspired, how do I know that the error is not on my part? Or that my brother is less honest than I am in his inquiries after truth?

The reason given by Christ why we should forbear judging is deserving of notice. "For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again." This I do consider as similar to the admonition given Peter, "For he that taketh the sword shall perish by the sword." It was not, I conceive, the intention of our Saviour to be understood in either case, that the wrong done would in every instance be retaliated; nor that those who should retaliate would do right; but to forewarn his disciples of what would be the natural consequence of such rash and injurious measures. As a motive to forbear such conduct, he would have his disciples keep in view the common retributions of providence, even in the present state. Now what is more

common than for censorious persons to be censured! Or for warriors, duellists and assassins, to perish by the sword, or suffer a violent death?

Another precept of Christ is this—"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." This precept is as applicable to judging one another as to any part of human conduct. But where is the Christian who "would" that his brother should impute supposed errors of opinion to the wickedness of his heart? If I would that others should forbear thus to judge me, then of course I should forbear thus to judge them. This is called the Golden Rule on account of its excellence. But alas, how often is it treated by professed Christians as of no worth at all!

OBITUARY.

Departed this life on Tuesday the 19th of July last, of a billious fever, after an illness of thirty-five days, ABRAHAM REMAY HATCHITT, son of Elder *Joseph Hatchitt* of Ia. aged fifteen years and nine months. Previous to his sickness, he became serious, and was thought by his friends to be under religious impressions. During his affliction he was constantly engaged in prayer, when he enjoyed respite from pain, or was not overcome by drowsiness. At length he professed to enjoy peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. A few days previous to his death he pronounced the following words with an audible voice:

"O Jesus my Saviour I know thou art mine,
For thee; all the pleasures of earth I resign;
Of objects most pleasing, I love thee the best,
Without thee I'm wretched, but with thee am blest."

The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, and blessed be the name of the Lord. J. H.

Also died a few months before MARGARET MILLION, consort of Dr. *Million* of Bourbon co. Ky. She was truly among the excellent of the earth, a Christian in deed as well as in name. She was young, when cut off by a sudden death, yet had she united herself with the church some years before. She was not surprized at death's approach, but with boldness met the tyrant and by faith triumphed.

SOLITUDE.

Crowded towns and busy societies may delight the unthinking, and the gay—but solitude is the best nurse of wisdom.

In solitude the mind gains strength, and learns to lean upon herself: in the world it seeks or accepts of a few treacherous supports—the feigned compassion of one—the flattery of a second—the civilities of a third—the friendship of a fourth—they all decieve, and bring the mind back to retirement, reflection, and books.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

By BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY.—OCTOBER 1831. [No. 10.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER is published monthly at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for 12 numbers. They who procure ten subscribers, and remit the money to the Editor, within the year, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage of each number is 1½ cents under 100 miles, and 2½ cents over 100 miles.

From the *Millennial Harbinger*.

REVIEW OF ARCHIPPUS—No. V.

AFTER reading the above essay, no person, I think, can say that I have erred in representing this writer as making a difference between the meaning of baptism to a Jew and to a Gentile. Why, else, all this explanation of the differences subsisting between the state and circumstances of the Jews? Why so often contrast them with the Gentiles, and Peter's address to them with his speech to the Gentiles, if he preach not one baptism for the Jew and another for the Gentile! Immersion, as respects the *action*, is the same whether man, woman, child, table or cup, be put under the water. It is the meaning of the act which characterizes it; and if immersion has one meaning to a Jew, and another meaning to a Gentile, then there are two baptisms instituted by Jesus Christ. This I contend is the legitimate import of the above essay. But the writer does not mean what he says! He explains himself as making no difference between the Jew and the Gentile, as respects the meaning of immersion. We must, then, ascribe to him what some of our good preachers ascribe to the Holy Spirit, viz: "He says one thing and means another."

But Archippus will tell us that he reasons upon the differences between the Jews and Gentiles, not to show that Peter preached baptism for remission to the Jews, and baptism because of remission to the Gentiles, but merely to justify the style that Peter used to the Jews. For, in truth, according to him it is only a difference in style; and the Jews, owing to their peculiar circumstances, ought to be spoken to in one style, and the Gentiles in another. This is his plea, as I understand him.—Well, then, it follows that if the difference in style be merely rhetorical, and not logical; if it be only in the selection of synonymous words, and not of words conveying different ideas, baptism must mean the same thing to Jew and Gentile, and the question will be, whether shall we explain literally the address