glad that when but one person subscribes for the work, to whom it is to be directed to a particular post-office, that he endeavor to obtain a few more; because, when but one number is sent, it is often injured or lost. I wish that my agents will attend to the business of obtaining subscribers, and sending me the names as soon as they conveniently can. Let them avoid, as much as possible, sending me double letters, or any letter not absolutely necessary. Let them be careful to put the letter A on the left hand corner of the letter at the bottom. My reason for this is to evade the heavy tax of paying postage for many useless letters sent me. Many write to me their approbation of the Messenger—some their disapprobation—others vent the contents of a malignant heart in abusing me—some write for the paper to be sent to an individual—some apologize for not sending money—some send communications for the Messenger, &c. &c. For scores of such letters I have to pay. This is oppressive. To avoid this oppression, I shall attend to no communication unless the letter A be found, or the name of the writer on the back of the letter, or post paid, or free. For this I cannot be blamed by my friends. If my agents and patrons wish the Messenger continued, they must let me know against the middle of September; by that time they can easily ascertain who will be subscribers. For less time than one year, or 12 numbers, subscriptions cannot be received; and it is stated, not to be forgotten, that the price, one dollar a year, or for 12 nos. must be paid within six months from the commencement of the volume, if convenient. Such as obtain 10 subscribers, and will collect the money, shall have one copy of the work for his trouble. I should be glad if my friends would convey by private hands rather than by mail, the lists of names. Let my agents endeavor to collect what remains due to me for the three former volumes, and send it to me as soon as possible.

Certain I am that the Messenger, rightly conducted, is useful, and ought to be continued among us. Let it once cease, and our opponents will greatly have the advantage of us. It is a medium of communication among us in America. Let then all the Messenger's friends be active in promoting the work.

EDITOR.

On the 3rd Lord's day of August next, a Christian Conference will be held at Boon Creek Meeting House, in Washington county, East Tennessee.

THE CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK is now ready. Those who want them may direct their orders to B. W. Stone, of Georgetown, post paid. The price is 50 cents by the single—$5 by the dozen—40 cents a piece, if 50 or more are taken.

STONE & ADAMS.

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. III.] GEORGETOWN, KY. AUGUST, 1829. [No. 10.

COMMUNICATED.

BRO: STONE:

As there is considerable excitement at present both in the religious and political world on the subject of the Sabbath. and as it is a subject of deep interest and importance, it justly demands the attention of the people. With a view therefore of facilitating the Biblical researches of your readers, and with a desire that Christians and politicians may correctly understand this important subject, it is the request of myself and a number of your subscribers, that you publish in the Messenger the views of Mr. Campbell, editor of the Christian Baptist, on the Sabbath and Lord's day, which will be found in no. 7, vol. 1, of that work. With the sentiments of that piece I am much pleased; of their correctness I entertain not the smallest doubt, and hope you will give such of your readers as have not had an opportunity of reading the Christian Baptist an opportunity of appreciating its *worth*. Reader, give it an attentive and impartial perusal, and compare it with the Bible.

PHILIP.

ADDRESS TO THE READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, NO. III.

The subject of our present address is the Sabbath day and the Lord's day. Either Christians are bound to observe the Sabbath day, or they are not. If they are, let us see what the nature of that observance is, which was prescribed for the Sabbath day. The law reads thus: "*Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do* ALL *thy work: the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. in it thou shalt* NOT DO ANY WORK, *thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.*" You will observe that in this command God positively prohibits all manner of work or labor on this day. Son, daughter, servant, cattle, stranger, are commanded to be exempted from all manner of work. In examining the particular precepts originating from this law, recorded in the Old Testament, we find the following specifications:

1. "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath day." Ex. xxxv, 3.

II. "Abide ye every man in his place, (house or tent) let no man go out of his place, (house or tent) on the Sabbath day." Ex. xvi, 29.

III. "He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days. Bake that which ye will bake this day; and seethe that ye will seethe, and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning." Ex. xvi, 19, 23.

IV. "Bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath day." Jer. xvii, 21, 22.

V. "Not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words. Isa. lxii, 13.

VI. "From evening unto evening shall you celebrate your Sabbath." Lev. xxiii. 32.

VII. "Whosoever doeth any work on the Sabbath day he shall surely be put to death." Ex. xxxi, 14, 15.

"And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, the man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." Nu. xv. 32–36.

The above items are a few of many that might be selected out of the Old Testament on this subject. We believe them to be a fair specimen of the law given by Moses, as explained and enforced upon the nation of Israel.

Now the question is, are we under this law? if we are, we pay little or no respect unto it. For who is there that does not *habitually* violate *the rest* enjoined on this day? Those who make the most ado about Sabbath breakers, are themselves, according to the above law, worthy of death. They kindle fire in their houses. They go out of their houses and travel on their cattle miles. Their sons and their daughters do some kind of work; they bring in burdens of water, wood, and prepare food. They celebrate it not from evening to evening, but from morning to evening they violate it. They speak their own words, and do many things worthy of death. Why then is not the penalty enforced? Assuredly their observance of this law is mere mockery. It is an insult on the Law-giver!

We know that some of the clergy have given, if not sold them indulgences to violate it. They have told them that certain "*works of necessity and mercy*" are allowable. But who told *them* so? They tell them they may prepare food, bring in fuel and water. But God forbade those under this law to do so. So far was he from countenancing such "*works of necessity*" that he wrought three miracles to prevent the necessity of doing a "work of necessity." He sent two days portion of manna from heaven the sixth day,—he sent none the seventh,—he preserved that gathered on the sixth from putrefaction until the close of the seventh; all of which were special miracles, for the space of forty years. If he wrought *three miracles* to prevent an Israelite from crossing his threshold to gather up a little manna for his daily food, how dare any give a dispensation, in his name, to do that which is tenfold more laborious!!!

Because the Saviour of the world put to silence those who accused him of breaking the Sabbath, by appealing to their own conduct in relieving animals from distress, this doctrine of "works of necessity and mercy" has been represented as of Divine origin. What a perversion! An *argumentum ad hominem* converted into a general maxim!! But such a perversion shews consummate inattention to the laws of Israel. While Israel kept the law, there never would occur an opportunity for a work of necessity or mercy, such as those law-givers tolerate. For while they kept the law, they should be blessed in their basket, stores, fields, houses, children, flocks, herds: no house would take fire: no ox would fall into a pit, &c. And if they transgressed the law, they should be cursed in all these respects, and no toleration of a violation of the law was granted, as a means of mitigating the curse.

Again, let me ask, was there a law ever published relaxing that rigid observance of rest enjoined upon the Sabbath? Was there a law published, saying, you must, or you may observe the Sabbath with less care, with less respect; you may now speak your own words, kindle fire in your houses, prepare victuals, &c. &c. I say, was there ever such a law published? No, indeed. Either the law remains in all its force, to the utmost extent of its literal acquirements, or it is passed away with the Jewish ceremonies. If it yet exist, let us observe it according to law. And if it does not exist let us abandon a mock observance of another day for it.

But some say "it was *changed* from the seventh day to the first day." Where? When? and by whom? No man can tell. No, it never was changed, nor could it be, unless creation was to be gone through again: for the reason assigned must be changed, before the observance or respect to the reason, can be changed. It's all old wives fables to talk of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. If it be changed, it was that august personage changed it, who changes times and laws *ex officio*, I think his name is DOCTOR ANTICHRIST.

But was not the Sabbath *given to the Jews only:* and again, was it not a *shadow* or *type?* This deserves attention.

The preface to the law of which it was a part, saith, "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage, *therefore* remember the Sabbath day," &c. The preface to this law, as the inscription or address upon a letter, ascertains whose property it was. It was the pro-

perty of the Jews. But Moses tells this, not leaving it to an inference, Deut. v. 15, "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, THEREFORE, the Lord thy God *commanded* THEE to keep the Sabbath day." Ezekiel says the same, or rather the Lord by the prophet saith, chap. xx. 12, Moreover, also, I gave THEM my Sabbath to be a SIGN between *me* and *them*. Yes, said the Lord by Moses, "The Sabbath is a SIGN between me and the children of Israel forever. Ex. xxxi. 17. It is worthy of note in this place, *that of all the sins in the long black catalogue of sins, specified against the Gentiles, in all the New Testament, the* SIN OF SABBATH BREAKING IS NEVER ONCE PREFERRED AGAINST THEM!! We conclude then that the *Sabbath day was as exclusively the property of the Jews as circumcision.*

But was it not a *shadow* and a *type?* Let us hear Paul. "Let no man judge you (condemn you for not observing) in meats and drinks, (for eating and drinking) or in respect of an holy day, or of a new moon, or the Sabbath, which are a SHADOW of things to come, but the body is of Christ, or according to Macknight, *the body is Christ's body.* Paul then says it was a *shadow.* In the Epistle to the Hebrews, fourth chapter, he makes *it* and Cainaan types of "that *rest* which remained for the people of God." The Sabbath then was a shadow; a type given to the Jews only.

Since beginning this article, we noticed, for the first time, a very correct note of Dr. Macknight's, the celebrated translator of the Apostolic epistles, which expresses our view of this matter. With many, we know, his views will be received with more readiness of mind than ours. He was, strange as it may appear, a dignitary in the Presbyterian church; yet he expresses himself in the following manner, on Col. ii. 16: "The *whole* of the law of Moses being abrogated by Christ," (Col. ii. 14,) Christians are under no obligations to observe any of the Jewish holidays; not even the seventh-day Sabbath. Wherefore, if any teacher made the observance of the seventh day a necessary duty, the Colossians were to resist him. But though the brethren in the first age, paid no regard to the Jewish seventh-day Sabbath, they set apart the first day of the week for public worship, and *for commemorating the death and resurrection of their master by eating his supper on that day*, also for private exercises of devotion. This they did, either by precept or by the example of the apostles; *and not by virtue of any injunction in the law of Moses.* Besides, *they did not sanctify the first day of the week in the Jewish manner*, by a total abstinence from bodily labor of every kind; that practice was condemned by the Council of Laodicea as *Judaizing*. Lec. Suiceri Thes. Eccl. voce *Sabbaton.*"

The Sabbath was, by the Lord of the Sabbath, set aside as well as every other part of the law of Moses as stated in our last address. The learned Macknight is with us also in this instance. His words on Col. ii. 14. "It is evident, (says he) that the law of

Moses, *in all its parts*, is now abolished and taken away. Consequently that Christians are under *no obligation to obey even the moral precepts of that law, on account of their being delivered by Moses to the Jews.* For if the obligations of the moral precepts of the law are still continued, mankind are still under its curse." I would just observe, on this item, that the Lord Jesus Christ observed the last Sabbath that was obligatory on any of the human race, by lying in the grave from evening to evening. In the silence of death and the grave he celebrated it literally, "*not going out of his place*" until the Sabbath was past. Then, very early in the morning, when the Sabbath was past, the Jewish religion being consummated, he rises and becomes the beginning of the new creation.

Christians, by apostolic *example*, which to them is the same as *precept*, are, in honor of the commencement of the new creation, constrained by Christ's authority and grace to meet on the *first day of the week*, to show forth his death, and to commemorate his resurrection. When they assemble they are to be instructed and to admonish one another. They are to learn his statutes; "and to continue *stedfastly* in the apostles' doctrines in breaking bread, in fellowship, and in prayers, praising God." Such was the practice of the primitive church as the Epistles demonstrate. The first day of the week is *not regarded to the Lord* when these things are not done. For if professors of Christianity were to keep in their houses from morning to evening and celebrate this day as the Jews did the Sabbath, instead of honoring they are dishonoring Christ. No two days are more unlike, in their import and design, than the Sabbath and the *First day.* The former commemorated the consummation of the old creation, the cessation of creation work; the latter commemorates the beginning of the new creation. The former was to Israel a memorial that they were once slaves in Egypt, the other assures us that the year of release has come. The former looked back with mournful aspect, to the toils and sorrows entailed upon the human body, from an evil incident to the old creation; the latter looks forward with an eye beaming with hope to perpetual exemption from toil, and pain, and sorrow. The Sabbath was a day of awful self-denial and profound religious gloom; the resurrection day is a day of triumph, of holy joy, and religious festivity. The Jew, on a Sabbath morn, from his casement surveyed the smokeless chimnies and the bolted doors of the silent tribes of Israel. A solemn silence holds the streets of the city and the hamlet, and not a vagrant foot disturbs the grassy field, the flowers breathe forth their fragrance to the gentle breeze, no hand plucks the blooming rose, no ear is charmed with the mellifluous notes of the tenants of the groves. The banks of the limpid streams are not frequented by the noisy youths, nor does their clamor mingle with the murmurs of the vocal rills. Striking emblems of the silent rest allotted to the tenants of the grave. The Christian welcomes the dawn of the triumphant morn. The new heavens

and the new earth open to his view. The incorruptible, the immortal bodies of the saints, rising from the ashes of the grave, in all the vigor and beauty of immortal youth, fill his soul with unutterable admiration of the wondrous victory of the all conquering chief. While he surveys his mortal frame, and feels the sentence of death in every department of his earthly house, his soul forgets the infirmities of its partner, and soars on the pinions of faith and hope to the resurrection morn, it is lost in the contemplation of millions of every tribe and every tongue clothed in the indescribable beauties of immortality. While overwhelmed in the extatic admiration of the glorious bodies around him, his eye ultimately fixes on the FIRST BORN of many brethren. While he adores him at the head of the innumerable host of ransomed immortals, his memory musters up the recollections of Gethsemane, Pilate and his judgment seat, Mount Calvary, and the sepulchre in the garden. To the assembly of the saints with eagerness he hastens, and anxious to share in the praises of his glorious chief, to join in the recollection of his humiliation unto death, and to participate in the triumphs of his resurrection, his soul is feasted with the abundance of his house and with the communion of those whom he hopes to embrace in his immortal arms, on the day of the resurrection unto eternal life.

Christians, what a difference between the Jewish Sabbath and this glorious day of triumph!! They have much to learn of the glory of Christianity who think that going to a synagogue and hearing a harangue, and returning to their firesides is suitable to the design, or expressive of the import of this joyful and triumphant day. On this day Messiah entered Jerusalem as Son of David, as King of Judah. On this day he rose from the dead. On this day, after his resurrection, he generally met with his disciples in their assemblies. On this day He sent the Holy Spirit down from heaven and erected the first Christian church. "On this day the disciples came together to break bread." On this day the Christians joined in the fellowship of the saints, or in making contributions for the saints. And, on this day, the Spirit finished its work of revelation on the Isle of Patmos, in giving to John the beloved, the last secrets of the Divine plan ever to be uttered in human language while time endures. If no authoritative precedent enforced the assembly of saints on this day, and the observances of the *order* of the Lord's house, the very circumstance of such a coincidence of glorious wonders would point it out as the Lord's day, and love to him, the most powerful principle that ever impelled to action, would constrain all saints not to forsake the assembling of themselves on this day; but to meet, to animate and to be animated; to remember, to admire, to adore, to hymn in songs divine, the glorious and mighty King. Christians, *could you say no?* EDITOR.

CRAWFORD CO. (ILL.) MAY 21, 1829.

Bro: Stone—I have lately read in your Messenger the first no. of the "gospel plan of saving sinners." I am far from impeaching the brother who wrote it, with any improper motives; no doubt he is sincere in wishing to instruct the people in the true light of the gospel. But a number of difficulties present themselves to my view, on his plan, which I am unable to reconcile. As I do not wish to enter into a controversy, all I design, at present, is to state some of the difficulties which present themselves in applying or construing several texts or portions of scripture in the sense the brother has done.

1st. On the day of Pentecost the prophecy of Joel was fulfilled; also the promise of our Saviour to his disciples, which was the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is not the case at the present time. I am convinced there have been great mistakes in applying certain scriptures, relative to the gift of the Holy Ghost, to the operations of the Spirit of God, and the witnessing or sealing Spirit of God in our hearts. Do people get the gift of the Holy Spirit at the present time, so as to speak with tongues &c.? I answer, no. As to the Samaritans, we find they did not receive the gift of the Holy Ghost when they were baptized, nor for some time after, we cannot say how long; but not until they sent to Jerusalem for Peter and John, who prayed for them that they might receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. So that it was not by baptism they received it. The gift of the Holy Ghost did not always accompany baptism; but believing with the heart, and confessing with the mouth, are accompanied with an inward evidence of our acceptance with God; or, in other words, with the witnessing and sealing spirit of God in our hearts. Faith, repentance, and salvation, appear to be inseparably connected in a scripture sense. There is no doubt in my mind, when the Samaritans believed Philip's preaching, they gave external evidence of their repentance, and as such were admitted to baptism. As it respects the Eunuch, I hardly think he was consummately ignorant of the scriptures; nor dare I say he was not a lover of God. We find he had been to Jerusalem to worship, and on his return was reading the prophecy of Isaiah, which foretold of a Messiah to come; and as soon as Philip instructed him into the meaning of the passage he was reading, his heart was open to receive it, and comply with the ordinances of the gospel. Agreeing with our Saviour's own words, John v, 46–7, we have no account of the Eunuch's receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost. Cornelius was ignorant of many things, that were profitable to know; and Peter came for the purpose of teaching him. But this does not prove that he was not a good man, for the scriptures teach the contrary. To me, if ignorance of a number of things neccessary to know, were made the test of our regeneration, it would operate against the disciples of Jesus previous to his resurrection, and thousands of christians down to the present time. I wish it not to be understood that I plead for ignorance.

I have mentioned, that I believe there have been improper or mistaken ideas attached to certain scriptures, relative to the gift of the Holy Ghost; wherever we read of the gift of the Holy Ghost, we see what accompanied it. On the day of Pentecost they spake with a number of tongues; when Peter preached to Cornelius and his friends, the Holy Ghost fell on them, and they spake with tongues and magnified God. Paul, when he came to Ephesus, found certain disciples that appeared to be ignorant of the Holy Ghost, (Note, he calls them disciples,) he baptizes them in the name of the Lord Jesus, (not, I presume, to give them religion) and when Paul laid his hands on them, (I conclude in the act of prayer,) the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophecied. The gift of the Holy Spirit is mentioned in the plural, I. Cor. ii, 12. When we examine the scriptures, we find a number of texts where the spirit is mentioned applying gifts to the regenerated, or converted soul; such as Rom. viii, 15, 16; I. Cor. ii, 12; Gal. iv, 4, 5, 6; II. Cor. i, 21, 22; Eph. iv, 30. I do not wish to be understood, that God is not the author or giver of the whole; they all proceed from the self-same spirit, but for different purposes. Confounding or blending the different scriptures together, where they speak of the Holy Spirit, has in my opinion run a number into wrong notions, both with regard to regeneration and the ordinances of the gospel. The brother, no doubt, is sincere in what he has written, and has struck at some real errors. But we ought to be careful never to blend truth with error. In opposing the different ways that mourners are instructed by their teachers, I am afraid he has gone a little too far; what must we tell a mourning or distressed soul? Ask and ye shall receive; call on the name of the Lord, for the time has come that whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved; and the soul that will do this, with a real desire to be saved from his sins, is sure to find mercy, even if he was in the deserts of Arabia. I am a firm believer in believers' baptism by immersion; but I cannot make it regeneration.

Your old brother in tribulation. DAVID M'GAHEY.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE COMMUNICATION.

Our worthy old brother has stated some objections to the doctrine of "Repent and be baptized in order to the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost." These objections, or difficulties, as he calls them, demand our serious attention, nor shall they demand it without regard.

Obj. 1. He thinks that there are two ideas attached to the expression, *the gift of the Holy Ghost.* One is the miraculous operation of the Spirit; the other is the witnessing or sealing of the Spirit. Still our brother must acknowledge it is the same spirit. For "there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are diversities of administration, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but the same God that worketh all in all." I. Cor. xii, 4-6. The apostle enumerates the various gifts of this one spirit in the verses following, and concludes that the whole body of Christ is in possession of this self-same spirit. Yet he lets us know, that all are not apostles, nor prophets, nor teachers; nor are all workers of miracles, nor do all have the gift of healing, nor do all speak with tongues. Yet they all were made to drink into one spirit: I. Cor. 12. It is certain that all obedient christians did receive the gift of the holy spirit; and such do yet receive it. But it is equally certain that all who received the holy spirit in apostolic times, did not receive the gift so as to perform miracles, speak with tongues, &c. It can therefore be no argument against Christians, not receiving the holy spirit *now*, because they cannot speak with tongues and work miracles. The body of Christ is the temple of the holy ghost, and this spirit is the health and life of every member of that body. It is the spirit of God and of Christ, that dwells in every believer. It is the witnessing spirit within us: Rom. viii, 9–16. It is the unction from the holy one, that teacheth us all things. I. John, ii, 20.

It is undeniable that the gift of the holy ghost was promised to the Jews on the day of pentecost, on condition that they reform and be baptized, and that on the performance of these conditions they did receive the holy spirit, and this holy spirit was the very sealing, witnessing spirit which christians yet receive. For it does not appear from the whole account in Acts ii, that one who received the spirit through repentance and baptism, received the gift of speaking with tongues, or of miracles.

If we confine the promise of the gift of the holy spirit to the gift of miracles, then the promise failed or was not fulfilled to the people on the day of pentecost, for they did not receive the gift of miracles. But this promise was not confined to those whom Peter addressed, for he adds, "The promise (of this holy spirit) is to you (Jews) and to your children (who may now live or exist hereafter) and to all that are afar off, (the Gentiles, Eph. ii, 17) even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (as many as shall hear the gospel.) Shall we restrict this promise to the apostolic age? If we say the promise meant the gift of miracles, we must; or concede the point that the promise not only failed *then*, but ever since. We give up one of the dearest pillars of our hope. If this promise be restricted to the primitive age, why not every other promise? Who shall determine which belongs to us, and which does not?

But our brother says, The Samaritans did not receive the gift of the holy ghost when they were baptized, (Acts viii, 15, 16,) not until the apostles came from Jerusalem and prayed for them and laid their hands on them. Hence our brother concludes, that they did not receive it by baptism, therefore the gift of the holy ghost did not always accompany baptism. I ask my brother, did they receive this gift before they were baptized? He will answer, no: and this is sufficient to our purpose; for we have never asserted, nor have the scriptures ever declared that this gift

should immediately accompany the act of baptism. Had the scriptures made this declaration, that the gift of the holy spirit should immediately accompany the act of baptism, the case of the Samaritans would have contradicted it. Does my brother, when he prays, expect immediately to receive? When he seeks, does he immediately expect to find? When he knocks, does he expect the door to be immediately opened? When he sows the good word, does he expect immediately to reap? or does he not patiently wait in faith and hope? Do the scriptures any where declare the witnessing and sealing spirit always and immediately accompanies *believing* with the heart and confessing with the mouth? The case of the Samaritans perfectly accords with the institution of our Lord and the practice of the apostles. They believed, reformed, were baptized, and received the holy spirit of promise

Our brother introduces the case of the Eunuch. He thinks he was a good man, a lover of God, because he went to Jerusalem and was reading the scriptures. If these were evidences of goodness, the Jews were a very holy and good people, for these things they never neglected. But they were notoriously wicked. But of the goodness or wickedness of the Eunuch we have no account previous to his conversion. That he believed in a Messiah to come is probable; for this was the doctrine of the worshippers at Jerusalem. The wicked murders of the Lord believed the same doctrine; yet were they not great unbelievers in the true Messiah? Such no doubt was the Eunuch. Their Messiah, which they expected, was a being of their own fancy. It is evident that the Eunuch was ignorant of the plainest prophecy of the messiah in the bible, and until Philip explained it as referring to Jesus, he was an unbeliever in the true Saviour. But he became a believer after Philip had taught him, and according to the institution of Christ, Philip baptized him, and he went on his way rejoicing. My brother says, "We have no account of the Eunuch's receiving the gift of the holy ghost." It is plain he received joy, and if this be not a gift and fruit of the spirit, we know not what it is. This he had not previous to his baptism.

Our brother introduces the twelve disciples of John's baptism found by Paul at Ephesus, and whom Paul baptized. It is too plain to demand proof, that these disciples of John had not received the gift of the holy spirit before they were baptized *in the name* of the Lord Jesus. Whether they had previously received the sealing, witnessing spirit, or even the remission of sins, is not named—it is mere conjecture, and is therefore no argument agains Peter'st doctrine, "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins."

Our brother concludes, "I am a firm believer in believers' baptism by immersion; but I cannot make it regeneration." In this our brother is correct. I know of none among us who ever hinted at this doctrine. If any in Illinois have thus believed, and thus preached, I hope my old brother will reprove them, and

convince them of error. It is well known that I have preached the doctrine for ten or twelve years, that baptism was an instituted means of the remission of sins, and of the gift of the holy spirit, or of regeneration, yet none have ever said before, that I preached that baptism was regeneration. My brother preaches that faith is the instituted means of regeneration; might I not with equal propriety say, that you preached that faith was regeneration?

Permit me to introduce an extract from the Christian Baptist, vol. 6, p. 277. "The Syrian Indians laughed at the stupidity of a Jewish prophet for thinking or saying that *the water* of Jordan had any such efficacy as to cure leprosy. No doubt they were very merry at the weakness of the old believer, and satirized his enthusiasm. However, the event proved, as you may all remember, that the Indians of that day were all sophists: for God had given such efficacy by his own mere appointment to the water in Jordan as made it omnipotent to cure. Such efficacy, too, once had the waters of Siloam when God presided over them! And such efficacy old Paul found in the waters of Damascus after he had believed in the blood of Jesus. He washed his sins away at the command of a messenger of the Lord. Without faith, however, neither the waters of Jordan, Damascus, nor Siloam, could possess such virtue. And if you have not this faith, we only ask you not to mock nor defame those who are so credulous as to believe that he who once turned water into wine, is able to forgive us our sins through water, if we cheerfully receive him as our prophet, priest, and king, and submit to his institutions."

I have just read a dissertation on baptism in the Gospel Luminary for July 9, written by one who professes "to stand for the defence of the gospel," and who *in spirit* zealously opposes the doctrine of "He that believeth and is baptized shall be SAVED." Or "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the holy ghost." He thinks with you, that a person must be saved and pardoned, and possessed of the holy spirit, before he should be baptized. But not one passage of scripture has he produced to prove it. Like you he concludes that the Eunuch was a pious man—what then? Does this exclude believers in Jesus from baptism? Does this nullify the institution of heaven in Mark xvi, and Acts ii.? The conclusion that the Eunuch was a pious man previous to baptism, is mere conjecture, and yet this writer thinks it "a *demonstration* that Philip would not baptize any one unless he gave evidence of having passed from death unto life."! In order to overthrow the doctrine for which we contend, he takes the liberty of transposing Peter's language, Acts ii, "Then Peter said unto them, in the name of Jesus Christ, repent every one of you and be baptized for the remission of sins (or for a testimony of your remission) and ye shall receive the gift of the holy ghost." To found an argument for the support of a doctrine, by perverting a plain text, and by giving it a meaning never intended, and no where in scripture confirmed, is a suffi-

cient refutation of the doctrine designed to be established. Who ever heard that baptism was a testimony of the remission of sins? To me the opinion is new, and needs proof to be received. The brother appears too to have mistaken the proper idea of repentance. There are two words in the Greek scriptures, translated *to repent*, or *repentance*, of very different significations; one is *metamelomai* and the other *metanoeo*. The first signifies *an anxious and distressing concern after something is said or done*. The last signifies properly *to change or reform the mind, sentiments and behaviour*. (Parker's Gr. Lex.) For confirmation of the first, see Matt. xxi. 29–32: "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. But he answered and said, I will not; but afterwards he *repented* and went." Properly afterwards being deeply concerned at what he had said and done, he went. Matt. xxvii. 3: "Then Judas who betrayed him, when he saw that he (Jesus) was condemned, *repented* himself"—properly, was greatly concerned and distressed at what he had done. II. Cor. vii. 10. "For godly sorrow worketh *repentance*, (reformation) not *to be repented of*." Here are the two words in the same verse. *Repentance not to be repented of;* properly a reformation, which never produces an anxious, distressing concern, because they had reformed from evil. The same distinction we find in Acts ii. 37, 38. When Peter preached that Jesus was the Christ, and that they had crucified the Lord of glory, they believing the truth, were pierced in their hearts; they were anxiously distressed and concerned at what they had done. They cry out, What shall we do? Peter says, Reform &c. Properly, You are now deeply repenting or distressed at your conduct, now reform and be baptized for the remission of sins."

The writer gives a few questions and answers, on which he seems much to rely. 1. "Who compose the family of God on earth? Ans. None but real believers." He should have added, *obedient believers*, and then he and James would have agreed. 2. "Where do the ordinances of his house belong? Ans. In the house or church of God, and not without." The query to me is obscure. "3dly. To whom do the ordinances of God's house belong? in the house, to the heaven born children? or without, to those among whom are dogs, sorcerers, &c.? Ans. To none but his spiritual children." This answer is a solecism indeed. How do people get into the house of God? Are they not baptized into the one body? or are they members of that body before they are baptized? If the ordinances belong unto the spiritual children alone, and not to those out of the church; then those without have no right to believe, to repent, to pray; for these are as much ordered of God, as any thing else. Who will say that those without have a right to believe, repent, and pray, but no right to be baptized? It is easier to assert than to prove. The writer enumerates a number of evils of baptizing a penitent believer previous to his having an acceptance with God. Of such evils the bible furnishes no evidence, nor do we know them experimentally. We may in support of long received tradition, imagine a thousand

evils arising out of the plainest truth. My great object is to seek and follow the dictates of the bible; and regard unscriptural tradition as the passing breeze. The conclusion of the writer is a tissue of hard, uncharitable insinuations against those who think differently from him, which are unknown among Christians in the West, and I pray God may be forever unknown. I am sorry that they ever found their way in the Luminary. The writer promises more when necessity requires. I hope, should he write more, he will give us scripture to the point; and not his difficulties arising out of unscriptural tradition; nor his notions, and perversion of scripture to support those notions; such we esteem as light as air, and with such Christians should have nothing to do, but to reject.

EDITOR.

CLERMONT CO. (O.) JUNE 23, 1829.

Bro: Stone—You will confer a favor on your unworthy brother, and, I think, do good to the cause of truth generally, if you will give us your views on I. Peter, iii. 18–22; especially on that part which relates to baptism. I make the request more especially, because we had an exposition of the passage not many months since, which was not satisfactory to all.

Your brother in the Lord, JOHN POWEL.

REPLY.

The passage, referred to, reads thus: "For Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit. By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him."

The first claim on our attention is the expression, "*Christ hath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust.*" Several times in scripture a similar expression occurs; as Isai. LIII, 5, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." I. Cor. xv, 3, "Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures." Heb. x, 13, "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." Gall. I, 4, "Who gave himself for our sins."

When a person is said to die for his own sin, there exists but one opinion amongst us all. We all understand it as meaning he died on account of his own sin. Thus king Amaziah slew his servants, who had murdered his father. "But he slew not their children, but did as it is written in the law of the book of Moses, where the Lord commanded, saying: The father shall not die for

the children, neither shall the children die for the fathers, but every man shall die for his own sin." II. Chron. xxv, 4. See also Jer. xxxi, 30. Ezek. xviii, 2, 3; xviii, 20; and xxxiii, 13, &c. Had an innocent, compassionate son gone to Amaziah, when executing the sentence of law against the murderous father, and said, My Lord and king, accept of my life for the life of my father—slay me and spare him—let me die for his sin, and let him live. Would not the king have answered: In doing thus, I should doubly transgress the divine law, which positively enjoins the death of your guilty father, and which as positively forbids the death of the innocent in his stead; "the soul that sinneth, it shall die;" and the son shall not die for the iniquity of the father." Though the laws of Pagans and Heathens may have admitted the innocent to die in the room of the guilty to rescue him from death, yet God's holy law forbids it. Was such a law in existence among us, how many innocent sons would suffer in the room of their guilty fathers. Was such a practice popular, and extolled as a virtue, as the burning of wives with their deceased husbands in India, how soon would our country resemble that barbarous land!

To suffer and die *for* sin, and to suffer and die *for* us, convey the same idea. "Christ once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust:" that is, the just suffered for the sins of the unjust. This is evident to all, and none we presume are so disposed, or ignorant to deny it. Boasted orthodoxy has drawn a dark veil over the scriptures by attaching its peculiar notions to these and similar expressions. According to it, when Christ is said to suffer and die for our sins, and for us, it means that he as a substitute died in our room and stead, and made a *proper*, *real*, and *full* satisfaction to God's justice and law, and fully discharged our debt, and reconciled the Father to us. These things we have boldly denied, as not being found in the scriptures, as anti-scriptural, and contrary to matter of fact. For it is admitted that death is the debt due by us to law and justice. If it be natural death, and Christ our substitute and surety, *properly*, *really*, and *fully* paid or discharged that debt, why do any yet suffer natural death? or why do all die? If it be spiritual death, and Christ our surety has *properly*, *really*, and *fully* paid or discharged it in our room and stead, why do any yet suffer it? Alas! the world is yet suffering it; for they are all under sin. But could Christ *properly* and *really* pay this debt, and not be a proper and real sinner? Could perfect justice or a holy law ever require or demand spiritual death or sin? Impossible. If the debt be eternal death, did Christ *really*, *properly*, and *fully* pay or discharge this debt in our stead? Impossible, for he now liveth forevermore. One hundred dollars due to a man is a real and proper debt; this debt cannot be *properly*, *really*, and *fully* discharged but by paying 100 dollars or their equivalent. Eternal death, according to orthodoxy is a proper and real debt due to justice; nothing besides eternal death can *properly*, *really* and *fully* discharge it. Orthodoxy starts back from this glaring absurdity; but tries to prop

the doctrine, by saying, he suffered not eternal but infinite death. By infinite death they mean either death boundless in duration or degree. Not the first they cannot mean, for that is the same as eternal death, which they must deny that Christ ever suffered; for if he did he is yet suffering it, and will be suffering it to all eternity; ever paying the debt, and yet it is impossible ever to be discharged, seeing it is eternal or boundless suffering. By infinite death they must mean, death boundless or infinite in degree. To form a correct idea of such a death, we will state familiar facts. A person of a delicate constitution can suffer as much as 10 degrees, and no more till death takes place; another stronger than he can suffer 20; another 50; and another 100 degrees. These are all finite, and belong to finite beings; but infinite sufferings in degree are without limit, without bounds; and can be endured by none less than an infinite being. Will any say that the infinite Being, God, suffered? and yet affirm that God is without body, parts, or *passions*? that he is unchangeable, and yet happy to day but suffering to-morrow? Mystery may be pleaded; put mystery, that affirms plain contradictions, is not of God.

Unwilling to give up the doctrine, some affirm that the divinity of Christ did not suffer, but was the altar on which the humanity only suffered; that divinity by this means gave infinite efficacy to his sufferings. This is urged; but to the honor of my fellow creatures be it said, it is only urged by the uninformed bigot, who will close his eyes on every thing in opposition to his received system. Who does not see with a glance of the eye, that on this plan the humanity suffered alone, and therefore the sufferings were not boundless in degree? What unscriptural, anti-scriptural, and unnatural props are invented to support the tottering systems of human device! Whoever read of divinity or very God being an altar on which the sacrifice was offered? And was the sacrifice offered *on* the altar *to* the altar? Such stuff is calculated to sink the religion of heaven; and it is believed to have done more mischief in the world than all the bold opposers of Christianity ever did. I have only touched on this subject; but should you wish to see our views fully, I recommend to your perusal the 2d Edition of my Address, in which the subject is fully handled.

The learned have urged that the meaning of the expression, "*Christ hath suffered for us* and *died for us*," is that he suffered and died *in our stead*. And they insist upon this as true, because the Greek preposition *huper*, translated *for*, has this signification. We grant the word *huper* is translated *in the stead of*, twice and but twice in the whole New Testement: II. Cor. v, 23, and Phil. 13; but in neither of these texts is the suffering or death of any one mentioned. *Huper* with a genitive, occurs hundreds of times in the Greek scriptures, and most generally signifies *on account of*, *for the sake of*, or *because of*, and not *in the stead of*. This I will make appear by introducing a number of texts.

1. "Christ hath suffered (*huper*) for us. Compare this with the following texts: Phil. i, 29, "For unto you it is given, (*huper Christou*) *in the behalf of Christ*, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer (huper autou) for his sake." If *huper* means *in the stead of* in the first text, why not in the second? If Christ suffered (*huper*) in our stead—so the Phillippians suffered (*huper autou*) *in his room and stead.* Our translators have rendered the word properly, to suffer *for his sake.*

Colos. i, 24, "Who (Paul) now rejoice in my sufferings (*huper*) *for* you, and fill up that which is behind of the affiictions of Christ in my flesh (*huper*) for his body's sake, which is the church." If *huper* when connected with sufferings signifies *in the stead of*, why not read it so in the last text? then it would be plain that Paul suffered in the room and stead of the Colossians, or of the body of Christ.

II. Thes. i, 5, "That ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God (*huper*) *for* which ye also suffer." Surely the Thessalonians did not suffer in the room and stead of the kingdom of God! but only for the sake of it, or on account of it.

Acts v, 41, "And they (the apostles after they had been beaten) departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame (*huper*) *for* his name." That is, *for his name's sake*, and not in the stead of his name.

Acts ix, 16, "For I will shew him (Saul) how great things he must suffer (*huper*) *for my name's sake.*"

Eph. iii, 13, "Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations (*huper*) *for* you:" that is on your account; or for your sake.

II. Cor. xii, 15, "And I will very gladly spend and be spent (*huper*) *for* you:" not in your stead, but for your sake

II. Cor. xii, 10, "Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, (*huper*) *for* Christ's *sake.*"

I. John, iii, 16, "Hereby perceive we the love (of God) because he laid down his life (*huper*) *for* us; and we ought to lay down our lives (*huper*) *for* the brethren." Surely, if substitution is intended in the one case, it must be in the other; for the sentences stand in the same relation.

Rom. xvi, 4, "Who (Priscilla and Aquilla) have (*huper*) *for* my life laid down their own necks." That is, for the love they had for Paul and the gospel, they exposed their own lives to secure his. If a man lose his own life in rescuing a friend from imminent danger, he is not considered a substitute; but he lost his life on account of or for the sake of his friend. Thus Peter said to the Saviour, "I will lay down my life (*huper*) *for* thy sake." Not as a substitute in his room and stead. John, xii, 37. So Rom. v, 6, 7, 8: "In due time Christ died (*huper*) for the ungodly. For scarcely (*huper*) *for* a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure (*huper*) *for* a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died (*huper*) for us." How many have ventured

into the hottest battle to rescue a good man surrounded by enemies, and by this have lost their own lives. So Jesus saw the world surrounded by the powers of sin, death, and hell, and in love fled to its rescue; and in the conflict lost his own life. But through death he conquered. This was the counsel of infinite wisdom.

More clearly to shew the fallacy of the argument for substitution, drawn from the preposition *huper*, as meaning *in the stead of*, I will add a few more texts, to shew that the word is explained by others, which learned criticism would blush to say signified substitution.

Luke xxii, 20: "This is the new testament of my blood shed (*huper*) *for* you." Comp. Matt. xxvi, 28, "This is the blood of the new testament shed (*peri*) *for* many:" that is, *for the sake of*, or *on account of* many. For the learned well know that *peri* has this signification, when joined with the genitive; and they well know it never in any case signifies substitution, or *in the room of.*

Heb. x, 12, "But this man (Christ) after he had offered one sacrifice (*huper*) *for* sins"—Comp. 18, "Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering (*peri*) *for* sin."

Again, Heb. x, 8, "Sacrifice and offering (*peri*) *for* sin. Heb. x, 26, "There remaineth no more sacrifice (*huper*) *for* sins." Heb. xiii, 11, "Whose blood is brought into the sanctuary (*peri*) *for* sin." From these passages it is plain that the apostles considered the two words *huper* and *peri* conveyed the same idea; and therefore *huper* does not signify *in the stead of*, in these cases.

To make it still more plain, I will add a few more texts. Col. i, 9, "We do not cease to pray (*huper*) *for* you." Comp. 30, "We give thanks to God—praying always (*peri*) *for* you." Col. iv, 3, "Praying also (*peri*) *for* us." I. Thes. v, 25, "Pray (*peri*) for you."

I. Tim. ii, 1, "I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made (*huper*) *for* all men." Matt. v, 44, "Pray (*huper*) *for* them that despitefully use you." Heb. vii, 25: Rom. viii, 26. Comp. Luke xxii, 32, "I," said Jesus to Peter, "have prayed (*peri*) *for* thee." I. Thes. i, 2, "We thank God (*peri*) *for* you all." So I. Thes. iii, 9. II. Thes. i, 3, ii, 13.

Rom. xiv, 15, "Destroy not him with thy meat (*huper*) *for* whom Christ died." Comp. I Cor. viii, 11, "And through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish (*dia hon*) *for whom* Christ died." Again, I Cor. xv, 3, "Christ died (*huper*) *for* our sins." Comp. Rom. iv, 23, "He was delivered (*dia paraptomata*) *for our offences.*" In these cases the word *huper* is explained by *dia* with an accusative, which, it is well known, never signifies substitution in any instance, but commonly, *on account of—for the sake of.*

Suppose I should invent this new doctrine, That the apostles were substitutes for Christ, and that they suffered and died in his room and stead; and to prove my doctrine true, I should introduce the very argument the orthodox do to prove that Christ was

our substitute, and suffered and died in our stead. Their argument, we have already seen, is that the Greek word *huper* signifies *in the stead of*. Therefore when Christ is said to suffer and die (*huper*) *for* us, it means *in our room and stead*. We will use the same argument. The apostles were substitutes for Christ. For they are said to be ambassadors (*huper*) *in the room and stead of Christ*, and they prayed the Corinthians (*huper*) *in Christ's stead* to be reconciled to God. II. Cor. v, 20. They also as substitutes suffered in his room and stead—for says the apostle, "I take pleasure in infirmities, in persecutions and distresses, (*huper Christou*) *in the room and stead of Christ*. II. Cor. xii, 10. "I am ready—says Paul—to die at Jerusalem (*huper*) in the room of the name of the Lord Jesus." Acts xxi, 13. See the texts above.

By the same argument we could prove that the first Christians were all substitutes for Christ, and suffered in his room and stead. For to them it was given (*huper Christou*) *in Christ's stead*, to suffer (*huper autou*) *in his room and stead*. Phil. i, 29, &c.

By the same argument we could prove that the apostles were substitutes for the primitive christians; and that they suffered in their room and stead. Says Paul, "Who now rejoice in my sufferings *for you* (*huper*) *in your room and stead—for his body's sake*, (*huper*) *in the room and stead of his body*. Colos. i, 24. And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you" (*huper*) *in your room and stead*.

By the same argument we could prove that the first christians were substitutes for the apostles, and suffered in their room and stead. For, says Paul, "Who have for my life (*huper*) *in the room of my life*, laid down their own necks." Rom. xvi, 4.

By the same argument we could also prove, that the primitive christians were substitutes for one another, and suffered and died in the stead of each other." "Hereby perceive we the love [of God] because he laid down his life for us (*huper*) *in our room and stead*; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren (*huper*) *in their room and stead*. I John, iii, 16. In the same sense that Christ laid down his life for us; so must we for the brethren. The word *God* in the last text is a supplement of the translators, and not found in the original.

I ask, by what arguments would the orthodox prove these doctrines false! Would they not say that the word *huper* does not mean substitution in these cases, because it is explained by other prepositions which never convey this idea. But is not the same word, when applied to the suffering of Christ, explained by the same prepositions, as already shown? Why must it signify substitution in the one case and not in the other? No good reason can be given. To say so, is merely arbitrary, and argues no great degree of honesty with the learned, who read and think for themselves.

I may be asked now, what is the difference between the sufferings of Christ and his people. I answer, the same as the sufferings of the head and the members of the one body. I Pet. iv, 13, But rejoice, said Peter to the persecuted saints, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings." Now if Christ suffered the wrath, and burning vengeance of God, as some say, so did the Christians of old suffer the same! How could they rejoice in this! II. Cor. i, 5. To the Christians in tribulation and trouble the apostle says, "For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ." Their sufferings were called the sufferings of Christ, because they were like his, and experienced on account of sin, not theirs, but that of a wicked world, who persecuted them for righteousness sake. The poor persecuted, imprisoned Paul thus writes, "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, *and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ* in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." Col. i, 24. Paul esteemed the fellowship in the sufferings of Christ far more than all he had lost. Phil. iii, 10. So did Moses of old. Heb. xi, 25. We must suffer with him if we be glorified with him. Rom. viii, 17.

I may again be asked, what is the cause of sufferings? I answer unhesitatingly, that sin is the cause, the only cause. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that (or on account of which) all have sinned." Rom. v, 12. Infants suffer and die for sin; not for their own transgression, but by the one offence of Adam, which brought suffering and death upon all the world. Had the Son of God in flesh died when an infant, he would have died for sin; because he took part of the same flesh and blood the children had, such as was subject to suffering and death, that he might die, and through death destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and to deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage. Were it possible that one of the human family should live perfectly holy and secluded from human society, yet he must die for sin; that is, on account of the first transgression. "In Adam all die." Perfect holiness would be no plea against death.

Not only is the first transgression the cause of suffering, but our own iniquities increase the sum—and this is still increased by the inquities of society. So the Christians of old before their conversion to God, had the common lot of suffering with others; but after their conversion, their faithful testimony and holy lives drew upon them the hatred, reproach and persecution of the wicked. They suffered for sin, or on account of sin; not on account of their own sin, but for or on account of the sin of others. In this sense Christ also suffered for sin, he was persecuted for the faithful testimony he bore to the truth, without flattering the folly of man. Read the whole history of Christ, and say, what but his faithful testimony and holy life caused him to be persecuted to death? Do not all Christians suffer with him according to the measure of his spirit received?

I may now be asked, what great purpose was answered in his thus suffering and dying for sin and for all? The answer to this

shall be deferred to our next number. I only refer you to the text, Christ hath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, *to bring us to God.* EDITOR.

TO BE CONTINUED.

MONTGOMERY CO. OHIO, JUNE 22, 1829.

SIR—What is the reason the people who call *themselves* Christians, cry so bitterly against a party spirit in religious community, and at the same time prove by their conduct and life, that they themselves are a *party*, and are as full of sectarian feelings as any other *party*; and would be as unwilling to give up any of their peculiarities, as other branches of the church are, in order to unite with them? Do you say it is not the case? I say it will require something more than I have yet discovered, to induce me to believe you. J. A. REEDER.

REPLY TO J. A. REEDER.

Query 1. What is the reason, the people who call *themselves* Christians, cry so bitterly against a party spirit in religious community?

Ans. You emphatize the expression, they call *themselves* Christians. Do you blame your wife for calling her name Reeder? Would you be pleased should she call herself by the name of another man in preference to yours? Would you not suspect her love and fidelity to you should she do it? Would it be a friendly act for another to call her by any other name than yours? Would you not be displeased with his conduct, thinking that he designed to reproach her? I know your answers to these queries without waiting a moment to hear them. Now, sir, we profess to be married to Christ, even to him that is raised from the dead—Rom. VII, 4—and professing to be *the Lamb's wife*, we call ourselves by his name, *Christians*. This we do, because it is the will of our heavenly Father; for the disciples were called Christians by divine authority first at Antioch. Acts XI, 26. This is the proper rendering of the word, as might be made fully appear by substantial testimony. We do it, because we, as well as the primitive Christians, were baptized into his name, and thus put on Christ. Gall. III, 27. For the name of Christ, or because believers of old were called Christians, they were reproached and suffered persecution. I Pet. IV, 14–16. We also take the name *Christian*, because believers were commended of the Lord, for holding fast his name, and for not denying it in order to save them from martyrdom. Rev. 2 & 3 ch. For these reasons we prefer this name to any other. Can you blame us for it? Were we to take another name, might not our love and regard to our husband be suspected? Might we not be justly charged with departing from the known will of God, who gave this new name himself? Might we not with perfect scriptural propriety be called *carnal*, should we take the name of Paul, Cephas, or Apollos, seeing we were not baptized into their names, but into the name of Christ?

Might we not now, as they formerly, escape reproach and persecution, should we take any of the sectarian names amongst us, as Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist? I am persuaded your good sense dictates to you the proper answer.

But you say we "cry bitterly against a party spirit in religious community." If we cry *bitterly* against it, we are wrong; for our Directory tells us, "Let all bitterness be put away from you." Eph. IV, 31. I have heard many of my brethren speak zealously and warmly against this spirit, for which they are commendable; but I have not yet heard any speak *bitterly*, and I hope never shall. But if you have heard such bitter declamation against a party spirit by any of our brethren, I hope you will not blame the whole of us for it. Many of us as cordially disapprove of this bitterness as you do, whether discovered in ourselves or in others. You would not think it just to be blamed for the improprieties of your own sect.

But, sir, your objection to us may be that we cry aloud against a party spirit in the religious community. Do you really consider this a crime in us? Would you consider Paul criminal in his zealous opposition to it? None did I ever hear equally so severe and so zealous as he was against this antichristian spirit. To bind the Christians in the bonds of love peace and union, was the will of God, the design and prayer of Jesus—the end of the gospel—the labor of the apostles, and the prayer of all living Christians. A party spirit stands in opposition to all these, and in opposition to the world's salvation; for the world are to be brought to this by the union of Christians. A more mischievous fiend never possessed a human heart. Shall we, under this conviction, speak softly, and administer opiates to the people in this spirit, and not rather cry aloud and spare not, and shew the people their transgressions and sins? If for this we are reproached, it is for righteousness sake, and we will rejoice that we are counted worthy to suffer for the truth.

But you may say you do not blame us for zealously crying against a party spirit. No; impossible that you, a believer in revelation can—you must for this commend us. But the cause why you condemn us, is, that while we are crying against a party spirit, "at the same time they prove by their conduct and life, that they themselves are a *party*, and are as full of sectarian feelings as any other party." O what painted hypocrites these people, called Christians, are! Not barely suspected to be hypocritical deceivers, but *proved* to be such by the most undoubted testimony, *their conduct and life!* Dear Sir, is this the opinion of your heart against us all? for you have made no exceptions. I would humbly inquire what immoralities, what wickedness is so obvious in our life and conduct, as to subject us to this charge? If by our lives and conduct you mean an immoral, irreligious conduct and life, we boldly deny the charge—a charge never before made against us by our bitterest enemies. But by *our life and conduct* you may not mean to impeach our moral character, but

may only refer to our conduct in preaching, building up churches, administering ordinances, &c. &c. This we hope is your meaning.

You see one of our preachers go into a neighborhood—he preaches the gospel to saints and sinners. The people feel the truth. He labors to tell the saints their duty—their whole duty, that they ought to be one—that division is contrary to the will of God—that by their union the world will be brought to faith and salvation—that the only righteous plan of union is to receive the word of God as their directory to heaven, and to live and walk in the spirit of it—to take the one name *Christian*, and be all one in Christ Jesus. They agree thus to do. He administers the Lord's supper to them. All the saints are invited—none forbidden—he does not sit an inquisitor on their hearts, but with Paul, he says, Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat and drink. Is there any thing like party spirit in all this? This is our universal conduct. Is this the conduct of sectarians?

But you may see us receiving brethren of other professions into the church. Yes, we do: is this a crime? If they are convinced that partyism and division of christians are wrong, and wish to testify against the evil by their life and conduct, what should they do, but forsake the evil? and where should they go but to those in the same spirit? Should they not be reckoned hypocritical, professing partyism an evil, and yet living in it, and supporting it by their presence? Indeed, sir, to say the best of it, it is a palpable inconstency. But do we receive such as partizans? No: we universally allow them the privilege we all claim, to read the Bible for ourselves, and believe and interpret it for ourselves. We have never debarred a Christian, a believer in Jesus Christ, whose walk was humble and holy, from our communion and fellowship, or from any privilege granted to us in the gospel. We do not make notions or opinions terms of fellowship. Is this the spirit of sectarianism? And do sectarians thus act?

But in your judgment we are sectarians, because "they are as unwilling to give up any of their peculiarities as other branches of the church are, in order to unite with them." Dear sir, are you acquainted with us and our conduct? Did you ever hear us require any member of any church to give up his peculiar doctrines in order to union and fellowship with us, when his life and conduct proved him to be a Christian? Should we do this you might accuse us of partyism. Is not this the conduct of all sectarians? You may justly condem them. But we "are unwilling to give up our peculiarities," you say, for the sake of uniting with others. Yes: we are freemen; we unite as Christians, but not as slaves. We cannot be bound to disbelieve what we do believe, nor will we ever be compelled to profess to believe what we disbelieve. This would be hypocrisy; and union on this ground we indignantly spurn. Many are received to fellowship among sectarians, who are as heretical as you deem us to be; and

they are known to be such; yet if they will be silent, they shall have communion with the sect! We cannot come under such restrictions. But you may say that we are a sect. Who made us such? Do not all the parties drive us from them? And will they admit us to fellowship and union with them, unless we act contrary to the will of God, and become hypocrites? Like the Christians in apostolic times, we confess we are a sect every where spoken against.

Yours to serve in the bonds of love.

EDITOR.

It has been thought by some, that all who profess Christianity, should commune together; while others have been of opinion that those alone, who agree on certain points of doctrine, ought thus to unite in shewing forth the Lord's death. To determine upon this question many have laboured to show the essential, and non-essential doctrines, as they call them, of the Christian religion; and this has generally led to a dispute upon the nature of God and his Son, and the plan of redemption. On these points they have disputed, until many have shewn that they are strangers to the essentials of our religion, and rendered themselves unworthy of Christian fellowship; for they have become contentious; and we have no such custom neither the churches of God, I Cor. xi, 16. They have not only become contentious, but their zeal for their opinions, and their conceited infallibility, have made them the character that, Paul says, we must mark, Rom. xvi, 17, "Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause division and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." In the following verse Paul says, "For they that are such serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." And as we believe there are many now, who deceive the hearts of the simple and serve not Christ, but by causing and supporting division, serve themselves, we will present a summary of what Christians have learned respecting *peace* among men. When Christ, who is called the Prince of Peace (Isa. ix, 6.) was born, a multitude of angels, who knew something of the design of the mission of Christ, praised God, saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth *peace*, good will towards men." As God, in instituting a system of peace among men, manifested good will towards them; so Christ taught that those who under the influence of this spirit are engaged in the work of peace, are God's children; saying, "Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God." Mat. v, 9. When Christ was speaking to his disciples of his departure from this world, which was to take place after his mission was finished here, he says, "*Peace* I leave with you, my *peace* I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid." John xiv, 27.

We learn that after Christ had ended the work that was given

him to do, and the Holy Spirit was given to the apostles, they taught the same doctrine of *peace* and good will among men, and gave it as a characteristic of God's kingdom: "For the kingdom of God is righteousness, and *peace*, and joy in the Holy Ghost; for he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of men." Rom. XIV, 17, 18. Paul says, "The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, *peace*, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." Gal. v, 22, 23. The same apostle gives this charge: "Follow righteousness, faith, charity, *peace* with them that call on the Lord out of pure heart." II Tim. II, 22. He again tells us "to follow *peace* with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." He exhorts to diligence, lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble the Christians. Heb. XII, 14, 15. James tells us that "the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then *peaceable*, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in *peace* of them that make *peace*." Jas. III, 17, 18. In this kingdom of peace the apostles and brethren lived in union. If differences of opinion existed, they were amicably settled among them, and not suffered to destroy their *peace*.

In order to know whom we should fellowship as Christians, we will notice some things, said of those who are not servants of Christ. Paul in writing to Titus, telling the condition of of himself and others previous to their adoption into the family of God, says, "For we ourselves also were sometime foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." Titus III, 3. From this we learn, that the apostle did not think himself a Christian while living in malice, envy, and hating his fellow creatures; but that he had been under the influence of the flesh; for these are a part of the works of the flesh, according to what Paul has written to the Gal. v, 19–21. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, *hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition*, heresies, *envyings*, murders, drunkenness, revellings and such like." These are the unfruitful works of darkness, with which we are to have no fellowship; and to this matter we should strictly attend. It matters not what a man's profession is; we are not to fellowship him unless he has the fruits of the spirit, for by their fruits ye shall know them. We should not be so particular as to a man's talents and connections, as to the spirit that influences him. THO: ADAMS.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

NOTICE.—The yearly meeting of the brethren Christian North of Kentucky River. will be held on the third Lord's day of September; to commence the Friday before, at Berea, on Cane-run in Fayette county, Ky. We hope as many brethren as can, will attend from a distance.

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. III.] GEORGETOWN, KY. SEPTEMBER, 1829. [No. 11.

REMARKS OF THO. ADAMS, CONTINUED.

Is he a preacher? Does his preaching lead his hearers to peace and good will? Is his language filled with meekness? Does he labor to make peace among men? Does he try to inspire his hearers with love to God, and love to men? Does he exhort them to gentleness, long-suffering, and forbearance? Is he in his neighborhood a peace-maker? Is he merciful and kind to the poor and afflicted? Is he to his wife affectionate, to his children kind, to his servants tender, and to the wants of strangers attentive? If these questions can be answered in the affirmative, with that man Christians are authorized to eat; but on the contrary, if his preaching lead men to malice, envy, and hatred; if it is calculated to cause and support division among Christians; if it cause his hearers to become unsocial, cool, and oppressive in their disposition towards others; if it cause them to be unkind to any, and to rejoice in the downfall of enemies;—this, you may truly say, is not a preacher of righteousness.

I will now ask those, who wish to serve the Lord, and to honor him in the world, if they can any longer submit to be governed by those who are building up parties, causing division and stirring up strife, contrary to the doctrine of Christ. They may plead that their conduct is allowable, because of the errors they wish to destroy; and that it is wisdom in them thus to keep the people apart, in order to destroy and keep down error; but James says, "If ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, and devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work."—From this we may learn, that the divinity of our doctrine can be best shown by our works; for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh; and every man shall be rewarded according to that which he has done. Therefore let us separate ourselves from those who cause division contrary to the doctrine of Christ: let us be ready to every good work; let us speak evil of no man; let us be no brawlers; but gentle, shewing all meekness unto all men; for we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

THOMAS ADAMS.

W