REPRINT OF THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER

PUBLISHER'S STATEMENT

It is our conviction that the writings of such men as Barton W. Stone and others who contributed from the fields of labor into the pages of *The Christian Messenger,* constitute some of the richest and most significant material this side of the New Testament.

The Christian Messenger reprint represents the combined efforts of hundreds of people. First, locating a complete set to photograph was a long search—a job we *never* attained! So far as our several months' research revealed, there is no extant complete set of these books in any one collection. Our work of photo reproduction was accomplished through "a little here, a little there," working from the basic set graciously made available by Roscoe Pierson, Librarian, Lexington Theological Seminary, Lexington, Kentucky. Among others helping in tracing down and supplying original copies were Enos Dowling (Lincoln Bible College), Lester Galbraith (Christian Theological Seminary), R. L. Roberts (Abilene Christian University), and Don DeWelt (Ozark Bible College), Wm. B. Miller (Presbyterian Historical Society), and David McWhirter, (Disciples of Christ Historical Society).

Especially grateful are we to R. L. Roberts, first for his urging that we coordinate the reprinting of the set, and second for producing a general index to the entire series. This required long hours of reviewing articles on his microfilm copy and assigning appropriate titles. The original indices at the end of each volume, as the reader will observe, were vague and inadequate. The general index is at the end of volume 14.

Sincere appreciation is expressed also to the hundreds who have entrusted us at Star Bible with their orders, a vote of confidence that gave us renewed courage and strength. We pray that these men of the early Restoration Movement will be duly honored, that many wise men will be led to their Savior, and that Jehovah's Name may be glorified through His Church now and evermore.

Alvin Jennings
Star Bible Publications
Fort Worth, Texas 76118

Dec., 1978

THE
CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST;

ASSISTED BY

Elders Tho's M. Allen and Jacob Creath, Jr. of Missouri:

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

VOL, XI.] JACKSONVILLE, ILL. SEPT. 1840. [NO. 1.

INTRODUCTION.

Some considerable time has elapsed since the Christian Messenger has been sent abroad. It never would have appeared again in the world, under my direction, had not some intelligent brethren urged the necessity of it in the "Far West," and promised me to co-operate in the work. Elders Thomas M. Allen, and Jacob Creath, Jr. of Missouri, especially, have given me assurance that they will liberally contribute to its columns. Their competency can be disputed by none who know them. With their aid, and with that of other brethren, we anticipate a work profitable to our readers. Without fear we shall state our firm convictions of truth, and urge them with scriptural argument to the acceptance of our fellow creatures. This we shall attempt in the meekness and gentleness of Christ, giving no offence in any wise to any man, unless to that unhappy class, who cannot bear to have their errors detected by the light of truth. We shall endeavor to avoid unnecessary, and bitter controversy which, too long for the interest of christianity has been indulged and practised by the professed advocates of religion.—Doctrine and precepts leading to piety, love, peace, and unity, shall have a prominent place in our columns—this is our polar star, by which we shall endeavor to guide ourselves, and direct others. We shall be close observers of the signs of the times, that the day of Christ come not upon us unawares. We shall notice the progress of truth in the conversion of souls, and in the building up of Zion, and record them for the comfort of our readers. We shall carefully watch anything like division among us, and

in the spirit of truth, labor to arrest its desolating, unchristian progress as soon as seen. We shall not be backward in reporting any public course among us, whose tendency is to destroy the work of God, and injure the progress of truth.

We have commenced in discouraging circumstances. Our subscribers are very few, and unless increased very considerably, the work cannot support itself without private sacrifices, which we are unable to make. Yet in the hope that the West will support one periodical among us we have commenced. If every brother or friend should think as we do, that such a work is necessary, and if each should try to obtain a few subscribers, and send them on to us in Jacksonville, Illinois, post paid; we think he would subserve the cause of truth. We solicit well written communications from competent breathren, especially notices of revivals in their knowledge. In all such notices we wish brevity, and simplicity; no *inuendos* of the mighty agent *I*, and no *puffing* of the co-agent *he*. This savors more of vanity than of religion.

The work will contain twelve numbers, thirty-two 12 mo pages issued monthly, at $1 25 a year. Agents who shall obtain eight subscribers, and shall collect, and remit to me the money, shall have the eighth vol. for his service. The money to be paid on the delivery of the second No.

INSTRUCTION TO POSTMASTERS:

The following is an extract of a letter from the Postmaster General, recently addressed to the Postmaster at Newport, R. I., to which we wish to call the attention of our subscribers;

"Postmasters may enclose the money in a letter, to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person and frank the letter, if written by himself, but if the letter be written by any other person the Postmaster cannot frank it."

Postage of this, each No. 1¼ sheets is, under 100 miles, 2¼. Over 100 miles, 3¾ cts.

NOTICE.

The wish of the brethren and friends generally, is, that the correspondence between myself, and Elder A. Campbell, on the various subjects connected with

the atonement, should be printed in the Messenger, from the commencement, in the same order in which it is printed in the Millenial Harbinger. With their wishes we shall comply.

ATONEMENT. NO. I.

JAACKSONVILLE, *Illinois*, March 30, 1840.

Brother Campbell—

LAST evening I returned from Missouri, after an absence from home of five weeks. I see in your Harbinger, for February last, a friendly invitation to me to correspond with you on a number of religious subjects, which you have named. The same thing you communicated to me privately some weeks before. I then answered you that I would take the proposal by you under consideration; but suggested to you my fears that, though we might discuss those points in a perfect Christian spirit, yet the minds of the people might be withdrawn from humble piety and devotion, to strife, contention, and division. My friends persuade me that such fears will never be realized. I have consented to comply with your invitation, though I am conscious that years have despoiled me of much of that vigor and strength of mind I may have once possessed.

All the subjects you have proposed are but so many fractions of one common denominator, which I shall call the atonement. To this they all refer.

You "affectionately solicit from me an essay on sin, and sin-offerings, scripturally setting forth the import of these terms in sacred writ."

1st. With respect to sin. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii. 4. "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." James iv, 17. From these two texts it is plain that sins are of two classes—sins of commission, and sins of omission; into which two classes, it is believed, that

all are resolvable. To treat of the tendency, and evil effects, and of the awful consequence of sin, is another subject, to which reference may hereafter be made in the progress of these numbers.

2nd. Your second inquiry is respecting sin-offerings. With regard to the victims offered for sin, as lambs, bullocks, goats, and the great anti-type, the Lamb of God, there can be but one sentiment in the Christian world—and that these victims for sin were offered to God, admits of no doubt. But the purpose, why these offerings were made to God for sin, has been, and yet is variously set forth by good, but erring men. Their discrepant, jarring systems on this subject, has long been the fruitful soil of discord, strife, and division.

Doctor A. Clark, on Lev. i. describes the purpose, end, or design of sacrifices or offerings for sin, thus: "By the imposition of hands, the person bringing the victim acknowledged, 1st. The sacrifice as his own. 2nd. That he offered it as an atonement for his sins: 3d. That he was worthy of death, because he had sinned, having forfeited his life by breaking the law. 4th, That he entreated God to accept the life of an innocent animal in place of his own. 5th, And, all this to be done profitably, must have respect to Him whose life in the fulness of time should be made a sacrifice for sin." From the 3d, 4th, and 5th items of this paragraph I must dissent, for the want of evidence, and because they stand in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures. The law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin. Sins of ignorance, and ceremonial defilement, only admitted of sacrifice for purification. Therefore the death of the victim could not be in the stead of the death of the offerer, seeing his sin did not require his death. But the D[illegible]r says farther, that the offerer, in order to be [illegible]olved, must have respect to Him whose life in the fulness of time should be made a sacrifice for

sin: I know it is a common opinion that the Israelites under the law always looked through their sacrifices to Christ the Lamb of God, who died on Calvary, without which view they could not be profited. Paul thought differently: he declared that the veil was on their heart, that they could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished. Now the thing abolished is sacrifices, and Christ was the end. Did they see this end in their offerings? Did the Jewish nation believe that Christ was to die? No: for when he taught them this truth, they said, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever." Christ crucified to the Jews was always a stumbling block, and is to this day to that unhappy people. The disciples of Jesus themselves could not believe that Christ was to die and rise again, till the facts proved the truth.

From these remarks it is evident that the Doctor, and all who think as he does, are mistaken. The design of the legal sacrifices was not to deliver from death, but to purify and cleanse the offerer, and thus make an *atonement* or reconcilation between him and his God and the congregation—before this purification was effected by sacrifice, he was separated by his sin and uncleanness from the fellowship of the congregation, not being permitted to enter the tabernacle and worship with them there.

This perfectly accords with the inspired views of the great commentator on Moses, Heb. ix. 22. "And almost all things by the law are purged with blood, and without the shedding of blood is no remission." One exception of the "all things purged with blood" by the law, is, the person guilty of a sin worthy of death, he must die without mercy under two or three witnesses—by the law there is no remission without shedding of blood, and as he is debarred by law from an offering for his sins, if he is forgiven, his forgiveness is not by sacrifice, or shedding of blood. Why does my brother Campbell so confidently assert that

"without shedding of blood there *never was* remission of sin"? *Christian System*, page 37. Was every moral transgressor under the law, and before the law, cut off by death, unforgiven? Though condemed by law to certain death, could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all, and as did many others recorded in the scriptures?

There are others who view the purpose or design of sin-offerings to be for reconciling God to us; so the Methodist Discipline states, that the death of Christ reconciled the Father to us. As this assertion is destitute of all scripture testimony, and as enlightened reason fails to lend her aid in its support, I pass it by as a relic of unauthorized tradition, probably taken from heathen mythology, or pagan customs. The pagans offered human as well as brute sacrifices for the purpose of appeasing or reconciling their angry gods to them; but this cannot be the design of divine sacrifices, whether under the Old or New Testament.

I am sorry my brother Campbell has very similar views with those just stated. You say, "Sacrifice atones and reconciles. It propitiates God and reconciles man. It is the cause, and these are its effects on heaven and earth, on God and man." *Christian System*, page 33. The sacrifice of Christ then, in your opinion, has an effect on heaven—on God, to *propitiate* him to man. "To propitiate is to appease one offended, and to render him favorable," *Webster*. Do, brother Campbell, point us to the scriptures that say that sacrifices either under the Old or New Testament, were ever designed to propitiate God, or that such an effect was ever produced or effected on him. This, to me, would be more convincing than volumes of speculation and philosophic reasoning from uncertain premises. Indeed, I think my brother has advanced a few steps farther than any other system-maker, when you say that "every sin wounds the affection of our heavenly father," and that the death of Christ "soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." *Christian System*, page 48, 49.

This is a strange *speech* to me; but if this be the doctrine or language of the Bible, do show it to us. Till then I shall be silent.

Others think that Christ by his death or sacrifice "magnified the law and made it honorable." Isaiah xlii, 21. Whether this text has any reference to Messiah is very doubtful. The context is against the idea. But admitting that the Messiah is intended, is it said that the law was magnified and made honorable by his sacrifice? Is there one hint of this in the text?—in the Bible? I can clearly see how he magnified the law and made it honorable, in his exposition of it in Matthew v. There he shows how spiritual, how extensive it was, extending from the sinful act to the very fountain of sin in the heart—he made it honorable in submitting to be made under it, and fulfilling every jot and tittle of it. Had it been a bad, dishonorable law, he would not have done it such honor. Did he, as the substitute of sinners, suffer the punishment which the violated law required of sinners in their stead, and thus pay their debts, that pardon might be granted consistently with the honors of law? By what inspired writer is this taught? I cannot find.

I have only hinted at the different theories current on the subject of sin-offerings, none of which can I receive without better testimony than I have yet seen. This I have done to prepare the way to state my own. For another number I must reserve that exposition. My avocations are many, and therefore I may be prevented from sending my communications regularly. Try to exercise patience with me. I have introduced a few sentiments of yours from your *Christian System*, in order that you may, if possible establish them by plain scripture, and not in the wisdom of words. If they be found true, I shall

joyfully receive them. May the Lord direct your mind and pen to the edification of the saints!

B. W. STONE.

A. C.'s REPLY TO B. STONE.

BROTHER STONE—

Dear Sir—I MOST cordially concur in opinion with those breth'n who have persuaded you that your fears were groundless, or would "never be realized," concerning the discussion of those points which you called for, under date of your letter of November 11, 1839, published page 21st of the current volume. The discussion of any of the grand elementary principles of the remedial or evangelical economy, "*in a truly Christian spirit*," never can, in my judgment, "withdraw the minds of the people from humble piety and devotion to strife, contention, and division." Shall those who love truth and peace fear that this love of peace and of truth, if fully developed, will issue in strife or impiety!

When in your kind epistle of November 11th, you asked me for my definition of a *Unitarian*, and assured me that you denied the name, though often applied to yourself, and urged me to say whether I "designed to co-operate with Trinitarians against Unitarians," &c: I felt it my duty to make the proposition alluded to in your letter of March 30th. I have done so in the full persuasion that the contemplated discussion is not only expedient, but necessary, and that it can be so managed as to disabuse the public mind of injurious prejudices both against you and myself. You have long disavowed Unitarianism, and I have also disavowed Trinitarianism and every other sectarianism in the land; and therefore that morbid state of feeling elicited by these partizan wars about the polemical abstrusities of metaphysical abstractions, which, in its excessive irritability, forbids the scriptural investigation of the great points which

have been so often distorted and mangled on the racks and wheels of party discord and proscription, should have no abiding in our minds, much less prohibit a scriptural examination of the facts, and precepts, and promises, on which these unhallowed theories have been reared.

The fear of irritating these old sectarian sores has, I verily opine, kept the minds of many brethren and of the public in suspense, if not in comparative darkness, upon the greatest question in this earthly world. There is no subject so vital to man as the death of Christ. The designs of his death are interwoven with all the designs of the universe, and are replete with the temporal, spiritual, and eternal destinies of man. Christ crucified is the most transcendant mystery in the moral dominions of God. Its power is the mainspring of all heavenly impulses, and it is itself the consummation of all divine wisdom and prudence. As all earthly waters arise from the ocean and descend to it, so the deep and the high counsels of God issue in this mysterious fact and emanate from it.

The subjects to which I invited your attention, my venerable brother—viz. Sin, Sin-offerings, Sacrifice for Sin, Atonement,"* &c. you very justly regard as terminating in what is usually called *the atonement*, or as all summed up in it. True, the doctrine of what is usually called "the atonement," is made to include the whole; but I designed no trite nor common-place examination of this subject, as it issues from the fiery furnace of sectarian zeal and bigoted devotion. I wish to explore the scriptural roots and grounds, the remote and the immediate connexions, bearings, and designs of "*the blood of the New Institution*."—I am glad, therefore, that you have so promptly advanced to the subject, and I most sincerely supplicate the FATHER OF LIGHTS to subdue our spirits and to imbue them with the holy spirit of the gospel of Christ; that,

* Page 82, vol. iv.

with all piety, benevolence, christian meekness and mildness, we may examine this great subject—so necessary to right conceptions of God, of Christ, and of ourselves.

You properly begin with SIN. Its existence, nature, and tendencies gave birth to the redemption that is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Wrong conceptions of this thing necessarily cast their penumbra over the Bible, and obscure all its golden treasures. I object not to your definition of *sin*, so far as it goes. You give us the word of the Lord for sin, as a violation of a law, and a neglect of it—commission of wrong, and ommission of right. Your quotations are appostite and striking. I will only add a definition in *fact*. There are definitions by words, and definitions by facts. Sin is the cause of death; or "*the wages of sin is death*," is verbal; but when we see Satan lose heaven, Adam lose Eden, and millions of infants lose life, we have a definition in fact, that death follows the substance standing in light. Sin, then, is a mortal thing. Death is in it. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." I emphasize on this, because of its bearings upon all bloody sacrifices—upon sin-offerings—upon the havoc of life under the Patriarchal and Jewish institutions.

2d. On sin-offerings as presented to God, all cordially harmonize; but, you say, not so on "the *purpose*" of them. You then review Doctor Adam Clark, and dissent from his conclusions. He is public property, and you have a right to lay on your warrant. I shall not dispute your right. You pronounce three of his conclusions, in your opinion, as in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures. Of course his friends will pronounce your conclusions in these three points, as, in their opinion, in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures; and thence we have Doctor Adam Clark and Dr. B. W. Stone as affirmative and negative; and their friends all take their station accordingly.

But you are led to express some important conclusions which involve some great scriptural facts, of which I am not so sure. These are:

1. "Sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement only admitted of sacrifice for purification." These sins you do not consider as deserving of death; and therefore you conclude that "*the death of the victim could not be instead of the death of the offerer*"—"seeing," you add, "his sin did not require his death." Your view, then, is, that the law made no provision for any sins but those of ignorance or legal defilement—that these were not mortal sins; and consequently the sin-offerings of the law save no one from death. Nay; you assert that "the law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law to offer a victim for sin." These are very important propositions, and deeply penetrate the whole subject of sin-offerings:—If legal atonement or expiation was made only for sins of ignorance or legal defilement, then they could not be typical of the death of Christ, else the death of Christ expiates only sins of ignorance. I must then conclude my brother Stone has expressed himself obscurely, or I have misconceived his meaning: for certainly he admits that the legal sacrifices were types of the true; and that the true sacrifice expiates more than sins of ignorance: for surely brother Stone believes that all manner of sins, excepting one, may be forgiven, because the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from *all* sin. There is a radical mistake here; I trust it is in my misconception of your meaning.

But is it a *fact* that the legal sacrifices and offerings expiate sins of ignorance only? Read Leviticus, vi 1 "If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in trade, or in a thing taken away by violence, or has deceived his neighbor, or has found that which was lost, and *lieth* concerning it, and sweareth falsely in any of all these things that a man doeth sinning therein, then it shall be because he has sin-

ned and is guilty; he shall make restitution, add one-fifth to it, and bring his offering to the priest; and the priest shall make an atonement [an expiation] for him; and it shall be forgiven him for anything that he has done in trespassing therein." Do You call these "sins of ignorance or legal impurities?" Or do you consider that there was no expiation or atonement made for them? I have been in error for many years if these were sins of ignorance or legal impurities, or if the law had no sin-offerings but for such sins as you have enumerated. I agree with you in differing in some points from Dr. Clark; but I cannot go quite so far as you go in these three items. But I have to do with Moses and Paul, and not with our erudite Doctors living or dead:

There is but one character for whom the law and for whom the gospel makes no purifying sacrifice. This is the man who presumptuously despised Moses and the Holy Spirit, or who renounces either dispensation. One of us may have mistaken this case. You say, "The law admitted *no person* worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin." You might have said, The gospel admits *no person* who, under it, has forfeited his life by dispising or renouncing it, to any forgiveness through Christ's sacrifice; for to such Paul says, "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; but the mistake, as it appears to me, consists in making out of a single case, or class of character, a general law against wilful transgressors. Hence you conclude that wilful transgressors of law, or those who sinned wittingly under the law, could find no sin-offering. This would, indeed, be a complete annihilation of the typical character of all the Jewish sin-offerings; and would, as far as it goes, exclude the hope of forgiveness through the anti-typical sin-offering every person who had sinned wittingly or wilfully in any matter against God or man. I especially request your views of Lev. vi 1-7., and more especially I call your attention

to the great annual and national expiation minutely detailed Lev. xxi. In this chapter we are told most unequivocally that when the priest laid his hands upon the scape-goat he was to confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgression in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the scape-goat; and again, the goat shall bear upon him *all "their iniquities*;" and again, "the priest shall make an atonement for you, to cleanse you that you may be clean from *all your sins*." "This shall be an everlasting statute to you to make an atonement for the children of Israel for *all their sins* once a-year." But I will not exhaust this subject at one effort, especially as I may have misunderstood you. Your allusion to the "*Christian System*," and quotations therefrom, shall all be considered in due time. I shall be exceedingly thankful to you, my aged and venerable brother, to examine that work with the utmost care, and to point out to me any ambiguous or erroneous expressions in it, as I may probably soon be called upon to *stereotype* it. The demand for it is very great and I have had the most flattering intimations of its usefulness to the public from numerous and eminent quarters of the professing world.*

* An involuntary misquotation and consequent misrepresentation of my views, appears in one of your quotations from page 49. You put a clause in page 48 with one in page 49, that started me no little, as no doubt you will have done every other reader. You make me say that "the death of Christ soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father, page 48-49." Whereas I say, "The death of Christ, in bringing many sons to glory, soothes and delights," &c. A very different idea truly! You make me say of a subject abstractly, what I say of it only in connexion with its consequences. The difference between these two forms of expression would jeopardize any man's life in many courts civil and ecclesiastic. I am aware you did not intend such a thing. In none of the three instances in which you have quoted the C, S; am I understood as I intended, or, as I think, my language indicates. This I attribute to your writing so immediately after your return from Missouri, before you had time to weigh the periods from which you quoted.

B

Give me leave to add, that I concur most sincerely with you in your objections to the Methodistic notion of sacrifices reconciling God to us. There must be some great obscurity in my style if you could infer from any thing I have ever written, that I entertain such an idea. When I speak of sacrifice as propitiating or pacifying the Divine Father, (a scriptural idea truly,) I intend no more, as I have explained myself, than opening a way in which his favor might shine forth. The opening of a vent for water to flow is making it to flow: so the opening a way for God to be propitious, is making him propitious, in all propriety of language—as appears to yours, most sincerely and affectionately, A. CAMPBELL.

ATONEMENT: NO. II.

In My first essay on sin-offerings I stated that the Christian world were divided on the design, end, or purpose of them. The overwhelming majority of Christians have placed their whole effect on God, in his law and justice, and on his government;—on God, to reconcile and propitiate him to sinners—on his law and justice, to satisfy their penal demands against them in the person of their substitute, on his government, to make it honored and respected in the universe.

Others, while they acknowledge these to be the designs of sin-offerings, yet do not confine their effects on God, his law, and government, but also acknowledge that they are designed to produce a moral effect on man, as to reconcile him to God, to purge and cleanse him from sin.

In my first number I stated that I could not believe that sin-offerings were ever designed to produce such effects on God, his law, justice, or government, because it was not so declared in the Bible, and I can-

not believe any thing as unerring divine truth but what I find there: if sin-offerings are designed to produce these effects, and this doctrine is taught in the Bible, why do not the advocates of it plainly refer us to the book, chapter and verse where it is taught. Let them not substitute vain philosophy, far-fetched inferences, and the wisdom of words for the doctrine of God.

I do not wish to be understood as denying that such effects are produced on God, his law, and government by sin-offerings, but that I cannot believe them for want of divine evidence; and I might add, because this doctrine seems to me plainly to contradict many things taught in the Bible, and to be condemned by matters of fact. But of these hereafter.

I will now endeavor to state my own views of sin-offerings, their end, and design. I agree with all Christians that the great design of sin-offerings is to make atonement. Though the sin-offering itself may be called the atonement, yet it is so called, because it is the means of effecting an atonement or reconciliation. More than thirty-seven years ago I defined atonement to be *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation. The authorities then adduced, it is believed, have never been seriously impugned, nor denied. Not long since I have seen the same definition given by high authority, as Calmet's Dictionary, enlarged and edited by Robinson, Theological Professor at Andover. On the word they say—

"We have evidently lost the true import of this word by our present manner of pronouncing it. When it was customary to pronounce the word *o.* as *own* (as in the time of our translators) then the word *atonement* was resolvable into its parts, *at-one-ment*, or the means of being *at one* i. e. reconciled, united, combined in fellowship. This seems to be precisely its idea Romans v 11—Being (to God) reconciled, or *at-one-ed* we shall be saved by his (Christ's

life, by whom we have received the *at-one-ment*, or means of reconciliation. Here it appears the word atonement doe snot mean a ransome price, or purchase paid to the receiver, but a restoration of accord, which is, perhaps, the most correct idea we can affix to the term expiation, or atonement, under the Mosaic law." See also J. Brown's Dictionary of the Bible on the word.

In order that we may see clearly the application of this definition of atonement, I will introduce a few propositions from the "Address" long since published:

1st: There did exist, and does exist, and will forever exist a close and intimate union between God and all holy beings:

2d. There did exist a close political union under the law between God and Israel, while Israel continued politically holy and ceremonially clean.

3d. Nothing but sin and uncleanness ever broke this moral or political union between God and his creatures. "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God." Isai. lix. 2.

4th Whatever removes the separation between God and his creatures, restores the union between them.

5th The blood of beasts, slain in sacrifice under the law, removed the political or ceremonial separation between God and Israel, and restored the union between them.

6th. The blood of Christ under the New Testament removes the moral separation between God and believers, and restores the union between them.

7th. God's holy nature cannot be in union with man's unholy nature. 2 Cor. vi 14 16. But when man is cleansed and washed from sin by the blood of Christ, then, and not till then, are God and man united, reconciled, or *at-one-ed*.

8th The *at-one-ment*, reconciliation, or union between God and his creatures, either under the law

or under the gospel, never took place before the person or thing defiled was cleansed, or purged by the blood of a sin-offering.

9th. There is an awful separation between God and the fallen world. Man's sin and wickedness is the cause. God is holy, just and good—man is unholy, unjust, and wicked;—God is light—mankind is darkness. How can natures so discordant be united? Either God must change into the temper and spirit of man, or man must change into the temper and spirit of God. The first is impossible; therefore man must be changed or lost from God forever. To effect this very end was the son of God sent by the Father of mercies, who lived, died, and rose again for our justification. His very ministry was that of reconciliation, or (*at-one-ment*;) "for God was in, or by, Christ reconciling (at-one-ing) the world unto himself"—"God hath reconciled (at-one-ed) all things unto himself by Jesus Christ"—"We are reconciled (at-one-ed) unto God by the death of his Son."

From these remarks it will be seen that the primary design of the blood of sin offerings, both under the Old and the New Testament, is, to purge or cleanse from sin and defilement, whether moral, political, or ceremonial; and the proximate effect is *at one-ment*.

The Apostle Paul says, "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood." Heb. ix. 22. Let us inquire what those things were which were purged with blood, how they were purged, and what was the effect of this purging.

1. The altar was one of the things purged with blood. Ezek. xliii. 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 (the altar) and on the four coroners of the settle, and upon the borders around about. Thus shalt thou *cleanse* and *purge* it; 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 shalt thou *purge* the altar, and *purify* it:" Moses describes the same thing in nearly the same language, Lev. xvi. 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 on 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," &c.

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 *kaphar;* nor is there any Hebrew word we translate *atonement*, but what comes from this root."

Now with respect to the case of purging the altar, we have remarked that Moses and Ezekiel were describing the same thing in nearly the same words. The altar was defiled by the uncleanness of the children of Israel. It must be cleansed or purged. How? Ezekiel says, "Thus by (the blood of a bullock) shalt thou cleanse and purge (*kaphar*) it." Moses says "He shall make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for it." Again Ezekiel says, "Seven days shall they *purge* (*kaphar*) the altar." Moses says, "Seven days shalt thou make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for the altar." Exodus xxix. 37. Again, Ezekiel, says, "When thou hast made an end of *cleansing* it [the altar."] Moses says, "When thou hast made an end of *reconciling* [*kapher*] the altar." The effect, then, of this blood was to cleanse, to hallow, to sanctify, and to make the altar most holy; or in the language of Paul, it was to purge the altar. As this effect is described by *kaphar*, frequently translated *to make atonement*, and *to reconcile*, we conclude that *to make atonement*, *to reconcile* and *to purge*, are synonymous, all expressed by, or translated from, the same word *kaphar*.

The word *kaphar*, it is believed, is as frequently translated *to purge* or *cleanse*, as *to make atonement*. Let the attentive reader turn to the following texts, and where he finds *cleanse* or *purge* in those texts, they are so translated from the Hebrew *kaphar*. Num. xxv. 33; 1st Sam. iii. 16; Psalm lxv. 3, and lxxxix, 9, Prov. xvi, 6; Isai. vi. 7, and xxii. 14 and xxvii. 9, and the texts quoted above.

Would it not be better always to translate the verb *kaphar*, when connected with sin, as the New Testament writers have done, by the Greek word *airo*, with its compounds, which is rendered *to purge*, *to cleanse*, *to take away sin;* than by translating it *to make atonement*, or *to reconcile?*

2. Another thing cleansed with blood is a leprous house. Lev. xiv. 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* [*kaphar*] for the house; and it shall be clean." How much more intelligibly would it read, 'And purge the house, and it shall be *clean?*' As the Psalmist, li. 7, "*Purge* me with hyssop, and I shall be *clean*."

3. The tabernacle of the congregation, the holy place, as well as the altar, were cleansed in the same manner, Lev. xvi. 16, 19, 20. "And he shall *make an atonement* [*kaphar*] for the holy place; so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation."—"And when he hath made an end of *reconciling* [*kaphar*] the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar."—"Thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and cleanse the sanctuary. And the priest shall take of the sin-offering, and put it upon the posts of the house: so shall ye *reconcile* (*kaphar*) the house." How preferable would be the translation of texts, to substitute the word *purge*, instead of *to make atonement*, or to reconcile. This is Paul's rendering.

Let the reader examine the following texts, and all doubt will be removed. When he reads these texts, *to make atonement, to reconcile*, the Hebrew word is *kaphar*. Lev. vi. 30, and xvi. 27, and viii. 15; Ezek. xi. 15, 17, 20; Dan. ix 24. Lex. xii. 7, 8, and xv. 15, 30, and xvi. 30, Num. viii. 21, Lev. ix 7, Lev. xiv. 19, 20, 21, 29, 31.

4. In these texts it will be seen that the people were also cleansed from their sins and uncleanness by their offerings for sin. Forgiveness always accompanies atonement, or purging, if it be not the same thing. Lev. iv 20. "And the priest shall make an *atonement* [*kaphar*] for them, and it *shall be forgiven* them." See also Lev. iv. 26, 31, 35, and v. 10, 13, 16 18, and xix. 22; Num. xv. 25, 28. So intimately connected are purging and remission, that they are often expressd be the same word *kaphar*. 2 Chron. xxx 18, 19. "The good Lord *pardon* [*kaphar*] every one of them—though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary." See also Psalm lxxviii. 38; Jer. xviii. 23; Deut. xxi. 8. "Be *merciful* [*kaphar*,] O Lord, unto thy people—And the blood *shall be forgiven* [*kaphar*] them." Deut. xxxii. 43 "He will be *merciful* [*kaphar*] unto his land and people." To be merciful unto, means to forgive. Heb. viii. 12 and x. 18.

Thus have I shown the design of the sin-offering under the law, to be, *purging* or *cleansing* from sin and uncleanness: When the person or thing is thus purged by the Lord through the means of sacrifice, then is God, his law, and government pleased, or reconciled with the person or thing thus cleansed, without any change in himself, his law, or government, because they were always pleased and satisfied with purity. The whole change has taken place in the person defiled. Now the at-one-ment' or reconciliation, is effected between God and man.

In my next number I will write an essay upon the sin-offering of Christ, our great High Priest.

B. W. STONE.

LETTER II.—To B. W. STONE.

Brother Stone:

My Dear Sir—Your second epistle, dated April 10th, one week after the first, treats of the *design* of sacrifices. Sacrifice could, as a matter of course, reach no farther than the sins for which it was offered. If offered only for one class of sins, it could only in its design reach that class. Much, then, depends on forming a correct estimate of the sins for which it was offered. I showed, as I conceive, in my last, that sins of ignorance and legal uncleanness were not the only sins expiated or purified by the Jewish sacrifices; that all the sins of the whole nation of Israel—all their iniquities and transgressions, were annually taken away by sacrifice.

In your first letter you stated that the design of the legal sacrifices was "not to deliver from death, but to purify and cleanse the offerer." Do you think that there was legal sanctification without legal salvation in the ancient sacrifices? A man's sins might be forgiven through sacrifice, provided they deserved not death; but if they merited death there was no sacrifice for them? Have you not thought, my dear sir, that this looks somewhat like the Romanist classification of sins into venal and mortal. The venal only were pardoned through sacrifice! The mortal were beyond the saving power of the law. Sins of ignorance, therefore must be considered in the light of venal offences—not as moral guilt. Lev. v. 17. declares that "if a soul sin and commit any of those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandment of the Lord, though he knew it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." Follows it not; then, that if any

of the things forbidden in the commandments of the Lord incurred death, though done ignorantly, the appointed sacrifice obtained forgiveness or release from that penalty? Even in the case of Job's friends, before the law was given, sacrifice saved from the wrath of God. The Lord said to Eliphaz, "My wrath is kindled against thee and thy two friends: therefore, take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering, and my servant Job will pray for you: for him I will accept, lest I deal with you after your folly." They did as commanded, and escaped.

In the case of one only legally polluted by the contact of a dead person, presuming to come into the congregation, death was to be inflicted; but if he had the ashes of the red heifer mingled with water sprinkled upon him, he might, without danger of death, enter the congregation at the time appointed. A still stronger proof that there was atonement in the law saving men from temporal death, is found in Numbers xvi. 48. "And the Lord spake to Moses, saying, Get you up from this congregation that I may consume them in a moment; and they fell upon their faces. And Moses said to Aaron, Take a censer and put fire in it from the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly and make an atonement for them; for there is wrath gone out from the Lord: the plague is begun. And they made an atonement for the people, and he stood between the dead and the living, and the plague was stayed." The sequel may show the importance I attach to establishing the fact that the atonements of the law did save men from the penalties of that law, even from death, excepting in the single case of a presumptuous violation of the covenant or renunciation of it. And under the Christian economy the sacrifice of Christ extends not as an atonement to any that despise or renounce Christ.

But the Divine explanation of the reason why the

Most High commanded blood to be used upon the altar, appears in my mind to banish all ambiguity both from the style of the Mosaic institute and from the Christian mind on the whole subject of atonement as taught both in the law and gospel. Sin is the forfeiture of life; or, what is the same thing, divinely expressed, "death is the wages of sin"—"the soul that sins must die." Now, says God, "I have given you *blood* upon my altar to make atonement for your souls; because THE LIFE is in the blood"—for your life I accept blood, which is the life of the victim. I accept its life *instead* of yours. To quote his own words—"For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul." Again he adds, "Blood is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life of it." Levit. xvii, 11–14:

If I understand your second letter, you and I agree that atonement is but the means of reconciliation; that atonement is the *cause*, and reconciliation the *effect*, though you are not so clear upon the subject as I could wish, but, perhaps, on a fuller explanation of the subject, we may perfectly harmonize on this great topic. I, like you, have all my life, divided the word *atonement* into three syllables—*at-one ment*. But I do not on that account exactly understand you when you make it mean simply *reconciliation*. *At-one-ment* is the making, or that which makes at one, those who were not one; and *reconciliation* is *made one*. Figuratively we often put the *effect* for the cause, and the *cause* for the effect; but when we discuss a subject for the sake of understanding it we come to the literal and leave the figurative. Therefore the atonement and the reconciliation are just as different as the two Greek words *hilasmos* and *katallagee* the former means atonement as the cause, and the latter means reconciliation as the effect. While I readily own that either

reconciliation or atonement may by a metonymy of the effect for the cause, or of the cause for the effect, be used indiscriminately, originally, literally, and properly; atonement [*hilasmos*] is that which *makes* one, and reconciliation [*katallagee*] is made one. The one is the cause—the other the effect. If this be doubted, we have a superabundance of evidence to offer. I shall, however, suggest only one fact at present, viz.—*that things that cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned*—such as the tabernacle, the altar, and their furniture. These are susceptible of atonement, but not of reconciliation, in the legal and proper sense of these words, as any one may see by examining only the book of Leviticus, particularly the 16th chapter.

Purification or expiation is also an effect of atonement, as well as reconciliation. In this sense atonement was made for the altar, the sanctuary, and almost all things are by the law purified by blood.

Propitiation or purification is also an *effect* of atonement. So we find it applies to God, Ezek. xvi, 53. "When I am *propitiated* [*exhilaskesthai*,* common version, *pacified*] to you for all that you have done, saith the Lord." So prayed the publican—"God be propitious to me a sinner." Hence we find the *hilasmos* twice in the first epistle of John applied to Christ's blood—*the propitiation for our sins:* Messiah, as foretold by Daniel will make *propitiation* for iniquity.

Do I misconceive my brother Stone when I interpret his views of atonement as excluding the idea of propitiating or pacifying our heavenly Father? I know that he repudiates the idea of effecting a change in God—of changing him from an enemy to a friend. So do I: But still I say God *repents*, is *propitiated*, and *pacified*, and even *reconciled* to us. But the effects of

* I have quoted from the Septuagint; but, by opening your Hebrew Bible, you will find it in your favorite KAPHOR.]

sacrifice, or atonement, so far as the propitiating of God is contemplated, is more appositely set forth in the Bible than in any other book in the world, in the memorable effect of Noah's sacrifice upon God himself. Let us, Father Stone, turn over and read it—"And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and of, fered burnt-offerings on the altar. And the Lord-*smelled a sweet savor;* and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." "*The Lord smelled a sweet savor*" not before, but while he sacrificed. Such was the effect of Noah's [the temporal saviour] sacrifice in God. And, in the same style, that learned Hebrew, our Apostle, has spoken of our Saviour. "Christ," says he, "has given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a *sweet smelling savor.*" This is what I mean by propitiating God. This *sweet smelling savor* is to God. It is a sweet and pleasing odor to him, on account of which he can be propitious to us. When then, you, brother Stone, ask me what I mean by sacrifice atoning or propitiating God, I refer you to the effect produced on him by Noah's sacrifice, by Christ's sacrifice—appositely, though pleonastically, expressed by Paul, "for a sweet smelling savor." Christ's sacrifice Godward, and not manward, was then for a sweet smelling savor—pleasing, propitiating, reconciling God to man.

With all your precision and caution, brother Stone, on this subject, I find you come to my conclusions in my very words: for at the close of your second epistle you say, "*Then* is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person or thing thus cleansed." You then place yourself under the reprobation of your own censure when you ask me, letter first. "Do, brother Campbell, point us to the scriptures that say that sacrifices, either under the Old or New Testament, were ever designed to propi-

tiate God, or that such an effect was ever produced or effected on him." After this you add, that you think I "have advanced a few steps farther than any other system maker." Well, I am glad to be in such good company as that of brother Stone, who concludes with me—*then*, and not till then, of course—"*then* is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person," &c. &c.

You were, my dear sir, driven into *hypercriticism*—to being righteous overmuch at the time you wrote your address, by the violence of men of that hard-mouthed age which refused bit, and bridle, and curb; you were driven, if not past Jerusalem, a little beyond the beautiful gate of the Temple. You had men of strong prejudices, and not much biblical science, to contend with; and who were determined to drive with a wooden wedge and mallet the barbarous scholastic jargon of old Nicence trinitarianism down your throat; and, therefore, I do not wonder at your conscientious fastidiousness concerning terms and phrases which they may have misapplied. I felt a good deal of your embarrassment and know experimentally many of your difficulties. I appreciate fully your critical display of *kaphar* and its derivatives, and see in all that you have said little or nothing from which to dissent. But you strangely in all this seem to overlook the very point in discussion, and which you ultimately have to concede, that *sacrifice has an effect on God.* You appear to deny this in the commencement, but you cannot but admit it in the conclusion.

Now methinks the matter can be greatly simplified thus:—Sacrifice is an atonement or propitiation as respects God; purification as respects sin; reconciliation as respects the human heart; justification as respects the sinner's conscience, and redemption as respects his person from all the penal consequences of sin. Atonement is, therefore, a grand cause; of which the prominent effects are, propitiation as respects God; purification as respects sin; reconciliation as respects the sinner; justification as respects his guilt, sanctification as respects his pollution, and redemption as respects his actual personal deliverance from sin in all its consequences. You seem, my dear sir, to labor on one point, as though it were with you a great difficulty. You seem desirous to make sacrifice affect only man. You have no doubt been horrified at some of the representations like that quoted from the Methodistic Discipline about Christ's reconciling God to man. The more intelligent of that community believe with you that God the Father sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world from his own benevolence, and that the atonement was in the divine nature and judgment necessary to justify God in justifying ungodly men—"that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." It propitiated God in no other way than as it opened a just and honorable way for his grace to be exercised, or as it gave him a justifiable reason to be propitious. No intelligent professor of the faith imagines that God was incorrigible, cruel, antagonistic, full of vengeance, and inimical to fallen man, and that his Son our Lord was more compassionate and merciful, and came to quench the fire of his wrath, to appease his ire. Such Pagan notions are neither the faith nor the opinion of any of those denominated evangelical. A few ultras of former days may have so reasoned, but such spirits are too antique for the nineteenth century.

Your own views of sin-offerings, as detailed in your 2d epistle, are clearly expressed. You say, "The great design of sin-offering is to make atonement.' But you make atonement only equivalent to reconciliation. But it means more in the Bible than the reconciliation of a sinner to God: therefore, until you more fully explain yourself, I object to your definition as defective. The design of sin-offerings is, indeed, to make

reconciliation by making a propitiation for our sins, and by making it both just and merciful on the part of God to forgive us. But I wait your explanation of the various items on which I have commented. As I see you have sometimes misconceived me, it is possible I may have misunderstood you. Meanwhile I remain as ever, yours in the kingdom of the Messiah,

A. CAMPBELL.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, OR CHURCH OF GOD.

Paul to the Romans 14, 17, describes its nature in a few words. "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Spirit." By these marks and attributes this kingdom is known, and distinguished from all others. Righteousness is supreme love to God and love and benevolence to man; this we may call inward righteousness, the fountain of all righteous acts towards God and man: for if we love God in heart, we will be led to unreserved obedience to all his commands; for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.' And if we love our neighbor, we will be led to do unto him, as we would he should do unto us.

Peace is another property and mark of the kingdom of God. Peace and righteousness are twin-sisters—they always dwell together, and are never separated. The Righteous have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ—They have peace in their own hearts, "for there is no condemnation to them, who are in Christ Jesus.—They are led to live peaceably with all men, as much as in them lies, because they love peace: They endeavor to make and promote peace, and "quench the coals of growing strife." Peace is the darling attribute of God himself; he is called "The God of peace." It is the attribute of the great Mediator; he is called "the prince of peace." It is also the attribute of his church and people, for they are called "the kingdom of peace, the children of peace," and the gospel, the word of reconciliation is called "the gospel of peace."

Joy in the Holy Spirit is another property and mark of the kingdom of God. We joy in God through our Lord

Jesus Christ—in his power to protect and bless us—in his wisdom to guide and direct us—in his love, truth and goodness—in his faithfulness to his promises—in all his perfections, and promises of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.

Should it be asked, "Who constitute this kingdom? or what is the character of its members? The answer is easy; they are those, who have the properties and marks of this kingdom, they are all righteous, they have the peace of God ruling in them, and the joys of the Holy Spirit. None else are recognized as members of this kingdom. So John the Baptist describes the kingdom which he proclaimed to be nigh—the very kingdom of which we speak. He told the Pharisees, and Sadducees coming to his baptism, to repent, and bring forth fruits, meet for repentance. Think not within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father, and therefore we have a right to the privileges of the new kingdom without repentance; no, says John "For, now the axe is laid at the root of trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire. In your old church were found the fruitful and unfruitful, like trees, growing together—not so in the New kingdom now at hand, none but the fruitful shall stand in it. In your old church, the good and the bad were mingled together, like the wheat and the chaff in one promiscuous heap; but now with his winnowing fan he will separate them, the wheat shall be gathered into his garner, and the chaff burnt up.

The same truth our Savior taught Nicodemas John 3 "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God; except a man be born of water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." To be born again, is, to be born of water, and of the spirit; to be born of water, is, to be baptised in water; and to be born of the Spirit, is, to be saved by the renewing of the Holy Spirit. Were it possible for an unrenewed soul to be admitted into the kingdom of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, could he see, or enjoy it? could he relish its spirit and enjoyments? Impossible "For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" With such a person there could be no fellowship, no enjoyment. Attempting to admit into the church such members has

been one cause of her glory departing from her, of that discord, strife and division, which had so long disgraced her in the eyes of the world. O when shall Zion's glory be restored! One thing is certain, her glory will not be restored till a reformation of these evils be effected—till the church be purged from idolatry, or the service of mammon—from seeking the friendship and honor of the world—from union with the States and Kingdoms of the world—from the vain desire and work of legislating, in order to check and destroy the reigning corruption of mankind—from the vain attempts to have better laws, and better rulers in the civil government to the neglect of the king and kingdom of peace. Had half the zeal been expended in the cause of christianity, which of late has been spent by religious professors in state politics, religion would have raised her drooping head, and smiled in hope of better times.

Paul to the Corinthians, Epis: 12 chap. beautifully describes the members of the church or kingdom of heaven: "For by, or in one spirit are we all bapti ed into one body, and have been all made to drink into one spirit." In Eph, iv 4 v 6. "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord one fáith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

Where, O Where is this church or kingdom, in which these things are, and which is thus shining! We long to see it---We long to see the world, attracted by her light, flowing to her, and joining with her to glorify our Heavenly Father. Lord Jesus, hasten the joyful hour.

B. W, STONE.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH TO GOD.

"Ye, said the great Teacher, are the salt of the earth—Ye are the light of the world—a city that is set on a hill, cannot be hid Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick and it giveth light to all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorysy your Father who is in heaven."

Men have talked and have talked much and loud

about many things as true, which have no place in the Bible. Among these things, is, the invisible church. Of such a church the Bible gives me no information, and as it would be as useless to the world, as a candle put under a bushel, we pass it by without vainly searching for it—*vainly* searching, I said, because if invisible it cannot be seen. But the church of Christ is as visible as a city set on a hill—as a candle set upon a candlestick. He designed it to be visible for the good of the world in darkness and death. He designed through the glory and right of his church, to bring the world unto salvation; and eternal life, "So shine said the Savior, before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven." The Church is the salt of the earth—salt to purify the world from corruption, and preserve it unto eternal life.

To this end, the Lord by his prophet Isaiah lx. I says to Zion, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee—And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about and see; all they gather themselves together, they come to thee—Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as doves to their windows?" or Who are these that fly as a cloud of pigeons to their roost? They are the Gentiles, induced and drawn to come to the light and glory of Zion to find salvation. The great lesson taught is that when Zion, or the church of God, obeys his command by rising and shining, sinners are influenced to glorify God, and are saved; but when the church sleeps in death, sinners for want of light die in their sins. Solemn thought! Shall the church be the cause of the damnation of sinners? Who can deny it?

The same awful truth is taught, Isaiah xlviii 17, 19. "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer—O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy

peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea; Thy seed also had been as the sand, and thy offspring like the gravel thereof. His name should not have been cut off nor destroyed from before me." Why does God so vehemently desire that his church had hearkened to and obeyed his commands? Not that he could be profited by this; but that we and the world might receive the profit. If Zion had only obeyed, her peace would have been as a river, perpetually flowing as the river—undisturbed as the river by the noise of a noisy world, and increasing as the river by tributary streams in its descent to the ocean. O happy state! and this the reward of obedience in this world. "Then had thy righteousness been as the waves of the sea." What majesty, grandeur, and beauty are seen in the rolling waves! How they attract the gaze of the world, and affect the heart with solemnity! And when they are furiously tossed by strong winds, as when Jonah was in a ship—How did the hardened sailors tremble, and pray to their God! Such would have been the effects of Zion's righteousness on the world of the ungodly.

"Thy seed also had been as the sand" Innumerable as the sands on the sea shore would have been thy spiritual children, had you only obeyed my commandments. The reason then why children are not born to Zion, is because she is disobedient to the commandments of the Lord. Is she not then responsible to God for the loss of souls? O that the church would lay this to heart! It is added, "And thy offspring as the gravel thereof." Who ever saw the gravel on the sea shore without admiration of their beauty? How pure, how clean, and how smooth! such would have been thy offspring; not only as innumerable as the sands on the sea shore, but possessed also of the purity, gentleness, meekness and humility of Christ—their rough tempers would have been

smothed, like the rough surface of the gravel, from constant and long attrition by the beating of the waves upon them. As is the mother, such are the offspring; a weak, sickly mother will have weakly and and sickly children; and *vice versa*. How important then, that Zion should hearken to the commandments of God! If she does, what a blessing to the world is she; if she does not, O what a loss!

The same truth is taught in the prayers of Jesus, John 17 "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also, who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one—that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." O that our sectarian world would seriously think, and solemnly ponder upon the important truth conveyed in these words "Are we not plainly taught that the world's salvation or damnation, is suspended on the unity or disunity of the professed believers in Christ? Shall we by disunion stand as an insurmountable mountain between the world of sinners and salvation? God forbid! This subject of Christian union we shall hereafter consider.

See the influence of a church in right order, and rightly exercised, on an unbeliever and an ignorant person in the Corinthian assembly. They were convinced of all, and judged of all, the secrets of their hearts were made manifest, they fell down on their faces, and worshipped God, and reported that God was in them. Cor. 14. Would not the same effect be now produced, if the same means were used? Certainly; for this is the very order of heaven. When such effects are not produced, ought not the church take conviction of error, and reform; so that she may answer the purpose of God, and be the means of saving sinners? These things are humbly, and affectionately submitted to the Christian community in the world.

B. W. STONE.

To the members of the Church of Christ in Missouri.

DEAR BRETHREN:

Brother Stone has commenced the publication of the Christian Messenger. Although the work is commenced in Illinois, there is a strong expectation of its being transferred to Missouri in a short time, and permanently established in this State. Should that take place, your desires will be realized; for the want of a periodical in our State, has been long deplored, and one urgently demanded by many of you. We therefore ask you to step forward, and with a liberal support to the Messenger, aid in building up, and giving general circulation to a religious periodical in the 'far west.' One is greatly needed among us for local purposes; and as many of our brethren have embraced the gospel but recently, they have not had an opportunity of reading the first religious works of this reformation, and consequently need reformation upon those interesting topics, which have been discussed in the incipient efforts that have been made; and still are making, to unite the people of God, upon the foundation that God has laid in Zion. We shall therefore endeavor to accommodate the work to the circumstances that surround us, and the wants of the people among whom it is expected most generally to circulate. To accomplish this object, we propose inviting the attention of the brethren and friends to the 'first principles' of this reformation; and that we may do so efficiently, we shall take copious extracts from the first popular periodicals, that were engaged in advocating the good cause in which we are now engaged. We shall continue our labors of love, with a desire to see the children of God intelligent, united, happy, and a sinful world become obedient, to the gospel; and where there desirable ends can be attained by the productions, of others, the brethren may rest assured, they shall have the benefit of their labors.

Bro. Jacob Creath jr. and myself, with other brethren have pledged our assistance to the Editor, that we will not only aid in its circulation, but will contribute to its pages. We desire the friends to lend a helping hand, by sending any useful thoughts upon any subject of Christianity—the location, number, and condition of any church—the success, of the gospel &c. and last, tho' not least, to send our venerable Brother, as many good subscribers as possible. We shall look for a liberal support west of the Mississippi, and whenever the patronage will justify, it is expected to be published in Missouri.

THOS. M. ALLEN.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Religion in the "far west" has almost been suffocated by the dust of politics, and the sickening breath of mammon; but she begins now to breathe more freely, and exhibits strong, encouraging symptoms of convalescence. Not far distant from Jacksonville between 20 and 30 have been immersed, in the neighbor-hood of bro. Scott Riggs, and in Clary's grove. Professors of religion appear to be awaking from their long slumbers. Within our neighborhood the Baptist too have had a considerable revival; about 16 have been immersed. In Missouri there is in many places a good work going on. On Salt river lately at one meeting 22 were added—I have not heard how many more; for the meeting was still protracted, of the success we have not heard. We only need spiritual evangelists. Lord, send forth more into the field now ripe for gathering!

EDITOR.

☞ As punctuality is the life of business, we shall expect our subscribers, to be govorned accordingly.

EDITOR.

AN APOLOGY.

I have taken up more room in this *No.* than I wished, in the correspondence between bro: Campbell and myself. My reason is, that I might save myself the labor of writing so much for the Harbinger. I design after this to send him regularly the first printed sheet of the Messenger? on the subject before us, and carry on the work in due order. I had designed to carry out my views in an unbroken chain, before I noticed the replies of bro. C.—but I hastily broke through my own arrangement, and forwarded to him a short reply. I immediately saw my error in this, and quickly wrote him to suppress its publication. It was published, I doubt not; my letter did not arrive before the communication was in type.

EDITOR.

As it has been a considerable time since our list of subscribers was returned, it is probable many may have removed or designed patronizing the work, only, in the event of its being published in Missouri—Should it therefore be sent to any who may decline taking it, we hope they will return it immediately, and we ask Post masters to do the same, when subscribers have removed, or are dead, or refuse to take them out of the office. Do attend to this.

EDITOR.

OBITUARY NOTICE.

Our well beloved brother, Leonard J Fleming, is called from his earthly labors to the rest prepared for the saints above. He died of congestive fever in Fayette County, Kentucky, last June, in the prime of life and usefulness. He was an an indefatigable preacher of the gospel, and greatly beloved by all who knew him, for his humility, piety and zeal in the cause of his Lord. The particulars of his death we have not received, only that he died strong in faith, nothing doubting. By none was he better known or more beloved than by the

EDITOR.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST;

ASSISTED BY

Elders Tho's M. Allen and Jacob Creath, Jr. of Missouri.

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

VOL. XI.] JACKSONVILLE, ILL. OCT. 1840. [NO. 2

ATONEMENT NO. III.

Brother Campbell,

Before we proceed to publish No, 3, which is in your hands, I wish you to print the following remarks immediately before that number, in order that we may be understood as we progress.

You object to the proposition I made, "That the law admits no person worthy of death, or who has forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin—and that sins of ignorance, and ceremonial defilement only admitted of sacrifice for purification; therefore, the death of the victim could not be in the stead of the offerer, seeing his sin did not require his death."

Can you deny the first part of this proposition? If you do, please to produce the scriptural testimony for my benefit, and for that of our readers. You dissent from the second part of the proposition for the following reasons;—1st. "If legal atonement; or xexpiation, was made only for sins of ignorance, or legal defilement, then they could not be typical of the death of Christ, else the death of Christ expiates*

---

*Do brother C.—,let us use a pure speech, or Bible language; expiate is of Ashdod. Webster defines it, to atone for, to make satisfaction.