drawn from this in opposition to the pre-existence of the Son of God, is new, and to me without weight. A better argument might be taken from it to prove the pre-existence of the body or flesh of the son of God—a doctrine received by none—and every where condemned in the Bible.

Your brother in the Lord, . EDITOR.

FAYETTE COUNTY, K. Sept. 3, 1828.

BR. STONE: Having been prevented, by the extreme illness of some of my family from meeting many of my engagements for the last several weeks, I avail myself of the opportunity of informing such of my friends as have not been informed of the cause, that my presence has been necessary in attending to the sick members of my family, and so soon as *the Lord will*, I shall again take pleasure in mingling with them in the social worship of God. In haste, I will also observe, that since the date of my last letter, published in the June number, 8 have united with the church at Antioch, and I have immersed 9; at Union 9 have united, and 8 been immersed; at Paris, 7 have united, and 10 immersed; at Cynthiana 6 have united and 4 immersed. The above account embrace only such as have united within my knowledge, and I have immersed; but as I have been necessarily compelled to neglect several meetings, the number may be greater.

On the third Lord's day of July last, I attended, with several other brethren, a very comfortable meeting at Harrodsburg. The congregations were large, and attentive, and many of God's children from different societies surrounded the table of their common Lord and master; 11 united with the church during the meeting, one of whom was a member of the Presbyterian church; the prospect was truly flattering, and I do believe the cause of the Saviour is advancing in our land, far beyond the most sanguine anticipations of its friends. In my next I will be more particular, and give an account of our labors in other places not hitherto named. The principal object of this communication being to advise my friends of the reason why I have not met my appointments, and to assure them, that as far as I am able, I will with pleasure co-operate with them in promoting the cause of our Redeemer. Your Brother, TH: M. ALLEN.

[We have received several communications which shall appear in our next.—EDITOR.]

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. II.] GEORGETOWN, KY. OCT. 1828. [No. 12.

A FEW REMARKS ON MR. STEELE'S SERMON ON BAPTISM—CONTINUED.

NO. III.

We have, in the two former numbers, considered Mr. Steele's indirect and direct proof for the church membership and baptism of sucking infants, and are well convinced that it is insufficient to establish those doctrines. We proceed to notice his other argument to establish the right of infant baptism, which is, "that baptism is significant of the same spiritual blessings to the Church of God now, as circumcision was to the Church of God in ancient times; and consequently the one has taken place of the other, by appointment of God himself." p. 18. That circumcision and baptism are significant of the same spiritual blessings, has been often asserted but never proved. Mr. S. has proved that circumcision signifies holiness of heart.—Dieut. xxx. 6. Rom. ii. 28, 29. But has he proved that baptism has ever this signfication? He has introduced as proof, John iii. 5; Acts i. 5; and 1 Cor. xii. 13: In not one of which texts does baptism signify holiness of heart. Baptism signifies the burial of Jesus Christ, and his resurrection from the dead; and is ordained as the means of the remission or the washing away of sin—of receiving the Holy Spirit, and of salvation. Did circumcision ever signify these things? and was circumcision ever ordained as the means of the remission of sins; of the receiving of the spirit; or of salvation from sin? It cannot be shewn; therefore baptism and circumcision are not significant of the same spiritual blessings. Their designs are vastly different, as will be shewn in the sequel.

We grant to Mr. Steele that circumcision is called a seal—once and but once is it so called. In Romans 4. it is said to be a seal of the righteousness of Abraham's faith, which

he had in circumcision. But where have we authority for calling it a seal of the righteousness of the faith of any other? —especially of an unbeliever, or of an infant incapable of believing unto righteousness? Infants once received the sign or mark of circumcision; but it was no seal of the righteousness of faith to them. As to baptism it is no where called a seal in the Bible. He introduces Col. II. 11, 12, in proof of his position. "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him by baptism, wherein ye are also risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead." The apostle (says Mr. S.) evidently speaks of a spiritual circumcision, and a spiritual baptism—and identifies the two ordinances as to their spiritual signification," as a change from a death in sin to a life of holiness." If Mr. S. be correct, the mode of water baptism is settled to be *immersion*, or a *burial*, and not *pouring* or *sprinkling*. But of this hereafter. On the text in Col: and its correspondent passage in Rom. 6, we will make a few remarks.

I. What is the circumcision of Christ?

II. Is the circumcision of Christ the same as being buried with him by baptism?

1st. The circumcision of Christ is that made without hands —it is a spiritual work—it is holiness of heart, effected by Jesus Christ. But by what means is this work effected? It is answered by being buried with him in baptism: for this is the means ordained to this end. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Arise and be baptized and wash away your sins." "The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us," &c.

2d. To the second query we will pay a little more attention, and shall take a view of Rom. 6, in which this subject is particularly treated. In chap. 5, the apostle had shewn that by the offence of the first Adam the condemnation to natural death was brought upon all mankind; and that by the obedience af the second Adam the justification from this condemnation to death, or a resurrection from the dead was brought upon all mankind. "By the disobedience of one many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous:" Or, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." He represents sin and grace as two reigning monarchs over the human family; sin reigns to death, and grace reigns to eternal life. In Chap. VI. 1. the apostle asks the question, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. For how shall we that *are dead to sin* live any longer therein?" How shall we love and serve that tyrant, which only reigns to kill us? *To be dead unto sin* is commonly explained to be spiritually dead. This cannot be true, for of this death the apostle was not speaking, nor does he once name it in the whole connexion. If spiritual death was intended, then did Christ also once die this death, "For in that he died, he died unto sin once," verse 10. Did he die a spiritual death *once*? Would not this imply that he had been previously alive to sin, that is, that he had been a sinner, but now had become dead to sin, or become holy? Will any affirm this? No. Therefore, *to be dead unto sin* does not mean to be spiritually dead to it. By the expression *dead to sin*, I understand, that all are naturally dead in the view of sin—all must die—"the body is dead because of sin"—Hence says the apostle, As Christ died unto sin *once*, so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin. Not that ye are now *really* dead, for you yet breathe and act, but you are doomed to die, and must shortly yield to the deadly dart of sin, as Jesus your head has done already; he died unto sin once, really submitted himself a victim of death to the deadly power of sin. Therefore, RECKON yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God—that is, RECKON yourselves as *alive from the dead*, or risen from the dead. That this is the meaning of the expression *alive unto God*, is evident from the whole connexion. vs. 8. "Now if we be dead with Christ we believe that we shall also live with him. Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more: death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once, but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise RECKON ye, also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Nothing can be plainer than this doctrine, that as Christ the head died and rose again from the dead to immortality and eternal life, or to die no more; so believers, his members, must die, and rise again to eternal life and immortality, to die no more. Paul represents believers as in Christ, the second Adam, or head, they are as members of his body

As he, the head, was crucified, dead, buried, and risen again to immortality; so believers, united with him, are viewed as crucified with him—dead with him—buried with him—and risen with him from the dead. In this sense all the children of the first Adam are reckoned dead with him, the natural head.

These precious truths are brought to view or represented by the figure of water baptism; for this, immersion, represents our burial with him, the head, and our resurrestion from the dead with him. Burial presupposes death. Hence says Paul, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so also we should walk in newless of life," or according to McKnight, "even so we also shall walk in a new life," meaning the new life in the resurrection, as is evident from the next verse: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." By baptism the believer becomes a member of Christ's body, puts on his name, or enters into his kingdom—he is baptized *into* Jesus Christ, and so becomes united with him—*baptized into his death*—not a spiritual death, for this death we have shewn before, Christ never died, unless he had been once alive in sin—*baptized into his death*, that is, every believer who is immersed should view that as Jesus was dead, and buried and rose again, so he shall as certainly die and be buried and rise again. He should after his baptism RECKON himself as dead, buried and risen with Christ; and consequently free from the reign or dominion of sin; because sin's reign ends at death with the believer. They may therefore RECKON themselves also as free from sin's power and dominion forever.

This same truth the apostle represents by another figure: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death," &c. Planting always implies a covering over. The Savior once said, with reference to his death, burial and resurrection, "except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." We, united with him, the head, are planted, covered over with him in water, in the likeness of his death and burial, and when we rise from the water it is in the likeness of of his resurrection.

We are now prepared to understand Col. II. 12. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are also risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead; and you—hath he quickened together with him." Mr. S. understands this *burial and resurrection in baptism*, as a spiritual baptism, the same as the circumcision made without hands, a deliverance from spiritual death in sin, and a resurrection to a life of holiness on earth. Surely he has not duly considered the awful consequences of his doctrine. For in the same sense that we are buried and risen, so was Christ Jesus our head. If our burial and resurrection mean, what Mr. S. says they do, p. 20. "that work of the Holy Spirit by which the sinner is changed from a death in sin to a life of holiness," it will follow that this same work was wrought in Christ, and therefore he must have heen a sinner, as we are, and experienced the new-birth, as others do; for it is said we are buried *with him*, risen *with him*, and quickened together *with him*. If one be spiritual, all are spiritual.

How can helpless infants be said to be spiritually *buried* and spiritually *risen* with Christ through faith in the operation of God in raising Christ from the dead, when they are incapable of believing or understanding this work of God? It is said by Mr. S. that circumcision required faith in the subject, and yet was applied to infants. p. 19. That faith, in every instance, was necessary in order to circumcision is destitute of proof, bible proof. The text introduced by Mr. S. (Rom. IV. 11.) we have before shewn to be entirely irrelevant, and must, we think, appear so to every unprejudiced mind.

As to proselyte baptism among the Jews, introduced by Mr. S., it can be viewed as nothing more than a human institution. We have no disposition to examine the controverted question, whether it existed before or after the Christian era. The pædo-baptist doctors have long been divided on the question In vain we appeal to human institutions to find out the mind of God respecting any doctrine. Equally vain is it to appeal to the Fathers of the first centuries. Such contradictory evidence is produced from them on many points in theology, that we should ever be in doubt what is *truth*, by attending to them. If the Bible fails to establish any doctrine, that doctrine should be honestly relinquished.

We feel as warm affections for our children as others, and feel the obligation as sacred to bring them up in the nurture, fear and admonition of the Lord; but we cannot, without a divine warrant, force them into the Church of God, under the New constitution.

I will here introduce an appropriate remark of Mr. S. p. 13 "Suppose a foreigner should arrive in the State of Kentucky, and have a desire to become a citizen; what would be the correct course for him to pursue, in order to ascertain the qualifications necessary for this privilege? Would he not at once refer to the constitution of the state?"—Certainly, we think, this would be the correct course. But we ask, would he refer to the old or new constitution of Kentucky? Certainly to the new; for the old one is set aside by the adoption of the new one. This is the correct course in order to ascertain the qualifications of citizenship in the kingdom of Christ, not referring to the old constitution, but to the new one, formed by Christ our King and law giver. Let a foreigner, not prepossessed by the opinions of any, read the new constitution or testament, would he ever imagine that any others besides believers were baptized and admitted into the kingdom? He would read the commission given by Christ to his apostles, Mar. xvi. 16. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He *that believeth* and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." He would read the Acts of the Apostles, and find that "they who gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about 3000 souls, who continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine," &c. Acts ii. 41.—"And when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. Acts viii. 12. So the Eunuch believed and was baptized—So the Jailor, Lydia, Crispus, &c. all believed and were baptized. Of all the instances of baptism and of admission into the Church, this foreigner would not find a sucking infant among them, nor a hint of its right to this ordinance, or to church membership. These are learned from the old constitution, which is superseded by the new. EDITOR.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

For the Christian Messenger.

THE COMMUNION OF CHRISTIANS AT THE LORD'S TABLE—No. I.

I am about to approach a subject, which I am aware, has divided great and good men, and which I readily admit is attended with greater difficulties than many imagine. That the Baptists and Pædo-baptists have both plausible reasons to offer in support of their views upon the subject, must be allowed. Conscious, therefore, of the difficulty of this question, and equally sensible of my own deficiences in point of capability to investigate it, I approach it with some degree of diffidence and hesitancy. I trust, however, I have some things to present upon the subject not entirely unworthy the attention of the christian reader: I shall therefore proceed to the point in hand. The question to be determined is simply this: Who have a divine right to partake of the Lord's Supper? The Pædo-baptists answer, "All the evangelical sects." But the Baptists respond, "Not so: none have a right there but the 'United Baptists.'" At least thus speaks their practice. These two opinions, now stated, form, it is believed, the two extremes upon this subject, which, I conceive, all christians would do well to avoid. I therefore take a medium where I believe the truth lies. I cannot go the whole length with the Pædo-baptists, in their plan of communion, because I have too much reason to believe, they convert this interesting ordinance of the Lord's house into a sectarian engine. They do not invite their sectarian neighbors to break bread with them, we fear, because of the christian love and good feelings they have for them; for much of these, as sects, it is impossible in the nature of things they should feel for each other, while standing as they do, upon different human creeds, and divided by different party names and opposing interests. But they invite them with a hope of increasing their popularity, and finally of gaining their sectarian brethren over to their creed. For, each bigoted sect looks forward to the time when their human creed shall triumph over every other, and all other sects be swallowed up in their own. If not, why cleave to their human systems? Notwithstanding, therefore, they all pray for the downfall of the kingdom of Antichrist, for the destruction of partyism, and the restoration of primitive order and simplicity in the Church of Christ; yet living and acting as they do, the import of their prayers, interpreted by

their conduct (a certain index to the sentiments of the heart) is substantially this: "O Lord, our creed contains the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;—we beseech thee, therefore, convert our neighbors and the world to our sect." Now it must be manifest that while such is the conduct of the sects, they are opposing the reign of the Messiah; they are fighting against his holy prayer for the union of his disciples through the word of truth;—and that their *free communion*, under such circumstances, is inconsistent, is a mere sectarian engine. For, what can it avail? This is the question. Should it even bring about the object in view, viz: the union of all the sects in one, it would have accomplished a most undesirable object; it would have effected a state of things which every christian should deprecate as one of the greatest calamities that could befall us. For, most assuredly it would not be that state of things, that union, for which the Saviour prayed; and therefore not permanent. What has our observation, in relation to such sectarian communions, taught us, upon this subject? Why, it has taught us clearly, that they produce no good effect. For many years we have witnessed the momentary friendships and inter-communions that have taken place among the sects, but as often have we seen them pass off, and sometimes end in more settled opposition and enmity than ever existed before! But whence this melancholy result? For there must be a cause. We answer, from the stubborn fact, that the sects are composed of jarring elements. As naturally, therefore, and as certainly, are strife, envy and contention connected with their very constitution, as an effect is connected with its cause. And just as soon may we expect to see a permanent union between light and darkness, between Christ and Belial, as between the different sects, while they cleave to their sectarian names and their human creeds. For these form the very core of the moral disorder which afflict and agitate them. All their momentary friendship, therefore, and attemps at free communion, must be looked upon as sectarian schemes; and are, to say the least of them, a healing of the hurt of the daughter of the people slightly, "saying peace, peace, when there is no peace; when God has not spoken peace."—It may be proper here to remark, once for all, to prevent misapprehension, that I rejoice to believe, there are thousands in the different sects, whose eyes have been opened to the evils of partyism, who,

from their hearts, deplore the sad state of things which exists in the church, and who are doing all in their power to restore peace, life and health to the mangled body of the dear Redeemer, which, alas! is bleeding freely at every pore. To such the remarks above made, do not, nor are they intended to apply. But they are intended to apply to the sects in their general characters as sects.—To return to the subject before us. For the reasons already given, I cannot go with the Pædo-baptists in their plan of communion. But I have another objection to their plan, which is this: They convert, or attempt to convert sectarianism into Christianity. Now, whether they do this designedly or not, we pretend not to determine, nor does it affect my argument which way soever you view it: for the consequence is the same in either case. But that such is the fact, we prove from the following considerations, viz: The Methodists will invite the Baptists and Presbyterians and all who are orthodox, to commune with them, and the Presbyterians, in turn, will invite the Baptists, and the Methodists, and all who are sound in the faith to come to their table; and thus they mutually acknowledge each other, in their sectarian characters, as churches of Jesus Christ!! What! has Jesus Christ a Presbyterian church, a Baptist church, an Episcopalian church, &c. &c. all rallying around different standards, and built upon different human foundations and influenced by different and sometimes opposing interests! And is Christ thus divided against himself! And do the scriptures recognise the existence of such sects!! Yet the Pædo-baptists, in their plan of free communion acknowledge all this!! I cannot, therefore, go with them.

If it would not be thought invidious in us (though we do most solemnly disclaim every such feeling) we would be tempted to draw a comparison between the conduct of the supporters of the various religions in the Roman Empire, at the time of the introduction of christianity into that Empire; and that of the sects, especially the Pædo-baptist sects of the present day.

1. "The Romans gave an unlimited toleration to all Religions, which had nothing in their tenets, dangerous to the commonwealth." Thus, they were disposed to support all religions which supported them: for religion, with them, seems to have been a matter of mere human policy. To the different sects. They are willing to give an unlimited tole-

ration to all those, who maintain the same fundamental principles of sectarianism. They will acknowledge the orthodoxy of all such, set down with them at the Lord's table; and thus give a kind of mutual support to each other, as a matter of sectarian policy.

2. But it is a stubborn fact which none will deny, that, while the Romans tolerated all other religions, they were most violent and unanimous in their opposition to the christian religion, though incomparably better, as all might see, than any other.

But what could have been the reason of this strange procedure on the part of the Romans? It was simply and manifestly this: All other religions in the Empire were substantially the same. But the christian religion sternly frowned upon them all, and aimed a death blow at their very roots. "They (the christians) dared to ridicule the absurdities of the Pagan superstition, and they were ardent and assiduous in gaining proselytes to the truth. Nor did they only attack the religion of Rome, but also all the different shapes and forms under which superstition appeared in the various countries where they exercised their ministry." Hence they were universally and violently opposed.

Now in tracing out the comparison, we remark, it is also a fact, that while the different sects tolerate each other, they are violent and unanimous in their opposition to all those who are pleading for the transcendent glory and excellency of the Bible, as the only authoritative rule of faith and practice. Now, we ask, what can be the reason of this? We answer, it is in this case equally obvious as in the other. The religions of the sects are substantially the same; they are based upon the same fundamental principles. But the religion of the Bible, equally opposed to all sectarianism, threatens the destruction of every sect. Nor do the friends of this Bible religion hesitate to expose, to public view, the anti-christian character, and dangerous tendency of all sectarian systems. They are ardent and assiduous in gaining converts to the truth. They follow sectarianism in all its various windings, and in all its attempts to hide its deformity and conceal its real objects, under fair pretences and pretty appearances. Hence the violent and universal opposition that rages against them. Hence the fact, that the sects form alliances and enter into combinations to crush the sons of religious liberty, and the cause of religious freedom as common enemies.

3. Another circumstance that brought the christian cause into contempt among the Romans was this: the simplicity of christian-worship and manners. They had no pompous ceremonies, nor outward circumstances of grandeur and glory connected with their religion, "and this was sufficient to bring upon them the reproaches of an ignorant multitude, who imagined that there could be no religion without these." So the cause of Bible christianity, and those who support it in the present day. Their manners and worship are simple. They have no pompous ceremonies, but little popularity, learning, wealth or power to aid their cause. In a word, they have scarcely any of those attractions which make a religion fashionable and pleasing to the world, and induce thousands, we fear, to embrace it as better suited to promote their interests here, than hereafter. Hence, those who have christian courage, fortitude and piety enough to stand up and oppose the desolating tide of popular and and fashionable religion, are every where (like the ancient christians) spoken against.

4. But once more: "The public worship of such an immense number of deities (among the Romans) was a source of subsistence, and even of riches to the whole rabble of priests and augurs, and also of a multitude of merchants and artists. And as the progress of the gospel threatened the ruin of this religious traffic, and the profits it produced, this raised up new enemies to the christians, and armed the rage of mercenary superstition against their lives and their cause. To accomplish more speedily the ruin of the christians, they loaded them with the most opprobrious calumnies, which were too easily received as truth by the credulous and unthinking multitude, among whom they were dispersed with the utmost industry."

So the popular sects and those whom they oppose. Ah! what thousands have wealth and honor flowing unto them in abundance, from the fact of their having embraced, and being engaged to support the popular systems of the day! And as the progress of the cause of Bible religion threatens the destruction of this religious traffic, and the profits it produces, they attack with the greatest virulence and bitterness those who oppose their human schemes, loading them with the most opprobrious epithets, as *heretics*, *deceivers*, *enemies of religion*, *wolves in sheep's clothing*, *Infidels*, &c. &c. Such are the best weapons they have to employ in defence of their cause, and against their opponents. TIMOTHY.

No. II—OF THE WORSHIP OF THE SON OF GOD

(CONCLUDED.)

Isaiah XLII. 8. is urged by our opposers, as an objection why the Son should not be honored as a being distinct from the Father, "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." This text has always, I believe, by Trinity-worshipers, been urged to prove that God never intended his glory for any other being than himself. Whether such a conclusion be correct, will be better ascertained by attending to the connexion. From the paragraph we learn that God was speaking of his Son, whom he had called in righteousness, whom he would keep, and give for a covenant of the people, a light to the Gentiles—who should open the blind eyes, bring out the prisoners, &c., and then he observes, "my glory will I not give to another," viz. to no other than the Son of God, the being of whom the Father was just before speaking, of giving for a covenant of the people, &c. From an impartial attention to the whole passage it will be evident, that this is the obvious meaning of it. For the satisfaction of the reader we will here insert it: Isaiah XLII. 5–9. "Thus saith God the Lord, he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it, he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein: I the Lord have *called thee* in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant to the people, for a light of the Gentiles; To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house: I am the Lord, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Was not God in the above passage speaking of his Son, whom he had called, would give for a covenant to the people, a light to the Gentiles; who would open the blind eyes, &c., and does not Jesus himself declare, that "*the spirit* of the Lord was upon him," that God had anointed him "to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind"? Had not the Father then given his spirit, *glory*, and fulness to his son Jesus, and "not to another"?

As this, however, is an important point, and lest there should be a remaining doubt, we shall adduce positive evidence to shew that the above is the plain meaning of

the passage. The apostle Peter in his address at the Temple, after he had healed the lame man, is positive upon the subject: "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers hath *glorified* his Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up, and denied in the presence of Pilate," &c. Acts III. 13. Hear this same apostle again, who is equally clear and conclusive: "Who by him (Jesus) do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him *glory*; that your faith and hope might be in God." 1 Peter I. 21. Do not the foregoing passages confirm the view we have given above, and satisfactorily shew that God had given the Lord Jesus *glory?* And it was to this effect that the Savior in solemn prayer to the Almighty, says, "And now, O Father, *glorify* thou me with thine own self, with the *glory* which I had with thee before the world was." Jno. XVII. 5. From the scriptures we are informed that it was not in vain that the Lord Jesus supplicated his heavenly Father; for it is declared that "he (Jesus) received from God the Father, honor and *glory*, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." 2. Peter, I. 17. And to this plain declaration of the Apostle, agrees the language of the Savior in his address to God, "And the *glory* which thou gavest me I have given them: that they may be one even as we are one."—John XVII. 22. And again he adds in the 24th verse, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my *glory, which thou hast given me;* for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world." Here then we have it plainly declared that God *glorified* his Son Jesus—gave him glory; that Jesus did receive honor and *glory* from his Father; for this *glory* he prayed and then declares himself that God gave him *glory*. Is not then the declaration true that God has not given his glory to "*another*," but to the Savior. Surely that man who would, with the above scriptures before him, say that God had not given Jesus Christ *glory*, must be filled with vain conceit, poisoned by bigotry, and warped by prejudice.

Again, say our opposers, it is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shall thou serve."—Matt. IV, 10; Luke IV, 8. God at various time in the old Testament, with a view not only of restraining the people, who were prone to depart from him, from committing "*idolatry;*" but also of impressing truth upon their minds, did

prohibit the worship of idols, false gods, or graven images; and that they should worship but one only living and true God; which heavenly truth is binding under the reign of Messiah.

But all this amounts to no prohibition under the dispensation of *grace*, to honor the son of God, as the Saviour, exalted Prince, and constituted Lord of all; for Jesus Christ is neither a false God, idol, nor graven image;—but the first begotten of the Father, the image of the invisible God;—a being whom *all* the angels of glory are commanded by the Father to worship;—a being that *all men* are required to honor; and in so doing they honor his Father also. It is a fact, I presume, admitted by all, that the worship of God has been materially variant under the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian ages of the world; and that form of worship which was acceptable to God in the days of Abraham, or David, would not under the Messiah be acceptable to him. As an evidence of the fact, there is not one sect of Christians that worship God as a Jew did, without Jesus as a mediator.—Thus we find, that Melchesidec could worship God acceptably without circumcision or the passover; that the Jews could worship God without baptism, or the Lord's supper:—But certainly no person who professes to believe in Jesus and the ordinances of his house, would pretend to say a Christian could do so now. But to worship in spirit and in truth, in the gospel age, you must honor the Son—bow to Jesus,—confess him Lord, to the glory of his Father, &c.

We profess to worship, honor, and serve *supremely* but one only living and true God. Yet next to him, and by his special command we honor his first begotten Son, and for this, any one who will examine the simple import of the foregoing scriptures, will at once discover that there is abundant authority. And while we are honoring the Lord Jesus, we certainly are, if there be any meaning attached to the scriptures, likewise honoring the Father also; for declares the Savior, "he that honoreth the Son, honoreth the Father that sent him." Moses declared that God would in the latter days raise up a prophet, whom we should hear in all things; and God himself, after the fulness of times had come, did audibly announce, "this is my beloved Son, *hear ye him.*" Now then attend to the Saviour, as God has required, and will he not in so many plain words tell you, *that all men should honor him;* and will you not believe it is acceptable to God, seeing

that by thus acting you thereby worship him also? But while we *worship*, and *serve*, supremely, the Lord God; who never did suffer, die, nor shed his blood—we next to him, adore the Lamb of God, who suffered and died on Calvary, who was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, who redeemed and washed us from our sins in his own blood—made us kings and priests unto our God and his Father, to whom be glory and dominion forever; and in thus fulfilling the plain precepts of Heaven, in giving glory and honor to the Lamb, in whom it has pleased the Father "*all fullness should dwell;*" let it be remembered we do not bow to a false God, idol, nor graven image; nor to a third part of Deity; neither to an ideal second person in the supposed Trinity; but the first begotten of the Father, God's own Son, the one to whom the Father has given all power in heaven and earth, and who will reign until his enemies are made his footstool. Neither is it deemed necessary for us, who supremely honor the Father, and next to him, his only Son, to commit *idolatry* in worshiping a *triune Being*, or a *trinity*, for which there is neither Bible precept nor example. If there is, let our opposers do as we have done, refer to chapter and verse.

Is it not impious for vain man, to oppose the authority of heaven, and affirm that God has not required men nor angels to worship and honor his son, as a being distinct from himself?—when he has exalted him to his right hand; made him head over all things to the church; when angels, authorities and powers, are made subject unto him;—when the Almighty has commanded angels to worship, and all men to honor him? The precept that "*every knee should bow to Jesus,*" is binding on all, notwithstanding some have the wickedness to rebel, yet the refusal of presumptious man, "who may *oppose*, or exalt himself above all that is called God," will not vitiate the law of him *whose ways are not mans ways.*

Christian reader, examine with impartiality and attention, the plain precepts given you in that precious book, *that came not by the will of man;* and while you learn of him, *who is meek and lowly in heart*, are you not taught to have your affections *supremely* placed upon the God of all grace, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and next to him, to respect his only Son, who came down from heaven to die that you might live, who shed his blood to wash away your sins, redeem you from woe, ransom you from the grave, and

take you to an inheritance that fadeth not away? Surely you will not only regard it a duty, but esteem it an inestimable privilege to honor that holy being who has done so much for you, who in agony could say, Father *not my will, but thine be done*, who after his resurrection affirmed, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive forever more." Yes, you will not hesitate to honor "*the Lamb that was slain*," knowing that to "*obey, is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams;*" and when you do homage to the Son, you know he is a being distinct from the Father; for the Father never was *slain, dead, and made alive again*, never redeemed you to *God* by his own blood—never said, not my will, but thine be done—never was sent to save the world. But Jesus came from heaven, loved the world, died for his enemies, to reconcile them to God—and will come the second time without sin unto salvation—to gather his followers home. Then be *faithful* unto death, and he will give you a crown of life. Hear as an idle tale, the cry of idolatry, and remember that "*it is a very small thing to be judged of mans judgment.*"

The charge is founded in ignorance, is in opposition to the command of God. the requirement of Jesus, the teaching of his apostles, the example of primitive christians, and the blissful employment of the redeemed in glory, who around the eternal throne, sing, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing,"—"for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation,"—therefore, "glory and power be unto *Him* that sitteth upon the throne, *and* unto the *Lamb* forever and ever." PHILIP.

DECALB COUNTY, (Geo.) July 30th, 1828.

BROTHER STONE,—You have received, and communicated to us good news through the medium of your Messenger from the most of the States in the Union. The Brethren of our State it appears have lain neutral; for I have seen no accounts in your paper from us. While the Brethren are giving the accounts of the success and prosperity of the cause in their several boundaries, it also seemed good to me to make some statements to you, which you may use as you please.

The Christian Church in this State has been in a prosperous situation for the last six years. A number of Elders have been added, and the number of Churches and members much increased. We have some faithful itinerant Elders, who travel extensively in our State and preach the gospel: yet the desires of the people are not half satisfied. Many of them are hearing and embracing the truth, while others raise all the opposition and persecution they can; yet truth is cutting its way, and they are applying to the only infallible Rule (the Bible) to know what they must believe, and not to the creeds of the day.

I came to this county some time in December last and found one Elder, (Bro: Holloway) and but few members. I began to proclaim, with Brother Holloway, the ancient gospel to but few at first; who were quite attentive—the number gradually increased. I had only one day in seven to preach; the rest of my time was occupied in labour for a support: but generally I made the best use of that in my power, preaching twice a day. The first Sabbath in June I adressed a large audience, who gave great heed to the word. At two hours by sun the people came together again, at which meeting six professed faith in Christ. On the Saturday following Elder Dupree met me, at which time we organised a church of eight members, to whom the next day five more were added. The fifth Sabbath in June I attended for the purpose of receiving and baptising, at which time some were added and thirteen immersed. On the next Sabbath, and Saturday before, Elders A. Dupee and Wm. McGaughey met me there again, at which meeting seventeen more were united, and I immersed nine. Our number at present is thirty-four, only two of whom joined by letter. We anticipate good times here at our intended Camp Meeting, which will commence on Friday night before the second Sabbath in October. At every meeting there are crowds of mourners and new signs of conviction. I preach at two other places where there is a good work commencing. They are about building meeting houses for me, and I expect to organise a church at one of them shortly. You shall hear from us again when convenient. JAMES BUYS.

DUBLIN, (Ohio) Sept. 10th, 1828.

BROTHER STONE,—I attended a Camp Meeting in Delaware county. It commenced on Friday 5th inst. and continued till Monday. There the power of God was displayed; many professed faith in Christ. There was a general

union among the different societies.—It was glorious to behold. Reformation is spreading rapidly through that section of country, under the labours of Elder T. L. Campbell. Many are turning to the Lord where I labour. Churches have been planted in different places. O Lord send salvation to the ends of the earth!—Your Brother, in hope of Eternal life, ISAAC N. WALTER.

Extract of a letter to the Editor from Elder WM. MCGAUHY, *dated Lawrenceville,* (Ga.) *July 4th,* 1828.

BRO: STONE,—On the 21st of December last I commenced preaching in the lower parts of Alabama, in Montgomery and the adjourning counties. No *Christian* preacher had labored there, except Bro: Ishmael Davis, whose labors though limited, have been blessed. I preached to large and attentive congregations. We met with much opposition from sectarians; yet within a few months we have organized three churches—one of three members, another of four, to which thirteen new converts have been added, and another of twelve, all new converts. The good work continues. If any fellow servant should feel disposed to visit the brethren here he will be gladly received. There is a great door opened for preaching the gospel here.

A QUERY,

Proposed for the C. Messenger by Elder JESSE HUGHS, *of Pa.*

If the Lord Jesus commanded the disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, why did they pursue the general practice of baptizing *in the name of the Lord Jesus?*

ANSWER.

The query is acknowledged to be difficult of solution, yet it is one worthy of inquiry. What I may say is rather designed to solicit investigation, than to give correct information. Others may improve on the hints which may be suggested.

1st. I remark that in the act of baptizing three prepositions *epi, en* and *eis* are used in the Greek of various signification when joined with *the name of.* Thus, Acts 2. 28. "Repent and be baptized—in (*epi*) the name of the name of Jesus Christ."—"And he commanded them to be baptized in (*en*) the name of the Lord." Acts 10. 48.—"Only they were baptized in (*eis*) the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 8. 16.

2. I further remark that the words *epi* and *en* are but once used in the case of baptism, and are found only in the two texts just referred to; in every other case the word *eis* is used. As Matt: 28. 19—"Baptizing them in (*eis,* into) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Acts 8. 16—"Only they were baptized in (*eis,* into) the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts 19. 5—"They were baptized in (*eis* into) the name of the Lord Jesus." Rom. 6. 3—"As many as were baptized into (*eis,*) Jesus Christ." Gal. 3. 27—"As many of you as have been baptized into (*eis*) Christ." 1 Cor. 10. 2—"They were all baptized unto (*eis,* into) Moses." 1 Cor. 1. 13–15—"Were ye baptised in (*eis,* into) the name of Paul? Rom. 6. 3—"Were baptized into (*eis*) his death."—"We are all baptized into (*eis*) one body." 1 Cor. 12. 13. "Baptized unto (*eis,* into) John's baptism." Acts 19. 3.

3. The whole difficulty seems to be in the understanding of the phrase *in the name of.* To me it is evident that when the words *epi* and *en,* joined with the dative case, are used before the phrase *the name of,* they generally signify, *by the authority of that name.* Thus Peter spake to the lame man in the temple: "*In* (*en*) *the name of* Jesus Christ, rise up and walk." They were presently asked, "By (*en*) what authority, or by (*en*) what name dost thou these things? They answered, by (*en*) the name of Jesus. Acts 3. 6. & 4. 7.—They denied that it was by their own power or holiness that this cure was effected—but it was by the power of Jesus, through faith in his name. For he had promised them this power to heal and work miracles—They believing in his promise spoke this cripple into perfect soundness in his name or by his authority. So in (*en* and *epi*) his name, or by his authority, they did all things—they cast out devils—they preached repentance and remission of sins—they received believers—they prayed, &c: Mark 16. 17. Luke 24 47. Mark 9. 29, 40. Col. 3. 17. Joh. 14. 13, 14, &c. So when our Lord says, "I come *in my Father's name*—The works that I do *in my Father's name*—such expressions mean that he came and acted upon the authority of the Father. "For all authority was given unto him in heaven and earth—authority to forgive sin—to give eternal life—to execute judgment, &c.—So Peter commands the people, "Repent and be baptized in (*epi*) the name of the Lord Jesus," and "He commanded them to be baptized in (*en*) the name of the

Lord Jesus." Acts 2. 38. 10. 48. This may signify *upon the authority of the Lord Jesus*, he baptized them in (*eis*, into) the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This appears to have been their practice from Acts 19. Here Paul found certain disciples, and asked them whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed. They replied "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." At this Paul was astonished, and said, "Unto (*eis*, into) what then were ye baptized?" Surely it could not have been with the baptism ordained by Christ, for in that the name of the Holy Ghost is expressly mentioned. He then instructed them, and baptized them in (*eis* into) the name of the Lord Jesus.

4. To me it appears clear that to be baptized *in the* name of Jesus, when *epi* and *en* are used, signifies by the authority of Jesus, who said "Go teach all nations, baptizing them—" The apostles therefore received authority to teach and baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. But when the word *eis* is used in the act of baptizing, it must certainly have a different meaning. Let us carefully examine the import of the word in the many passages where it occurs in connexion with baptism. Rom. 6. 3—"Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto (*eis* into) Christ Jesus; were baptized into (*eis*) his death." Paul, in the connexion, had been speaking of the first and second Adam. The first Adam brought mortality and natural death upon all his seed. Christ the second Adam will free all the first Adam's seed from death, or raise to natural life again; but his grace abounds, for he will grant immortality and eternal life to all his spiritual seed. The first Adam and his seed are one—the second Adam and his seed are also one. The first Adam is the natural head of all his children—The second Adam is the spiritual head of all his children, for they are the members of his body. How do they become members of his body? or how do they become united with him? I answer, by baptism. For "so many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death. By being baptized into Christ we become one with him—being make members of his body. Hence, says Paul, "we are all baptized into one body," 1 Cor. 12. 13. of which Christ is the head, and all baptized believers are the members in particular. By this union with Christ the head, believers are said to be crucified with him, buried with him—risen with him—and *sit*

ting together with him in heavanly places. That this union with Christ and his body is effected by baptism is farther evident from Joh. 3. 5: "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot *enter* into the kingdom of God."—and therefore cannot be in union with the body of Christ, which compose that kingdom.

By being baptized into Christ, we are not only united with him and his body, but we also *put on Christ*, Gal. 3. 27—that is, we bear his character, and name. This may be properly the meaning of those texts before cited where it is said we are baptized into his name.

The Israelites were said to be baptized into Moses in (*en*) the cloud, and in (*en*) the sea. By this we surely understand that they were all united in him as their head and leader to Canaan, and bore the name of *Moses' disciples*. When Paul was correcting the Corinthians for their divisions, he said "Were you baptized into the name of Paul?" If they had been, then they might with propriety have said, We are of Paul; he is our leader and head, we are united in him, and his name will we wear.

From these remarks we conclude that the apostles baptized in the name of Christ, or by the authority of Jesus Christ into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. By this baptism they became united with the Father, Son and Spirit—or as it is more commonly expressed, with Jesus Christ. For when united with him, we also are united with the Father and his Holy Spirit—"That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us."—Joh. 17. 21.

These thoughts, dear brethren, are with much diffidence submitted to you and the public. There is a shew of learning exhibited, which could not be avoided. I hope the attention of the learned may be awakened to the subject, and that they will give us more correct information on this point, if what I have suggested be not correct. We had better act in baptism, according to the plain commission of our Lord in Matt: 28.—Here can be no error. It is a text plain and undisputed. EDITOR.

For the Christian Messenger.

"Several of the preaching brethren desire that you will give us, through the medium of the C. Messenger, all the light you possess on the intercession of Christ. We there-

fore send you a text, Heb. 7. 25. Your compliance with this request will oblige several of your readers and friends in the state of Indiana." Jo. Hatchitt.

ANSWER.

The Greek word *entugchano*, translated intercession is seldom used in the New Testament. It is twice used with reference to the Holy Spirit; Rom. 8. 26, 27. Once it is applied to Elijah, Rom. 11. 2, and once to the multitude of the Jews, Acts 25. 24, in which last text it is translated *have dealt with us*. I have long since adopted the opinion of the celebrated John Taylor, whose opinion is also received by Doctors A. Clarke and Dodddridge. It is this: "Our Lord makes intercession for us, by negotiating and managing as our friend and agent, all the affairs pertaining to our salvation."—*To manage the affairs of*, is the proper meaning of the word translated *intercession*. The application is easy and full of comfort. Editor.

OBITUARY.

Died, August 17th, the wife of Elder John Longley, Hamilton County, O. after an illness of about three weeks. From the very day on which she was taken sick, she viewed death as certain and near, and without fear talked with perfect composure about it. I read to her (writes her husband) a letter just received from brother Jourdon, in which were these words, "preach all you can and I will do the same." Yes, said she, my dear, preach all you can, devote yourself to the work—the Lord is about to set you free." She requested to be sung, "Farewell vain world I am going home," and joined us in singing and shouted and clapped her hands. She called her son Peter to the bedside, and said, "my son I am going to heaven, prepare to meet me there." She exhorted him most tenderly and solemnly; she then called her daughter Sally Ann, and addressed her nearly in the same manner. Her son John was next called. Ah, John, my son, your mother is about to leave you—be a good boy—try to get religion—quit running about on the Sabbath—read your Bible and pray to God, and he will prepare you to meet your God and your mother in heaven. Then having called her little ones near, she, in a most pathetic and solemn manner, commended them to God. After having in the same manner exhorted her brother C——, she said I have now discharged my duty; I wished to talk to you all before I became too weak. Next morning we all concluded she was dying; I asked her how she felt in the valley and shadow of death? She said it was light, for Jesus is here. The patience and resignation with which she bore her extreme suffering, astonished all who saw her. She retained her perfect senses to to the last. Just before she breathed her last, she said, "All is peace—the victory is gained—O! he is a God of all grace," and yielded up her spirit to him that gave it, without a struggle.

INDEX TO VOL. II.

An humble Addres to the various denominations of Christians in America, Pa. 1
Continued, 25
Continued, 49
Letter to Editor from the Christian Baptist, 6
Reply, 10
Revivals near Bloomington Ia 13
Minutes of Conference at Rood's Creek Ky. 14
Letter of Elder E. D. Moore, 16
Letter of Elder J. E. Matthews, 17
A Christian Church amongst the Arabs, 18
Timothy on partyism, 18
To Prochorus, 41
On a general Conference, 57
On the spirit of orthodoxy, 124
Continued, 145
On the Communion of Christians at the Lord's Table, 271
Elder John Secrest's success, 22
Obituary of Nancy Mitchell, 24
Elder Clark's letter to A. Campbell, 28
Reply, 29
Continued, 52
Queries proposed and answered, 36
Letters of revivals, 40
Differences of opinion not the cause of division, 45
Obituary of Elder Js. Dickinson, 46
Letter of Joshua Irvin, and Editor's reply, 61
Letters of revivals, 64
Elder W. Kincade on Church Government, 66
Continued, 73
Editor's address to Christian Preachers, 70
A friendly invitation, 77
The Keys, 82
The Logic of Ins and Outs, 86
The Speech of Mr. Montgomery, 90
Continued, 102
Continued, 121

	Pa.
Letter from Philo-adelphos,	97
Elder D Purviance on Christian Government,	107
Editor's strictures on a pamphlet, sent him by a friend,	112
Elder B. F. Hall's letter to Editor,	119
Minutes of Wabash conference,	120
Evils of partyism,	131
The Waldenses,	132
A friendly Dialogue,	135
Letters of revivals,	140
A letter by an inquirer, and the Editor's answer,	142
Letter to ——— a Presbyterian preacher,	148
Continued,	181
Continued,	200
Continued,	244
Letter of O. Seward, with reply,	151
Letter of R. Taylor,	155
Letter of S— H—	155
Queries by E. Goodwin, with answers,	156
Communication of the Church at Antioch,	157
Editor's reply,	161
The first covenant,	163
Feet washing by L. Duncan,	166
Letter of revivals,	167
Sunday school union,	169
Elder A Hill on Church Government,	178
Letter to J. Scott,	187
Answer to A. Allen,	188
Letters of revivals,	189
Elder Wm. Kincade on the ancient order,	193
Colonization society,	196
Letter of G. Bush,	199
Strictures on a sermon of S. Steele,	204
Continued,	228
Continued,	265
Progress of reformation,	208
Extract of C Morgridge,	212
——— of J. Edwards,	218
Letters of revivals,	214
Elder D Purviance to Church at Antioch,	117
Letter from Bible Christian, and reply,	229
Revivals,	237
Obituary of Elder C. Nance, and Mrs. L. Wilkinson,	239
Origin of evil,	240
A secret society,	241
Elder T Smith's strictures on N. H. Hall,	249
Philip on the worship of the Son of God,	255
Continued,	270
Minutes of E. District conference Pa.	259
Letter of Elder E. Church and answer,	261
Letter of T. M. Allen,	264

LITERATURE
OF THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER by Barton W. Stone consists of 14 volumes, clothback binding, gold stamped, indexed and a total of 4,653 pages. It is a reprint of the famous restoration publications of this illustrious Kentucky reformer during the years of 1826-1844. #1844 (Complete Set) $125.00.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER by Alexander Campbell. 41 volumes—from 1830 to 1870. Index in each volume. Over 600 pages in 2 color hard-cover binding stamped in gold. #1529 — $350.00

T. M. ALLEN (Pioneer Preacher of Kentucky & Missouri) by Alvin Jennings. A biography of this great man of the Restoration Period. A good reference book or just an interesting story for your enjoyment. 224 pages. #1740 — $6.95.

THE SEARCH FOR THE ANCIENT ORDER. A two-volume work on the search for the landmarks of primitive Christianity covering 1849-1865 and 1866-1906, 358 and 468 pages respectively. By Earl Irvin West. Cloth $11.50 each.

16-Page Tracts
$5 per 100 — $45 per 1,000

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL — WHO WAS HE? by James Willcutt. The man and his cause. #269.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY by Alexander Campell. The biblical and reasonable justification of honorable public religious debate. #268.

ADD-RAN COLLEGE by Don H. Morris. The late long-time president of Abilene Christian University reviews incidents that led to division in the movement. #152

THE RESTORATION PRINCIPLE by Bill Humble. Unity and strict adherence to the Bible as the pattern for life and religion. #131

Star Bible & Tract Corp.
Fort Worth, Texas 76118