dency of Universalism is to destroy order and subvert civil liberty. A great part of the learned Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses," is employed in establishing these two important propositions. "All mankind, especially the most wise and learned nations of antiquity, have concurred in believing and teaching, that the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is necessary to the well-being of civil society—and that the inculcation of this doctrine is of such use and importance to civil government." He, therefore, who endeavors to destroy the influence of this belief on society, is alike the enemy of his God and his country, and in a high degree, forfeits his claim to the protection of either.

8. Finally, I renounce and abjure the doctrine of Universalism, on account of its *Absurdity*, *Infidelity*, and *Profanity*.

Its absurdity lies in the supposition that men shall be saved, whose whole life has been one continued developement of a depraved heart, vicious and impure dispositions, and diabolical conversations; and whose very dying hours have breathed nothing but irreverence and despair. But all this comes far short of the climax. Universalism holds that the vilest miscreant can, when he pleases, dye his hands in his brother's blood, look up and attack the throne of heaven by execrations and blasphemies, then turn the weapon on himself, and by an act of suicide, compel the holy gates of heaven to open and admit him to rank as chief among the saints.

The *Infidelity* is manifest by a total contempt of the Scripture testimony, which uniformly distinguishes the righteous and the wicked, by their lives and conversations in the present world, and their awfully different destinies in the world to come; and also from its contemptuous rejection of the unanimous Faith of the Christian Church, in all ages, from its foundation to the present time.

The *Profanity* cannot be concealed; for this heresy cuts the very thread of spiritual life, by placing the profane, the blasphemer, and the assassin in the family of God, thereby rending the veil of the Holy Temple, casting holy things to dogs, and making sacred things common. By making no distinction between persons who serve God and those who serve him not, it degrades the Song of the *Redeemed* to the same rank with the obscene mirth of the *libertine*. In a word this *novel heresy*, blights with the breath of *Upas*, the very trees, as well as the fruits of righteousness, in both the moral and religious world; and nothing less than the outstretched arm of Almighty God can snatch the soul from ruin, that has once imbibed the deleterious draught of a delusion so lethal and stupifying. May the Lord in mercy pardon the sinful instrumentality of the writer, in his former efforts to diffuse the doctrine; and may the Great Head of the Church arrest the progress of this delusion, and lead its disciples to a timely repentance. Amen. JOHN S. THOMPSON.

[Receipts for this month will be given in the next No.]

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

By BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. MAY 1831. [No. 5.

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

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

No. IV.

The Baptism of John; and the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; and of water, as a Christian ordinance.

The baptism of John was preparatory to the appearance, and the reception of Jesus Christ. John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sin, "saying unto the people that they should believe on him, who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus," Acts XIX, 4. Christ himself was to be exalted with the right hand of God, a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance and forgiveness of sins. All that John demanded from such as repaired to him to be baptized, was to declare their readiness to reform, and to recieve the Messiah, who was expected shortly to come, and to frame their lives in a manner agreeably to that expectation, Luke III, 7–14. He did not require a belief in any existing individual, as Messiah, in the previous part of his ministry, for he himself did not know him, John I, 31, 33. John came baptizing with water that Jesus Christ should be made manifest to Israel, (John I, 31–34,) which was done when he was baptized of John in Jordan, Mat. III, 5, 6, and v. 13–17. What occurred at Christ's baptism confirmed the mission of John, as Christ's fore-runner, and the mission of Christ also, as the Son of God.

John told the people that he baptized in water unto repentance, but that he who should come after him, was mightier than he, and would baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire, Mat. III, 2. John did not baptize in the name of Christ, nor by his authority. The baptism of the Holy Ghost, or the out pouring of the Holy Spirit, and the miraculous gifts, ministered by Christ after he was glorified, were promised to, and were bestowed upon *none but believers*, and upon those, who had been made to believe previously to their receiving the Holy Spirit by *external revelation*, consisting in what they *saw* and *heard*, exhibited in *miraculous works*, and *revealed words*. In proof of this, read carefully the following passages, John VII,

38, 39. XIV, 12–18, 25, 26. XV, 26, 27. XVI, 7–15. XX, 30, 31. Read also Mark XVI, 17, 18, and Luke XXIV, 45–49. Christ, after he rose from the dead, and before he ascended into heaven, directed his disciples "not to depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which *saith he*, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," Acts I, 4, 5. The meaning of these promises, and of the prophecies relative to the out-pouring of the Spirit, we have fully explained in their fulfilment, for which see Acts II, throughout, also VIII, 12, 14–17; and X, 44–48; and XI, 15–17. When the Spirit fell on the Gentiles, as stated in the last reference, and they began to speak with tongues and glorify God, "then" said Peter "remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" Acts XI, 16. All the revelations made to the Apostles, and the gifts bestowed upon them and on other disciples, and the signs and wonders wrought by them, were in consequence of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and were the fulfilment of ancient prophecies. This baptism of the Holy Ghost, and these miraculous gifts and out pourings of the Spirit, were the promise of the Father, which Jesus Christ recieved after he was exalted by his right hand, and which he shed forth in a *visible* and *audible* manner, to manifest and establish fully the truth of the new covenant, his own mediatorial character, reign, and glory, as the Son of God and heir of all things, and Saviour of the world; and to *perfect and confirm the whole Gospel System*, which embraced in its divinely rich and boundless provision, Jew and Gentile in its fellowship. These miraculous operations and revelations proved that the old covenant was abolished by the death of Christ, and the new covenant established, and that the middle wall of partition, that was between the Jew and the Gentile, was broken down, and that God had put no difference between them, Christ having abolished by his death in the flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, to make in himself of the two one new man, or church, thus making peace between them Eph. II.

The Apostle calls the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost the Christian's Seal and earnest of a heavenly inheritance. Eph. I. 13–14. Ch. IV. 30. 2d. Cor. I. 22. They were moreover a Seal and confirmation of the divine appointment, merits and reception of the atonement made by Christ, and of the power and success of his intercession with the Father; of his having received all power in heaven and in earth, in consequence of his death, and of his divine claim upon us to honor him, even as we honor the Father, and that in worshipping the Father or the Son, we must worship the Father *in the Son*, and the Son *in the Father*, John V, 23. X, 38. XIV, 10, 11. XVII, 21. After the Jews and Gentiles were both sealed by the same Spirit, as being *one* under the New covenant, the disciples were called Christians.

As the visible or sensible descent of the Holy Spirit, and the powers which were conveyed by it to the first Christians, was the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and made the proper seal of the Christian doctrines, so the power of imparting these extraordinary gifts, in certain due proportions to other Christians,—that is, to those that believed, was the seal of the Apostolic office and authority, as having been of divine appointment, and conferred by Jesus Christ. This power, which sealed and confirmed their mission, and their *infallibility* in *speaking* and *writing* the whole council of God in reference to the new covenant, and laws, ceased with the Apostles; and they of consequence have no Apostolic succession. The infallible and perfect record, which they wrote by the direction of the Holy Ghost, and in the *words* and *sentences*, which the Holy Ghost taught them, are in their place, and possess the Divine verity, and authority, which the Apostles themselves possessed.

The opinions and notions that exist of the out pourings of the Spirit in our day, in revivals of religion, are unscriptural. If they were true, they would *unsettle* the whole gospel record. We have as much right to expect another Messiah, as we have a repetition of the out pourings and baptism of the Holy Spirit, which existed at the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, and through the Apostolic age. The Spirit is never absent. His diversity of gifts and miraculous operations have varied. In him the sinner lives and moves, and has his being; but his immediate natural presence, and physical operations, never gave religion. His *religion giving operations* ever have been, and are his *external* revelations made in intelligible words. These are now wholly of record. He gives to the mind susceptibility for Spiritual improvement, or sustains it by his immediate power; but the Christian religion, which consists in a system of truth, affection and conduct, of which God is the great subject or Supreme object, he communicates by his word. The Spirit himself is an *object of faith*, and his word is the instrument of it, and he is only known to exist by his word. By that word he glorifies Jesus Christ, and does not speak of himself, and converts and sanctifies sinners.

Since the miraculous gifts of the Spirit ceased, the Holy Ghost has sealed every true believer "to the day of redemption," through faith in Jesus Christ, by the infallible record, that God has given of his Son, and the divine influence imparted to the soul through it. This is known by the integrity of his faith, and the fruits of the Spirit, exhibited in his conduct and temper, corresponding with the Gospel. According to this record, the seal of the Holy Ghost confirms the truth, that God justifies the Gentiles, or remits their sins, before they are baptized, through faith alone in Jesus Christ; as I proved in my second number; so that nothing shall be thought to intervene between the heart of the believer, and Jesus Christ, in the justification of the ungodly, and in their obtaining the Divine fa-

vor, Acts x, 44–48. xi, 15, 14–18. xv, 7, 9. Rom. i, 16, 17 iii, 29, 30. iv, 3–5. The faith that justifies and obtains *primarily* the divine favor, comprehends the *seminal principle* of every virtue, and will, if suitably improved by active obedience, and due exercise, be fruitful according to the gospel. The faith of a true believer recieves Jesus Christ into his heart, in the fulness of his character and offices, for his salvation. He is by the grace of God made unto him, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption, and he recieves him as such. This he does before he is baptized. What more can a sinner recieve for his justification? or what more can God give?

I now come to consider water baptism as an ordinance of the Gospel.

From the various passages of scripture in which baptism is mentioned, and from all the allusions made to it as an ordinance of the gospel, it seems to me, to have a uniform reference to the New covenant, either in respect to the death, resurrection, and glory of Jesus Christ, in his mediatorial reign and kingdom, or to the effects of his death and reign upon the state and destiny of man.

Jesus Christ was delivered for our offences, and rose again for our justification. The gospel promise in general, is, that whosoever believeth in Jesus Christ, shall recieve remission of sin. The Jews on the day of Pentecost were commanded to repent and be baptized in the name of him, (Christ) for the remission of sin. Baptism to a believer, in its *primary* meaning, symbolically applies the promise of remission through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and represents its accomplishment in the present and future state, as the bread and wine in the supper represent to the believing communicant, the broken body and shed blood of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sin: but I do not believe that baptism any more imparts *actual* remission, than that the bread and wine, broken and poured out, contribute the *real* body and blood of Christ, broken and shed for sin.

Baptism is not, in its primary meaning, a sign of the sanctifying operations of the Spirit, or an external sign of internal grace, as are alleged by some pedobaptists; but it is a sign of *justification*, or of *the remission of sin*, as the Presbyterian confession of faith has stated it, ch. 28. "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace; of his ingrafting into Christ; of regeneration; of *remission of sins*, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ to walk in newness of life." It would be a gross error in theology, to confound justification or the remission of sin, with sanctification; or to give to the latter predence to the former. A sinner, or an ungodly man cannot be made *holy, in his sins;* he must therefore be first justified, or his sins be remitted, before he can be recieved into the divine favor, or be made spiritually holy. This is done through faith in Jesus Christ; and he must have this faith before he is baptized, or the ordinance will be misapplied and lose its *meaning*. Sprinkling of water is not an emblem of the Spirit, but of the doctrine of the gospel, or of the influence of Gods word, Deut. xxxii, 1–3. Psal. lxxii, 6. John lv, 10, 11. Baptism represents to the believer his union and communion with Christ in his death, burial and resurrection, and immortal glory. The expressions "baptized into his death"—"buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead," imply this communion. It also represents his resurrection to a new life of holiness, and ought to be a powerful incentive to it, in conformity to Christ's resurrection from the dead, Rom. vi, 4. vii, 4. Colos. ii, 11–13. iii, 1–5. Baptism represents the death of our natural body, and our resurrection from the dead, to inherit eternal life, which will be our complete conformity to Christ, who was put to death in the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit. Under the new covenant, although the bodies of believers are under the sentence of death, denounced upon the transgression of Adam, because the redemption of Christ was not intended to prevent the execution of this original sentence upon their bodies, it converts it into a benefit by the resurrection, by which the natural body is made a spiritual body—saints are thereby entirely freed from their remaining connection with, and conformity to the first man, in order to their being conformed to the second, 1 Cor. xv, 47, 48, 49. That baptism represents the resurrection of the saints from the dead, to inherit eternal life with Christ, and that his death and resurrection are a proof and pledge of it, is plain from 1 Cor. xv, 29. "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead," for their belief in the resurrection of the dead, "if the dead rise not at all? To deny the resurrection of the dead, it would appear from this passage, sets aside the crowning design and meaning of baptism, and renders it of no consequence. And to deny that baptism is a representation and pledge of this, takes from it an essential part of its meaning. The resurrection of the righteous, will be a regeneration in the most proper and perfect sense, and is that to which our regeneration, by the gospel of God's grace, and our baptism ultimately refer; "He saved us (or gave us a pledge of salvation) by the law of regeneration, and the renewal of the Holy Ghost, which he shed upon us abundantly throught Jesus Christ our Saviour, to the end we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life," Tit. iii, 5, 4, 7. Believers are now the sons of God, (Gal. ii, 27; 1 John iii, 2,) being born by the incorruptible seed of the word, 1 Pet. i, 3–5. They are therefore waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body from the grave, when they shall be regenerated from death, in con-

formity to Christ the first begotten of the dead, and be the children of God, being the children of the resurrection, Rom. VIII, 23; Rev. I, 5; Acts XXVI, 23; Luke XX, 36. And if I mistake not, the declaration of Christ to Nicodemus had particular reference to the resurrection of the dead, in John III, 7, and perhaps primarily to his own; because none of his immediate disciples, who were baptized before his death, entered into the kingdom by baptism, nor did the Gentiles. The Kingdom was not set up when the former were baptized, the blood of the new covenant had not been shed, and the King had not been crowned; and the Gentiles were in the kingdom, and the kingdom in them, before they were baptized; for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, Rom. XIV, 17, which they realized before they were baptized, Acts X, 44–47; Acts XI, 15–18.

By the resurrection from the dead, which is alone incident to the new covenant, and is represented by immersion, as is also the remission of sin, believers will be in the most ample and perfect sense, "*born of the Spirit*," and "born from above" and will *be spirit*. Without this, their bodies cannot inherit the kingdom of God, 1 Cor. XV, 50. The body is sown a natural body, it will be raised a spiritual body; for as we have borne the image of the earthly Adam, we shall bear the image of the heavenly. Hence through that faith, by which the mercy of God hath begotten us to the hope of another life, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working, whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself, 1 Pet. I, 3–5; Phil. III, 20, 21. "We shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every one that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself, even as he is pure" 1 John III, 2, 3.

Having thus exhibited what seems to me to be the general meaning, and design of baptism, I desire to state what I apprehend ought to be the particular views, and purpose of an individual believer, in submitting to the ordinance.

There is one baptism, as there is one body or Church, and one Spirit, as we are called in one hope of one calling; one Lord, one faith, one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in all. The one baptism is designed to unite all believers in one Spirit, and body, or fellowship in Jesus Christ, as the foundation and head of the church. The observance of every ordinance, and duty in religion, promotes experimental religion; that is, it increases the proof of the truth of religion, in the heart of the Christian, by actual trial, John VII, 17. XIV, 21, 23. Baptism, by divine appointment, when scripturally apprehended, is necessary to this end. The religious *state of mind* of the believer, produced by baptism, cannot be obtained in any other way than by it. Without baptism being voluntarily submitted to, the heart does not feel itself bound to Jesus Christ by the obligation of personal baptismal profession, and consecration, nor can it feel confidence in his protection and favor. Without baptism the believer has not had the symbolical application of God's promise of remission of sin, made to his conscience, nor has he received the baptismal representation of the remission of sin into his soul, by being immersed into Jesus Christ. Without baptism he has not the answer of a good conscience towards God, by which he is saved, or has the pledge of salvation 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, 1 Pet III, 21, 22. Without baptism, unless the conscience be perverted, the believer cannot be satisfied; he must be involved in uncertainty, fear and perplexity. He feels that he has not surrendered himself to Jesus Christ, and cannot claim his smiles according to his promises; as he cannot claim his protection in a course of disobedience.

By the act of baptism, submitted to *understandingly*, the heart of the believer is fixed in Christ, and he commences the public life of a Christian. In this solemn ordinance, and act of worship, the believer gives himself up to Jesus Christ, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, to be instructed, governed and saved by him—from this solemn transaction he goes forth with his heart confirmed, and with a fixed purpose of living the life he lives in the flesh, by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him, and to cultivate the fruit of the spirit, in love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, and temperance, Gal. II, 20. III, 22, 26.

Although baptism is submitted to but once, it operates upon all succeeding life, if *scripturally* understood and improved.—All the blessings of the new covenant are associated with it, and it connects itself by the word of God, with every future change and event, up to the last judgment, and final glory. In his probationary state, it keeps the Christian firm and fast in his profession of faith in Jesus Christ, as it perpetually reminds him, that he has been translated by the grace of God, into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom he has redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin, Col. I, 12–14.

Christian baptism is an individual and personal duty, and is not a subject of fellowship, which implies plurality. If there be any fellowship in the ordinance, it is between the soul of the subject of it, and Christ himself. It is not a church ordinance, nor is it administered by the church, or in the church, or to the church, if administered according to the gospel. The Christian should ever remember that it was the ordinance of Jesus Christ, with which he was baptized, and not a Baptist or Pedobaptist ordinance, and that he was baptized into the one spirit and body of Christ, and not into the spirit and body of a

sect or party. He should therefore feel it to be as much his duty to exclude from his views, affections and conduct, after being baptized, every thing of a Sectarian nature, as he did, if he acted truly and scripturally, from Jesus Christ, his gospel and ordinance, when he received and submitted to them.

There is nothing in which we are more liable to err, than we are in our views of baptism; and error here tends to give a wrong direction to the whole course of our religious and moral feelings and sympathies, as far as it is concerned. We err, if we confer upon baptism the importance of an ultimate object, or the efficacy of the blood of Christ, when submitted to, either with or without faith. Indeed the faith that does this is itself erroneous. We err, if in being baptized, we are baptized into a party spirit, or system, or if we are not baptized into the spirit of Christ; and we err if we make our own views and opinions of baptism, whether they be right or wrong, the test of Christian character, or fellowship at the Lord's table. Sincere Christian men, men, who love and desire to honor the Lord Jesus Christ, may err through ignorance, and in scriptural views on the subject of baptism; but God does not suspend his fellowship with them, or their salvation upon the correctness or infallibility of their opinions, or judgment on the subject of baptism. There is not a baptist upon earth that might not tremble, were his salvation suspended upon this principle.

There are five different opinions, if not more, of the time when sinners are justified or when their sins are remitted, viz:

1. Some believe that the sins of the elect were remitted in eternity. This is what is called eternal justification

2. Others believe that sins were remitted at the death of Christ.

3. Others believe that sins are remitted when a person believes in Jesus Christ.

4. Others believe that sins are remitted only in the act of immersion, and that all are in their sins, notwithstanding their repentance and faith, until they are actually baptized for the remission of their sins.

5. Others believe that the faithful will not be in truth justified, until the final judgment, when the sentence of acquittal will be pronounced upon them, with a view to their whole probationary state.

Good men thus divide in opinion, and employ scripture authority to support them. But of all the five opinions stated. the 4th one is the most exclusive, Sectarian, and uncharitable and if fostered, cannot fail to drive from the affection and fellowship of those who entertain it, all who differ from them, as being in their sins, however otherwise pious and Godly! And the exclusive authority by which this strange opinion is formed, is found in the expressions used to the Pentecostal Jews, in the second chapter of the acts of the Apostles, and to Saul of Tarsus, in the twenty-second chapter of the Acts;

and which were never used to the Gentiles. The former were commanded to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin, and the latter to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins; but in no instance were the like expressions used to the Gentiles in the Acts of the Apostles, while direct and unequivocal proof was given by God himself, that he had remitted the sins of the Gentiles before they were baptized, Acts x. xi. xv. Surely *all New Testament Christians* will consider these things, and accommodate their views, affections and fellowship, to "*the ancient order of things*" as exhibited in the gospel, and not so far *Judaize*, as to *transmute* the Gentile into the Jewish state, in the beginning of the gospel, so as to *unchristian* all Gentile believers, who may differ from them in their *mistaken* views of baptism, in the present day. Christians have use for all the doctrines and ordinances of the gospel, that they may stand fast in the faith, and possess and manifest the temper and spirit of their common Lord, as they are interested in his common salvation. The profession of their faith and baptism, separate them from the world, and associates them in visible union and fellowship with all the people of God, in Christ Jesus, and lay them under obligation to love all, with brotherly affection, who love him. The supper, properly attended to in the fello . hip of the saints, renews the visible and sensible memorial of Christ's love, and the love of his people to him, and to one another, and employs them in the actual manifestation of them, while it publishes his death, or shows it forth until he come. These things with the regular observance of all other Christian duties, establish a *habit* of spiritual mindedness, and Christian philanthropy, which secures us against selfishness, against a Sectarian spirit, and party pride, and against the assaults of sin; and enable us to stem the force of a torrent of corruption, that never ceases to flow. This habit opposes the enjoyment of religion, and the hope of heaven, to the spirit and customs of the world:—it opposes a sense of the divine favor to the pleasure of sinful indulgencies, and enables us to *prove* by actual trial, or experiment, what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.

ARCHIPPUS.

TO ARCHIPPUS.

DEAR BROTHER:—At your request I have deferred making any remarks on your numbers, till you had closed your communications on "the remission of sins." In the close of your 3rd No. you invite me to reply to your views on this subject. I confess to you that I feel very little inclination to comply with the invitation; because I begin seriously to fear that too much of late is spoken and written on the subject of baptism;—so much, that other all important parts of truth are partially neglected. Hence may have proceeded that great dearth in religion, which is so visible in societies, where this subject is com-

monly agitated. Another reason why I reluctantly engage to meet your wishes, is, that I have frequently, and clearly stated in the former volumes of the Messenger, all the information I had derived from the scriptures, on this subject. To reply to you fully, would be only to repeat what I have already written. However I will make a few strictures on what I deem objectionable in your views.

In your first number, you have clearly stated what you designed to prosecute in your subsequent numbers; as follows:

1st. You say, "It is asserted (by the Reformed Baptists) that Baptism is the only medium, or action, known in the word of God, by which he remits the sins of believers—I assert the contrary."

With regard to this statement I need say but little; yet I feel bound to say in justice to those Christians, I never heard one of them express this sentiment—I never read it in their writings. They do teach that baptism is the only medium or action, known in the *New Testament*, in which God remits the sins of believers; yet they firmly believe, that by other means, known in the scriptures, as in the Old Testament, God did remit sins. Bro. Campbell has clearly stated that by means of sacrifices God did remit sin under the Old Covenant. This sentiment, you know I have long since rejected, and I am persuaded bro. Campbell will also reject it, after a more careful examination of it by the scriptures. Moral iniquity was never remitted by the blood of bullocks, or of any other victims. Such blood never pertained to the conscience, could not possibly take away sin. I confess I have digressed from the subject; but now return. I have no suspicion that you designed to present their doctrine unfairly: I believe it was unguarded—By *the word of God*, you meant the N. Testament. "I assert the contrary," say you,—the contrary of what you have stated as their doctrine—So do they with you assert the contrary—and so do I.—Yet we all differ. They teach that baptism is the *only* medium or action in which God, under the N. Testament, remits the sin of a believer, Jew or Gentile—I believe that it is the instituted medium under the N. Testament in which God remits the sins of a believer of any nation. You do not believe it a medium in any sense in which God remits sin, especially the sin of a Gentile. Had bro. C. omitted the word *only*, I should have agreed with him in opinion; but with you I cannot agree in this particular. You proceed,

2ndly. "I maintain that it is the doctrine of the N. Testament, that God justifies the Gentiles through faith *alone*"—Again, you say, "I will adduce proof that the N. Testament does not authorize the belief, that the sins of the Gentiles are remitted in baptism at all."

I cannot with you see the great difference between the Jew and the Gentile, after that Jesus by his death had broken down the middle wall of partition between them. The apostle Paul

taught there was none, and I think the commission given by the risen Lord, makes it evident. "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them &c." Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; &c. Surely this language clearly declares that the Gentiles, as well as Jews are intended—that the same gospel is to be preached to both—that the same faith is required of both—that the same baptism is to be administered to both—and the same effect (salvation) is experienced by both, Jews and Gentiles, after their baptism. As well might you contend that salvation is never granted to the believing Gentile through baptism, as that remission of sin was never granted them through this medium. You might introduce as proof of this position, the case of Cornelius as equally applicable. You might say, Cornelius was saved before he was baptized, therefore salvation is never granted to a Gentile by baptism. This would go so far to contradict Peter, "Baptism doth now save us"—and the Saviour's commission, I think you would hesitate to affirm the sentiment; and yet I see no difference between the two positions. But you have proved, as you think, that the sins of Cornelius and his friends were remitted prior to his baptism, and from this one case, have concluded that remission of sins is never granted through baptism to any Gentile. The case of Cornelius, with other arguments, has convinced me that though God instituted Baptism as the ordinary means of obtaining salvation and remission of sin; yet he has not bound himself not to bestow these favors upon any, out of this medium. On this point I have already explicitly written in former numbers, and need not repeat.

In your second number, you adduce your proof that the sins of Gentiles are not remitted in the action of baptism. You define remission to be forgiveness, pardon, or justification, and you might have added, redemption: Col. i. 14. The meritorious ground of remission is, you say, the blood of Christ, and the instrumental cause is faith. These you consider *fundamental* truths; and hence conclude that they are wrong, who contend that sins are remitted in baptism. The terms *merit* and *meritorious*, I have long since rejected, not being found in the system of grace revealed, and, in fact, directly contrary to it. It is a popish doctrine, and means the works of supererogation; that is, works beyond what God requires of his saints, for their own justification and salvation. This superabundance of good works, or righteousness performed by a saint, may be by him imputed or transferred to another person, for his justification or salvation. These good works merit or deserve from God salvation for that person, for whom they are performed. Not to say any thing of the absurdity of such a doctrine, it is at once seen to be contrary to justification by grace. For "to him that worketh the reward is not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Does bro. Archippus think that the blood of Christ

merits from God, justification or pardon for the sinner? If so, does he not also think that pardon is merited for every creature? for Christ died for all. Can the justice of God deny and refuse the claim? If the merit was complete, was not the remission complete, independent of faith, repentance or baptism? for if these were required, it would imply a defect in the merit.

Might we not argue with equal propriety that the *prime* cause of our justification and salvation, is the grace of God—or the faith or gospel of Christ—or the resurrection of Christ—or the baptism of Christ, as that the blood of Christ is? For these same effects are applied to each of these cases Let us examine. "Being justified freely *by his grace.*" "By grace are ye saved," Rom. III, 24. Eph. II, 8. "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Christ"—"The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believes," Gal. II, 16. Rom. I, 16. "He was raised again for our justification"—For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life"—or resurrection," Rom. IV, 25 and V, 10. "Repent and be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." "The like figure whereunto, baptism doth now save us," Acts II, 38. 1 Pet. I, 21 But why insist that the blood of Christ is the meritorious ground of remission, to the exclusion of the word of faith, the resurrection, or baptism, when the same effects are represented as produced by each? You may say these are means through which the benefits of pardon and salvation are communicated. Well; but is not the blood of Christ the means also of communicating the same blessings? Surely it is the means of sanctifying—of cleansing from sin—of washing from sin—of reconciling us to God &c. But how does the blood of Christ produce these benefits? I unhesitatingly answer, by faith; for an unbeliever never recieves them. Now if we can understand how the word, or faith of Christ is the means of justification, salvation, reconciliation, cleansing from sin &c.; we can also easily understand how the blood of Christ, his resurrection and baptism, are the means of effecting the same benefits. There is, I think, but one sentiment among all Christians, with respect to the word being the means. They all say, the word is the means, but this means will prove inoperative till believed by us. Faith in the word discovers the glorious truth revealed from heaven, by which the sinner is led to repentance, reformation, and to obedience, and by which he recieves the spirit of God. The word reveals the glorious plan of God, subduing the enmity and rebelion of the world against him, and his government, and of reconciling them unto himself; his plan is, To overcome evil with good, and by his goodness, to lead mankind to repentance, or reconciliation to himself. We are required to be imitators of God, and like him to treat our enemies with loving kindness, and like him to overcome evil with good. This plan gives an exhibition of infinite goodness, love, grace and mercy. This plan is developed in the gift, the life, the death and in the resurrection of the Son of God, all prove and hold forth the same glory of God. Hear Paul, "God has *commended* his love towards us, in that when we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Hear John; "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and gave his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Again, says Paul, "He, (Jesus) by the grace of God, tasted death for every man." The blood of Jesus speaks better things than the blood of Abel. It speaks love, grace, mercy, and the good will of God to the world—It speaks the same truth that the word does; but the word gives it the voice. We hear—we believe—we repent—we obey—and receive the remission of sins, and the Holy Spirit of promise—the spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba Father. In a word, the whole ministry of Christ in his life, death and resurrection, was, to reconcile the world to God, or to lead them to repentance, and consequently to the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit Baptism is a part of the same plan, and holds forth in figure, the burial and resurrection of Jesus. It is a means in connexion with faith in the word and blood of Christ, and with repentance, of receiving remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Let the believing sinner reform and be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and according to truth, he shall recieve the blessing. It is the duty of all; but not obeyed by all. Many, from the dark clouds of tradition, have been prevented from seeing their duty. Those clouds will soon be blown away, by the breath of the Lord. Let forbearance be patiently cultivated, and wonders will be effected. I might as well say, that none have eternal life in them, who have not eaten the flesh and drunk the blood of the Son of God, at the Lord's table, as to say, none have received the remission of sins, who have not been immersed.

My dear bro., I feel no disposition to wrangle with you, respecting our diversity of opinion on this subject; and I hope you feel the same spirit towards me. Let us love one another, and hold forth our religion, not in the belief of certain dogmas, but in good works.

I have not attempted to reply but to a few prominent ideas in your numbers. I have written more than was expected. Should any brother, in a Christian spirit, feel it proper to reply to your numbers fully, the columns of the Messenger are open to their service.

In Christian love I am your friend and bro. EDITOR.

DEBATE BETWEEN MR. McCALLA AND MR. LANE.

I have lately read with much interest the debate between Mr. Wm. McCalla, a Presbyterian preacher of Philadelphia, and Mr. Wm. Lane, a Christian preacher from Ohio. The de-

bate is published in the Gospel Luminary. I am pleased to find the most weighty and influential arguments, long used against us, are becoming ineffectual with the intelligent community. The arguments to which I allude, are, detraction, vituperation, misrepresentation, German and Boston infidelity, blasphemy, &c. &c. These arguments it must be confessed, Mr. McCalla used with wonderful adroitness; for the management of these he has a natural talent, and this improved by long practice. When he found his arguments produced not the desired effect on the listening assembly, he wisely declined the debate, and left the impression behind, that his doctrine of trinity was indefensible. In the debate, with others he lugged in my name, and stated that I had been taught my errors on Trinity and atonement, by an old man from Virginia. This is no disparagement of my character, for I confess I have no innate ideas. I have been dependent on others for the greater part of my little stock of knowledge. It is a mistake in Mr. McCalla, when he says I received those errors from an old man from Virginia. I cannot recollect of any old man or young man, from that state or any other, that taught me these errors. I suppose he alludes to old Mr. Palitto of N. Carolina, a Presbyterian preacher of the highest standing. I never yet have known that he denied orthodox atonement. The views I received of the Son of God I had before I had ever seen or heard his.

EDITOR.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith, which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the Catholic faith is this; that we worship one God, in trinity, and trinity in unity; neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.

But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one; the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate, and the Holy Ghost uncreate. The Father incomprehensible, and Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Ghost eternal; and yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated; but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, and the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty; and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord; and yet not three Lords, but one Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge every person by himself to be God and Lord; so are we forbidden by the Catholic religion to say, there be three Gods or three Lords.

The Father is made of none; neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

And in this trinity none is afore, or after another; none is greater or less than another; but the whole three persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the unity in trinity, and the trinity in unity, is to be worshipped.

He, therefore, that will be saved must thus think of the trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that he also believe rightly the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man of the substance of his mother, born in the world. Perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul, and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood. Who although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God; one altogether; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.

Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies; and give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic faith; which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved."

REMARKS.

We have transferred to our columns this Creed as a curiosity, for the amusement of our readers. A writer of celebrity observes; "It is cause of sorrow and regret; that men of talents and learning, in this age of inquiry and investigation, should be found to contend for the monstrous absurdities of this creed, as an essential part of Christianity. We are fully convinced that nothing absurd or incomprehensible can constitute any part of the Christian religion. Its simplicity, and adaptation

to every capacity, the lowest as well as the highest, are among its most engaging features, and its strongest recommendations to the understandings of reasonable beings."

CHRISTIAN EXPOSITOR.

From the Herald of truth.

I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE.

If this declaration be understood according to the letter, then our Lord is interpreted to say, that he and his Father are one being, *literally* and *numerically one*. It is the same as if he had said, the person whom I designate by the pronoun "*I*," and the person designated by the name of "my Father" are not two distinct beings, but only *one*. I am the Father. We are not two different persons, but one person. But this interpretation certainly does not accord with the popular notions respecting the Deity. The prevalent doctrine among our brethren is, that he who made the declaration of the text, the Son of Man, Jesus Christ, was not the Father, but a person distinct from the Father, and equal to him in every perfection. And it is downright heresy to say that our Lord was God the Father, that it was the Father who came down and taught, and toiled and suffered. Yet if our text is literally understood, this must be its meaning. And our Saviour must be understood as saying that he and his Father were one *and the same being*. Consequently, this passage literally understood, contradicts the very doctrine which its literal interpretation is insisted to uphold. It asserts that there is one, not two. But we are told, that although there is only one *being*, there may, nevertheless, be a distinction of *persons* in the Deity. Is it not strange that any one can be deluded by such a wretched quibble about words! The term *being* may be applied to every thing that exists, rational and irrational, animate and inanimate. There are beings material and spiritual. The term as applied to God—what does it signify? When you say, for instance, that there is one being and three persons! Do you mean that there is one material being—one corporeal substance, and three infinite minds! and that the divine existence is like three separate human minds, existing in one human body! You reject these notions at once, as striking at a fundamental truth, the spirituality of the Most High. With reference to God, then, the word being must inevitably involve intelligence. When we say that God is one being, we mean, of course, that he is one intelligent being, for he exists only as a pure mind, an unmingled intelligence. Now an intelligent being is a person. And when it is said that God is one being in three persons, it is the same as saying that he is one person in three persons, which is about as rational as saying, that the length of one yard is the length of three yards. In short, the word *being*, as applied to the Deity, has, and can have, no signification but *person*. The terms are in this relation perfectly synonymous. It is not, therefore, by any sophistical use of lan-

guage, that the literal interpretation of our text can be shown to uphold that doctrine, in whose support it is so often quoted. If it is literally understood, it declares that Christ and his Father are *one being—one person*, and that of course it was God the Father who came, endured, and died. But no one can believe this—no one supposes that the Infinite Father is the one and the same being that hungered, thirsted, and expired upon the cross, eighteen centuries ago. Such a sentiment is not only too shocking to the mind to be received for an instant—it contradicts the reiterated declarations of scripture. If any thing is clear in the Bible, it is this, that God the Father, and Jesus Christ, are two distinct persons, as distinct as any two natures can be. And this, every Christian, whether Unitarian or Trinitarian, firmly believes. The literal understanding of the text will be rejected on all sides, because if it asserts any thing, it asserts that Christ and his Father were not two distinct persons, but one person, and that it was the Father who appeared on earth.

We must see now what other signification the words under consideration will bear. *I and my Father are one.* It cannot have escaped the notice of any one who has attempted to understand this passage, that a similar mode of speaking occurs in other parts of the scriptures, particularly in the prayer of Jesus in behalf of his disciples. In the 17th chapter of John's Gospel, our Lord prays that all who believe in him "may be *one*, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be *one*, even as we are *one;* I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in *one*." This passage explains itself to the comprehension of the humblest. We perceive that our Lord here prays that his disciples may be one with himself and with God, by the possession of the same spirit—by having their wills brought into elevated and perfect unison with the will of God—by having the same objects—the same generous and beneficient purposes. This is not the only place in which this mode of speaking occurs. St. Paul says, "ye are all *one* in Christ." There is another passage in the same apostle still more in point. "I have planted; and Apollos watered:" "Now *he that planteth and he that watereth are one*." Here is no mystical unity expressed. Paul and Apollos were *one*, inasmuch as they had one and the same end in view.—They labored in one spirit. Now, how easily may our text be interpreted! It is impossible that he who was conscious of human weakness, who called himself continually a man, who confessed his entire dependence upon the Father, declaring, in immediate connexion with the text, that his Father was greater than all; and, in another place, that of himself he could do nothing, should make a declaration so absolutely incredible as that he was the Father; for to this the text, literally interpre-

ted, amounts. We are by no means compelled to put such a meaning upon his words. The usage of scripture language points to quite a different signification, and shows us, that when Jesus asserted that he and his Father were one, he must have meant that they were one in design and spirit—that they were one because they had one object. "My sheep, he says, hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." He immediately adds, (and you will please to observe the language,) "My Father who *gave* them me is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." I and my Father are *one* In this matter, as to the protection of my sheep, my true followers, I and my Father act in concert. We are on the same side, and have one and the same end in view. I have said that no one can pluck my sheep out of my mind. Why? because he who gave them me is greater than all; no one can withstand him; no one can pluck my sheep out of his hand. In fact we are as *one*. It is only necessary to add that this understanding of the passage is sustained by the authority of the most eminent trinitarian expositors.

The unity, therefore, which the text states, as subsisting between Jesus Christ and the Father, is such a unity as may exist between any two persons labouring in the same cause, and for the same object. If any one is still inclined to believe that the passage implies something more, a unity of essence, still he will not deny that it expresses all that we have stated a unity of design. It teaches as much as this, whatever more it may teach. However it is explained, it declares that God and Christ are one in spirit—that they have the same deign—that their moral attributes are similar. Now, I beg leave to observe, that in this respect, the text is contradicted by the popular faith, and is at variance with it. In the apprehensions of the generality of christians, God and Christ, I venture to assert, are not one in moral character. Their moral qualities, or accding to the representations frequently given of our heavenly Father, & of our Saviour, are distinct and opposite. The Father, to the common mind, is the personification of justice, stern, terrible, & awful: while the Saviour is regarded as overflowing with mercy and compassion. The former inspires fear: the latter love. The one comes before the mind in the attitude of intercession. The other in the clouds and darkness of omnipotent wrath. Is there any *moral* unity here? The one raises over the wretched head of man the fiery sword of vengeance, the other interposes the shield of infinite mercy. I repeat, is there a *unity* of spirit here? Such representations, (and who will say that they are not continually made?) contradict the sentiment of the text, so far as the moral qualities of the persons spoken of are concerned. In the view of our Christian brethren, God and Christ are not *one* in the most important and interesting point, nor

can they be regarded with the same feelings. The sentiments they inspire are as distinct as those which any two different objects of worship may excite. But it is unnecessary to pursue these remarks any further. We gladly quit the ground of controversy, and in our next number we shall ask the attention of our readers to a far more interesting view of the text which we have been considering. F.

ORTHODOX DISAGREEMENT.

[*From Whitman's 2d Letter to Professor Stuart.*]

Many individuals in your denomination have attempted to make the unlearned part of the community believe these two statements. First, that the orthodox disagree only in *non-essentials* of religion. And, secondly, that they differ from the Unitarians in the *essentials* of the gospel. I perceive that you have endeavored to confirm these impressions. One quotation will be sufficient for my purpose. Here are your words:

"We are prone to ask a question which is not recent. 'How can two walk together unless they are *agreed?*' We do not urge these words beyond what we think to be their plain and obvious import. We do not think that *small* difference of opinion about *non-essentials*, are intended to be included in them. We limit the agreement to things which in our view are *essential*. Such we do honestly believe to be the *difference* between *Unitarians* and *ourselves*." Now is all this true? Are the orthodox really agreed in all the essentials of religion? Is the difference between them and the Unitarians so vast, as to place an impassable gulf between the two denominations? I think not. I do honestly believe that you differ more among yourselves on those very doctrines, which you call essential, than you do with Unitarians on the same subjects. But let facts decide.

First. The nature of God. In relation to the *nature* of God; there are now *four* distinct systems prevailing among the orthodox. The *first* class profess this belief: "That in the godhead are three *persons*, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these *three* are *one* God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." This is the doctrine to which you are obliged to assent every five years. One of the distinguishing advocates of this view has made this declaration: "That the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are as *really distinct persons*, as Peter, James, and John; and *each of which is God*. To say that these three are three divine persons, and not *three distinct infinite minds*, is both *heresy and nonsense*." I should call this a belief in three Gods. For if you aver, that the Father alone is a *perfect* Being, the Son alone is a *perfect* Being, and the Spirit alone is a perfect Being; then you believe in three perfect Beings; and if so, in three perfect Gods; for God can be nothing more nor less than one perfect Being.

A *second* class profess this belief: "That God exists in three

distinct persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that these three are one God, the same in nature, and equal in every perfection." A distinguished advocate of this view assures us, "that the *Father alone is not God.*" And another defender of this form of the doctrine makes this declaration: "That the Father, Son, and Spirit, are *three proper distinct* persons, entirely equal to, and independent upon each other, yet *making up* one and the same Being." I should call this a belief in no God. For if the *Father alone* is not a *perfect* Being, the Son alone is not a perfect Being, the Spirit alone is not a perfect Being; then you believe in three imperfect Beings; and if so, you believe in no God; for three imperfect Beings can never *make up* one perfect Being.

A *third* class profess this belief: "That the Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten. The Son is *of the Father alone;* not made, nor created, but *begotten.* The Holy Spirit *is of the Father, and of the Son;* neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding.*" I should call this a belief in that kind of Unitarianism sometimes termed *high Arianism.* For if the Son was *begotten* by the Father, then the Father must have existed before he begat the Son; and consequently the Son cannot be *self*-existent; but must have been dependant for his existence on a self-existent Father. And if the Spirit proceeded from both Father and Son, then he could not have had so early a beginning as the begotten Son: and consequently must be subordinate to both.

A *fourth* class profess this belief: "That there is one Infinite, Eternal Mind, and *three somethings* that are *not distinct minds.*" So far as I am able to understand your explanation of the doctrine, I think this is the particular form you advocate, notwithstanding your quinquennial vows to the contrary. I should call this a belief in the simplest form of Unitarianism, sometimes termed *humanitarianism.* For if your *somethings* or *distinctions* are not distinct minds, they are mere unmeaning names. And those who adhere to this view of the subject, impose upon themselves by using words without any definite ideas; and then endeavor to make others believe that they are sound in the orthodox faith.

Such are the various and contradictory system of the trinity now in vogue among the members of your denomination. I suppose you will aver, that so long as all the classes will agree to use the word *trinity*, all this disagreement in ideas is non-essential.

Secondly. The Nature of the Son of God. In relation to the *nature* of the Son of God, there are now five distinct systems prevailing among the orthodox. One class profess to believe, "That the Son of God had no existence until conceived by the Virgin Mary." This is your view. To establish this point you wrote a volume of letters to your friend Dr. Miller. He regarded your form of doctrine as approaching to Unitarianism. For in his answer to your publication, you find these explicit declarations: "A number of your arguments; the strain of your principal objections; and the license which you indulge, in many cases, in the interpretation of scripture,—*all savour so much of a school* with which I should abhor the thought of associating your respected name, that I read them with *not a little pain.* Yes, my dear sir, though I know you abhor the sentiments of that school from your heart; yet, *if your name were removed from the title page*, and if the several passages in which you profess your firm belief in the divinity of Christ, were expunged from the pamphlet, *I should really suspect that it came from some member of the Unitarian ranks*, rather than from the midst of the orthodox camp." Now the doctor is mistaken in calling your belief on this subject Unitarian; he should have pronounced it real Socinianism. For Socinus held the same view of the Son of God, and still contended that he should be worshipped. And I believe you would have all men honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. For I recollect hearing one of your party utter these sentiments in solemn prayer about the time of your controversy: "O thou who hast ascended to thy God and our God, we beseech thee by thy wearisome labors, by thy bloody sweat, and by thy agonizing cross, to hear and answer our prayers." So long as reason remains, I shall never forget the shock produced on my feelings, by this prayer to a human Deity. I do hope you will advance one step further, and take your stand on the more rational and scriptural ground of Unitarianism.

A second class profess the same belief, that you assure us the Christian fathers did, for the three first centuries of the Christian era. As you have investigated this subject very thoroughly, I will give the result of your labors in your own words. Here it is. "I begin then by giving the result of my investigations respecting the three first centuries. It is this, viz. *that the great body of the early and influential Christian Fathers*, whose works are extant, *believed that the Son of God was begotten at a period not long before the creation of the world.*"—Among the unlearned members of your churches, you will find not a few who adhere to this opinion. I must call this *low Arianism*, or the most prevalent form of Unitarianism in this country.

A third class profess this belief: "That the Son of God was begotten by the Father from all eternity." To establish this position, your friend, Dr. Miller, addressed a volume of letters to yourself. I find your opinion of his doctrine in the following observation. "I am unable to conceive of a definite meaning in the terms *eternal generation;* and I cannot regard them in any other light than as a *palpable contradiction of language.*" This remark gave the doctor so much offence, that he makes this assertion concerning it: "I will venture to assert that it is as *unphilosophical* as it is *impious.*" I believe you and other

New England divines regard this doctrine of your southern brethren and our pilgrim fathers, as wholly subversive of the real divinity of the Son. For in a volume of discourses by the late Dr. Parish, I find these assertions: "The notion of an *eternal generation* is not merely a *mystery*, but an *impossibility*. It is a violent solecism in language to call any being the son of another, who is of the same and equal origin. *This, therefore, infallibly destroys the real divinity of the Son.*" I should call this belief *high Arianism*, or one form of Unitarianism. I think you entertain the same opinion; for in your answer to Dr. Miller, I find these observations: "I must confess that with the views which I now entertain, if I could be persuaded that the doctrine of eternal *emanation* or *generation* is true, I should feel that the *first step was taken towards embracing the Arian system.* I cannot help feeling that the idea of a *derived* God is, in reality, a vastly greater approximation to Arianism, than that which we adopt; and that the antagonists of Arius had much less reason to dispute with him than they apprehended." You are right in this opinion. There is certainly as little difference between the doctor's system and the Arian scheme, as can possibly be imagined.

A *fourth* class profess this belief: "That the Son of God is equal to God himself. One quotation from a discourse published the present year, will confirm my statement. These are the words of the reverend divine: "As a *Son*, he possessed perfectly the same nature with the Father, is the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person; is without beginning, eternal, uncreated, and almighty, omniscient, and every where present; in truth, possesses all divine perfections equally with the Father, is equally with him the object of divine worship; and must be honored even as the Father. And if any error can destroy the souls of men, it must be that which denies the Son's equality with the Father." I should call this a *belief in a second God*, which is an absurdity.

A *fifth* class profess this belief: "That the Son of God is God himself." In proof of this assertion, I will give you an extract from a sermon published the present year, by a distinguished divine in Ohio, and circulated widely as a tract in the Western Country. Here it is. "*That babe that lies in a manger at Bethlehem is the mighty God! That man of poverty who travels through Judea, preaching peace to the lost, is the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace! The man who is pressed with sorrow, and covered with bloody sweat in Gethsemane, is the Lord of Hosts! He who wears the crown of thorns, and endures the cruel scourge, and receives the sentence of death at Pilate's bar, is he who distributes crowns of life! That mangled victim which languishes on the cross, is God over all, blessed for ever! And that blood which issues from his opening wounds, is the blood of God!*" This is explicit. What to call this belief, I know not. I cannot describe it by any *Christian* name. Such are the various and contradictory systems now in vogue among your denomination. I suppose you will aver, that so long as all classes will agree to use the words *divinity of Christ*, all this disagreement in *ideas* is non-essential.

THE PRESBYTERY OF PHILADELPHIA.

From a Report of the Debates of the Presbytery of Philadelphia, held in that City Nov. 30, and continued to Dec. 3d, 1830, for the perpose of hearing and deciding on objections to the orthodoxy of a sermon preached by a Mr. Barnes, pastor of the first Presbyterian church in Philodelphia, we learn, that the Presbytery was divided into two opposing parties, one headed by Dr. Green, the other by Dr. Ely. In the debates is manifested a great deal of excitement, bordering on what is vulgarly called quarrelling. One of the members, Mr. Patterson, thus spoke—"I join in protesting against trying this sermon alone. If the Presbytery of Philadelphia must be divided, let it be done. Some years ago, Synod was petitioned on this subject. We have had much wrangling and quarrelling; and, it is very well known that the difference is not so much about purity of doctrine, as purity of opinion. Members of this Presbytery have long been at variance on some points, but have been obliged to bear and forbear. For four or five meetings of the General Assembly, their aim has been to steer a middle course, not an exclusive one. In all Protestant Churches we find a high and a low church party. Four or five General Assemblies have endeavored to keep together, and not to become exclusionists. If it must be so, let us divide, but in peace. Perhaps it would be more for the peace and good of the church. I am in favor of Dr. Ely's motion."

The sermon was condemned by the majority of the Presbytery. The editor of the Herald of Truth, observes; "The parts of the sermon to which objections were made, are those that treat of original sin, imputed righteousness, the atonement, and the nature and objects of the sufferings of Christ. On these points the sermon is said to be inconsistent with the authorized standards of the Presbyterian Church. It is more liberal, more rational, and more scriptural than the Confession of Faith. It is rendered more than probable, by the facts contained in the debates, that some of the Presbyterian clergymen are becoming too much enlightened to be confined within the narrow limits of their own creed. The spirit of free inquiry which is abroad in the world is contagious—and it would not surprise us if it should spread, and infect the teachers of orthodox theology, until the whole fabric of creeds and dogmas of human invention which cramp and confine the energies of the mind, should fall before it.

The Editor has long since determined, and published in the Messenger, that he could not insert in his columns any anonymous pieces sent him. Such communications, however ap-

proved, are rejected from publication. One moment's reflection will convince all of the propriety of my course, and free me from censure. "A searcher for truth, and pure charity," from Belmont co. Ohio, for the reason above stated, cannot be admitted a place in the Messenger. It is requested again that my correspondents pay the postage of their letters. My agents alone are excepted. I have many communications on hand, which shall hereafter receive attention. EDITOR.

RECEIPTS FROM MARCH 1ST TO MAY 1ST.

Little Sandy Saline Ky.—From G. Scott, for self, Wm. Jourdan, Moses Kibby, John Everman, Geo. Henderson, $5.

Lexington, Ky.—By Elder T. M. Allen, for M. Yates, 2: by Ben. Cassell, $5; for Dr. Fishback, 1 for vol. 5; for Js. Towler, 1 for vol. 4; for J. Steel, 1 for vol. 5; for J. Curd, 1 for vol. 5; for Jac. Stone, 1 for vol. 5. By Ben. Cassel, for others, $4. *Pennsville, O.*—By Wm. French, 1 for vol. 5. *Felicity, O.*—Elder John Powell, by Js. Conn, 3 50. *Georgetown, O.*—By Js. Clack, $5; for self, 1; for J. D. White, 1; for R. Allen, 1; for H. Pickering 1; for O. Johnson 1. *Cincinnatti, O.*—By J. D. Garrard, Agent, $7; for self 2; for Js. McCash 2, for vols. 4 & 5; for Mr. Gillaspel 2, for vols. 3 & 4; for E. Lockwood 1, for vol. 4. By James Long, of Manchester, O. 1. *Elkton, Ky.*—By Thos. Philips 2; for self 1; for Js. Coleman 1, for vol. 5.—*Georgetown, Ky.*—By Wm. Moseby, 1; Sam. Benton, 1; Ann Leonard, 1; Robt. J. Ward, 1. *Versailles, Ky.*—Charles Ware 1; J. Hunter, 4, for his father of Lawrenceburg, Ill. for vols. 1, 2, 3 & 4; B. Gains, 1. *Fulton & Fruits, Mo.*—By Wharton Moore, $4; for Wm. Grant 3; for Js. Grant 1. *Abbotts Mill, Tenn.*—Ross Houston 1. *Lawrenceburg, Tenn.*—A. Miller 1. *Meigsville, Tenn.*—By A. Kirkpatrick $5; for self 1; for James Kirkpatrick 1; for Thos. Hutchison 1; for E. Sanders 2.—*Princeton, Ky.*—By Dr. C. Webb, $4; for self 1; for Stevenson 1; for Black 1; for Gore 1. *Union, Ky.*—Dr. Ennis 4; Elder T. Waller for Mrs. Hallock 1; for Jac. Sidener 1; for Js. Hurst 1; for H. Lighter 1; for Gen. Russell 1; for Wm. Cox 1; for A. Rice 1; for T. A. Russell 1; for Maj. Moseby 1. *Paris, Ky.*—Thos. Stamps 1; Dan. Smedley 1; S. G. Martin 1; B. M. Riggs 1; Mrs. E. Garrard 1. *Paoli, Ia.*—By Elder Lewis Byram $10. *Royalton, N. Y.*—By Wm. Smith 2. *Newcastle, Ky.*—By M. Sidener for Geo. Shivel 1. *Gites C. H. Va.*—By A. Stewart 5; for Isaac Hale 1; for Chas. Hale 1; Andw. Johnson 1 for Jacob Peck; Monroe Va. 1; Tho. Hale 1; all for vol. 4. *Somerville, Ala.*—By Eld. E. Randolph $15. *Newnan, Ga.*—By Js. Meriwether 1. *Greensburg, Ia.*—By J. Corbin 1 50. *Maysliek, Ky.*—Js. Tebbs 1 for vol. 5. *Leesburg, Ky.*—Wm. Bodkin 1 for vol. 5. *Harrodsburg, Ky.*—By L. J. Flemming for Thos. Allin, Sen. 1 for vol. 5. *Carlisle, Ky.*—By Elder J. Rogers $4. *Cameron, Ky.*—By John Graves, 2; for G. T. Dennis 1 for vol. 5; for John Sleat 1 for vol. 4. *Mt. Carmel, Ky.*—By Elder F. R. Palmer for R. Mock 1 for vol. 5.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

By BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. V.] GEORGETOWN, KY. JUNE 1831. [No. 6.

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

As truth is our object, we feel disposed to aid its progress in the world, by impartially exhibiting its claims to be attentively heard by all concerned to know. We have given Archippus a patient hearing in the four preceding numbers; we design now to hear our brother A. Campbell in reply. To this course I am advised by brethren of eminence in society. It is hoped that my correspondents will be silent on this subject, till I shall have come to a close of Mr. C's reply.

REPLY TO ARCHIPPUS BY THE EDITOR OF THE MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

Always willing that our readers shall have the same opportunity of judging for themselves that we have, I am solicitous that they may hear both sides of every important question, and know all that can be said against, as well as for every proposition which we offer. This is what we ask from our opponents, and although they will not yield to our importunities, still we feel ourselves compelled by the controlling principles of our religion, not to imitate them, but to give a fair exhibit of both sides.

The essay above quoted from the Christian Messenger deserves special attention, because it contemplates a new ground of opposition to the Apostolic Gospel, as we consider it. The writer of it seems to be a half reformer or middle-ground man, who divides baptism into two species; one for the Jews, for remission of sins—and one for the Gentiles, after they are pardoned. He has taken a middle ground. To the Jew he would preach baptism for remission; to the Gentiles, baptism without remission. From the versatility of his genius in other matters, we shall not be surprised to find him abandon his Jewish baptism, that he may secure his Gentile baptism.

But it will be time enough to examine the grounds and reasons of this opinion when he has presented them to the public.