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

REPLY TO ELDER JOHN POWEL'S QUERY,

ON I. PET. III, 18-22.

Having in a former number considered the importance of the phrase, "Christ hath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust," I shall next consider the great purpose, answered in his thus suffering and dying for sins, and for the unjust. To the scriptures I shall confine myself; for in vain do we expect to get information from any other source on a subject of pure revelation.

First, I will state what his blood, death, or sacrifice was not designed to effect.

1. It was not designed to "reconcile the Father to us," as the Methodist Book of Discipline declares. Art. 2. That it was designed to reconcile the world of sinners to God, is frequently taught in the New Testament; but not once hinted at as designed to reconcile God to sinners. Were it true that the blood of Christ reconciled God to sinners, it would also be true that God is a changeable being; for reconcileation declares a previous enmity; therefore if God was reconciled to sinners, he was previously at enmity against them. What greater change can we conceive in God, than that his enmity should be changed into reconciliation? The sins and impurity of sinners are the objects of God's enmity or hatred; and this enmity or hatred of God never changes; he eternally and unchangeably hates sin, and stands in opposition to it, as much after it is taken away from the sinner as before. The sinner, the poor creature, he loves; and so great was his love that he sent his only begotten son, that we might be saved from sin. When sin is removed from the creature, the object of enmity is removed; he is now brought into union and reconciliation with his God. Though the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all *ungodliness* and *unrighteousness* of men, yet he loved the world at the same time, even when we were yet sinners.

The word *reconcile* (*katallasso*) in the original scripturess, properly signifies *to change*, and is so translated in the N. Testament in its simple form. See Acts VI, 14; Rom. I, 23, 25, 26; Cor. XVI, 51, 52; Gal. IV, 20; Heb. I, 12; Js. I, 17. The word *katallasso*, Parkhurst defines "*to reconcile*, i. e. to *change a state of enmity between persons to one of friendship.*" He derives the word from *kata*, intensitive, and *allasso*, *to change*, *to alter*. Park. Eng. Gr. Test. In this sense which is the only proper one, it cannot apply to God. It would be a derogation from his glory.

If Christ died for the whole world, and his blood was designed to reconcile the Father, and did truly effect this reconciliation then indeed God was reconciled to the world 1800 years ago, irrespective of their faith, repentance, or obedience! How can this comport with the scripture doctrine, that the wrath of God abideth on the unbeliever!

If Christ's blood reconciled the Father, then was the Father at enmity before the blood was shed. How will this accord with

the declarations of his love, good will, and mercy, to the world before Christ died!

2. Neither was the blood of Christ designed to make God *placable*, according to modern *orthodoxy*. This doctrine plainly implies that God was *implacable* before Christ died: that the blood of Christ effected in him a great change. The doctrine we view only as a temporary subterfuge from increasing light, and must die the death. We leave it unpitied in its dying throes, and proceed to another particular.

3. Neither was the blood of Christ designed to open the door of God's mercyand grace to the world in sin. This is confidently affirmed as true; yet it is never found in the bible. Did not the scheme of our salvation originate in mercy, love, and grace to the fallen world? Was it not because God was merciful, and gracious, and loved the world, that he gave his Son, and sent him to be the Saviour of it?—and this prior to his death? Was it not "*by the grace of God* that Jesus tasted death for every man"? How then can any say that by his death he purchased the grace of God!—that by his death he opened the door of God's mercy, and grace, when this mercy and grace were the cause why he was given and died, or submitted to death, that he might bring us to God?

4. Neither did Christ die to satisfy the demands of law and justice in our room and stead. If he did, we boldly say it is not mentioned in the scriptures. This I have sufficiently made appear in the last number; and the anti-scriptural consequences I have lengthily shewn in my *Address 2d Edit.*

Other ends and designs of Christ's blood are urged by the more ignorant supporters of human, dying systems, as that he died to restore free will to man—to justify infants—&c. These are too weak, and foreign from the doctrine of the holy scriptures to notice. I pass them by, unworthy of regard.

I will here remark, that the scriptures no where represent the blood, death, or sacrifice of Christ, as having any effect on God, so as to make him merciful, gracious, or placable towards the human family. Their whole virtue and effect pass on man, not on God. True the death of Christ was a sweet savor to God; because God was well pleased with his obedience unto death, as well as his obedience in life to the commandment given him. Neither is the blood of Christ mentioned as having any further effect on the law, than by abolishing it or taking it out of the way, nailing it to hiscross.

I now proceed to state the real designs of the blood of Christ. As the Epistle to the Hebrews stands confessed the best commentary on Moses, to this I shall call your attention. The apostle shews that the sacrifices of the law especially on the great day of atonement, were typical of the great sacrifice of the Gospel, Christ Jesus crucified.

1. He shews "that almost all things by the law were *purged* with blood, and without shedding of blood was no remission."

Heb. ix, 22. These things, purged or purified under the law by blood of beasts, were only patterns or types of heavenly things, which were to be purged or purified with a better sacrifice, *that* of the Lamb of God. The blood of Jesus was designed to purge from our sins, to purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God. Heb. ix, 14. I remark the Greek words (*kathairo* and *katharizo*) translated *purged* and *purified* in the texts above are sometimes translated *cleansed;* I John i, 7, 9. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son, *cleanseth* us from all sin." See II Cor. vii, 1; Eph. v, 26; Js. iv, 8, &c. Therefore purging and cleansing are the same, and these are effected in us by the sacrifice or blood of Christ.

2. By the blood or sacrifice of Christ our sins are taken away. Paul, He. x, 4, was shewing the weakness of the law, that it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins; but shews how the blood of Christ can do it. John the Baptist says, "Behold the Lamb of God *that taketh away* the sin of the world." "He was manifested *to take away* our sins;" I John iii, 5. To take away sin is the same thing as to purge, and cleanse from sin. This none can deny. But should a doubt remain, I will farther remark, that the Greek words translated *purged, cleansed,* and *taking away* are the same, except that the former two have the preposition *kata* prefixed to make the meaning more intensitive or forcible.

3. The blood of Christ was designed to *put away sin*. Heb. ix, 26. In verse 28, "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Or, according to McKnight's translation, "*to carry away* the sins of many." So I Pet. ii, 24. These texts convey the same idea as those mentioned above: for, to put away sin—to carry away sin—to take away sin—and to purge and cleanse from sin, are tantamount expressions.

4. The blood of the Son of God is shed for the remission of sins. Matt. xxvi, 28, &c. The word remission signifies properly *to send off* or *to send away, to dismiss* or *put away*. The Greek words translated *remit* and *remission*, are very frequently translated *to send away, to put away*. See Matt. xiii, 36; Mark iv, 36; I. Cor. vii, 11–13. The same word is very frequently translated *forgive* or to *pardon*. Therefore to pardon, to forgive, and to remit sins, are the same as to put them away, send them away, to purge and cleanse them away. The same idea is still retained.

5. The blood or death of Christ is said *to redeem* us from the transgressions of the first testament, Heb. ix, 15. "Knowing that ye are redeemed from your vain conversation—by the blood of Christ." I Pet. i, 18. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Col. i, 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, *even* the forgiveness of sins." In these verses *redemption* is explained, by an inspired apostle, to be forgiveness or remission of sins. These we have before proved to be of the same signification as *purging, cleansing, taking away, putting away* &c. Still the same idea is retained.

The simple meaning of redemption (*apolutrosis*, Gr.) is deliverance. Heb. xi, 35: "Others were tortured, not accepting *deliverance*, (*apolutrosin*) that they might obtain a better resurrection." Under the law, certain men were redeemed, or delivered from captivity, or from punishment, by paying a certain sum of money or its equivalent. "In the New Testament, says Parkhurst, redemption (*apolutrosis*) denotes *figuratively* the spiritual redemption of men by the blood of Christ from the bondage of sin and death." To this sentiment we think none will object.

6. By the blood or death of Christ we are said "to be *purchased* and *bought*." Acts xx, 28; I Cor. vi, 20, vii, 23; II Pet. ii, 1. The word *agorazo*, translated *bought* in the texts above, means redemption, and is so translated in the following texts: Rev. v, 9, xiv, 3, 4. This is edidently its meaning; for Moses speaking of the redemption or deliverance of his people from Egyptian bondage, thus speaks: "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise! Is he not thy Father, that hath *bought* thee!" Deut. xxxii, 6. "Fear and dread shall fall upon them—till thy people, O Lord, pass over, which thou hast *purchased:*" Ex. xv, 16. "Remember thy congregation, which thou *hast purchased* of old:" Ps. lxxiv, 2, Therefore to *buy, to purchase, to ransom, to redeem*, and *to deliver*, are of the same signification, and that is a deliverance or salvation from sin and death; or that sin is remitted, taken away from us, and we purged and cleansed from it. "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us:" Ps. ciii, 12.

By the blood of Christ we are washed from our sins, and sanctified from them. Rev. i, 5: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood." "Wherefore Jesus that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate:" Heb. xiii, 12. This effect is the same as purging, cleansing, and taking away sin.

8. By the death of Jesus we are reconciled to God: Rom. v, 10; II Cor. v, 18, &c. This follows the purging of our sins. For so long as we love and practise sin, so long we remain at enmity with God; but when cleansed from sin, then we become reconciled or at one with God: and are brought nigh to him.

9. By his blood we are justified. Rom. v, 9: "Much more then being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." In chapter iv, Paul, to prove the doctrine of justification by faith, introduces David as a witness, "Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Therefore the inspired apostle considered justification by faith as tantamount to the forgiveness of sins—to having sin covered so as to be seen and remembered no more—to the non-imputation of sin. If this be not his meaning, his proof is irrelevant. This effect differs not from those mentioned before.

10. By the blood of Christ he entered into the holiest of all

into heaven itself, having destroyed the grave and death, and him that had the power of death, the devil; and opened heaven for the reception of all his followers, who shall rise from the dead at the last day, and receive glory, honor, immortality, and eternal life. These are every where taught in the New Testament.

These are the designs and effects of the blood of Christ; and these effects are experienced only by him that believeth in Jesus, "who died according to the scriptures, and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the scriptures." The woman of infirmity would never have felt virtue flow from Jesus to heal her, unless she had believed on him, and touched the hem of his garment. So none of the fallen family will experience one of these divine effects of the blood of Jesus, till he believe on him that died and rose again. No unbeliever is justified, sanctified, washed, cleansed, nor purged from sin, according to the New Testament.

I have now stated the design and effects of the death of Christ, which simply amounts to salvation from sin and death, to which salvation are united glory, honor, immortality, and eternal life. While we are condemned for not believing the system of orthodoxy, let us bear with our brethren, who may view that system correct, and true. We know by experience the force of education on the mind. Too often the mind is fettered by a wrong doctrine received in youth. I lament to see that a system of education is now introduced to bind the minds of the rising generation to party creeds and notions. Nothing can counteract this effect, but the Bible, which now abounds in our country, and that Christians imbibe its spirit and practice its precepts.

I defer the farther consideration of the text you gave me for the next number. EDITOR.

LOVE TO GOD.

We frequently hear something like this: Is it possible that they can love God, who deny the *orthodox* notions of trinity? Or how can they love God, who do not believe that he exists in three persons, and three persons exist in one God? It is evident that those who thus speak, are as ignorant of the Being or essence of God as others. Of this all are equally ignorant. His character is all we know, or can know; and this alone is the object of religious affection. God is infinitely perfect in holiness, justice, mercy, love, goodness, &c. These divine attributes are the object of a christian's love in whatever being they are found. We love this character when seen in fellow creatures—we love it supremely in God, because it is infinitely perfect. "Hereby we know that we love God, if we have love one for another—and hereby we know that we love the brethren, if we love God." Love to God, and love to the brethren, are inseparably connected—for christians bear his image and possess his spirit. A christian does not love a christian because of the beauty of his person, but because of the beauty of his character; for many have beautiful persons, whose character is hateful; and many persons have an amiable character, whose persons are rough and deformed. So, we love not the essence or being of God, because we know not what it is; but the amiable character of that unknown being all Christians love; and they adore the invisible Being in whom it dwells. It may be observed that in the whole history of our Saviour, as written by the inspired writers, nothing is said of his person or being, whether it was large or small, whether it was beautiful and well proportioned, whether it was white, ruddy or swarthy. Yet his lovely character was by them pourtrayed in the liveliest colours. Surely then it cannot be that his natural person is the object of our love, but his character.

There cannot be a more simple idea than this now suggested; so simple, that it has almost been covered from view by the rubbish of human wisdom, and overlooked by sticklers for *orthodoxy* and the traditions of men. Do not the pious, whether trinitarian or anti-trinitarian, love the same character, and long and labor for a perfect assimilation to it? Do they not all love the Saviour, because he is the perfect image of the invisible God; so perfect, that when we see him we see the Father—not the being of the Father, for that is invisible, but the character or glory of God shining in the face of Jesus? Do they not all love the brethren, because they bear the same image of the invisible God? There are none, it is believed, who would not give an affirmative answer to these queries. Why then should we remain in disunion? All love the same God, though some may think he is but one person, and others that he is three; though they profess he is three, yet they confess he is but one God, one infinite spirit, one infinite mind. The sentiments are really but one. My brethren may have their notions, and all we ask is that we may have ours—that we cease from strife, and unite as lovers of the same God, and Saviour, and follow after peace and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. EDITOR.

TERMS OF COMMUNION.

Much is said on the subject of terms of communion at the present day. The Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, can pray together, praise together, preach together, and worship together in all the commandments of the Lord, except in one, which is the Lord's supper. From this the Baptists debar all others not immersed. Why cannot they have fellowship in this act of worship as well as in others? Has God said, you may pray, and praise together with persons not immersed, but you must not eat and drink with them at my table? You may worship with them in all my ways, but this command of eating and drinking at my table is most holy, you must debar all unbaptized persons from this act of worship with you? Were our Baptist brethren to act consistently, they should debar all unbaptized persons from fellowship in every act of worship, as well as from the Lord's table; or give a good reason, why they should commune in all but this.

The Lord's supper has long been made, by the artifice of men, the very reverse of what was designed by the Institutor. It is made the very means of dividing christians; as if it was too sacred to be defiled by persons admitted to every other act of worship, and considered as pious christians by the very men who debar them. The sectarians of the present day act consistently with regard to us, known only by the name *Christians*. They profess, (the majority of the leaders) that they do not acknowledge us *Christians*, and therefore debar us from worshipping with them in any way. But should any believe we are christians, and yet debar us, we judge them not, but submit the case to him that judgeth righteously. These hints on terms of communion are suggested to engage the attention of the religious community. Correct information is much needed in the present state of society, and such we earnestly solicit from all who are qualified to give it. EDITOR.

AN ORTHODOX DICTIONARY AND EXPOSITOR.

Nothing contributes more to the cause of truth than a clear and definite understanding of language. This must appear very evident, when we consider that the most if not all our information is derived, and certainly all communicated by language. Hence the fact, that they who know least of language, have fewest ideas; and hence also another fact, that such persons are easily imposed upon, and drawn into the schemes of cunning crafty men, who lie in wait to deceive; and hence, moreover, much of the wretchedness and misery of the world. Aware of the importance of this subject, our greatest philologists have done and still are doing all in their power, to ascertain and fix the true meaning of the English language upon a permanent basis. They have done much for the cause of truth, and consequently for the happiness of mankind, and have, as is meet, our warmest thanks. None of them however, have interfered with my humble design, which is to present the public with "an orthodox dictionary and expositor." That such an "expositor" is a desideratum in the christian world, must be evident from the fact that the "orthodox" have a dialect peculiar to themselves—that they use a great many words and phrases, in a sense entirely different from their common signification.

These things premised, I shall proceed to the main object before me. And as orthodoxy is a prominent word among "the orthodox," I shall commence with it.

Orthodoxy.—Sectarianism, or that system which is embraced in common by all the different sects, the Baptist Regulars, the Methodists, the Episcopalians, the Presbyterians, the Roman Catholics, &c. &c. Its soul is found in the sentiment, that the scriptures, given by inspiration of God, are insufficient; or, (which is the same thing) that they are dark and mysterious, and consequently dangerous to the souls of "*the many*," unless accompanied by "forms of sound words," furnished by "*the few*," "specially called and chosen" for that purpose. These "forms of sound words" contain the "fundamentals of religion," "which, (to use the language of good St. Athanasius, the father of creeds and creed-makers) if a man believe not, he must without doubt perish everlastingly." This, we have said, is the soul of orthodoxy, but this soul inhabits various *religious bodies*. For, we may say with propriety, there are *diversities of sectarian bodies*, but *only one soul*, which influences and keeps them all alive.

Heterodoxy—The opposite of *orthodoxy;* or whatever stands opposed to the interests of *general* or *particular* sectarianism. By *general* sectarianism, we mean those fundamental principles, on which the existence of all sects depend; and in which they all have a common interest. But by *particular* sectarianism we mean, whatever opposes the interest of any individual sect.

Soundness in the faith.—The hearty receiving of those "forms of sound words" compiled by the priests, and the seeking to promote their interests.

Heretic.—One who opposes human systems of religion.

Blasphemer.—One who speaks against the kingdom of the clergy; for "he that rejecteth you (my apostles) rejecteth me," said the Saviour. And this they consider applicable to them; for they claim to be the legitimate successors of the apostles.

Agent of Hell.—One who would rejoice to see the clergy obedient to the faith. One who would rejoice to see them stoop from that lofty, criminal, and dangerous self-created eminence on which they stand, and lord it over the heritage of God, to the feet of the blessed Jesus; and become teachers of the word of truth, unadulterated by the traditions of the elders. He is one therefore who, from a principle of love to the Church, and to the clergy, exposes the corruptions of the present religious party establishments, and calls loudly for a return to primitive ground. Such is an *agent of hell* in the vocabulary of the truly orthodox. And, indeed, such a one may seem to interfere with the *heaven* of the clergy *here*, but he would point them the way to the *heaven of heavens hereafter*.

Infidel.—An unbeliever in the doctrines and commandments of men. One who does not fall in and co-operate with the "mighty schemes" of the present day, which are to introduce the Millenium: such as Sunday-schools, tract societies, missionary societies, education societies, &c. &c. For although he is aware that the ostensible object of all these schemes is the happiness of man, and the glory of God, and believes that thousands are drawn into them, who verily think that such is their tendency,—yet he is strongly inclined to believe, that the *master spirits* who are their very life and soul, have set them on foot, and are giving them all their influence for party purposes. Nor can he conceive how they are to introduce the Millenium, in which, most assuredly, all party feelings and distinctions will be destroyed, and christians be one, as the Father and Son are one, according to the prayer of the Redeemer. And, it seems to him that would be an extra-

ordinary millenium indeed, in which there should be found Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Catholics, &c. with the whole apparatus of sectarianism, all rallying around their different standards, and each sect seeking to promote its own interest at the expense of all the rest. The Presbyterians one while representing the Methodist preachers as without a message to the world, (so far at least as they oppose "the five points,") as preaching a doctrine pleasing to the Deist, the Universalist, the Socinian, the Arian, the man who abuses his wife, the drunkard, &c. and another while inviting them to their communion table, calling on them as believers in the essentials of religion (or rather, of sectarianism) to forget their little differences, and unite with them against the common enemy—those infidels, who have but little faith in any of their plans, and who strike at the root of their spiritual Babel. And the Baptists all the while, taking their own course, refusing to commune with any of the other sects. Such, he verily believes, is the legitimate result of these *mighty plans*, and their connectives—(*mighty*, through priests, to the destroying of christian comfort and union.) And such the millenium they are suited to introduce. However good, therefore, many of their works may be in themselves, yet considered as parts of a mighty machine, prostituted to sectarian purposes, he cannot give them his aid. Such is the religious infidel, in the vocabulary of the orthodox. But this is not all his character. This *unbeliever believes* much more. He believes that light is rapidly disseminating; that truth is making mighty conquests in the kingdom of error; that sectarianism is shaken to its center; that its vitals are incurably afflicted; that its life's blood is running freely; and that all the efforts of its most skillful and successful physicians to stop it will be ineffectual; and that, therefore, its friends will soon be gathered to its funeral, to mourn over its fall as those who have *no hope;* that they will stand at a distance, saying, Alas, alas, that great city, Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is thy judgment come! And while her merchants, who were made rich by her merchandize, shall call to mind her former magnificence, in connexion with their own, they will "cast dust upon their heads, weeping, and wailing, and saying, Alas, alas, that great city, wherein were made rich all that had ships in the sea, by reason of her costliness; for in one hour is she made desolate! Such is the language of inspiration, and such, therefore, in the estimation of this orthodox infidel, is to be the end of all sectarians, and sectarian establishments. While, therefore, he regards the voice of his God, "come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues," he cannot encourage them; for although he believes and rejoices in the belief, that sectarians are promoting their own destruction, yet he is well aware that they have no more intention of doing so, than had the Jews of crucifying the Lord of glory. But "all things work for good to them that love God," and hasten the consummation of the church's glory. And when that

period, so long and ardently desired by the saints, shall have arrived, when Babylon shall be destroyed, he hopes to be enabled to participate in the triumphs of the heavenly hosts, while they join in singing her funeral anthem, in obedience to the command, "Rejoice over her thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her." *They shall be eternally destroyed the power of that evil spirit, which in ten thousand forms, and ways*, has, since the murder of pious Abel, been exerting its hellish influence against the saints of God. And *then, also*, shall be consummated the benevolent purposes of the Almighty in relation to man, contemplated in all his revelations.

TIMOTHY.

Georgetown, Ohio, Aug. 6, 1829.

Bro: Stone—I here send you for publication in the Messenger, (by request of some brethren, who are subscribers to your useful paper,) not because we deem the doctrine therein contained entitled to credit, or worthy of being received by the christian public, but that some of the errrors and false doctrines of the day may be exposed through the medium of your paper. I have given the outline of our preacher's discourse, perhaps not verbatim, but I am sure it is the substance, and in some points verbatim, without exaggeration. I give it without making any strictures, leaving that part to abler pens, to show the sophistry therein contained. Your strange friend and brother,

JAMES CLARK.

ON BAPTISM.

Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.—Acts II, 38.

Our preacher laid out his text in the three following heads:

1st, The nature of repentance. 2dly, The subjects of baptism. 3dly, The proper mode or form to be practised in administering the ordinance of baptism.

In commenting upon the first part of the text, our preacher was very brief. He merely stated that it was sorrow for sin, sick of sin, &c.

To explain the subject of baptism, our preacher went to the sign of circumcision given to Abraham;—that the mode of admission into the Jewish church was circumcision, which was the type of baptism in the christian church—that members could not be admitted into the Jewish church but by circumcision, and that all who were sorry for their sins, were fit subjects of baptism. Our preacher told us that it was not essential whether they believed or not, if they were penitents, and that the scriptures no where said it was essentially necessary for them (the sinners) to believe prior to baptism. He informed us that baptism was given to us in the room of circumcision, and such only as were subjects of circumcision were subjects of baptism; and to prove it

was not required of the subject of baptism to believe. He told us, that the scripture no where said believe and be baptized. He admitted that it was written "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved," &c. But, said he, *believeth* is in the present tense, and baptized is in the past tense—that they were baptized, and then believed, perhaps from one to twenty years after they were baptized.

Our preacher then went on to inform us, that, with penitents and believers, infants were also fit subjects of baptism. To prove this, he told us that infants were to be circumcised at eight days old; that as baptism was given in the room of circumcision, it was also right to baptize infants in obedience to the command of God; and as baptism was the only door of admittance into the church, they must necessarily be baptized. He stated farther, as proofs, that Jesus took little children in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them, and that Cornelius and his household, Stephanas and his household, Lydia's household, the Jailor's household, were all baptized by sprinkling; and there was but little doubt that there were infants in each house mentioned, and it would be something wonderful to go to four houses promiscuously in a neighbourhood, and find no infants. Our preacher thought it would be almost impossible. He farther stated that a church that had no infants in it, was more like hell than heaven; and as there were but two classes in the world, the righteous and the wicked, believers and unbelievers, and as unbelievers were subjects of hell, and believers of heaven, infants must be placed in one of these classes, and in order that they might be placed among the believers they must be baptized. If they were refused the ordinance of baptism, they must be placed among the unbelievers, and consequently must be subjects of hell; which he was unwilling to admit. As none were admitted into the church militant but by baptism, they must as a matter of course be excluded from heaven, which he thought a sufficient reason to prove their right to baptism; and that he must be baptized into the name (not *names*) of the adorable trinity.

Our preacher, in commenting on the 2d part of his text, or in explaining the proper mode of administering the ordinance of baptism, told us that sprinkling was undoubtedly the proper mode, by bringing forward the following proofs and arguments:

I will sprinkle you with clean water. I will pour out my spirit upon you, &c.

He told us that to take a bucket of water and pour it out, it might descend in sprinkles before it fell on the subject. That baptism was a type of the out-pouring of the spirit, and sprinkling had more the resemblance of the outpouring of the spirit, than immersion. The Jailor, he affirmed, was baptized in prison, and it was not very probable there was a pool or cistern in the prison to immerse in; therefore he and his household must of course have been baptized by sprinkling; and that those who affirmed that there was no scripture for sprinkling or baptizing

infants, ought to remember that it could as easily be proven there was no scripture for women to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

Our preacher then began to throw out some squints at those who are called by the world, *Newlights* (*Christians*) and such as are endeavoring to pull down the walls of partyism, and sectarianism. They say, (said he) let us have free communion, lay aside partyism, and let us go together. But no, (said he) we must have no communion with idolators; and they are such, who deny the divinity of Christ. They say, (said he) throw away your discipline, and come go with us; be Christians. Yes, go with us, then all will do very well! But oh, brethren, remember the Arian persecution, remember the rivers of blood that flowed under that persecution, and have no fellowship with idolators, and such they are, who deny the adorable trinity.

Your strange friend, JAMES CLARK.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE COMMUNICATION.

In the preacher's discourse I observe but little of novelty except in word. The arguments, used by him, have been noticed already in former numbers of the Messenger. With respect to their strength the public have judged, and can yet judge by adverting to them.

Pedobaptists have said much on the doctrine of baptism having come in the room of circumcision. We think we have already shewn its fallacy. Should this doctrine be admitted, will it therefore follow that infants should be baptized? It is plainly stated in the scriptures, that Jewish infants were circumcised;—is it any where stated in the scriptures that infants were baptized under the new dispensation? or that it was the will of God they should be baptized? We read of none being baptized under the new dispensation, but such as gladly received the word—believed—and repented. These are not the acts of sucking babes. Did not the Baptist plainly declare that the terms of church membership were changed, when he said, "Think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father; you must bring forth fruits meet for repentance."

The position of your preacher, that it is unessential to baptism that the sinner should believe prior to baptism, if he only be a penitent, is a strange position indeed to be taken in this day of inquiry. Will a man repent till he is convinced he has done iniquity? Does he not receive this conviction by the belief of the truth? Therefore he must believe before he can repent. If repentance be necessary prior to baptism, so must faith be. His exposition too of "He that believeth and is baptized—" is more strange, yet not new. He thinks that "believeth" is the present tense, and "is baptized" is the past tense. Had he been acquainted with the original Greek scriptures, he would have blushed to make this assertion; for they are both in the same tense, called the first indefinite tense. According to your preach-

er's exposition the apostles received no commission to baptize any body; for he that believeth and has been baptized, shall be saved. It might be asked, who had previously baptized the world to whom they were commissioned to preach? For instance, when Paul came to Corinth, he preached, and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized. Had they been previously baptized in their heathen state, or by the Christian ministers after they believed? Had the 3000 on the day of Pentecost been previously baptized? Why baptize them again? I have really wondered how men, who should know better, have ever received such an idea of the text. They must be hard pressed for argument.

Your preacher argues that infants by divine command were to be circumcised; therefore in obedience to God's command, infants should *now* be baptized. Such a command to baptize infants is only inferable at best; and inferable from premises dark and uncertain, and to us very foreign from the point. As to the text, "suffer little children to come unto me," &c. I had concluded that no man understanding language would apply it to the baptism of helpless infants: for the following verse determines the point that these little children were sufficiently large and intelligent to receive the kingdom of heaven, and therefore were believers. But why argue baptism from a text, in which is no mention made of it, either directly or indirectly? As to the four households baptized, it is plain there were no sucking infants among them; for the connexion excludes the idea. We refer the candid to the texts for proofs. It is confidently argued that in four households there must be some infants. I have shewn in a former number three households in the New Testament, in which there was not an infant. But will your preacher baptize whole households, including wicked unbeliving children and servants of every age? To act consistently he must: or else be able to point out the age, size, and qualifications of those to be received, and of those to be rejected, as determined by the New Testament.

Your preacher argues, that as infants are fit subjects of the church, and as baptism is the door of entrance into the church, therefore they should be baptized. He doubtless believes that the Jewish church, and Christain church are the same. The Jews, who were baptized on the day of Pentecost, were, according to Pedobaptists, in the church previous to their baptism; *query*, into what church did they enter by baptism? When this query is solved, then pedobaptists may argue that baptism is the door of entrance into the church with more plausibility.

Your preacher's view of the likeness existing between hell and a church without infants, and what follows in connexion, is calculated to excite disgust, but not to produce conviction. With the intelligent such arguments, if worthy of the name, sink the cause they are designed to support.

His squinting at the Christians, and all such ill-natured insinuations, are unworthy of notice. Be it known to your preacher that we seek not union nor communion with such spirits as are manifested in his sermon, especially in the close of it.

EDITOR.

ON BAPTISM AND REMISSION OF SINS.

NO. II.

Rrother Stone— I have read your answers to my questions, and with the most of them I am pleased; but I will answer the queries you have proposed to me, and offer to you a few more, before I present a review of your answers.

Query 1. Can you find one instance under the new dispensation, of the apostles baptizing any, *because* they were saved, or forgiven, or had received the gift of the holy ghost—Cornelius and household excepted?

Ans. Not in these words: but I expect to shew in this investigation, that the persons who baptized required faith in those whom they baptized, Acts VIII, 37: and that he that believeth on Christ is not condemned, John III, 18.

Query 2. Have we any authority to believe that we shall receive the gift of the holy ghost in these days? Ans. Yes.

Query 3. If we have, upon what plan do we receive it?

Ans. By faith. See for proof of both these answers, John XIV. 12–17.

Query 4. What do you understand by the expressions, believing with the heart and with all the heart?

Ans. By the heart is sometimes meant the *mind*, and sometimes *wisdom* or *judgment*, and also *affection*, and *courage*, or it may mean the *whole man*. Then, to believe in Christ with the *heart*, and with *all the heart*, is to have the *mind* placed upon him, and to have the *judgment* so enlightened as to captivate the *affections* so completely, that every power of *resolution* will be engaged for obedience. In this way the whole man is animated, and the heart is purified by faith. Acts XV, 9. This is the faith that works by love: Gal. V, 6. It is thus by *courage* the double-minded can purify their hearts: James IV, 9. It is in this way we obey the truth through the spirit, and in obeying purify our souls: I Pet. I, 22.

I will expect answers to the following questions.

1st, In what name did John baptize? 2d, What was the design of John's baptism? 3d, Were those whom Christ, or rather his disciples baptized (John III, 26, and IV, 42) baptized into John's baptism? 4th, What are we to understand by baptizing in the *name* of the Father, and in the *name* of the Son, and in the *name* of the Holy Ghost? 5th. Did any receive the Holy Spirit before the ascension of Christ? 6th, What is *repentance*? 7th, What is confession? 8th, What is prayer? 9th, What is obedience? 10th, What is the *gift* of the Holy Ghost?

THOMAS ADAMS.

REPLY TO ELD. THO: ADAMS' QUERIES.

Query 1st, In what name did John baptize?

Ans. If by the expression "in what name" our brother means *by what authority*, I answer *in the name* or *by the authority* of his his God: John, I, 33, "But he that sent me to baptize with water—" If he means by the expression, *into what name* he baptized, I cannot tell; for the scriptures are silent on this subject.

Query 2d, Were those, whom Christ, or rather his disciples, baptized, baptized unto John's baptism?

Ans. We are not informed in the New Testament.

Query 3d. What are we to understand by baptizing in the *name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?

Ans. *In the name of*, (Greek, en to onomati) signifies *by the authority of*. This I have made appear in former numbers of this work. But to be baptized *into the name* (*eis to onoma*) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matt. XXVIII, 19,) conveys a very different idea; it denotes union and communion with that person, *into whose name*, or *into whom* we are baptized. Thus it is said of the Israelites, "They were all baptized (*eis Mosen*) *unto*, or *into Moses*." I Cor. x, 2. By this it is understood that they were all incorporated, and united in him. So Paul censuring the Corinthians for dividing, and incorporating or uniting themselves under different heads, as Paul, Cephas, and Apollos, says, Were you baptized (*eis to onoma*) into the name of Paul? Had they been baptized *into the name* of Paul, Cephas, or Apollos, then they would have been united in those different heads, and have had a good reason for their division. But as they had all been baptized (*eis Christon*) *into Christ*, and therefore incorporated in him as their head, they had no shew of reason for their division. For this reason Paul, when urging the doctrine of unity among Christians, says, there is one *baptism*, Eph. IV, 5. Again, speaking of the unity of Christ and his members, (I Cor. XII, 13) he presents baptism as a means of this union, "For (*en*) in one spirit ye are all baptized (*eis*) *into* one body." To be baptized (*eis*) into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, signifies our union with the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. A Jew who believed not in the Son, would not be unwilling to be baptized into the *name* of the Father, and own him to be his head; but he would not submit to be baptized *into* the Son. A believing Jew would willingly submit to be baptized into the name of the Father and Son; but would object to being baptized into the name of the Holy Ghost; for he could not brook the idea of being incorporated into the one body or temple of the Holy Ghost, which temple is composed of Gentiles as well as Jews. But the command is imperious; and if we would not reject the counsel of God, we must be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Query 5th. Did any receive the Holy Spirit before the ascension of Christ?"

Ans. That the saints in every age experienced the sanctifying

operations of the Holy Spirit, is a truth admitted by all. But the promise and gift of the Holy Spirit, as found in the New Testament, appears to be peculiar to this dispensation. We will advert to a few of the promises and their fulfilment on this subject. John VII, 38, 39: "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not glorified.) John XVI, 7–15: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you—and when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment—will guide you into all truth—will shew you things to come, &c." Luke XXIV, 49: "And behold I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." "And ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you:" Acts I, 8. After his resurrection, and after he had commissioned them to preach the gospel, "Jesus breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:" John XX, 22. On the day of Pentecost the promise was fulfilled. The 120 received the Holy Ghost, and were endued with various gifts of the spirit, in its various operations. On this point I have in a former number been sufficiently explicit.

I would here passingly remark, that in the receiving of the Holy Spirit, and his operations, are included those operations yet experienced by Christians. "Then had the churches rest—and walking the fear of the Lord, and *in the comfort of the Holy Ghost*, were multiplied:" Acts IX, 31. "And hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us:" Rom. V, 5. "The kingdom of heaven is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost:" Rom. XIV, 17. "That ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost:" Rom. XV, 13. We read of the communion of the Holy Ghost—joy of the Holy Ghost—renewing of the Holy Ghost—praying in the Holy Ghost. We read of the Spirit of God dwelling in Christians—leading them—bearing witness with them—helping their infirmities—quickening them, &c. These are all included in the promise of the Holy Spirit. Tho' the miraculous gifts of the Spirit have ceased, yet the promise is still good, and shall be fulfilled to the obedient believer.

Query 6th. What is repentance?

Ans. Reformation. This is its general meaning.

Query 7th. What is confession?

Ans. Walker's definition I accept.

Query 8th. What is prayer?

Ans. "God be merciful unto me a sinner," is a good specification of it.

Query 9th. What is obedience?

Ans. To be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus is one act of obedience.

X–x

Query 10th. What is the gift of the Holy Ghost?

Ans. Sometimes it is the Holy Ghost itself. Acts VIII, 16: "Who prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet he had fallen upon none of them." And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostle's hands the *Holy Ghost was given*, he offered him money. Peter severely reproved him, "because thou hast thought that *the gift of God* may be purchased with money." That the Holy Spirit was promised is plain—that Jesus received this promise from the Father at his ascension is equally plain; and that he poured out this spirit upon the people according to promise and prophecy admits of no doubt. This is the gift of the Holy Ghost given to Christ the head without measure, and to each of his members according to the proportion of faith. The gifts of the Holy Ghost are known to all acquainted with the New Testament.

It is hoped that bro: Adams will come to the point at once, and no longer ask questions foreign from the subject in hand.

EDITOR.

REVIVALS.

Bro: Daniel Long writes to the Editor from Petersburgh, Pa. July 22, 1829:—That the cause of God is still gaining ground in his circuit. In the Harbor, Bedford Co. he had baptized 11 since his last communication. At the Narrow Passage, Shannandoah Va, he baptized 6 at his last visit there—that there is in those bounds a great excitement among the people, who were enquiring what shall we do to be saved.

Elder P. Hatchitt, of Bullitt co. Ky. writes to the Editor, that he has lately constituted a church of 14 members, and the prospect for addition is good. On Salt river bro: Dorsey Scott has also constitued a church of between 20 and 30.

Bro: James Evans from Columbia Ky. writes that he with bro: Hobbs has been riding and preaching through the Green river country for several weeks—that the minds of the people are much excited by the subject of religion, and that there is a prospect of much good being done. They meet great opposition from sectarians. They had an apointment to preach at Mount Pleasant meeting-house. When they came, they found the door locked, with this inscription on it:—

"All ministers of the gospel, that believe that Jesus Christ is the eternal God, are invited to preach at this meeting house; and those who do not believe this, would well to go where they are invited. JAMES DUNCAN,

"July 13, 1829. Trustee for Mount Pleasant."

He also writes that bro: Jacob Warner, formerly a minister of the South Ky. Association of separate Baptists, but now a Christian with the Bible alone for his Creed, has constituted two churches of the same name and Creed, one at Liberty, the other at Harricane creek. Bro: John Longley gave us the same information, and says that bro: Warner has relinquished his former

views of the doctrine of Universalism together with his name and creed. Bro: Longley also states that seven Baptist churches on the south of Kentucky, some regular and some separate, have also renounced all party names and creeds, and have taken the name Christian. Several preachers have united with them on these principles.

Elder Thomas McIntyer of Newmarket, Upper Canada, thus writes to the Editor, July 27, 1829:—Bro: Stone: I have read your Messenger with pleasure, and many others have done the same. I have been in these cold, northern climes for four years, and have travelled and preached all the time. I have seen many bow to Christ; but the work has been hindered by opposition from the enemies of the cross. The last year the work has assumed a more favorable aspect. Since last fall I have baptized about 70 souls. Sectarianism is falling, and the merchants of Babylon are wailing. I am just about to move to Whitby. Thither I wish all communications to me directed."

Elder James E. Matthews of Alabama, writes, Aug. 4, 1829, to the Editor:—"I visited McNairy county, Tenn. about two weeks ago. We had a two days meeting. The prospect was very encouraging. Four were immersed, and one or two more added to the church. The church there has increased in a few months from 6 to 40 members. Four have lately been immersed at Republican in this county (Lauderdale) and one baptist brother, who was under censure for communing with us, joined us."

Elder John W. Roberts of Harrison county, Ky. communicates to the Editor, August 24th:—I have immersed a considerable number where I have laboured. At Minerva we have had good seasons. We had a three days' meeting at Lawrence creek, Mason county, the first Lord's day of this month. The congregation was large and solemn. When the Lord's table was spread, a great number took their seats at it, of Christians, Baptists, and some Methodists. We immersed one and received two more. The appearance of greater additions is good. On the first Friday of this month I constituted a church of eighteen new members on the North fork of Licking, at Major George Thompson's. The prospect for additions is encouraging. On Wednesday following I constituted another church at Russelville Ohio, of 26 members; the prospect for additions is also good at that place. On the fourth Lord's day of this month I also constituted a church of eight respectable members. A number more we expect shortly to be added, at bro: Silas Trabue's in Madison county Ky. At this place we design to have a communion on the fourth Lord's day of October next. We solicit the aid of preaching brethren. I meet with strong opposition from the various sects, but am not discouraged.

Bro: Jonathan Butler of Milfield Ohio, writes to the Editor, Aug. 16:—that the work of the Lord is reviving on Sandy creek, where he had just been attending a two days meeting, and where he saw 12 baptized. The saints were joyful in the presence of the Lord.

Bro: David R. Stout, of Hart county Ky. writes, Aug. 10th—That the Baptist church there is convulsed. That on the Lord's day following, about 20, with their worthy old Pastor, S. Bagby, would meet at Salem, and constitute a church on apostolic ground, rejecting all human creeds, to be called a Church of Christ.

A brother in Montgomery, Alabama, writes to the Editor, July 24th, 1829:—"We have had a great split among the Methodist churches in this part, on account of church government."

SOMETHING NEW.

A brother from Indianapolis gives us information of a very zealous advocate for trinity. "There are but few texts in the Bible by which he will not attempt to prove trinity. He preached from this text: 'If any man will be my disciple, let him take up his cross and follow me.' For the instruction of his hearers, he undertook to tell us what the cross of Christ was, which we were to take up. My friends, (said he) the doctrine of the trinity is the cross of Christ, which you must embrace and believe; and then went on to shew why it was a cross, &c."

This looks like retrograding to the dark ages of Christianity. I hope the spirit of inquiry now in the world will check this motion, and cause such preachers to read the Bible, and cease from the doctrines and commandments of men. The preacher's exposition of his text reminds me of a preacher of the same cast, who took the first, second, and third stories of Noah's ark for his text, from which he insisted largely on the doctrine of the trinity. Another I knew who always preached baptism from every text he took except one. Such a course is badly calculated to promote Christianity, or the knowledge of the truth.

EDITOR.

DAYTON, OHIO, June 26, 1829.

TO THE PATRONS AND AGENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

I find in reading the 7th no. vol. 3d of the Christian Messenger, an address and appeal made by the Editor to the agents, informing them that the money received from them in payment for the Messenger has little more than paid for the paper and printing of the two first volumes; with this enquiry: "What shall I do? Let my friends realize my situation, and answer the question." In answering the question to advantage to the Editor, I think it will be necessary for each agent and subscriber to begin immediately to act with that promptness and diligence, that a publication of the highest order demands.

For my part I feel unwilling that the Messenger should cease to circulate on account of negligence in its patrons; for I can testify with many of my brethren, I have often been refreshed with the messages it has brought, and delighted with the writings of the editor and others.

This being the only publication of this sort among the Christian Churches in the west, and in general circulation amongst them, ought to stimulate us to renewed exertions. This also being a medium by which communications may be kept up, and many misrepresentations and false charges cast upon us, may be answered or refuted.

The exertions to be made, or the sums of money required, would be light amongst the numerous patrons, in order to keep the Messenger in circulation and relieve its editor from a burden, that must otherwise fall upon him, who very generously tenders his services as editor.

I would ask, shall we let this Messenger stop for want of a little exertion? I fancy my readers answer in the negative—we cannot so slight this medium of communication in which liberal principles and gospel liberty are discussed.

Perhaps some of the agents for the Messenger have heard the subject of money so often dwelt upon in religious assemblies, that they have turned away with disgust, and have feared more to ask a subscriber for his dollar, than at first to solicit his name as a subscriber. My brethren, let us try to avoid either extreme, and not shrink from what we see to be our duty in this case, as the editor must of necessity depend on his agents and patrons.

The third volume is now hastening to its close; and shall we suffer it to cease to circulate? Have not our enemies been long waiting for our halting? And will they not exult to find that the supporters of the Messenger are relaxing their support?

LUTHER BRUEN,
A member of the C. C.

Not many days ago I was asked by a worthy Baptist brother this important question: Why do not you, as a people, and the New Testament Baptists unite as one people? By the *New Testament baptists*, he meant those who reject all human creeds as authoritative, and who are generally disposed to receive the name *Christian* to the rejection of all others. I answered briefly his question, but promised to give him a full answer in the Messenger. This pledge I will now redeem.

Ans.—I know of no reason, according to scripture, why all *Christians* of every name should not unite as one people. The New Testament enjoins it upon all in the most solemn and express terms. That this is the will of God—the prayer of Jesus—the labor of the apostles—and the design of the gospel, no man in this enlightened day can deny. In this is the name of God glorified—his religion honoured—his church exalted—and the world drawn by her light to faith and salvation. The division of christians is therefore contrary to the will of God—the prayer of Jesus—the labor of the apostles—and to the design of the gospel. It dishonors God and his word—debases the church—and opposes the world's salvation. Who, with the New Testament in his hand, and not blinded by the smoke of the bottomless pit, will deny these simple facts? "A house divided against itself cannot

stand." What stands in the way of all Christians being united as one people? We fearlessly say, nothing in the whole New Testament. For if they are Christians, they are humble, holy, obedient believers, and walk even as he walked. They may differ in opinion of some of the truths of God; but where these opinions do not lead to irreligion, we are to exercise the grace of forbearance. "He who is weak in the faith receive; but without regard to differences of opinion:" Rom. xiv, 1: (McKnight's translation.) The cause of division exists among ourselves. Trace it to its origin, and we shall find it in carnality. Paul the inspired man of God declares this to be true, when he said to the divided Corinthians, "Are ye not carnal, and walk as men"—as men, who walk after the flesh, and not after the spirit. Among the fruits of the flesh he numbers *strife* and *divisions*: Gall. v, 19. Had we all followed after the spirit, division had never been known among Christians. Until we thus walk and follow after the spirit, in vain do we expect and pray for union; as soon may we expect to see the rivers revert their course, and the fixt laws of nature change. If we follow after the spirit, we shall receive his word alone, and cease to follow men—we shall be influenced to holiness, humility, and all the divine graces and fruits of the spirit.

But the New Testament reformers among the Baptists have generally acted the part which we approve. They have rejected all party names and have taken the denomination, *Christian;* so have we. They allow each other to read the Bible, and judge of its meaning for themselves; so do we. They will not bind each other to believe certain dogmas as terms of fellowship; nor do we. In fact, if there is a difference between us, we know it not. We have nothing in us to prevent a union; and if they have nothing in them in opposition to it, we are in spirit one. May God strengthen the cords of Christian union. EDITOR.

Extract of a letter from the Georgetown Baptist Church, to the Elkhorn association, when met at Lexington on the second Saturday in August 1829:

"Beloved Brethren—From information from various sections of the country, the times with us, as an Association are ominous; darkness broods around us; and the storm of dissention and strife is hovering over us, and we are threatened with disunion and discord. "Reformation" and "restoration" are sounded in our ears by a certain periodical of the times, and from thence echoed from some of those standing in the place of ambassadors of God; and again re-echoed by many of the crowd, who drink in novelty with delight, and roll it under their tongues as a sweet morsel; and we are threatened to have torn from the archives of our churches, the evidence of the faith and practice of our fathers; and to have torn from our recollections, those happy periods, as vain and visionary, when the Holy Spirit delivered us from a sense of guilt and bondage, and the Saviour first revealed himself

in love to our souls; and in lieu thereof, to have a new system given us, affording us comfort alone through the medium of our own performances, in yielding to the ordinances without any previous regeneration of the soul!! Let us meet the storm, brethren, as those that have been warned of God. Let us search the scriptures, and compare the present times with those of which we have been so abundantly admonished by the apostles of primitive times. Let us invoke the Holy Spirit to afford unto us all the christian graces, that we may be enabled through his special guidance, to endure hardness as good soldiers, with all long suffering and patience—looking forward with prayerful anticipations to the time when infidelity and error shall be dispelled from the churches, and the holy truths of the gospel shall succeed and cover the earth as the waters do the channels of the great deep."

REMARKS

Had we room we should make some remarks on the above extract. It seems dictated indeed by a mind shrouded in gloom, trembling for the fate of human tradition in faith and forms.—Truth will stand the shock, but every thing else is shaking, and must fall before the word of God. This church has nothing to fear, if they cordially receive the doctrines of their creed. The elect cannot be lost, nor the non-elect saved—God's decrees are fixt from eternity, and every thing that comes to pass was foreordained by him. Why then, if these be so, should this church be uneasy at any event. These poor infidels and errorists are equally fulfilling the purposes of God as the orthodox. Uneasiness implies a defect of that faith, of which they boasted their steadfastness in a preceding item. EDITOR.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

OBITUARY.—Died, on the 7th of April, 1829, after a lingering illness of about two months, in the 73d year of her age, Mrs. JANE ESTILL, consort of Wallis Estill esq. near Winchester, Franklin county, Tennessee. She was a woman of unblemished character. In the great revival, which took place in Kentucky about 26 years ago, she became a professor of the Christian religion; and some time afterwards, she became a member of the Christian Church; and ever since she has adorned the doctrine of the gospel by a godly walk and conversation. A little while before she died, she was enabled to sit up in her bed, and address her family in the spirit of the gospel, and in the most pathetic and christian zeal of a mother. She exhorted them to attain to that holiness, without which none shall see the Lord. And after shaking hands with all around her, she committed them to the Lord and to the word of his grace, and after delivering what was on her mind to her family, she resigned herself to the will of the Lord, and died in the triumphs of faith, in the full assurance of a a blissful immortality. W.

——Also, died in this county, June 1st, Mrs. MARY PEAK, con-

sort of Jourdan Pead, and daughter of Captain Lewis Nuckols. She was young, amiable and pious; and in her illness and death, manifested an unusual degree of faith and assurance of immortality.

——Also, a few days before, died Miss POLLY DOWNING, of Bethel. Her sufferings were long, and unusually severe; yet the gracious presence of the Lord, whom she had long and faithfully served, supported her, and caused her continually to triumph to the last moment of her existence.

——Also, Mr. JAMES KELLY, July 31st. He had long suffered by a paralytic stroke, which greatly affected the strength of his body and mind. He had long been a professor of religion, the fruits of which we hope he now reaps in heaven.

——Also, Mrs. ELIZABETH BELL, on the 8th of August, in the 77th year of her age. She had been a member of the Christian church upwards of 20 years, and adorned her profession. She was beloved of all her acquaintance, benevolent and kind to the needy. She died in the faith, giving glory to God.

——Also, Mrs. KATHARINE GAY, consort of John R. Gay, about the first week of August. She professed faith before she died, and departed in peace.

——Also, NICHOLAS BITNER, August 29th. He was an early settler of Kentucky—advanced in life—and we hope died a Christian.

NOTICE.—It is hoped that my brethren and patrons will not continue the practice of sending me communications and letters without paying the postage. Their conscience cannot justify the practice, when they have been so frequently told how oppressive it is to me. My agents only are allowed this privilege, when matters of consequence are communicated by them. I wish my patrons and agents to remember the third volume of the Messenger will close with the next number. Many are largely in arrears yet for the first and second volumes. I wish all the accounts liquidated before I shall commence the next volume. My agents will remember my request in the last number, to send me speedily the names of those who wish to continue. This can be done with little expence.

Our Hymn Books are ready for delivery. We advise brethren to send or come and take them at a considerable discount, sufficient to satisfy them for their trouble. EDITOR.

Several communications on hand shall hereafter be attended to, unless pushed out by others deemed more important.

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. OCTOBER, 1829. [No. 12.

EXTRACT OF A SERMON

Delivered by JAMES MADISON, D. D. *President of the University of William and Mary, and Professor of Moral and Natural Philosophy, before the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the state of Virginia, May 26, 1786. The text is, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."* John iv. 24.

The object of this sermon is to urge the necessity of christian union, and the injurious tendency of creeds, &c. in originating and promoting dissentions and feuds among christians.

Permit me, then, to make some observations upon the means most likely to forward such an event. This I attempt with readiness, however imperfect the observations may appear, not only because it is, in my mind, of great importance that we should particularly attend to those means at this period, but also because the same means which would most effectually promote the ends just spoken of, will be the best guides to us at a time when we are forming, as it were, anew our own religious society; for without attention to them, we shall deprive ourselves of the inestimable privilege of worshipping God in Spirit and in truth.

Fortunately for christians, those means are altogether of the negative kind. They depend upon the *rejection*, not the *adoption* of those *human systems* of belief, or rules of faith, which have often *usurped the place of christianity itself.* They only require christians to *revert to the gospel*, and to *abandon every other directory of conscience.* I will then venture to recommend earnestly to all christians to reject every system as the fallible production of human contrivance, which shall dictate articles of faith, and *adopt the gospel alone as their guide.* Am I not sufficiently warranted, my brethren, in this recommendation? I trust there is scarce any one amongst us who will object to a recommendation of this nature, whether we attend to the fallibility, the ignorance, the prejudice of men, or to the truth, wisdom, and perfection of the Author of our divine religion.

I will take the liberty to advance a general proposition, the evidence of which, I persuade myself, may be established by the most incontestible proofs. The proposition is, indeed, simple and plain; it is, "that those christian societies will ever be found to have formed their union upon principles the wisest and