in the Chinese Testament *to sprinkle*, and yet they had never objected to the circulation of the book with the funds of the Society. It is probable that the Baptists will do as the Methodists and Episcopalians have done, withdraw and have societies of their own.

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

ILLINOIS. Franklin, J. Challen vol. 10. Lawrenceville, Js. Pool for B. F. Melone, Js. Lamatt, 10. Centreville, for J. Shadle 10, Sophia Greathouse 9, 10, Geo. Leatherland, Luther Orcutt, Eld. W. Causter 10, E. Greathouse 8, Danl. Run 9. Jacksonville, J. McGinnis 9, Samuel Simms 10, Jac. Huffaker sen. 10. Cleary's Grove, Tho. Edwards for 5 copies of 9, C. Smedley 10. Greenville, Js. McCaslin 1 50. Cochran's Grove, Wm. Dugger, 5 00.

TENNESSEE. Nashville, Rec'd other half note of 20 00 by A. Trabue for self, C. C. Trabue, B. S. Willer, B. F. Shields, Wm. Shields for 10; and N. S. Anderson 9, 10, and Wm. Hart of Carthage 9, and 2 00 more. Lebanon, Eld. J. Green for self, A. Cowth, Js. Scobee, Wm. Palmer, Eld. E. Sweat for 10.

ALABAMA. Florence, Brother Young last July sent 5 00 for Ammonett Geo. Herndon, himself and two others—lost by mail.

KENTUCKY. Elkton, Tho. Phillips 5 00. Russelville, David Smith 4 00. Hopper's Tan Yard, Wm. Hopper for vol. 9, 10. Cerulean Spring, A. Thompson 10. Georgetown, Js. Grant for Geo. Shroyer 9, E. Downing 9, Alfred Allen 10, M. L. Patterson 10. and for self 10.—These 5 00 Grant paid J. T. Johnson. Eld. F. Palmer 10. Mrs. Keene L. Lloyd 10. J. Rogers for A. Howe, A. Couchman, T. Letton, Wm. Caldwell, Wm. Doughty, J. Sanders, B. Mathers, R. Ardery, J. Doughty, R. McCune 10. Centreville, Eld. J. A. Gano for Wm. Conn, W. Cox T. Ware, N. Spears, Geo. Palmer, Hir. Calvin, for 10; and for Js. Garrard and J. Snell of Paris 10. Lexington. Fld. Tho. Allen for self, T. Russel, Js. Moore, J. W. Moore, Js. Hurst, Js. H. Hall, J. Moseby, J. Sidener, 10.

OHIO. New Paris, S. Frame, J. Cline, J. Mitchell, J. G. Jameson, W. Jameson 10. Eaton, H. Monfort for J. Quinn, M. H. Hill, D. Robbins 10, and for Dennis Pottinger 2 00 of which one was for 10. Gillaspieville, Eld. J. Baker for self, Eld H. Bun, and Eld Sam. Darby 10. Rutland, A. Hubble, Susanna Laskin 10. Greenfield, E. Byram 10. Manchester, Js. Long 10. Cincinnati, D. Trowbridge, N. Stewart, E. Lockwood, L. Knowles, A. Trowbridge 10. Bethel, D. Crane for self, E B Thompson, Betsey Webster, Jac. Chatterton, A Treble, Geo. Ulrey C Beck, Nath. Osborn 10. David Thompson 8, 9, 10. These eleven dollars were paid to J T Johnson.

INDIANA. Bloomington, D. O. Ellet for J B Berry, J A Givens, C. Kearns, J Nichols, M McPhetridge 10.

MISSOURI. Columbia, Elder M P Wills, A Stone, S Bedford, R Graham, T Conyers 10. Millersburgh, Dan. Miller, Geo. Tutt 9, George Maupin, Wm. O. Turley A. Miller 10.

PENNSYLVANIA. Carmichaeltown, Wm. Denny for self 10, Js. Curle 9, 10, A. Bottenfield 1 00, old account, and 1 00 for 10.

S. CAROLINA. Chesterville, Eld. J. L. Davis 5 00 in full for his agency for vol. 10.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY B. W. STONE:

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—PAUL

VOL. X.] JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS, JULY, 1836. [No 7.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

Is published monthly, in Jacksonville, Illinois, at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for three numbers, if paid on the reception of the second number—or ONE DOLLAR AND TWENTY-FIVE cts. if not paid within six months. Persons procuring eight subscribers, and remitting the money to the editor, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage is 12½ cents a year at any distance in the United States.

For the Christian Messenger.

MAY 25, 1836.

Having waited some time to see what attention the brethren would bestow upon the things submitted to their consideration, in the number on practical reformation, and seeing some approbate and none deny the truth of what has been written, I feel encouraged to invite attention again to practical Christianity. From what source has the Redeemer's cause most to fear? Not, as brother Rogers seems to think, from the establishment of Popery in the Valley of the Mississippi; neither from persecution by the world, so long as the church continues obedient to its spirit, maxims, and fashions; for the world will love its own. But while the love of money, "the root of all evil," with all its kindred evils, has root in the church, the cause has much to fear. If the rapidly increasing rage for riches, and the growing disposition to walk implicitly in the footsteps of fashion, are not extinguished in the hearts of christian professors, they will necessarily issue in the total neglect of all devotional exercises, and pave the way for the open renunciation of the christian religion. I am aware that before such a reformation as the New Testament would approbate can be effected, stronger measures must be taken than have hitherto been resorted to. Those who feel interested in the fate of the cause, and in the salvation of mankind, must unite their untiring efforts in redeeming it from the combined and deadly grasp of the world, the flesh, and the devil. They must be reconciled to the slander of being accounted the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things, while setting themselves against the popular current and exhibiting in their lives *all* the holy principles of the Gospel. Those who will not do so, must be compelled by the purity of the faithful to resign their pretensions to Christianity, and declare in favor of opposition to Messiah's reign. As well to live and die avowed rebels against God, as inconsistent professors.

What can be done? Exterminate the *root* of all evil, and then its trunk and branches will wither and die. What is the root of all evil? The love of money. 1 Tim. 6, 10. How is it to be exterminated? Be patient, and to this we will attend. Sister Clark, whose most interesting communication appeared in a late number of the Messenger, would say, by extinguishing individual interest in property, remove the cause, and the effect will cease. Whether the other churches followed the example of that in Jerusalem, or whether our heavenly Father intended that his people in all ages, countries and circumstances should follow it, I am not informed; but if circumstances then made it necessary for the saints to do that which heaven most certainly approbated, we surely have a right to do the same thing, when any description of circumstances requires it in order to the good of the cause. Then if we cannot otherwise subdue and, control the inordinate love of money, let us have "all things common." But if any thing like an equality can obtain in the church of Christ upon any other principle, the object of my labors will be gained.—The *thing* I wish to see effected. As to the particular *way* in which it is to be done, I leave for the present to the wisdom of the brethren under the direction of God's word.

It is written that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which (temple or body) you have of God, and you are not your own; for you are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit which are God's. We are here taught that we are not our own, but the Lord's, both in body and spirit.—On what principle then can we call any thing our own, irrespective of the Lord's claims? The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof. The scriptures require that we shall not be slothful in business but labor with our own hands, that we may have to give to him that needs. The Lord requires all our faculties and members to be exercised in his service. To whom then belong the products of our labor? To ourselves, or to the Lord? If it please him through that care and industry which he requires of us to place any amount of this world's goods in our hands, does he not consider us as his stewards, and hold us accountable for the use we make of his property?—If this is not clearly taught in the scriptures, I am still ignorant of the will of God. But if these are the principles upon which our heavenly Father requires his people to act, what a fearful account will those have to render, who have inhaled the spirit of the world, and walking in its ways, continue to increase earthly treasures, holding them in possession, in view of the widow's rolling tear, and the orphan's bitter cry!

The world's customs and regulations will allow each member to have an equal interest in what belongs to the whole family. This is what nature and right reason dictate. Then should not those who constitute the body of Christ, who are members one of another, heirs

of God and joint heirs with Christ, have equal interest in all things which our gracious Father allows us to enjoy? Are we not to sympathize with each other? To suffer alike, to enjoy alike? And as far as possible fare alike in every thing? If this is Christianity, we never can have it while one in our Lord's kingdom has abundance, and another in consequence of stern poverty is doomed to ignorance and want. Let equality be established among christians, whether by a community of property or otherwise, and the temptation to love money will be removed, and they will seek their greatest comfort in keeping the commandments of Jesus. When these principles shall be received and acted upon, will be arrested the progress of that potent evil which threatens the extinction of pure religion. When this is accomplished, will be in all the borders of Zion hushed in perpetual silence the piercing cries of the poor and needy. Then being delivered from motives of selfishness and sordid gain, the redeemed of the Lord will love each other with a pure heart fervently, evincing to all the world that they are the disciples of Christ. And then, as from a city set on a hill, will a light shine forth carrying in it a redeeming influence which shall cause myriads of lost sinners to exult in the cross of Christ. May this glad day quickly dawn, and never know a succeeding night!

A. REYNOLDS.

From the Journal and Luminary.

HOW IT STRIKES THE MISSIONARIES.

A CRY FOR PEACE.

In the last Boston Recorder we find a solemn appeal to Pastors and Missionaries of all denominations, signed by eleven missionaries in India. It occupies three columns so that we are obliged to abridge it; but we shall aim to give a fair specimen of its spirit. We have no doubt that in the excitements of the last few years, we have some times been betrayed into the spirit here rebuked; but we will never suppress true principles to shield our own derelictions. A disposition to concentrate the power of the church on some subordinate object, to the neglect of her vital principles, is the curse of the age.—These missionaries, standing aloof from all our controversies, look with grief and shame on ecclesiastical bickerings, and call for peace. But our readers are waiting to hear them.

TO PASTORS AND MISSIONARIES OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

JAFFNA, August 17, 1835.

Dear Brethren:

It has pleased our heavenly Father to prolong our lives in this pagan land, until some of us have begun to look forward to the time

when the work of the messengers of the church will close. Whether finished as it should be, we leave to Him who is Judge of both quick and dead. Feeling it a privilege to strive together with you for the faith of the gospel, and wishing to stir up your minds by way of remembrance, we take the liberty to address you, and to invite you to give your serious and prayerful attention to one of the most plain and important duties based on the broad principles of the Bible. We refer to the duty of

CHRISTIAN UNION.

Christians are branches of the same vine; members of the same body; a building fitly framed together, as lively stones built up a spiritual house for a habitation of God. As his sons and daughters, they call no man master. There is neither Paul nor Apollos.—Perfect love casteth out fear, and unites all in one; "as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."

* * * *

We believe there is a great mistake on this subject. Christians have considered that they have the right to censure those of other denominations and societies; to withold communion and fellowship by way of securing or defending what they call their privileges, feeling quite safe under the bulwarks of party. But from the little we have learned of Christ, we have no doubt that the King of kings, guided by his own laws, looks upon it as nothing less than civil war and rebellion. Whatever may be the economy of statesmen, among Christians there can never be strife on the question, who shall be accounted the greatest? "Ye shall not be so." "Be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.—He that is greatest among you shall be your servant; and whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased, and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." We can easily see the beauty and feel the force of this principle.

Every Christian recognizes its justice; and yet how seldom do we confess our faults to one another, and pray for one another, that we may be healed! On the contrary, the feelings of personal and relative importance are roused up, and put themselves in attitudes of attack or defence on the slightest occasions. But why? Does not our knowledge of good and evil admonish us not to enter into temptation? Do not our better feelings check us? Why then do we not "rather suffer ourselves to be defrauded?" Or if we are conscious of being wrong, why not gain a triumph over ourselves and our worst enemy, by a frank confession?

* * * *

Every one's theory on this subject is correct. How then is our practice? "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. Every one that heareth these things and doeth them not shall be likened unto a man that built his house upon the sand." How then stands our house? And when every one's work shall be tried so as by fire, will it not appear that we have suffered unspeakable loss, while in fact we might, in our intercourse with each other, have been preparing by all these daily but necessary trials of our love and union, to reap great benefits?

To illustrate this, suppose an individual has been ill treated by his brethren. His opinion is disregarded, and some very severe remarks have been made. He feels wounded; if a man of spirit, indignant. If otherwise, he pores over the subject, but his feelings are alienated from those who have wronged him. What shall be done? Shall he withdraw, and thus at once set up a personal and public opposition, and cut himself off from all opportunities of doing or [illegible] good, until by a system of coercion or of argument, or both united, he can gain his object? If so, he is led captive at the will of his worst enemy, and does his own soul an injury which his brethren could never inflict, and which they cannot repair. But if he conquers his own spirit by patient endurance, he gains an important victory, and bruises Satan under his feet.

And why not? Did his trouble spring out of the ground? Has any temptation overtaken him but what is common to man? Was there no Providence in this? The history of Joseph, of Job, of Daniel, and of Paul, gives us abundant evidence that God designed it for good; that this severest trial of his life is designed by his heavenly Father to discover to him his own heart, and to remove some deformity, or to add some beauty which lighter treatment could not effect. If he make this use of it, and endure chastisement as an obedient and humble child, his reward is unspeakably great; but if he be restive and revengeful, he will reap the fruit of his own perverseness.

* * * *

We do not object to differences of denomination. These we have among ourselves. But as the voice of a little band crying in the wilderness, we do call upon pastors and missionaries, that they prepare the way of the Lord, and make his paths strait on this subject. Without this we have no reason, as has been before remarked, to expect the special blessing of God on our labors at home, nor on the labors of missionaries abroad. We appeal to the testimony of his Providence as well as to his Word, and ask, Where or when has he ever sent down the special revivings of his grace and Spirit, where real Christians have been at strife about a doctrine or a name? On the contrary, how soon, even in a revival of religion, has the spirit of disunion extinguished the kindlings of his love and mercy, and buried both Christians and impenitent sinners in moral death; or if life remained, it was only for the dead to bite and devour their dead. This train of thought, as it sweeps through the world, and looks forward to the retributions of those who have been misled, stumbled, or neglected, by the disunion of their shepherds, is most awful.—What then shall be said of such shepherds, and where shall they appear?

Again let us look on the subject of union, as brought to view in the prayer, "thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth."

Now if the will of God is to be done on earth as in heaven, it is to be done by men—by us. Have we any doubt about the meaning of this prayer? There is, undoubtedly a difference between heaven and earth, and these bodies are very different from those fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body. But on the subject of humility, of union, of love, and of holiness, have we any doubt? How then can we add, "lead us not into temptation," when with these plain, glaring and acknowledged duties before us, sometimes in the pulpit, some times in our studies, and sometimes even in the house of prayer, we give place to pride, self-complacency and party feelings; [illegible] aside from our best resolutions, violate our knowledge of duty, and almost bid defiance to responsibility!

It was once asked concerning a man of undoubted piety, "How could he pray so well, while in writing and preaching he maintained such doctrines?" The reply was, "I dont know, excepting that he was not praying then." Here is an important and most alarming fact, which is sometimes brought to view by the expression—"His heart is right, but his theory leads him astray." The very great difference between the prayers of Christians and their conduct, is astonishing. No one believes that there is the least feeling of a sectarian spirit in the effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous man:—and the very thought of praying with disaffected hearts is revolting.

Yet how IS the church divided! And how many to whom the head of the church has given ten talents, are found in the arena of controversy with apparent fears for the safety of the ark, with much less occasion than had Uzza. If Christians would receive the blessings of God their Saviour, they must, in their intercourse with each other, and in their labors for the conversion of the world, come up to the spirit of their prayers. If those who occupy the heights of Zion have no intention to do this, if they have no conviction that this is their own life and the life of the world, and if they will not act agreeably to these convictions, with corresponding effort, they are without excuse: like the captain of a vessel fraught with souls, with his chart before him, the breakers distinctly within the reach of his glass, the wind beating and the tide drifting, while he is deliberately looking on the whole scene with his hands folded, busying himself and his seamen in washing the decks and coiling the ropes, or discussing the nature of rocks and winds. Christians must act agreeably to their convictions of duty, and make their life a commentary on their prayers.

If not, the charge is irresistible: "This people draw nigh unto me with their mouth, and honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me." How often, oh! how often in their prayers, Christians ask the most exalted and glorious gifts, and make the most solemn promises, and in a moment forget what manner of persons they are! [illegible] can be said of them, are these the persons who a mo-

In view of these remarks, what is the duty of the managers of different missionary societies at home? We believe there is a grand mistake on this plain and most important subject of union; and we most earnestly call on them to send out such men, and such only, as will unite most cordially with all their missionary brethren of different denominations, on those catholic principles, which recognize no sectarian feelings, and who will not turn aside from the great object of preaching Jesus and the ressurrection. We earnestly entreat them to give their missionaries definite instructions to this amount, and to hold them responsible for keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Missionaries among the heathen should know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified.

With christian salutations, we are most affectionately your fellow laborers in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

B. C. MEIGS,	J. KNIGHT,
J. SCUDDER,	S. HUTCHINGS,
N. WARD,	D. POOR,
L. SPAULDING,	H. R. HOISINGTON.
G. H. APTHORP,	A. C. HALL.

F. S. MINOR.

REMARKS.

The deep feeling and solemn earnestnes of the above will commend it to every pious heart. Let elders read it, let private members read it, and pray that its spirit may once more return to our beloved church.

The following anonymous communication was sent me some weeks ago for publication. I refused to publish it unless the author would give his name. This he has since done. As he is a clergyman of high and good standing in society, I have consented to publish his piece, and make a few remarks on it.

Lest blame may attach to me for agitating this long vexed subject, I will state a few facts. For some time past I have been determined not to bring up the doctrine of atonement before the public only in the language of scripture, and not to introduce any previous opinion, or speculation I may have entertained on the subject. This I have done, not because I deemed the doctrine, as I have viewed it, untrue or indefensible; but because I judged other topics more useful to urge on the public mind, and better calculated to arrest their attention to the great concerns of eternity. In a few instances I have been driven from this course by opposers to write a few things touching the doctrine in question, in order to conciliation, and self-

defence. The spirit of controversy is dying within me under the weight of years, and in my nearer advances to eternity. I wish it never to revive.

The Baptist Banner, in some late numbers had made a violent attack on brother A. Campbell and myself, in which I was dragged before the public as denying the atonement, or that the blood of Christ has any direct influence on God in the pardon of sin. I requested the editors, Noel and Dillard especially, to write on this point, and to shew us in the Bible, that the blood of Christ has a direct influence on God, his law, and his government in granting pardon and grace to the sinner. While waiting in hope for the answer this anonymous clergyman anticipates them, and sends the following communication, in order to Prove the doctrine true. How far he has succeeded, the public must and will judge: but whether their criterion be the Bible, or preconceived opinion, is very doubtful.

COMMUNICATED.

For the Christian Messenger.

Mr. Editor—In the April number of your periodical you express a desire to be shown, where, in the book of God, you may find the doctrine that the blood of Christ has had any direct influence with God, his law, and his government in granting pardon and grace to the sinner.

Though this request is presented to men distinguished, as I suppose, in theological debate, perhaps you will not be unwilling to be shown by so humble an individual as myself.

I agree with you that the doctrine in question is to be determined by an appeal not to philosophy, but to the word of God. I hope that this will be distinctly borne in mind, through the whole discussion.

I could at once quote scores of proof—texts which to my mind undeniably teach the doctrine that the blood of Christ has had direct influence with God, in granting pardon and grace to the sinner.—But I cannot doubt that these passages are as familiar to you as myself. And yet you cannot discern in them this doctrine. Why this difference? It is precisely because you put upon a passage one interpretation, and I another. This suggests a preliminary question to be settled, upon which, in my apprehension, the whole discussion hinges. This question is, what principle of interpretation is to govern us? Is there any fixed principle of interpretation, by which we may ordinarily arrive with certainty at the true meaning of language? Or may every man put the construction upon a passage he pleases, provided the language will possibly admit of his construction? Here is a passage which you interpret in one way, I in another, and a third person in still a different manner. Neither, we will suppose, is an absurd interpretation on the face of it. But they cannot all

be the true meaning. Is there then any mode of determining in ordinary cases what is the true meaning whens several are possible?—If not, then are we afloat upon a shoreless ocean of conjecture!—And language, instead of a medium, is a labyrinth of thought! But it is not so. There is an invariable rule, by which language is to be interpreted—a rule commending itself to the common sense of men; and a rule always followed by an unbiassed mind under the influence of common sense. The rule is this. We are always to receive the obvious meaning of language as the true one, unless there be a decisive reason compelling us to depart from it. Such a reason is—inconsistency with known truth. If the obvious meaning be absurd or inconsistent with the context, or with the nature of the subject, or known facts, or any other known truth, the unbiassed mind understands it as an indication of the author, that the literal or obvious meaning is not the true one, and that some other natural, not forced, interpretation is to be put upon it. Thus, when our Saviour says, "I am the true vine." "This [bread] is my body," the nature of the case compels us to depart from the literal obvious meaning of the words.

I feel confident, sir, that you will assent to the correctness of this principle, viz: that the obvious meaning of scripture is the correct one, unless it is inconsistent with some known truth. If you do not, you are the first man I have met with that would not, and the last man I would consent to reason with. If a man denies that two and two make four, there is an end of argument.

I come now to the citation of a passage or two in proof of the doctrine, that the blood of Christ has had a direct influence with God, in granting pardon and grace to the sinner. One or two witnesses, when divine, are as good as a score; though several scores, it is believed, might be summoned. Bear in mind now that there are two questions, and only two to be raised, 1, What is the obvious meaning? 2, Is the obvious meaning inconsistent with known truth? You ask for a "thus saith the Lord." Our Lord says, Matt. 26, 28, "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." What is the obvious meaning? "My blood—shed—for the remission of sins." It will not be denied surely, that this is the blood of Christ spoken of, nor that remission of sins means forgiveness of sins—"pardon of the sinner." [The word translated remission, is the same in the Greek as that translated forgiveness.] Nor will it be denied, as I think, that it is God who forgives sin. If, then, the blood of Christ was shed for the forgiveness of sins on the part of God, how does it not appear that the blood of Christ had direct influence with God, in granting pardon and grace to the sinner? It will not be denied that this passage teaches that the blood of Christ had direct influence somewhere. Upon whom, then, according to the obvious import? Upon God?—or the sinner? It says for remis-

s'on of sins," and that is an act of God, and not of the sinner. The obvious meaning therefore is settled.

We might here rest the matter. But to set it in as fair a light as possible, we will enqui e what claim the interpretation of the Editor has to be called the obvious one. If I understand him, it is substantially this. The blood of Christ has a direct influence upon the sinner—not upon God—moves the heart of the sinner to repentance and faith; these are followed by forgiveness. That the death of Christ exerts a powerful influence upon the sinner I do not deny.—I only deny that such is the doctrine of our text. It is not the obvious import. Let us test it. A man is under sentence of condemnation for murder. Before the execution, a friend comes forward and says, "I will lay down my life for the pardon of the criminal."—The question is what does the man mean by such language. That the sacrifice of his life is designed to influence the criminal to repent? or the governor to pardon? Who can doubt? The object of the friend is to influence the government, which is bound to sustain the law, and prevent the evil consequences of gratuitous pardon.

One more inquiry under this head. How must the disciples have understood this language? They were Jews. They had been accustomed to all the rights and ceremonies of Jews. Now let it be remembered that violations of the Mosaic law, were forgiven only on condition of atonement made by the shedding of blood. See Lev. 4, 20 etc. So that the apostle says: "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission." These disciples, therefore, whenever they had sinned against any of the commandments of the Lord, were accustomed to be forgiven only through atonement made by the shedding of blood. With this language they must have been perfectly familiar. Nor can it be supposed that forgiveness here means repentance. With or without repentance, there was no forgiveness except through atonement by blood. This blood did have a direct influence with God, for he would not forgive without it. What then, I ask, must have been the obvious, not to say the only possible import of this language of our Lord, in their minds: "my blood—shed for the remission of sins." I presume it will not now be deemed arrogant, to assume it as proved beyond debate that the blood of Christ has had direct influence with God in granting pardon and grace to the sinner.

The next question is, is it inconsistent with known truth? Is there any decisive reason compelling us to depart from the obvious interpretation? I know of none. It cannot be shown to be inconsistent with the fact, that the death of Christ exerts a great moral influence upon the sinner; or with the revealed character of God; or with justification by faith before or after the coming of Christ; or with just principles of government; or with reason or common sense or philosophy, whose umpire, however, I am glad to see you anxious to decline. One word more on this subject. If you can hunt up any

absurd or foolish theory, invented by the "orthodox" in regard to the atonement, be so good as not to impute it to me or to the doctrine as I have advocated it. I will be responsible for all that I have advanced, and for nothing more. Now sir, if I do not mistake, I have proved the doctrine, that you and I will be held accountable for the belief of it at the judgment day.

I will cite only two passages more at this time. Eph. 1, 7; Col. 1, 14. Here, as in the passage already considered, we have forgiveness of sins through his blood. Remember the question is not what you can explain it away to mean, but what does it obviously mean? What would a plain, unbiassed, unsophisticated mind understand it to mean?

W.

P. S. A candid application of the above common sense principle of interpretation, would, sir, if I am not deceived, straighten you on other points in which you differ from the "orthodox world." I hope you will yourself test your views by the two questions, What is the obvious meaning of scripture in regard to them? and, Is it inconsistent with known truth?

REPLY.

Dear Sir—Your rule of interpretation is admitted. That the obvious meaning of scripture is the true one, unless it is inconsistent with some known truth, or Bible fact. You attempt to prove from the scriptures, that the blood of Christ has had direct influence with God in granting pardon and grace to the sinner. You think you could summons scores of witnesses to prove the doctrine. This is not disputed; for in many cases witnesses are summoned who fail to establish the point for which they were called. But you think two or three are sufficient, and therefore introduce Matt. 26, 28. "For this is my blood of the new testament shed for many for the remission of sins." The obvious meaning of this text, you think, is, that God forgives, and that the blood of Christ influences him to forgive. Let us try another text: "Repent for the forgiveness of sins." According to your logic, God forgives, and repentance influences him to forgive. You will observe that the same words are used in both texts, (eis aphesin, for or in order to forgiveness or remission.) Again: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins." According to your obvious meaning, God forgives, and repentance and baptism influence him to forgive. I could introduce scores of similar texts, but these are deemed sufficient to shew that if the blood of Christ has had direct influence upon God to forgive, so repentance and baptism have direct influence upon God to forgive. The obvious meaning of the text to my mind, is, that the blood of Christ is the foundation or primary cause of forgiveness, because this leads

to repentance and obedience, and through these God forgives. We never read of God forgiving an impenitent, disobedient sinner. But your plan (in theory the orthodox plan) is, that he forgives solely, without repentance or obedience, by the direct influence on his mind effected by the blood of Christ. This contradicts his unchangeability. This is evidently your obvious meaning, which is unequivocally stated in your supposed case of a murderer about to be executed. A friend proposes to the governor to lay down his life for the pardon of the criminal. You ask, "Is it that his death may influence the criminal to repent? or the governor to pardon? Who can doubt? The government is bound to sustain the law, and prevent the evil consequences of gratuitous pardon," or pardon by grace. The obvious meaning is this, the governor was influenced solely to pardon the criminal by the death of his friend, and not by the repentance of the criminal. So you think of God; he pardons the sinner solely by the influence of the blood of Christ upon him without regard to repentance or obedience. Again: you say, "the government or governor was bound to sustain the law;" and therefore was bound to punish the criminal or his substitute. Then we must conclude that the government of God is a government without mercy, without grace. How will this sentiment comport with God's own express declaration? "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. Ezek. 18, 20, and 33 chap. Yet ye say, Why doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father?" According to God's government, the sinner alone shall suffer the punishment due his iniquity—his wickedness shall be on him alone, and not imputed or transferred to the righteous, for the righteousness of the righteous shall be on him alone, and not on the wicked. Is not this the obvious meaning of this declaration?—If so, the meaning you have attached to Matt. 26, 28, is not the obvious meaning, and it stands opposed to a Bible fact. How blind theologists are generally to Bible truth.

Did any well regulated civil government ever admit a law to punish the innocent instead of the guilty? The theological system makers have ransacked the governments of the world to find the case. They have to their great joy found it in the government of the Grecian tyrant, who had made a law that every adulterer should be punished with the loss of his eyes. His own son was convicted of the crime. The father to sustain the law, in pity to his son, had one of his own eyes put out, and one of his son's. Was not the righteousness of the father put upon the son, and the wickedness of the son upon the father? Shall we compare the government of God to that of the reckless tyrant? Shall we attempt to model the divine government by that of poor, ignorant, wicked men? On this point I will transfer from an eastern print a few pages in this number, which

will fully refute your argument, though you think your position proved beyond debate, and settled—so proved that you think I will be held accountable for the belief of it at the judgment day. Dear sir, we are well acquainted with dernier arguments. If confident assertions—if clerical denunciations—if ecclesiastical censures—if human traditions and opinions, sanctioned by antiquity, be good arguments, we have them in abundance. Arguments from a higher source have weight only with us, who, maugre every thing else, have the boldness and independence of measuring them by the divine standard, the Bible. I recommend the same course to you; then am I certain you will be less confident in your received opinions, and more charitably disposed to brethren, who may entertain views different from yours.

You ask, How must the disciples have understood the language of their Lord, when he said, This is the new testament in my blood, shed for the remission of sins? They were Jews, and must have known that violations of the mosaic law were remitted only by the shedding of blood—What then is your argument? God forgave, and was solely influenced to do it by the blood of a victim; for you say, "They were forgiven only on account of the atonement made."—But, sir, did all who offered sacrifices at the altar, receive forgiveness or remission? No: for many of such offerings were an offence unto the Lord. But, why? Because the offerers repented not, nor were influenced to repent from the remembrance of their sin, brought to view by the bleeding, dying victim. Heb. 10, 3. These sacrifices, under the law, were designed to be the foundation of repentance; and hence the apostle says, "Leaving the doctrine of repentance from dead works," or works of death, which consisted in slaying victims for sacrifice. If the apostles rightly understood the language of our Lord, "blood shed for remission of sins," then must they have understood it similarly to the statements I have already made.

You introduce Eph. 1, 7, Col. 1, 14, to prove the same doctrine. But, sir, from the considerations already suggested, you will see that your sense of their meaning is not so "obvious" to me, as they appear to you. They cannot be the obvious meaning.

Before I conclude, I beg leave to explain a few terms I have used on this subject.

1. By the blood of Christ having influence upon God to grant pardon, I have understood that it has made him placable—reconciled him to the sinner—disposed him to mercy in forgiving sin; or as Dr. Watts has it, "turned his wrath to grace." This I have understood to be the doctrine of orthodoxy. This doctrine I feel unwilling to impute to you, though your language is strongly spiced with it. I am inclined to think that this is the very doctrine which you call the absurd and foolish theory invented by the orthodox world, which you request not to be imputed to you, nor to the doctrine of atonement. I think, sir, I am well acquainted with the ground on which

you stand, having travelled the same when you were a child. You will find that your theory and language are at variance. The theory is at bottom Calvinism—The superstructure is Arminianism.—They cannot amalgamate—such is Fullerism, or the doctrine of the new school, if I understand it.

2. By the blood of Christ having influence on the law and government of God, I have understood that "by his obedience and death he made a real, proper and full satisfaction to God's justice in behalf of them that are justified, and fully discharged their debt—That he purchased reconciliation, and procured the favor of God—That the obedience and satisfaction of Christ are imputed to the sinner for justification." This is undoubtedly the orthodox doctrine, and a link in that system, which I think you justly term, "the absurd and foolish theory invented by the orthodox world."

This system I cannot receive; and have therefore contented myself with the doctrine as stated in the Bible. There I read that the blood of Christ has a direct influence on the believing sinner—as by his blood the sinner is reconciled to God, purged, sanctified, cleansed, purified, washed, cleansed from sin, etc. These divine effects of the blood of Christ are of very frequent occurrence in the scriptures, but are left out of the system of orthodoxy. In that system the whole effect of his blood is represented as having passed on God, his law and government. I am glad sir, that you have admitted that the death of Christ exerts a powerful moral influence upon the sinner. When you shall have proved from as plain, and as good witnesses as I have done, that his blood exerts, or has exerted a powerful moral influence on God, I shall joyfully receive the doctrine. Your friend.

EDITOR.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

City of New York, May 13, 1836.

Beloved Brother Stone—It affords me pleasure to have to say to you, that the good cause is still progressing east of the mountains. A wide field is open. If there could be obtained faithful laborers, I have no doubt but that the Gospel would triumph, and many souls be brought into the kingdom of Christ. I am in bad health at this time; but I feel strong in the Lord. About four weeks since I left home; I have preached a few times on the way, baptized 15 persons, seven of them in Hyattstown, where there is a good work begun.—May the Lord send them some faithful laborer! They have many adversaries. I am now about to take a sea voyage for my health. Dear Brother Stone, pray for me. May grace, mercy, and peace attend you in your declining years. In much haste, yours in the bonds of love—Farewell. JAS. McVEY.

Georgetown, June 3, 1836.

Dear Bro. Stone,—I have received your kind favor since my return from Bethel, Ohio, where we had a fine meeting. We received 5 at Bethel, and one at Higginsport. I then returned through Mason county, and received 6 more, amongst whom were the father and mother of Mrs. Ricketts upwards of 70 years old. He had been a good Presbyterian many years.

The harvest is ripe every where, almost.

Brother Burnet was at Warsaw at the same time, and 22 more were immersed. May the Lord bless you and yours—Affectionately

J. T. JOHNSON.

Poplar Hill, Fayette Co. Ky. June 12, 1836.

Dear Brother Stone—I have just returned from Union, where we have had a very interesting meeting, and as it is one of the churches you planted about 13 years ago, and where you have long labored as a Christian Teacher, I feel inclined to let you know what is still going on there. Yesterday our meeting commenced. Brother J. A. Gano, brother Wm. Parker and myself were the speakers. To day we had a crowded house, and an attentive congregation. Seven came forward and made the confession that Jesus is the Christ. Brother Gano and myself have appointed to preach and baptize them on next Wednesday at Brother Jas. Hursts; and from the attention, solemnity, and deep feeling manifested to day, I look for many others to obey the Gospel at that time. A Baptist who had long been a worthy member of the Baptist church, also made application for membership, desiring to enjoy that freedom and union that is to be found among those who have no creed but the Bible—and was added to the church at Union. The meeting to day reminded me of some I have seen there in former days, when we were cheered by your presence, and edified and comforted under your teaching and exhortation. This day week, and the day before, I was at Clintonville and its vicinity. On Saturday evening I preached at Gen'l Pendleton's in Clarke county, where I immersed four on profession of their faith in Jesus. They were, your old friend Jho. Allen, Mrs. Pendleton and her daughter, and Mrs Step.

On the 3 Lord's day in May 2 confessed the Lord at Antioch, and on the 5 Lord's day one more was added to the congregation. On the 30 ult. brother Palmer and myself had meeting at your son-in-law Capt. Moore's, where I immersed one. The good cause seems to be reviving a little in this country.

I am at present engaged in making preparations for my removal to Missouri; if the Lord will, I expect to set out early in Sept. next for Boone co. Mo. where I now calculate to spend my few remaining days on earth, in preaching the Gospel. THOMAS M. ALLEN.

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY. Lees-burgh, J. Watson, B. Coppage, L. Coppage, B. Shropshire, Sam. Linginfelter for 10. Henderson, Bro. Livesay 9, 10, J. Griffin 8, and 2 00 more. Dan'l F. Hatchitt for self for 10, 11, A. Fowlks, Ed. Jones, Eld. J. Hatchitt. Oak Grove, A. Blue 9, 10, Wm. Harelson 9, 10.—Graysville, J. T. Grubbs 10, Mr. Sterling, Eld. J. Smith paid J. T. Johnson 9 50.

TENNESSEE. Statesville, Post master Hubble for L. Eddings 7, 8—for Js. Ayres for 2, 3, 4. Lynchburgh, Js. Kyser 9, 10, H. Dean 10, Peterson Gramer 10, Hez. Brown 10. Isom's Store, 5 00 in full for 10.

ALABAMA. Moulton, C. McDonald 10 00, lost by mail—Walker, C. H. E. Randolph for self, Wm. Billingsley, Jep. Billingsely, Jesse Billingsley for 10, and for T. Payne, Js. Kenady, J. Sullivan 9, 10—in all 10 00.

Blountsville, J. A. Williams for M. Mede, G. P. Rice, Wm. Rector for 9, 10, and for self, A. H. Rackley, Wm. Self, Jer. Daily for 10.

OHIO. Manchester, J. Long 10. Rutland, S. S. Payne for B. Williams 5, 9, 10. Mansfield, Eld. Js. McVey for self and Js. Smalley for 10 and Aaron Matheny 9, and Mary Ann Nixon 10. Bethel, Neh. Tatnam, J. Fairfield paid J. T. Johnson for 10, and agent paid the same 50 cts. for old numbers. Ripley, A. Campbell 8, 9, 10.

MARYLAND. Js. McVey for Josiah Wolfe for 10, Lewis Ramsburgh 10.

INDIANA. Greencastle, G. R. Young 3 00 and Geo. Pearcy 2 00.—New Salem, J. Cartmel for T. Anderson, M. Stockwel, Geo. Flint, John Higgins, Js Smith, J. Patterson, S. Alley, S. Hays, Rob. Higgins for 10. Spencer, B Pierson, D. Baker, J. Johnson J. Snoddy, T. C. Johnson for 10. West Lebanon, Ezra purviance 5 00 in full for his agency for 10.

MISSOURI. Aubury, Fulton Thompson paid J. Hughs for 9, and myself for 10. Fulton, Wm, Russel for 6, 10, Js. Gray, W. Rogers, T. Collier, E. Coruth for 10. Jones' Tan Yard, Js, Moseby 10. Paris, O. Adams, Js. C. Fox 10. Florida, Eld. H. Thomas paid for all his agency 7 00, and for Isaac Hostutter of Frankfort for 7, 8, 9, 10. Hannibal, Wm. Darr, D. Dunlap 10. Palmyra, J. Manuel 9, 10. Columbia, Barger and Pockman 10, Doc. McMillen 6. Portland, Js. Love for self, Wm. B. Douglass 10, I. McMahen 8, 9, 10—These in hands of Wm. Russel. Liberty, J. Kurcandall 5 00 in full for 10.

GEORGIA. Emanuel Zuber for self, J. Lowe, D. Elder, Ed. Cox, Wm. Hendrix for 9—all lost by mail, yet letter preserved.

ILLINOIS. Jacksonville, Geo. Ritchie, Sam. Ritchie, N. Dewessee, Js. Todd for 10. Robt. Cassel, Doc. Cassel, Anne Cassel, each for 9, 10.—White Hall, Elder John Henderson 9. Cleary's Grove, L. Humphrey, Brother Masterton 10. Salt Creek, M. Hall 11 50 in full for 9, 10.—Berlin, Elder Sweet for A. E. Meacham, P. Poindexter, and W. Grant for 10. Sugar Creek, Col. Wm. Caldwell for 10. Lewistown, Eld. J. Scott for A. Baughman, J. M. Hartford, H. Rigdon. Wm. Ball for 10.—Springfield, T. Jones, T. Constant, Judge Logan, J. Langston, L. Gorley, A. G. Groves 10, G. Sanders 9, 10, P. Beers 9, 10, P. Latham 9, Geo. Dickson 9, Dr. Elkin 9, A. Trailer 9, D. England 9, Harrison Watson 9. Rochester, Js. Baker 10. Terre Haute, T. Parsons 10. Hollands Grove, Dan'l Travis 5 00 paid to D. P. Henderson. Mackinaw, A. B. Davis, R. Drane 9, 10, J. Allensworth, J. Smith, Geo. Hittle, Jac. Judy, M. Judy, J. Adams, J. Turley for 10, in all 11 75. Centreville, A. Baird 10 00 for 10—lost by mail, do. 4 00 in June 1836 for 10.

Walnut Grove, D. Travis 5 00 by D P Henderson.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY B. W. STONE:

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."—PAUL

VOL. X.] JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS, AUGUST, 1836. [No 8

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

Is published monthly, in Jacksonville, Illinois, at ONE DOLLAR a year, or for twelve numbers, if paid on the reception of the second number—or ONE DOLLAR AND TWENTY-FIVE cts. if not paid within six months. Persons procuring eight subscribers, and remitting the money to the editor, shall have one volume for their trouble. The postage to be paid by the subscribers. The postage is 12½ cents a year at any distance in the United States.

A few extracts from Eusebius, who wrote early in the fourth century, and Socrates, who wrote a little after.

THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

Eusebius quotes Josephus in these words. "There was at that time one Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, a worker of miracles, a teacher of them that embraced the truth with gladness. This same was Christ. And though Pilate, by the judgment of the chief rulers amongst us, delivered him to be crucified; yet there wanted not them, which from the beginning loved him.—He appeared to them alive the third day after his passion, as the prophets have foretold; not only these but innumerable more marvellous things of him; and to this day the christian people, which of him *borrow their name*, cease not to increase." Lib. 1, Cap. 12.

"Ireneus reporteth: Polycarpus (saith he) was not only instructed by the Apostles, and conversant with many which saw Christ, but also of the Apostles ordained bishop of Smyrna in Asia, whom we in our youth have also seen; for he lived long, and was very old, and at length finished this life with most glorious and renowned martyrdom."

Speaking of the trial of Polycarp, he says—"When he was come upon the theatre or stage, a voice came down from heaven (which by reason of the great tumult was heard of few) "Be of good cheer, O Polycarpus, and play the man." The speaker no man saw, but the voice was heard by many of us. When the proconsul urged and said, 'Swear, and I will let thee go; blaspheme and deny Christ; Polycarpus answered, Fourscore and six years have I served him, neither hath he ever offended me in any thing, and how can I revile my king, which hath thus kept me. Hear freely, I am a Christian."

"The Christians, which rightly do challenge that name, are far from falling away from the service due unto God, etc." Eus. Lib. 8, Cap. 22.