BEAUTIFUL APOLOGUE.

THE VIRTUE OF PATIENCE UNDER WRONG.—A dispute one day arose between Omar, son of Kattab, and one of his friends. The latter exceeding the bounds of civility, annoyed Omar very much by the terms he used. Omar, however, bore them with patience.—The prophet was present and listened without saying a word. Finding that his friend's tongue grew intolerable, Omar began to retort, whereupon the prophet turned his back and withdrew. Disturbed at this, Omar followed him and said, 'Prophet of God, why, when this man was pouring out abuse upon me, did you remain quiet, and as soon as I began to reply to him, why did you turn away?'

The prophet answered thus.

'As long as you listened patiently to that man's outrageous speech, angels were by you, each of whom made him ten replies; but the moment you began to reply to him yourself, the angels disappeared at once and left you alone with him.—*Asiatic Journal.*

MORE CATHOLIC PRIESTS!

We learn from the Daily Advertiser, that in the ship Francis Depau, from Havre, came passengers, Bishop Bute of Indiana, and 19 Catholic ecclesiastics, all for the Western country.

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY.—VERSAILLES, Diana Fisher, vol. 9; 10.
HOPKINSVILLE, Eld. W. Dunkeson 5 00. Wisconsin, F. Redding 1 00.
TENNESSEE.—EXCHANGE OFFICE, C. Gist, 9, 10, 11.
ILLINOIS.—JACKSONVILLE, E. Rice 10. CARROLLTON, Br. Rampey 2 50.
RUSHVILLE, L. Benton 10. KNOXVILLE. J. Eads 10.
INDIANA.—CYNTHIANN, Jos. Rosboro, R. C. M'cConnel, Sam. Miller, J. Mangrum, R. B. Richards, for 10. BUSROW MILLS, Rich'd Maxwell 5 00, for 10, lost by mail. BRUCEVILLE, Wm. Bruce for 9, 10, Ludazer 10, Jesse Gude 9, 10, lost by mail. ILTON, John Crum. R. Leason, A. Crum. F. Graham, C. Roberson, for 10 lost by mail.
RUSHVILLE, Eld J. Longley 15 00
OHIO.—MAYFIELD, B. Sanders, J. Pugsley for 9, lost by mail.
MISSOURI.—COLUMBIA, B. F. Proctor 10. MILLERSBURGH A. Miller 10.
ALABAMA.—MANNINGHAM, A. Dickerson 5 00.

My losses by mail are too heavy to be borne. Money sent by mail to me is very precarious. Can nothing be done to correct the evil? I advise my friends, after enclosing the money well in a letter, to direct the letter to some known honest friend of theirs living near me, with directions to hand the money to me, and I will pay the postage. My wants must be relieved or I must be greatly embarrassed. Not more than one third of the present and last vol. is yet paid. Will not my patrons pay their dues? and pay speedily? EDITOR.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY B. W. STONE:

AN ELDER IN THE HURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. X.] JACKSONVILLE. ILLINOIS, NOV. 1836. [No 11

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.

SACRIFICIAL BLOOD.

The apostle Paul, the greatest and best expositor of Moses, states plainly, that the primary design of the blood of sacrifices, is to purge or cleanse that which is defiled, unclean and sinful. Heb. 9, 22—"For almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission."

Let us particularly enquire what those things were, that were purged with blood, and how they were purged.

1. The altar was one. Ezek. 43, 18——26—"And he said unto me, these are the ordinances of the altar—thou shalt take of the blood thereof (a young bullock) and put it on the four horns thereof, and on the four corners of the settle, and upon the borders round about. Thus shalt thou cleanse and purge it (the altar,) and on the second day thou shalt offer a kid of the goats without blemish for a sin offering; and they shall cleanse the altar as they did cleanse it with the bullock. When thou hast made an end of cleansing it, seven days shall they purge the altar and purify it." Lev. 16, 18, 20—"And he shall go out unto the altar, and make an atonement for it, and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. And when he hath made an end of reconciling the altar," etc.

Dr. J. Taylor in his Hebrew Concordance says, the word atonement is always in the Old Testament, rendered from some tense or noun derived from the root *keper*, or *kaphar* with the points, nor is there any Hebrew word we translate *atonement*, but what comes from that root.

Now with respect to the case of purging the altar, we remark—that Moses and Ezekiel were describing the same thing in nearly the same language. The altar was defiled by the uncleanness of the

children of Israel. It must be cleansed or purged. How? Ezekiel states it—"Thus (by the blood of a bullock) shalt thou cleanse and purge (*keper*) it." Moses states it thus—"He shall make an atonement (*keper*) for it." Again: Ezekiel states the case thus—"Seven days shall they purge (*keper*) the altar." Moses states the same thing thus—"seven days shalt thou make an atonement [*keper*] for the altar," Exod. 29, 37. Again; Ezekiel states—"when thou hast made an end of cleansing it [the altar.]" Moses states it—"when thou hast made an end of reconciling (*keper*) the altar." The effect of this sacrificial blood was to cleanse, to hallow, to sanctify and to make the altar most holy; or in the language of Paul the inspired commentator of Moses, it was to purge the altar. As this effect is described by *keper*, frequently translated, *to make an atonement*, and *to reconcile*, we conclude that to make an atonement with sacrificial blood, to reconcile and to purge are synonymous expressions, all translated from the same word *keper*.

That the word *keper* is frequently translated *purge*, I refer to any Hebrew concordance of the scriptures. A few texts I will set down. Num. 35, 33—"For the land cannot be *cleansed* (*keper*) of the blood shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." 1 Sam. 3, 16, "I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged [*keper*] with sacrifice, nor offerings forever."—Psalms, 65, 3—"As for our transgressions, thou wilt purge [*keper*] them away." Psalms 79, 9—"O God, purge away [*keper*] our sins for thy name's sake." Prov. 16, 6—"By mercy and truth iniquity is purged [*keper.*]" Isai. 6, 7—"And he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, thy sin is purged (*keper.*)" Isai. 22, 14—"Surely this iniquity shall not be purged [*keper*] from you till you die."—Isai. 27, 9—"By this therefore, shall the iniquity of Jacob be purged (*keper.*)

Would it not be better always to translate the verb *keper*, as the New Testament writers have done, by the Greek word *atro* with its compounds, to purge, to cleanse, to take away, etc., than by the common rendering, *to make an atonement*, or *to reconcile?* Instead therefore, of reading *to make an atonement* for the altar, the tabernacle and the people, read *to purge* the altar, the tabernacle and people.—But this will more plainly appear from what follows.

2. I have shewn one of those things purged with blood, i. e., the altar. I now proceed to another, viz, a leprous house. Lev. 14, 52, 53. "And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, but he shall let go the living bird, and make an atonement (*keper*) for the house; and it shall be clean." How much more intelligibly would it read thus, "and *purge* the house, and it shall be clean." As the Psalmist, 51, 7, says, "purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean."

3. Another thing purged with blood is the tabernacle. Lev. 16, 16; 19, 20. "And he shall make an atonement [*keper*] for the holy

place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel—and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation. And when he hath made an end of reconciling [*keper*] the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar." Ezek. "Thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and cleanse the sanctuary. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering, and put it upon the posts of the house, and upon the four corners of the settle of the altar, and upon the posts of the gate of the inner court—so shall ye reconcile (*keper*) the house." Does not every person at one glance see how preferable would be the translation in these texts, *to purge* the holy place because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, than *to make an atonement* for it because of the uncleanness of Israel, and, so shall ye *purge* the house, instead of so shall ye *reconcile* the house? This is certainly the proper rendering, because Moses describes the effect to be, to cleanse the sanctuary, and Paul in reference to this very case, declares that the tabernacle was *purged* with blood. Heb. 9, 21, 22.

I have already shewn that the expressions, to reconcile and to make an atonement, are synonymous, being translated from the same word *keper*. To remove all doubt, I will introduce a few more texts. Lev. 6, 30. "And no sin offering whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle to reconcile (*keper*) withal in the holy place, shall be eaten. Lev. 16, 27—"And the bullock for the sin offering, whose blood is brought in to make atonement (*keper*) in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp, and they shall burn," etc.

Lev. 8, 15—And Moses took the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar, and purified the altar, and sanctified it to make reconciliation (*keper*) upon it." Now to make atonement on the altar is the doctrine of the law, every where stated.

Ezek. 45, 15, 17, 20—"And one lamb for a burnt offering, to make reconciliation (*keper*) for them—to make reconciliation (*keper*) for the house of Israel. So shall ye reconcile (*keper*) the house."

Dan. 9, 24—"Seventy weeks are determined, to make reconciliation (*keper*) for iniquity."

To make an atonement, or reconciliation for iniquity, or for uncleanness, is proved already, it is believed, to mean, to purge, or cleanse from them. But to remove every doubt, I will bring forward a few more texts. Lev. 12, 7, 8—"Who shall offer it before the Lord, and make an atonement (*keper*) for her, and she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood." Here the phrase is explained beyond all doubt. 8—"And the priest shall make an atonement (*keper*) for her and she shall be clean." Lev. 15, 15, 30—"And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord for his issue." Lev. 16, 30—"On that day shall the priest make an atonement (*keper*) for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." Num. 8, 21—"And Aaron made an atonement

(*keper*) for them [the Levites] to cleanse them." I need add no more in proof of what cannot be denied with any show of argument.

4. I have shewn that the altar, the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and a leprous house were all purged with blood. I will further remark that the people were also purged with blood. So said Paul Heb· 9, 21, 22. Also, Lev. 9, 7—"And Moses said unto Aaron, Go unto the altar, and offer the sin offering, and thy burnt offering, and make an atonement (*keper*) for thyself, and for the people; and offer the offering of the people, and make an atonement (*keper*) for them." Lev. 14, 19, 20, 21, 29, 31—"And the priest shall offer the sin offering, and make an atonement (*keper*) for him [the leper] that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness—and the priest shall make an atenement [*keper*] for him, and he shall be clean." On this point there is an abundance of cases unnecessary to mention.

Forgiveness always accompanies purging by sacrifice. Lev. 4, 20—"And the priest shall make an atonement [*keper*] for them, and it shall be forgiven them." The meaning of which, as proved above is, that the priests by sacrificial blood shall purge them, and they shall be forgiven. For this is the very doctrine of Paul—"almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission, or forgiveness." Blood purges and forgiveness follows.

Lev. 4, 26—"And the priest shall make an atonement—*keper*—for him, as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him." The same is found in verses 31, 35.

Le. 5, 10—"And the priest shall make an atonement [*keper*] for him for his sin, which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him. The same expressions are found in verses 13, 16, 18.

Lev. 19, 22—"And the priest shall make an atonement [*keper*] for him for his sin, and the sin which he hath done shall be forgiven him." Num. 15, 25, 28—"And the priest shall make an atonement [*keper*] for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and it shall be forgiven them."

So intimately are *purging* and *remission* or forgiveness connected, that they are sometimes expressed by the same word, *keper*. 2 Chr. 30, 18, 19—"But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon [*keper*] every one of them, that prepareth his heart to seek God the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. Psalm 78, 38—"But he being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity."

Jer. 18, 23—"Yet Lord, forgive [*keper*] not their iniquity."

Deut. 21, 8—"Be merciful, [*keper*] O Lord unto thy people Israel, and lay not innocent blood unto thy people Israel's charge, and the blood shall be forgiven [*keper*] them."

Deut. 32, 43—"He will be merciful [*keper*] unto his land and people." *To be merciful unto*, frequently means to forgive—to remit sin—as Heb. 8, 12, and 10, 18—"I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more."—"Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin."

The word *keper* or *caphar* generally signifies to cover. See Parkhurst, and Taylor on the word. As Gen. 6, 14—"And thou shalt pitch it, [*kepher*] [the ark] within and without with pitch" (*keper*)—that is, cover over the wood entirely. In allusion to this, the forgiveness of sin is represented by being covered. Neh. 4, 4, 5—"O our God, give them for a prey in the land of captivity, and cover not their iniquity, and let not their sin be blotted out from before thee." Psalm 32, 1—"Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." Comp. Rom. 4, 7, and Psalms 85, 2—"Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people; thou hast covered all their sin." When sin is forgiven, it is then covered from view. God represents it as cast behind his back—cast into the depths of the sea, so as to be seen and remembered no more against the sinner.

The word *keper* in Num. 35, 31, 32, is translated satisfaction. "Ye shall take no satisfaction (*keper*) for the life of a murderer, who is guilty of death; but he shall surely be put to death. And ye shall take no satisfaction [*keper*] from him that is fled to the city of his refuge, that he should come again to dwell in the land, until the death of the priest." No atonement, no sacrifice, purging, or forgiveness could be admitted in these cases according to law. No ransom, however great, could redeem them—no bribe should cover the eyes of the judges to remit the penalty.

I have been thus particular in order to prove the point that the primary design of sacrificial blood under the law, was to purge from uncleanness, and pardonable iniquity; and that forgiveness and remission inseparably followed. In my next number I will shew that the blood of the Lamb of God, the great sacrifice for sin, is designed to effect the same thing in the obedient believer.

EDITOR.

To Be Continued.

Morgan Co. Ia. Sept. 12, 1836.

My much esteemed and venerable Brother Stone—Having seen a piece in the May number of the Messenger, written by sister Lois Clark, my attention was unusually called to the subject matter which it contained. And as you laid open the pages of the Messenger for an investigation of the subject, I have had the temerity to send you the following remarks on the subject of Sister Clark's letter; which if you think proper, you may give to the brethren, and sister Clark through the medium of the Messenger. Not that I wish to enter into a controversy with our beloved sister; for then some modern Solomon might say that a new thing under the sun had come to pass. But I design to throw a few things before sister Clark, and the brethren, on a subject of so much importance.

But, not to be tedious—Sister Clark thinks that christians ought to embody and throw their interests together, and have all things common. Her reason for thinking so is, because the church at Jerusalem did so under the direction of the Holy Spirit. This reason looks plausible, and to this point we shall direct our enquiry.

First, then, let us consider some of the circumstances by which this Heaven-sealed church was surrounded. The disciples had heard the prophets say, that Jerusalem should be trodden under foot of the Gentiles, and ploughed as a field. They had heard their Lord say, that the generation then standing around him should not pass away until that awful day of vengeance had come upon that devoted city and nation. In view of such circumstances as these, what could the disciples do? It would have been needless for them to have retained their property; for they knew if they did, it would soon be swept away by the Roman army. But directed by the unerring Spirit, those who had land, sold it—and they had all things common; and no man said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own. But I ask, does it follow that because the church at Jerusalem, thus acted, therefore all churches, in all time coming, should do likewise?—Sister Clark responds in the affirmative. How we differ! But I would ask, were not all the churches which were planted and set in order by the inspired apostles, heaven-sealed?—I know that my sister will admit that they were. Again I ask, did all or any of the Gentile churches ever embody and throw their interests together, and have all things common? I take the negative and now for the proof.—Paul tells Timothy to teach the church at Ephesus—1 Tim. 6, 17—charge the rich in this world not to be elated in mind, nor to trust in uncertain riches. Now from this passage we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that some of the members of this heaven-sealed church held personal property, for they were rich, and if they had all things common, there was no propriety in the apostle saying *the rich*, if there had been no poor. Again, same Let. 5, 8—For if any one provide not for his own and especially for those of his own house, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. This never could have been said of a man, unless he had a separate interest. Now let us hear some of Paul's language to the Corinthians. Last chapter of the 2nd letter he says—On the first day of the week let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered. Now I ask how the Lord could prosper one man more than another, if they had all things common. But once more—3 Thess. 3, 12—Now them who are such, we command and beseech by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work and eat their own bread. This looks like individual interest, or claim. Indeed to destroy the idea of individual interest, is to destroy the idea of individual contribution, so much commended by the apostles! But here let me state that I very much deplore that awful state of things of which sister Clark bitterly complains. And to

remedy the evil I would say, let us all put on charity which is the bond of perfectness. Practice holiness in the fear of the Lord.—Let us have the same mind that was in Christ. In short, let us reduce to practice what we profess. Let the laws of Jesus Christ be executed, and we should never find one extortioner, drunkard, covetous man, etc., in all the kingdom of Christ.

This hint must suffice for the present. May the Lord direct us into all truth, is the prayer of Your Sister in the Lord,

SALLY TREAT.

REMARK.

I am pleased with our Sister's communication, and think it contains the truth, with one exeeption—which is this. She thinks the disciples in Jerusalem sold their possessions by the direction of the Spirit, because they believed according to prophecy, that those possessions would be destroyed with the city itself. I ask sister Treat, Suppose she had possessions which she certainly knew by divine premonition, or otherwise, would be destroyed in a very short time, and consequently useless to herself, or to any body else—should she under this firm belief, sell those possessions to another for a fair price, would she act honestly? Would it not be in common language, downright cheating? and shall we say this was by the direction of the Spirit?

I was once travelling—my horse was taken sick with a violent fit of cholic. A waggoner came up, and with great kindness and exertion relieved my horse. Now friend, said he to me, take my advice, sell this horse immediately, for the next fit of cholic he has, he will certainly die. I ask, did this advice proceed from honesty? and should I have acted honestly in following his advice? If on this principle the disciples at Jerusalem had acted, where shall we find their honesty, liberality, and charity?

EDITOR.

The Church of Christ at Mount Vernon, Posey county, Indiana: To the Brethren composing a meeting of correspondence, to be holden at Jacksonville, Illinois, on the Friday before the 5th Lord's day in October, instant.

Dear Brethren—Having heard of your meeting through the medium of the Christian Messenger, we have resolved to correspond with you. We wish to let you know of our existence as a church, so that travelling, preaching brethren, whom we cordially invite to visit us, may know where to call on us. We answer your first enquiry in the affirmative. We do feel it our duty to aid in evangelizing the world. The second enquiry—We have an individual among us, namely, brother Elijah Goodwin, able to discharge the du-

ties of an Evangelist, but we are unable to send him of ourselves.—We have solicited sister churches to aid us, but failed to get assistance. We proposed ourselves giving him about a hundred dollars. We are at peace among ourselves, and hope we are with all the world. Our number is small, but increasing. We have lately had times of refreshing. A number in our neighborhood have lately made a good profession. Fourteen within the last two or three weeks have joined our church. There is a general move—a general enquiry, what shall we do to be saved. If your meeting send any travelling preachers abroad, we want a share of their labors.—We will contribute to their support according to our abilities. We have an appointment for a correspondence meeting at this place, commencing the Friday before the second Lord's day in December next, at which we wish the attendance of foreign brethren. We shall hold a two or three days meeting at this place on the second Saturday and Lord's day of May next, and September, and invite the assistance of preachers from your section of country. If they come, we will bear their burdens by contributing to them of our carnal things.

Done by order of the Mount Vernon Church of Christ, October 8, 1836. EBENEZER PHILLIPS, *Clerk.*

Brother Stone—The above was written with the idea that I would attend your conference meeting, but my business being such that I could not leave home, we resolved to send it by mail, and if it reach you in time, we wish you to lay it before the meeting addressed through it.

The cause of Christ is gaining influence here. Last Lord's day week I Baptized nine, and on last Lord's day one. On yesterday week my brother baptized five making in all fifteen who have been baptized in about ten days. There are more whom we expect soon to obey the Lord in the same ordinance. I am, dear brother, yours in Christ, ELIJAH GOODWIN.

This communication was not received in time to lay before the meeting addressed. EDITOR.

GEORGETOWN KY. Oct. 19, 1836.

Brother Stone—We have had the pleasure of brother Scott's company and labors with us for about three weeks past. We were at Leesburg three days with brother John A. Gano and had a most happy and successful time. Nine made their obedience to the Lord of glory, and the prospects were most cheering for more.

We then went over to Madison county, from whence I have just returned. We labored at different points, but would have done more had we remained at one place. We however had a most glorious time for about ten days. We had the great pleasure to witness the submission of twenty persons, who rejoiced our and their own hearts. Among the number was a near female relative of mine, 88 years of age. Oh! she rejoiced. The prospects still fine for more. Brother Scott has acquitted himself as a noble and skilful defender of the faith, and endears himself to all the brethren wherever he goes. His invaluable work is highly praised by the friends of the cause, and is making its way into many families. I start in a day or so for Ghent and Liberty again. I am now clear of my editorship, and I hope to labor more and more in the good cause. All is well. Most affectionately yours, J. T. JOHNSON.

A few friendly remarks on brother Walter Scott's views of atonement, contained in his last book, "The ancient Gospel restored." [I have made these remarks in order to turn the attention of the brethren from speculation to the scriptures of truth.]

Brother Scott has said much on respite of punishment with respect to Adam and his posterity—all drawn from uncertain premises. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," is the translation of King James's translators. From this brother Scott concludes that Adam, and in him all his seed, that very day of transgression *must* die, or God's word *must* fail. But it is evident that he did not die on that day; it would therefore seem that the word of God did fail. But this conclusion cannot be admitted—to evade which has puzzled theologians much. Brother S. evades it by saying, that "he (our heavenly Father) respited them, or suspended for a time their fate."—page 49. This appears to be unauthorized speculation.—By adopting marginal reading this difficulty disappears—"in the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." This was literally fulfilled. For on that very day of transgression he began to die, and continued to die till he ultimately expired, some hundreds of years after. This was evidently the meaning of God's threatening. In adopting this translation, acknowledged by critics of eminence to be the best, all those speculations introduced to secure the truth of God, are rendered useless, and nugatory. Indeed, according to the common translation received by brother Scott, maugre all speculation, the truth of God's threat would appear dubious.

Brother S. has introduced a good deal of philosophy in his definition of justice. He has commercial justice—civil or legal justice, political justice, communicative justice, distributive justice. It reminds me of our orthodox brethren's definition of faith, as the faith of credence, the faith of assurance, the faith of reliance—a temporary faith, a historical faith, a saving faith, etc. These are rather

calculated to bewilder than to edify. Faith is one, and so is justice. Shall we establish a philosophic theory of justice, by which to judge of God, and his ways? It would not only be vain and unwise, but presumptuous, for us, poor ignorant worms. What is justice in God? It is to do right. What is justice in man? It is to do right. This rule of right to us is the Revelation God has given us. This definition is intelligible to babes in knowledge. What saith the scripture, should be our polar star in all our enquiries; and not, What says erring and vain philosophy?

Brother Scott attempts to answer an objection against his theory. "It is objected," says he, "that there can be no demonstration of justice in that case in which the innocent is made to suffer instead of the guilty."—This objection has never been removed satisfactorily to him, he acknowledges; and therefore he proceeds to do it according to what he deems the truth. Had he stated the objection in its full force, his answer would appear as unsatisfactory, as any he may have read or heard. The objection is this, when forcibly proposed, "that there can be no demonstration of justice in punishing the innocent instead of the guilty, and in clearing the guilty by imputing the punishment of the innocent to him." That the innocent suffer for, or on account of the guilty, is a very common case in the divine government, disputed by none; nor has the justice of it ever been denied. Now we will attend to brother S's answer to the objection above stated. "The just person receives nothing, gives nothing, but is acting politically, and as the guardian of the public safety. If, therefore, ten innocent persons should voluntarily offer themselves for one guilty one—that the law might be magnified, he is not unjust —the community is only the more secure."—Now I ask, what government on earth ever saw the justice of such procedure so as to incorporate such a law in their code? Even the tyrant of the Locrenans had not such a law—he only devised the plan of saving his guilty son's eyes by submitting to lose one of his own. This may be called political justice by philosophers, but what saith the scripture? Ezek. 18, 4, 20—"Behold all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; 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." It may be said, that in these cases, neither the son nor the father was *made to suffer* by law, but should the innocent son voluntarily give up himself to suffer or to die in the stead of the guilty father, it would be just for the ruler to accept it. But let it be asked, has the son a divine right to give up his life in this manner? Does not the Lord say, "all souls are mine"? Where in the book of laws is it said that God the great Ruler will accept the life of an innocent person or even ten in the stead of the guilty, so as to clear the guilty from punishment? When this is found in the law of God, I

will cheerfully acknowledge it just, "for the judge of all the earth will do right." Till this be done, the objection is not answered, but to me remains in full force.

But it may be said that Christ did voluntarily lay down his life for the sheep. But did he do this judicially in the room and stead of the guilty, that the law might be honored and glorified in clearing the guilty? But he laid down his life by authority received from the Father. John, 19, 18. And the same authority is given us; but can the innocent man now lay down his life judicially instead of the guilty? Will the law of God admit it?—But in what sense did Christ lay down his life for the sheep? The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. The hireling fleeth, when the wolf cometh, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep. The hireling will not venture his life to oppose the wolf when coming to destroy the sheep; but the good shepherd exposes his life to rescue them as David did from a lion and a bear.

It is written that Christ laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.—1 John 3, 16. If then Christ laid down his life in the stead of us, so as to clear us from guilt, then Christians must lay down their lives in the stead of their brethren. What! in a judicial sense? No: "they ought to lay down their lives; therefore it is their duty to do it. But surely they do not this in the stead of the brethren, to free them from judicial punishment, in order to magnify and glorify the law. What law admits it? What law would accept it? This is the question.

Aquilla and Priscilla, said Paul Rom. 16, have for my life, laid down their own necks." To save his life, they exposed their own. "For a good man some would even dare to die." Rom. 5. Of this fact there are scores of instances on record, and in the memory of man. Such should be the love of christians to one another—such was the love of Christ to us; beautifully represented by the love of the hen for her brood, exposing herself to the cold winds and rains to secure her brood from suffering—flying to meet her enemy, the hawk when coming to take her chickens. The very language of her conduct is, here, enemy, take my life, but spare the life of my beloved brood. So acted Jesus, and so his whole conduct in the world speaks.

I have a few objections to brother Scott's theory, or to Fuller's if you please. First, it wants the sanction of scripture. This appears plain, because very little scripture is quoted in proof of it: but philosophy and paganism are substituted. True this text is often mentioned, "he shall magnify the law and make it honorable;" but is it any where hinted in the Bible that this was done by his death? No: we might as well say it was done by his resurrection from the dead. The truth is, he magnified and glorified the law by rescuing it from the false glories of the Rabbis; and yielding to it perfect obedience. Had it not been a good law, he would not have done it this honor.

2. Another objection I have is, the dangerous tendency of such a theory. Let it once become a law, (and why not if it be just?) that an innocent person may be punished, or made to suffer in the stead of the guilty, so as to free the guilty from punishment, how many innocent children would give their lives for their wicked parents condemned to die! How many innocent parents would die in the stead of their guilty children! And innocent friends for guilty friends! Say not, this would be unnatural, and would never take place. Go to Hindoostan, and see a refutation of this in the thousands of wives who for love to their deceased husbands, or for tyrant custom, submit to be burnt on the funeral pile.

3. Another objection is, that it is contrary to good government. Here is a man whose hands are red with repeated acts of murder, and still inclined to the same acts: he is wicked in in every sense, and full of all mischief to the community. He is apprehended and condemned to die by the laws of the country. When under the gallows, an innocent, honorable and good man proposes to die in his stead: he is accepted: he dies, and the guilty, hardened wretch is turned loose again on society to their injury. Is this for the public good? Can that law be good which admits of it? Can it or the maker of it be worthy of honor? Can it be just?

But why talk of objections against an unscriptural theory? As philosophers we might enter the arena as disputants; but as christian, whose faith is solely based upon the scriptures, by profession, we are bound to succumb to "What saith the scriptures?"

It is conceded that Adam and his seed would have been under the power of death, natural death, forever, had not Christ the *resurrection* interposed. The threatening of God was natural death. This threat was actually executed upon Adam and his seed, according to the intention of God the great Ruler. In this, God's truth was secured, had Christ never interposed. If God had threatened that Adam and his seed should die, and never live again, there would have been an end of hope; for had they lived again, the truth of God had failed. Room was left for the exercise of favor, the favor of raising them from the dead. This was one grand part of the work of Christ. Adam by disobedience to a positive law, brought death upon all mankind; Christ by obedience to another positive law, brings all mankind from death to natural life; for they shall be raised again. These laws were founded on the will of God, and therefore must be just and right. Why then, so much speculation on the justice of God, in order to secure the honor of his law, and of his truth?

In one thing the christian world can agree, and do agree, "That God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation, or mercy seat through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness that he might be just, and the

justifier of him who believeth in Jesus," Rom. 3, 25. One thing is done by the blood of Jesus, which is, that God might be just in justifying the believer in Jesus. What this one thing is, God has not revealed; and Bishop McGee says, he knows not, nor is he concerned to know what it is. Others, wiser than he, think they know all about this one thing, and have invented their various theories of speculation, as that the demands of law and justice were satisfied, our debt paid, grace purchased, etc. Why indulge in such speculation? Is it not sufficient to believe that God, through the mediation and death of his son, has declared that he can be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus?

EDITOR.

HOME, November 1, 1836.

Brother Stone—Brother G. W. Elley and myself have just returned from a trip to New Liberty, where we had a most delightful time. Ten happy persons came to the foundation of the Apostles, etc.—Two of the number were from the Baptist Church. The prospects there are as fluttering as ever. I am more convinced upon every experiment, that two evangelists ought to go together. We touched at Warsaw and Ghent in the rout, and had a pleasant meeting; but the notices were not long enough to have as large congregations as we should have had there.

May the Lord bless and preserve you all to his everlasting kingdom, is the prayer of your affectionate brother in the Lord.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Brother J. G. Ellis of Dry Creek, Campbell county, writes Nov. 6—"In the last twelve months, fifteen persons have joined the congregation here, and upwards of forty in the several places where I preach."

Brother Js. Young, of Florence Ala. writes Oct. 28—Five were lately added to the church here, and tho prospect is good. At Moulton a week ago, six confessed the Savior, and five were immersed. At Carrollville, Tenn. I attended a meeting 4th Lord's day of August, and baptized four. We constituted a church there of fourteen members about a year ago: it now numbers twenty-eight.

The Presbyterian congregation in Jacksonville, Ill. has lately separated, and worship no longer together. The same thing has taken place in Madison, Ia. I have understood the cause to be, the old and new school doctrines, as they are called.

By the Baptist Banner, we are informed that the Mad River association of Baptists, Ohio, have recently cut off a number of churches, because they were supporters of Bible, Missionary, Education, Sunday School, Tract and Temperance Societies. These churches thus forcibly cut off, collected in a neighboring village, and organized as the Miami Association, and went on regularly with their business.

The grand revolution in the Christian world, is donbtless commenced. The fire of discord has long been gathering strength in all the sects, and now begins to burst forth in hostile divisions. The Lord will yet bring order out of confusion, and that order will be the same established 18 centuries ago. The church must be one.

OBITUARY.

Died on the 5th of October last, Charles Brite, at his father's in Callaway county, Mo. He was taken with congestive fever a few days after his return from College in Jacksonville Ill. in which he was a student. For twenty days his illness continued intensely severe.

Seldom have we recorded a death more distressing to us than this. He was certainly a youth of great promise; he was beloved by all who knew him for his amiable character, his diligent attention to his studies, and his whole moral deportment. We sincerely sympathize with his parents and relatives for the loss of such a son; yet resignation is our duty. To us he was as a beloved child.

EDITOR.

So great and distressing have been the sickness and affliction of my family since the latter part of July, that I have had little opportunity to attend to the Messenger. I myself have just been snatched from the jaws of death, and am yet only able to walk about the house. The tenth volume will be closed with the next number. I have in a back number stated that if I continue the work, it will be considerably enlarged, stitched in printed covers at 1 50 for 12 nos. of 32 pages each. My agents and friends, if they desire the work to continue, must send me a new list of subscribers, seeing many of my old ones are dead or moved off to other countries. If a sufficient number be sent before the first of March next, I will continue the Messenger; if not, I shall desist, and employ my few remaining days in something else. If my friends are disposed that the work be continued, I should be glad to receive the lists of subscribers sooner than March. My patrons and agents must remember to send all letters to me free of postage. They would greatly oblige me by collecting what yet remains due.

PROSPECTUS OF THE

CHRISTIAN PANOPLIST.

The name is indicative of the design. While the advocates of every system, and the champions of every creed are being supplied with human weapons from their respective armories, we intend the Panoplist to be a depot for the armor of God, subject to the draft of every christian soldier. Notwithstanding the fearful odds in the field against us, we fear not the result. For if piour Eneas could vanquish the mighty Turnus, when by negligence he left behind him his Vulcanian steel, we feel assured that the weakest soldier of Zion when panoplied from Heaven, will be an overmatch for the strongest sectarian knight arrayed in the most approved armor of Greece and Rome. Viewing the matter in this light, we will, of course, give every knight of fair reputation and common abilities, the opportunity of defending his favorite cause or leader, under equal and impartial laws. We need not here specify the various subjects we mean to discuss, nor will we make any promises concerning the course we will pursue, as these matters will greatly depend on the circumstances that may surround us. But this much we will promise: we will do our best to vindicate the ways of God to man. We think that we have the means of giving a volume to the public, in some degree worthy of the great and good cause in which we are engaged.

CONDITIONS.

1. The Panoplist will be the Gospel Advocate continued under another title. We change the name, because there are so many "Advocates that confusion is often created in the minds of their different patrons. All the subscribers to the Gospel advocate will be considered subscribers to the Christian Panoplist, and the paper sent them accordingly, unless notice to discontinue be received by the first of December next.

2. It will be edited by B. F. Hall and Wm. Hunter, and issued monthly, commencing January 1837, on a super-royal sheet, the size of the stereotype edition of the Christian Baptist, and like that, in double columns. It will be printed on new type procured for the purpose.

3. It will contain one third more matter than the Gospel Advocate, but the price will be the same, viz: One dollar per annum, if paid on the receipt of the first number—one dollar and twenty five cents, if not paid within six months—one dollar and fifty cents, if not paid until the end of the year.

☞All communications on business with the Christian Panoplist, to be addressed to Wm. Hunter, Versailles, Kentucky—post paid.

Versailles, Oct. 6, 1836.

All who receive this prospectus are authorized and requested to act as agents for the Christian Panoplist, and forward their list of subscribers by the first of January next, or as soon afterwards as possible.

The brethren of the editorial corps will please insert our prospectus in their respective papers. EDITORS.

RECEIPTS SINCE LAST NUMBER.

KENTUCKY.—Hopkinsville, Ben Campbell vol. 9; Mrs. Shipp for 10; B. Woods 9, 10; D. Woodruff $1. Cloyds, N Gregg 9, 10. Carlisle, Jno Dougherty 10—This paid before by J Rodgers. Versailles, Elder L. Fleming for C. Ware 10; J. W. Craig $3 for 9, 9, 10; Wm Grady 10; J. Brown 9; H. Douglass 9; T. Grady 9; A. Summers 9; Sam. Nichols 10 G. W. Eller 10—of this he paid Wm Johnson 10 00.

ILLINOIS.—Green Plains, Sam. Knox 9; A. McMahon 9, J. Wills 10; H. Crawford 10. Holland's Grove, B. McCorkle 9, 10. Knoxville, Mothershead 9, 10; Monmouth, A. Reynolds for Wm. Murphy; Wil. Beckenpaugh, Jack Rust, A. Moore, E. Ground, E. Davidson, P. R. Haley, Cor. Dewesse, and J. M. Dodge, all for 10. Mackinaw, Mrs. Demming 1 50, for vol 11. Rushville, C. Johnson 9; Richd Doherty 9, 10. Franklin, L. Mayfield 9, 10. Jacksonville, A. Wright 10.

INDIANA.—Smockville, Saml. Maxwell 8, 9, 10; J. Ramsey 8, 9, 10; P. Tilford 8, 9, 10. Hillsboro', D. Purviance for Thompson and Harland 10—and 5 00 in Pamphlets. Mt. Vernon, E. Goodwin for self, A. Baker, F. Mills, E. Philips, and W. Finch, all for 10. Indianapolis, N. R Ellis 5 00 in full for his agency. Greencastle, Mr. Buckhannon 5 00. Stilesville, Wm Rawlings 5 00 in full for his agency.

OHIO.—Fairfield, E. Wheeler 10, W. Smith 10, A. Sparks 10, Mr Oldwin 10. This last in the p. m. hands at Fairfield.

WISCONSIN.—Des Moins, Frank Redding 10.

GEORGIA.—A. Clemens 10.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Wm Denny 10 00.

MISSOURI.—Lexington, S. Cox 9; A. Elliott 8, 9, 10. Columbia, B. F. Proctor 10. Millersburgh, A. Miller 10.

During our illness, several valuable communications were lost, and some obituary notices. We are sorry for it, but plead our great distress as our excuse. They may yet be found, and find a place in the next and last number of volume tenth. EDITOR.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY B. W. STONE:

AN ELDER IN THE HURCH OF CHRIST.

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

VOL. X.] JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS, DEC. 1836. [No 12

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.

In the Religious Herald, a popular and respectable periodical of the Baptist denomination printed in Richmond Virginia, we have read with much pleasure and interest, "A short outline of the Baptist denomination," taken from Allen's Baptist Register. Willingly would we transfer the whole of it into the Messenger, but it is too lengthy for my limited pages. I must content myself with a few extracts, on the principles avowed by the Baptists from the beginning to the present day. On this subject he says,

"I cannot help requesting attention to an important fact in this inquiry. That liberal and independent principles, with a devoted opposition to every species of usurpation over the conscience and religion of man, whether arising from Pope or King, generally characterized the Baptists, and for this they suffered. Such principles are avowed by the Redeemer himself,—they are essentially connected with the history now under consideration, and eminently distinguish the Baptist denomination at the present period. Dr. Mosheim, a Lutheran Divine, who wrote a valuable work on church history, states that the following position was maintained by the ancient Waldenses: "That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church he had established on earth, was an assembly of real saints, and ought therfore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all these institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and transform transgressors." "This principle," says Mosheim, "is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and discipline of the Baptists in Holland;" and I may add, of the Baptists in every part of the world at this moment.

Thus, then, we are connected with the ancient confessors, not only in agreement of opinion on the subject of baptism, but in rational and enlightened views of the rights of men, and the claims of God.