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.

only sins of ignorance." And does not my brother C. believe that all those sacrifices, offered for sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement, were not typical of the death of Christ? This, to me, is a new doctrine. But, as you say, we have to do with Moses and Paul, to Paul we appeal. Let us read Heb. 9th and 10th chapters, and without doubt you will be convinced of your error.

2. You ask, "But is it a *fact* that the legal sacrifices and offerings expiate sins of ignorance only? [you refer to Lev. vi. 1.] and then ask, "Do you call these sins of ignorance, or legal defilement? Or do you consider that there was no expiation or atonement made for them?"

I answer; Those sins mentioned in Lev. vi: 1: were not mortal sins, or sins that subjected the sinner to death; and therefore a sacrifice was admitted, and an atonement made for his sins; Hence my conclusion is good that the death of the victim could not be in the stead of the offerer's death, seeing his sin did not require his death. To this point my mind was turned when I wrote the sentiment. 2dly. Those sins purged with blood, come under one general name of *errors*. Heb: ix. 7. But into the second went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and the errors of the people. 3dly. Paul says, "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sin." But they did take away errors; therefore there is a marked distinction between sins, and errors, according to Paul. The sacrifice offered by the priest can "never take away sins"—but they took away errors, or sins of ignorance;" therefore, Paul did not consider these as sins subjecting the transgressor to death. The legal sacrifice did not purge the conscience—did not make him who did the service perfect; as pertaining to the conscience, they only sanctified to the purifying of the flesh.

Heb. ix. Now can we, my dear brother, in the face of such authority, say that the legal sacrifices could, and did take away sins—*all their sins*, whether moral, political and ceremonial? 4th. Paul to the Romans and Gallatians labors this point to show the Jews that by the deeds of the law no person could be justified in his sight—that they were justified by faith without the deeds of the law. How can you reconcile your doctrine with this?

3dly. You refer me to Lev. xvi. in proof of your position that legal sacrifices did take away sins—*all their sins*. To this let us attend. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over him *all the iniquities* of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness and the goat shall bear upon him *all their iniquities* unto a land not inhabited, and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." And you add, "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."

You emphasize the expressions *all their sins*, *all your sins*, and *all their iniquities*, in proof of your position that sins of all descriptions are intended. I observe, first, that the scape-goat, that bore all their iniquities was not sacrificed, or slain; therefore, the scape goat does not bear them away by blood; no, not one of them. Their iniquities were purged with the blood of sacrifices, which were offered at the same time. 2d. The expressions *all their iniquities*, *all their sins*, did not include sins of every description, for reasons already stated: because "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins," &c. 3d. Again, Paul commenting on the transactions

of that same greatday of atonement, speaks thus: Heb. xi. 7, "But into the second went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the *errors* of the people." *All their iniquities, all their sins*, he includes in the general term *errors* The original word translated *errors*, is *agnoeemata*. Now every Greek Lexicon, which I have seen, defines this word, *an error, sin of error, or ignorance*. Parkhurst, Greenfield, and Schre. This is the only definition given; and indeed, the derivation of the word confines it to this. No word is better defined.

You yourself admit that *all their iniquities* did not include all *sins;* for you say, "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." This sin, then, is an exception. But, brother C., you will admit that this "one character" includes all idolaters, Deut. xvii.2-7. all blasphemers, Lev. xiv. 10.—all Sabbath breakers, Exod. xxxv. 2,—all disobedient children to parents, Exod. xvi 15. 17. Deut. xxi. 18 all murderers, Exod. lxxxi. 12.—all adulterers, Lev. xix 10, 11,—all manstealers, Exod. xxi. 16,—all falsewitnesses, whose testimony went to convict of a capital crime, Deut. ix. 16—all presumptuous sinners, Num. xv. 30, 31. All these classes of sinners were despisers of Moses, and were to die without mercy under two or three witnesses, without the privilege of sacrifice. The passage in Lev. vi. 1. I have considered difficult to be reconciled with Moses and Paul on the law of sacrifice; if what I have written be insufficient to clear the difficulty, it devolves upon you.

Your concluding remarks are to me unsatisfactory. You say, "When I speak of sacrifices as propitiatory, 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 a vent for water to flow, is to make it flow; so opening a way for God to be propitious, is making him propitious, in all propriety of language.'

I ask my brother, Is propitiating and purifying the Divine Father *by sacrifice, a scriptural idea truly?* In what part of the Bible is it written? You say, you intend no more by these expressions, than *opening a way in which his favor might shine forth.* I ask, Where do the scriptures declare this to be the intention of Christ's sacrifice? Water obstructed, or dammed up, must have a vent made for it to flow forth. So the favor of God was obstructed, and could not shine forth till a vent was made for it by the sacrifice or death of Christ. How does this agree with Paul, Heb. ii. 9. That he by the favor of God might taste death for every man"? Your opinion is, that the death of Christ opened a way for the favor of God to flow, or shine forth: Paul teaches that the favor of God flowed to the world before the death of Christ, and was the reason why he did die. You farther say, "The sacrifice of Christ made God propitious." This is your intention or meaning; but what saith the scripture? Do tell us the difference between the death of Christ *reconciling the father to us*, (which you reject,) and propitiating him! I understand your views as those stated in the old orthodox system. They represent the door of mercy closed by the strong bars of the broken law, and offended justice; and that the death of Christ satisfied law and justice, and opened the door of mercy, that it might flow to the world. Let this be established by the divine scriptures, and I yield to the old orthodoxy.

I thank you for the honor you have done me in requesting me to give your "Christian System" a

careful examination, and privately to propose to you my objections, previous to its stereotyped edition. This I will gladly do as I may have opportunity. Do not hurry the work, for I do believe you will see good reasons for correcting a few inaccuracies.

Yours in warm affection,

B. W. STONE.

LETTER III.—To B. W. STONE.

Brother Stone:

My dear and respected Sir—Your favor before me reverts to the beginning; and, glancing at numerous points, teaches the necessity of doing one thing at a time, and of doing it well. Your questions and remarks on the legal sacrifices call for a more distinct enunciation of my views on the legal system. Permit me, then, with a reference to your demand, "Do I deny 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?"—I say, permit me in reference to the queston to lay down a few propositions:—

Prop. I. The legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system— a system contemporary with the Fall, and indispensable to any fallen man's acceptable approach to God.

Proof.—Abel offered a bloody sacrifice *in faith* two thousand five hundred years before the law. Faith presupposes testimony; and hope a promise: No testimony, no faith. No promise, no hope: Pious Jews may, therefore, like the pious patriarchs Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, &c. &c. have had views superior to the legal economy.

Prop. II. That all the legal sacrifices were for the exclusive benefit of those who were in the Sinaitic covenant with God, and consequently if they broke that covenant and apostatized from God, its sacrificial provision extended not to them.

Prop. III. The life and death, the blessing and the curse of the law were merely fleshly and temporal, and therefore the virtue of its sacrifice could extend no farther than temporal life and temporal blessings. When therefore, a Jew had forfeited these, the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for him. Deut. xxviii. 1–68.

Prop. IV. But, until a man had forfeited these, the legal sacrifices accompanied with repentance, and the previous qualifications, had power to remit all the penalties of that institution, to sanctify its subjects, and to save them from the consequences of transgression See Lev. vi. 1–7, xv. 31.; Num. xix. 32.

Prop. V. That while the law of Ten Commands constituted the substance of the Sinaitic covenant to which the sacrifices were annexed in good keeping with the fleshly people who were its subjects, the fleshly privileges that were its blessing, and the fleshly and temporal curses which were its penalties it wisely and benevolently regarded the overt act only as the violation of its precepts. Hence no sin under that covenant, but the literal and overt violation of those precepts, could debar a Jew from the benefits of the altar and the priest.

Prop. VI. That no transgression or sin, even that of ignorance, or of mere ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven. No repentance, nor amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission.*

Prop. VII. That the legal institution was typical.

---

* In reference to the 5th and 6th proposition it must be stated, that even when precepts of the second table had been violated; and the covenant so far broken, yet if the transgressor truly repented and forsook his sins; he was pardoned through sacrifice. For example David guilty of murder and adultery, was pardoned, and certainly not without sacrifice: for without shedding of blood there is no remission.

Its covenant, altar, priests, victims, "all were but the shadows of good things to come through a greater and more perfect tabernacle." Therefore faith, repentance, baptism, prayer, and all acts of obedience, without the blood of the new institution, cannot obtain the remission of the least sin in the universe of God.

While these seven propositions contain *in extenso* my reply to your emphatic interrogatory, I have other uses for them to which in the sequel I may apply them:

My remarks on your second proposition, viz—"That legal atonement was made only for sins of ignorance, or legal defilement," you seem to have misunderstood, if I may judge from the question you ask. You did note my words accurately. You pass by the word only, on which my question turns. You call it a new doctine, &c. On reconsideration you will perceive the error.

But have I not shown from Lev. vi. 1–7. in contrast with Lev. v. 15., that yours is indeed a new doctrine? Have we not, Lev: v. 15., the law for a trespass through ignorance; and also a second general law for any and every sin of ignorance in the 17th and 18th verses of the same chapter, immediately preceding another law for sin offerings, without a single allusion to sins of ignorance? Nay, verily, but to the contary: for it is impossible to suppose any of those to be sins of ignorance. This instance, not to cite others, is all-sufficient to show how unscriptural the conclusion of some is, that legal atonement was only for sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement. I truly admire your candor in giving up Lev· vi. I 7. as irreconcileable with that system.

I can sympathize with you in your morbid excitement about certain terms—such as *expiation*, *pacified propitiate*, &c., and bear with all good feeling your admonition about living up to my maxim about the pure speech, and the language of Ashdod. I know

the reasons of this peculiar sensitiveness on certain terms. It is, believe me, my venerable brother, unhealthy: for in the same breath of complaint against the word *expiate* as unscriptural, you use, the still more unscriptural terms "victim," "ceremonial defilement," &c.:—to which terms I make no objection.

But is *expiate* an unscriptural term? Open your Cruden's Concordance, and see the opinion of that greatest of verbal interpreters. Or do you assume that all oth r renderings than those of King James are unscriptural! Cruden gives *expiation*, Num. xxxv, 33. as the proper term. "The land cannot be cleansed [expiated] of the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it." Macknight also so renders *katharismos*, Heb, i. 3. "When he had expiated our sins, or made expiation for them." *hilaskomai*, a word found in the Greek of both Testaments, often in the Old, is, by all good Lexicographers, rendered *atone*, *expiate*, *propitiate*; so Parkhurst, Greenfield, Robertson, Serevellius, &c. &c. You quote Webster to prove that *expiate* is not scriptural, because he defines it "*to atone for*" and is *to atone for* an unscriptural phrase? What is the difference between "*to atone for*" and "*to make atonement for*"? Please explain to me, for I do not appreciate any. Now are not the words "to make atonement for" of frequent occurrence? You will find them, I think, eight times in a single chapter, [Lev. xvi.] According to Webster, then, expiate is a scriptural and proper term! The words atonement, propitiation, and expiation, are equally scriptural, being all of them a current coin in the hands of all Lexicographers for one and the same class of words, both in the Septuagint and New Testament Greek: So I conclude, and will thank brother Stone to show me any error in this conclusion.

Permit me also, my respected brother, to suggest

for your reconsideration a few objections to some points in this letter. Touching a certain matter you request me to read Heb. 9th and 10th chapters, and you say, 'without doubt I will be convinced of my mistake.' Touching that matter, however, it happened there was no mistake by either of us, except your passing without notice the word ONLY. But as to this recommendation, I have to say, that I thank my brother Stone for it, and am glad to perceive the high value he places on these chapters, as well as his high estimate of their perspicuity. The Epistle to the Hebrews I committed to memory when a child; I recommitted it when a man; I have repeated it many a hundred times; and yet so enamored am I with it, that I lately spent the greater part of a day in thinking upon one or two verses in these two chapters. They afforded me a feast while I rode some forty miles.

Through my delightful musing on this epistle I have come to the conclusion that the reformation has lost much by the unhappy controversy which has made us all so sensitive on sacrifice, atonement, expiation, &c. &c. I am fully persuaded there are some very erroneous opinions and much ignorance among us on the subjects treated of by Paul in this epistle. Therefore I the more cheerfully responded to the call of my venerable brother Stone to discuss some of these subjects. And I earnestly importune the *Father of Lights*, that, with all candor and Christian feeling, these great questions may be reconsidered, and that our brethren may be more enlightened on the epistle to the Hebrews. But from this episode to return.

You say, "Those sins purged with blood" (and what, I ask, were the sins purged without!) "came under one general name—*errors*. Heb. ix. §7." My dear sir, is not this building a castle on one stone! The word rendered errors, on which you descant, is found but once in the whole New Testament. You reason as follows:—The blood of bulls and goats

could not take away sins; but they could take away errors! This, of course, you would not call speculation! This blood, you repeat, did take away errors; but these errors, you admit, are sins of ignorance. And does my brother Stone teach that the blood of bulls and goats had virtue to expiate sins of ignorance —errors, but no virtue to expiate other sins. From this I do, indeed, wholly dissent. I do not believe that all the blood of all the animals on earth, were it all poured out at the foot of one altar, could take away one *anoeema*—one sin of ignorance—one of the errors of the people. I do, moreover, regard the contrast between sins and errors to be purely speculative and imaginative. If I am called upon I will prove it by a list of quotations in which those errors are called sins; and, as such, it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could atone for, expiate, or cleanse from one of them.

Brother Stone, you will perceive, then, that you have also mistaken me as much as I presume you have Paul, when you ask, Can I say "that the legal sacrifices did take away all their sins?" I never said so, only in the sense of my third proposition. No sin, or error, ever was taken away, but as respected temporal blessings and curses, by all the blood shed from the foundation of the world, except that of the SLAIN LAMB OF GOD. Hence the transgressions forgiven, as respected all legal penalties, in those who obtained the earthly Canaan, were redeemed or 'expiated' as respected God and conscience by Jesus Christ. Might I ask you, my dear sir; to read and consider again Heb, ix. 15. Mark these words—"The Mediator" Jesus, *by means* of (his own) death for the redemption of transgressions, not transgressors—not sinners, but sins—committed by *the called* under the first or former Testament.

You appear to me equally unfortunate in a former allusion to this chapter, Letter I. page 285. You

quote Heb. ix 22. "And almost all things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission." Here are two propositions—a general one and a universal one. The one respects *things*—the other respects *persons*. The general one is, "*Almost all* THINGS *are purged with blood*" —the universal one is, "*Without shedding of blood there is no one pardoned*, or *there is no* REMISSION.' You say, one exception of the "Almost all *things* purged with blood," is the person guilty! A hint to the wise is sufficient.* I trust you will not again ask, Why does my brother Campbell so confidently assert without shedding of blood there never was remission! Does brother Stone teach that *errors* were forgiven through blood, and *sins* without it! Or what means this question—"Could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all?" And was Abraham saved by faith, without blood, without sacrifice—by faith and works, without a sin-offering! Surely my brother forgot himself here. Abraham worshipped always through blood; hence Jesus said, "Abraham *saw my day and was glad.*" I have not many objections to your remarks on Lev. xvi. concerning the great national atonement. That concerning *errors* and *sins* in contrast is already noted. Two things are taught in the slain goat and the scape goat—*forgiveness* and *forgetfulness*. "Their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more." They were borne away into the land of forgetfulness by the scape goat; but they were first atoned for by the slain goat.

You wish to find some exception to the "*all sins*" and "*all iniquities*" atoned for, and would make my words concerning a certain character countenance

* By the way this is a remarkable verse. There is no exception to a universal rule.—Without shedding of blood there is no one pardoned. This is Almost all things; but it is universal—NO REMISSION.

your conclusions. But the character to which I allude was not that day in that congregation. "The man that despised Moses' law," and renounced his mediation, is not by me regarded as one of that immense host, all of whose sins were that day expiated. So that your conclusion receives no countenance from my words.

You ask me another important question near the close of your letter. "Is propitiating and pacifying the Divine Father a scriptural idea?" The language is divine, and of course the idea also. Our heavenly Father is said to be *against evil doers*—to be angry, increased, provoked—and to be pacified, pleased, &c. See a notable example of this style Ez. xvi 63. "When I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done"—"Many a time turned he his anger away"—"His anger endureth but for a moment' —"He retaineth not his anger for ever," &c. You can add to these many such sayings. Now Jesus is called OUR PEACE. He is the Prince of Peace. At his annunciation it was shouted from heaven, "Glory to God! Peace on earth and good will among men!" &c. This language authorizes the idea that although God is immutable and benevolent, gracious and merciful, and full of compassion, still because of our iniquities he is spoken of as above; and in reference to such bold and correct imagery Jesus Christ is called a Mediator, our peace and propitiation, our mercy-seat; and God sent him forth in this style to justify him in showing mercy to sinners. But of all this in its proper place.

As to your allusion to old orthodoxy, I have only to remark, that I go neither for 'orthodoxy nor heterodoxy, but for orthopraxy.' Still I think "old orthodoxy" is just as learned, as respectable, as pious and moral a thing as young heterodoxy. But I advocate neither. I do not adopt nor reject tenets because of nick names, fashionable or unfashionable

And I am glad that in this, as in a thousand other points, you cordially concur with

Yours with much esteem and affection,

A. C.

P. S. Although our style is diffuse and the points numerous, perhaps this method of glancing at every thing, may be more entertainin g; but to me it is by no means agreeable. One single point in a letter is enough. If you will now select the points, I will follow.

A. C.

ATONEMENT: NO. IV.

Brother Campbell;

I will preface the following remarks with an extract from my "Address" 2 Edition: 1821.

"In God's dealing thus with Israel, he is to be viewed as their temporal king, or political Head 1. Sam. viii. 6, 7, and xii. 17, 19. In this relation, although he granted no pardon to presumptuous sinners according to law; yet as a spiritual Savior and Redeemer, he did shew mercy, and grant pardon to those offenders, who repented, believed in, and plead his gracious Promise or covenant: In other words, they were justified by faith in the gospel preached to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before the law, and which was continued to be preached to the Israelites; and by which without the deeds of the law, all the children of Abraham, whether Jew or Gentile, have been in every age justified. Lev. xxvi. 42. Deut. 30. 31. Num. xiv. 19. 20. Gal. iii. 8, Heb. iv. 1." Page. 38.

I am glad to find that we agree in the leading principle of legal sacrifices, that their virtue only extended to temporal blessings, and to the averting of temporal curses—that they could not purify the conscience

nor justify the sinner in the sight of God, so as to free him from the future judgment of God, and from future punishment in another world; and to give him a place among the sanctified in heaven: For this doctrine I have been an advocate for many years. Though we agree in this, yet we differ in two points. You contend that the benefit of sacrifice was granted to transgressors of every class, but one—"this is the man, who presumptuously despised Moses, and renounced his dispensation. "I contend that there are many unpardonable transgressors of the law, to whom the benefit of sacrifice was not granted, nor pardon obtained by them. They must die without mercy—These characters are the idolators, the blasphemers—the Sabbath breakers—the disobedient children to parents—the murderers—adulterers, and many similar characters named in the law—all of these are worthy of death and must surely be put to death. Let us have the general law, Deut. xvii. 6 "At the mouth of two witnesses or three witnesses, shall he that is worthy of death, be put to death." What can be more explicit than Num. 35. 31. "Moreover ye shall take no satisfaction (*kaphar atonement*) for the life of a murderer, who is guilty of death." So of the other characters mentioned above. See and read attentively the following texts. Gen. ix, 6. Deut. xvii. 2--13 vi 13. xii. 18. Exod. xxi. 14 17 Lev. xxiv. 16. Exod. xxxi. 15. xxxv. 2. Lev. xx 10 11. Deut, ix, 16. Exod. xxii. 20. Num. xv. 30, &c. are any of these characters directed in the law to take a lamb, or any other victim, and offer it for their sins in order to forgiveness Not a hint do we find in the law.

You admit, that "one of us may be mistaken in this case." Yes, my brother, one of us is certainly mistaken, unless you in the class of presumptuous despisers of Moses, include all idolaters, blasphemers, murderers, and all those characters mentioned above. But you confine the presumptuous despisers of Mo-

ses to those "who renounce his dispensation"—Such are apostates from his laws and government. These we acknowledge are presumptuous despisers of Moses; but are not idolators, murderers and all those classes named above, also presumptuous despisers of Moses? To the law we appeal—Num. xv. 30, "But the soul that doeth aught *presumptuously* the same reproacheth the Lord, and that soul shall be *cut off* from among his people; because he hath *despised* the word of the Lord and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall be utterly cut off." 2 Sam. xii. 9, 10. The Lord says "Wherefore hast thou *despised* the commandment of the Lord to do evil in his sight? Thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite, and hast taken his wife to be thy wife. Now therefore the sword shall never depart from thy house, because thou has despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy wife." Here we are plainly taught that the Lord and Moses are despised, presumptuously despised, when their commandments, are presumptuously broken to do evil.

Moses in the chapter just quoted Num. 15. very plainly arranges sins into two classes "Sins of *errors* or ignorance, and *presumptuous* sins. vs. 22. "If ye have *erred*, and not observed all these commandments then it shall be, if aught be committed by *ignorance*, without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the congregation shall offer a young bullock—and the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation—and it shall be forgiven; for it is *ignorance*." vs. 27. "And if any soul sin through *ignorance*—then he shall bring a sin offering and the priest shall make an atonement for that soul that sinneth ignorantly and it shall be forgiven him." Vs. 30 But that soul that doeth aught *presumptuously* shall be cut off." Is this soul directed as those are, who erred or sinned ignorantly, to bring a sin offering and obtain pardon? No they must be cut off—utterly cut off. The reason, why

those who erred and sinned ignorantly had the privilege of sacrifice and pardon, is plainly stated, because it was ignorance, evidently shewing that none but such transgressors had this privilege granted them. Vs. 31 But who are those that sin presumptuously? Those that despise the word of the Lord, and hath willingly broken his commandments, comp. Deut. i. 43. Exod. xxii. 14. Deut. xvii. 12-13.

One, or both of us may have been mistaken, because of inattention to the proper import of errors, sins of *ignorance*, *presumptuous* or wilful sins. Moses has explained errors, sins of ignorance to be the same thing, and contrasts or sets them in opposition to presumptuous or wilful sins, Num. xv. 22--29. Now a sin of ignorance is, according to the Septuagint translation, a sin committed unwillingly or reluctantly. As far as I have examined, they invariably use the word *akousioos*, when expressing what we call, a sin of ignorance. Now the learned well know that this word signifies unwillingly not with full consent of the mind. See Lev. iv 2 v 15. Num. xv. 22—29. In this sense Paul uses the same word without the privitive *a;* Heb. x. 26. For if we sin wilfully [*ekousioos, willingly*] after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, these remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. The same word is used also, Phile. 14. and 1. Pet. v. 2. In these verses, the word is translated *willingly*. It is no where else found in the New Testament. Presumptuous or wilful sin is that which is committed knowingly and willingly, with the full consent of the mind.

That many saints lived from Adam to Christ, is evident—that their sins were pardoned and pardoned through faith, and not by the deeds of the law, is true as far as we are informed; but that they were justified by the blood of law sacrifices, looking through them by faith to the blood of the great anti-type to be shed in future, I must reject for reasons stated in

my 1st No. on Atonement. If they were pardoned and purified from sin by the blood of Christ, it could not have been by faith in the blood, or from any knowledge they had of it. It could therefore have no direct influence or effect on them to reconcile them to God, or lead them to repentance—that whole virtue, influence and effect of his blood must have been directly on, or in God himself—who by it was so effected that he was pacified, propitiated or reconciled, and the honor of his law and government so well sustained, that he granted pardon and favor to sinners. Of all this we have no account in the scriptures.

My dear brother, are you not inconsistent, when you state that "the legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system," that this institution extended no farther than to temporal life and blessings; and yet that the old saints in the patriarchal age, as Abel, Shem, Noah, &c. received spiritual pardon and spiritual blessings through their sacrifices? The reason you assign, is because they *may have had* views superior to the legal economy." *May have had*, is no argument, that they really had superior views, so that they through their sacrifices saw the blood of Christ to be shed in future, when the Israelites under the law could not see it. How do you know whether Abel's offering was a sin-offering, or a thank offering? Why was Abel's offering accepted and Cain's rejected? Not because Abel's was a sacrifice of blood, and Cain's was not: But because Abel offered in faith—faith in what? In the blood of Christ to be shed 4000 years after! Of this you, my dear brother, are as ignorant as myself. Do read the 11 chapter of Hebrews, and understand the faith by which the elders obtained a good report. In all the instances of faith there recorded, do you find one that had the blood of Christ as its object? Do read again the last

chapter of Job, and see whether the sin pardoned there was not wholly an error, or sin of ignorance; and this pardon not by faith in the blood of Christ.—You think David, in the case of Uriah, was pardoned by sacrifice. Once more read this case in Ps. 51; and you will see your mistake. David says. "for thou desirest not sacrifice else would I give it." This shews that he had not given it; because his sin admitted not of sacrifice. As to God smelling a sweet savor from the sacrifice of Noah and others, nothing more is intended than that God was pleased with his obedience and piety. But of this more fully hereafter.

Your broad assertion that no sin of any description was ever pardoned but by shedding of blood, is very doubtful. Was it by blood of any description that pardon was granted to those Num. xiv. 19, 20? How were the Israelites pardoned in Babylon for 70 years? Not by blood of victims, for their temple, altar and all were in ruins and sacrifices must be slain at the temple—how were those pardoned who were not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary? 2 Chron. xxx. 18 19. How were those pardoned who were led captive into foreign lands? Read 2 Chro. vi. 34 20. Is there one instance on record from Adam to Moses of one person being justified by faith in the blood of Christ? Not one. Is there one case of such justification from Moses to Christ? Not one. It is easier to assert than prove.

Paul's simplified plan of sacrifice I have accepted. He adduces them to a few points. 1st. By them a remembrance of sin was made every year, and we may say correctly, every day. No ravenous, unclean beast or fowl was admitted for sacrifice; the sight of such dying could excite in the mind of the worshiper no pity nor compassion. But the innocent and clean beasts and fowls were only required. When the offerer saw these innocent animals writhing in

agony and death, he then was made to remember sin, and saw its effects, misery and death. Had not sin entered into the world, death had been unknown. These dead works, or works of death were considered by Israel as the foundation of repentance Heb. vi,2.

2d. "Almost all things by the law were purged with blood"—men as well as things, for all things include persons as well as things. John. 1. "All things were made by him;" surely persons are here included.—*To make an atonement for*, means to cleanse or purge, as I have proved in my 2nd. No. None can say that God was ever cleansed by any sacrifice under the law or gospel. This needs no proof. I know not any better reason, why God ordained sacrifice for purification, than his own will; thus in type pointing to the death of his Son, "who is exalted to give repentance, and remision of sins."

3. *By law*, without shedding of blood there is no remission. Heb. ix. 22. This is evidently Paul's meaning. Now remission of sin is granted to the penitent only—the blood of the victim cleansed the offerer, who by it was made to remember sin; which is essential to repentance in every age,

4. These sacrifices were typical of the blood of Christ. Did the innocent lamb suffer death for sin; sin not its own? And in this, is not sin in its evil nature, bringing misery, and death, seen and remembered? So in the innocent Lamb of God is sin in all its horrors seen, remembered and condemned. Sin instigated the powers of earth and hell to hate, to persecute and kill him. "Away with him—Crucify him, Crucify him," was the voice of sin in the mouths of wicked men, his servants. Satan put it into the heart of Judas to betray him. The wicked slew him and to them is the crime charged. God did not kill him, nor instigate others to the horrid act, nor did he league with hell and the wicked world in the wicked deed. Now a qustion arises, How is the justice

of God displayed and glorified in this wicked deed? How are the honors of his law secured by this death so contrary to all just laws, human and divine? How can the authority and dignity of divine government be glorified by such a wicked deed? I confess I cannot see as is generally stated. The death and sufferings of Christ, according to the first prophecy, were to be inflicted by the old serpent the Devil. Gen. iii 15. "He had the power of death." Heb. ii. 14. God in his predeterminate counsel delivered up his Son into the hands of wicked men, foreknowing their treatment of him —that they would crucify him. Yet he determined through this very death of his son to condemn sin, and to save sinners. This was his will, that the Son came to do. The Father was well pleased with the offering the son made—it was to him a sweet savor—hence "It pleased the Father to bruise him," i e. to suffer him to be bruised. He was not pleased with the pains and dying groans of his son, only as they were suffered in obedience to his will, and were the means through which he would "destroy him that had the power of death i. e. the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their life time subject to bondage"—and through which means, he would condemn sin, and save the sinner.

Who took vengeance on the Son? The orthodox say God did it—himself poured out the vials of his wrath on the head of his Son. If Jesus was the substitute in the law, room and stead of sinners, then the Lord must take vengeance; for he it is who takes vengance or inflicts punishment on the wicked, therefore he must on the substitute of the wicked. This is indispensible in the system of orthodox atonement, and yet we have just seen that God did not crucify or slay his son, but the wicked did it. What then becomes of the system? It must be sheer speculation, infinitely foreign from truth, though long sanctioned

by human authority from the Catholick archbishop Anselm in the eleventh or twelfth century, down to the present day. Before his day, according to Professor Murdock, we cannot find this doctrine of substitute punishment taught by any.

Brother C.; I shall after this attend to my original plan. In my next two numbers, I shall publish the 3d and 4th Nos on atonement, which have been sent you some months ago; the 3d you inform is mis laid, and cannot be found. After I have published these Nos. I will then take a general and particular review of your objections against my views of this doctrine, and consider particularly your own.

As ever yours in love

B. W. STONE.

Oct. 1st 1840,

RENUNCIATION OF UNIVERSALISM.

The Christian public, we believe, are very generally apprised of the fact, that the Rev. Mr. Smith, late of Hartford, and late a minister of the Universalist Church in that city, has recently renounced the faith of that denomination; He has since been called to the pastoral care of an orthodox church in Salem, Mass. We have now to add another renunciation from that delusive faith, by the Rev. Mr. Whitaker, of the Universalist Church in Duane street—the oldest of that sect in the city. It is an important document, calculated to make a deep impression upon all who will read it in a proper spirit. *N. Y. Crmmercial.*

To the Trustees of the 4th Universalist Society, Duane street:

Dear Brothers:—I hope you will excuse the liberty which I have taken in addressing to you these few lines, on a subject which I deem of infinite importance,

It is now about two years since I first commenced my labors among you, and you will not deem it an instance of vanity, if I say that my efforts to advance the cause of Universalism have been generally approved, and signally successful.

To this, you have frequently born testimony, and for which you have had my warmest acknowledgments.

But in looking calmly and dispassionately at the result of my ministrations, there is one draw back to my happiness—one source of disquietude, which weighs heavily upon my mind.

By the providence of God, I have recently been led to ask myself the following important questions:

What have I done toward promoting particular piety among my congregation?

Have I induced them to become a deeply religious people—a praying people?

Alas! I am constrained to answer these questions in the negative, and to take unto myself shame and confusion of face.

Now, if the doctrine I have preached be the truth of God, ought I not to have expected a different result?

What, then, is the unavoidable inference?

Why, that Universalism is not a scriptural doctrine.

Perhaps you may think this a hasty conclusion, but I assure you it is not so.

I have been led by the Spirit of God to investigate its claims—I have prayed to the Almighty that he would enlighten my understanding, and lead me to a knowledge of the truth, and blessed be his holy name, he has heard and answered my petition.

I can truly say, that I now see and feel the importance of personal religion, in a manner that I have never done before; and I ardently beseech the "Giver of every good and perfect gift," that he may open your eyes, and give you to see that Universalism is but a "cunningly devised fable," calculated to darken the mind, harden the heart, and induce mankind to wander from the paths of righteousness and peace.

Such being my convictions I can advocate it no longer, and I beseech you, as you hope for mercy at the bar of the Almighty, to renounce it immediately:

Do not, I pray you, suffer yourselves to be deluded by a sentiment, which is dangerous and licentious in all its tendency.

By renouncing it, you loose nothing, for if it is true, you in common with the whole world, will be saved—but if it is false,—Oh! remember—remember—the awful consequences!

But I must close, and may the Lord grant that you, to

gether with my dear congregation may soon be led to see and feel the necessity of an interest in the atoning blood of Jesus, which is the ardent prayer of your sincere friend. WM, WHITTAKER.

New York, July 21st, 1840,

THE CHRISTIAN EXPOSITOR.

Matt. xi. 20--25. "Then began he to upbraid the cities, wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not. Woe unto the Chorazin! Woe unto thee Bethsaida! For if the mighty works which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sack cloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you."

Ah, says one, he might as well upbraid the blind for not seeing, the deaf for not hearing, and the dumb for not speaking, as to upbraid the sinner for not repenting; for all are equally impossible without the immediete interposition of almighty power. If some have not the hardihood thus to speak in as plain language to reproach the Savior; yet how many plainly declare that no sinner can repent till God by almighty power works it in him, which is the same idea.

The Savior commands all men every where to repent, and except they repent they shall perish. But when are they to repent? As soon as they hear the command; and if they disobey it, they are guilty before God. This shews that sinners are reponsible, and therefore judged capable of obeying the command, Repent.

Jesus is exalted to give repentance and remission of sins. How does he give repentance? Our text informs us; by the mighty works which he performed on earth, as opening the eyes of the blind

causing the deaf to hear, the dumb to speak, the dead to live by a word or a touch. Now, says he, If the mighty works which have been done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented in sack cloth and ashes. These works are then the means and foundation of repentance.

Another query arises in the mind; How do these works produce repentance? I answer, they abstractly, do not produce repentance, else the cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida would have repented. They were amazed and marvelled greatly at the wonderful works, but did not repent. Why? Because they did not believe the design of these works, which was to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, sent by the Father to be the Savior of the world. Thus Nicodemus reasoned with himself from seeing the miracles of Jesus, and knowing for what purpose they were performed. There are the works of almighty power—would God lend his omnipotence to an impostor and thus confirm his imposture upon the world? impossible. He must be a teacher come from God:

These miracles viewed with an unprejudiced mind, brings us to believe in Jesus as the Son of God, and Savior of the world: This raises the mind to the Father of mercies, from whose bosom we see boundless love bursting forth to a poor sinful world. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life." These miracles produced faith in Jesus, as the Son of God—faith in him reveals the Father's infinite love, goodness, and mercy. This leads to repentance; for the goodness of God leads to repentance.

Woe to that man, who is exalted to heaven with respect to the knowledge of Christ Jesus, his works, his death, burial, resurection, and yet does not repent. It shall be more tolerable for the wicked—the abominably wicked Sodomites at the day of judgment,

than for him. The Sodomites were ignorant of these things, therefore they are more excusable—their condemnation will be lighter, more tolerable, than his. Is it true, that the world was under the reign of sin and death, and the powers of hell triumphantly leading them captive to eternal woe?—Is it true that God so loved the world as to give his only begotten son to save us from perishing forever, and to give them eternal life, on condition that they believe and repent, and obey? Is it true, that when he saw no other in his vast dominions than his own Son, who could break the grasp of sin, death and hell, and redeem a fallen world, that he spared him not, but delivered him up for us all? If this be true, it is the most tremendous truth ever heard by mortal man. Can he believe this, and yet make light of it? Reject it; and spurn the gift of God, and choose death rather than life? Dear sinner, your soul is at stake, in danger every moment, in danger of eternal fire. Repent, and convert, that your sins may be blotted out—believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and prove your faith by works of humble obedience. O that you would consider these things seriously, speedily, and effectually! B. W. S.

[*Communicated.*]

For the Christian Messenger.

At the earnest request of father Stone, I have taken up my pen to contribute to the pages of the Christian Messenger: and having some knowledge of the state of religion amongst us, and being assured from personal acquaintance, as well as from information received from others, that our brethren in many places are living beneath their privileges, I will submit a few thoughts, particularly designed for those, whose duty it is to watch for souls, as those who shall give

an account, for I am persuaded that much of the coldness and indifference manifest among us, is chargeable to the Elders, or Bishops of our Congregations.

I wish to remind all my brethren, who have agreed to serve in this most responsible office in the Christian Congregations, of Paul's charge to the elders of the church at Ephesus; "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, (*the Lord*) which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts. xx., 28, also 1. Peter: v.1 –4. "The Elders which are among you I exhort, who also am an Elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being Lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

I am persuaded that if these precepts were faithfully obeyed by all those, upon whom they are binding, a different state of things would exist among us. I will now take the liberty to state what I firmly believe to be a part of the duties, resting on those, who have been placed over the congregations. But I will first remark that I write for the instruction of those brethren, who have been placed in circumstances not the most favorable to obtain a knowledge of their duty, and not for those who know and do it.

This I cannot do more effectually, than by giving a statement of facts, relative to the course pursued by some Elders of congregations in my acquaintance. The Elder of the congregation at G—, apprises his brethren of his intention to visit them for the purpose of inquiring into their spiritual welfae, and to give them, what he might consider, necessary admonition and instruction. The brethren expecting a visit from their Elder at the time appointed, re-

main at home; and when he arrives, the family are assembled together. A portion of the sacred scriptures are read, after which a hymn is sung, and prayer made that the blessing of God might attend the instruction to be given. It was carefully observed that the scriptures read, should embrace the relations existing in the family circle, and the many christian duties; as the duty of husbands to their wives, and of wives to their husbands—of parents to their children,and of children to their parents. These duties were effectually enforced. Inquiry was made of the head of the family, whether family worship was duly attended to morning and night; if not, the necessity of it was enforced together with family culture and the duty of bringing up our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Secret prayer was inquired after and enforced, if neglected. If any neglected the duty of assembling with their brethren for worship, a suitable admonition was given them, and the necessity of promptly attending to this duty was urged upon them. If there were any found, who were not professors of religion, and who were willing to receive instruction, they were also attended to. In this way the elder proceeded, going from house to house, till all the brethren were visited.

This course has a happy influence upon all the brotherhood, an influence, which our public discourses fail to have. I say not this against the utility of public discourses, for our Apostle taught publicly, as well as from house to house. In this way, each brother and sister feel themselves directly addressed; and cannot hand over the truth to another. I have witnessed the happy effects of this course—the brethren become alive to their duty, and the house of worship is soon crowded:

Nor does its influence cease here; sinners too are aroused, and become obedient to the faith. If this course were pursued by all the elders of our congregations, many apostacies would be prevented, and the brethren kept alive to their duty; piety and spiritual mindedness would exist and increase among us, and those engaged in this good work would find it a great blessing to themselves, their own spiritual welfare would be promoted, and they would purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith, which is in Christ Jesus.

Will our elders awake to this work? To you is committed an important trust—You are to watch for souls, as those who shall give an account to God; the souls of men are committed to your trust. O consider their immense value, and labor to present them spotless before the throne of God. Then shall you receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away—then shall you realize what you may have often sung.

Here I see the under shepherds,
And the flock they fed below;
Here with joy they dwell together,
Jesus is their shepherd now.

But there is an important duty binding on those who are taught in the word. They are to communicate to him that teacheth in all good things. This duty must be attended to on the part of the brethren taught, to enable those who teach to discharge their duty. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." These few remarks are submitted to the consideration of the brethren, in hope that they may be useful to some. May the Lord enable us all to be faithful in our various relations till death! and then may we receive a crown of life! S. HATCHITT.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Religion, in our section of country, is reviving after a long sickly condition. Last week at a meeting of our brethren in Jersey Prairie, 18 were immersed and added to the church—on last Lord's day

at Winchester, three were immersed and added to the church—within two or three weeks about 10 at Riggsville—4 at Lynnville—and two at Antioch. At our annual meeting at Springfield 9 or 10. There is a good appearance in Hart's Prairie—2 were lately baptized there, and added to the church. There is a general revival among the brethren. We hope in the next No. to have a good account to give—Bro. Ballenger, from Missouri, writes that a good number, I think, odds of 20, lately were baptized in his neighborhood, not far from Palmyra—and since, we have heard that bro. McCall has baptized between 20 and 30 on the Fabies.

EDITOR.

The following letter was sent to brother Campbell for publication last December. It was never printed. The reason, I suppose of its not being published was, that before its arrival at Bethany, he had ceased publishing more on this subject for awhile, and so signified in the Harbinger. There may be a few verbal alterations in the letter, but it is in substance the same.

ON THE NAME CHRISTIAN.

BROTHER CAMPBELL;

I wish to appear on the pages of your Millenial Harbinger in defence of a name, to me the most dear of any other worn by man—a name, for which I have suffered much and long—and for which, I am willing to suffer to the end of my life—that name is CHRISTIAN. The reason of my predilection for this name, above all others, I will state as briefly as I can, that more useful matter may not be pushed out of your Harbinger.

1st. Barnabas had sought for and found Paul, and brought him to Antioch. "And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called christians first at Antioch." Acts xi. 26.

Read the same verse according to the pointing of Griesbach, acknowledged the most accurate copyist of the Greek scriptures. "And it came to pass, that for a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people; and called the disciples christians first at Antioch."

Your version, 3rd Edition, Reads thus. "And it came to pass

that they assembled with the congregation for a whole year, and taught considerable numbers; and the disciples were first named christians at Antioch:"

By our standard version and by yours, it cannot be determined by whom the disciples were called or named Christians in Antioch. Hence some have concluded that their enemies called them christians by way of reproach. But by the punctuation of Griesbach and Greenfield's Greek text, such a conclusion cannot be drawn; for it is plain that Paul and Barnabas are described as assembling with the church—as teaching much people, and as calling or naming the disciples christians first at Antioch. This no Greek scholar will deny, if he will but glance his eye over the text in Griesbach and Greenfield. King James' version and yours have given a passive translation of the active verb *chrematisai*. This in a few cases is admissible in the Greek language, but I see no good reason for admitting it in the case before us. Instead of the disciples were called—were named Christians, it should be read, "And they, the Apostles, called the disciples Christians. The verb cannot be construed passively, because Paul and Barnabas were the subjects of it, It would then be read, "and they i. e. Paul and Barnabas the disciples were themselves called Christians first at Antioch, and not the Antiochians.

But I have more to say on this passage Acts. xi. 26. The verb *chrematisai* signifies more than simply naming or calling the disciples christians. It means that they, the Apostles so called them by divine admonition or appointment. Thus Dr. Doddridge renders it. They were called Christians by divine appointment. Donnegan renders the verb *chrematisai*, "*to deliver an oracle give an intimation of the divine will pass* to receive an oracular response, or intimation of the divine will." Greenfield on the word says, In the New Testament it means "To impart a divine warning or admonition—give instructions or directions under the guidance of inspiration."

Dr. Parkhurst says of the verb, it means "to utter oracles, give divine directions of information. Pass, To be directed informed, or warned by a divine oracle, to be directed or warned of God." He refers to Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus who thus apply this word. Park, in verbo.

Doc McKnight on the word (Heb. viii. 5.) says, it sometimes, signifies "to receive an oracle or a revelation, or a divine direction—to deliver an oracle."

Schrevelius differs not from those above. See also Doct. A. Clark on Acts xi. 26; J. Brown says, "The Christians, by divine direction first received this designation at Antioch, in the Apostolic age, and still retain it" Dict. in verb.

Though Lexicographers and critics admit the difinition above given, yet they give others of the same verb which are generally admitted. But how shall we determine the signification of the word as used in Acts xi. 26? I answer with you; not by

examining the signification of the word in classic Greek writers, but in the Syriac Greek of the inspired writer. If in every passage where the word occours in the New Testament we find the same signification, we may safely rest on that as the true meaning. We will now examine every text, where the word *Chrematizo* occurs in the New Testament.

Matthew ii. 12. "And being warned of God (*Chrematisthenes*) in a dream that they should not return to Herod." The word *God* is not expressed in the Greek, but is included in the word *chrematizo* as in several cases below. It might be rendered, "Being divinely warned or admonished, or directed not to return to Herod.

Matthew ii. 22. "But being warned of God (chrematistheis) in a dream, he turned aside into the parts of Gallilee."

Luke ii. 26. "And it was revealed (kechrematismenon) unto him by the Holy Spirit, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ.' All will acknowledge this a divine admonition.

Acts x. 20. 'Cornelius was warned of God (echrematisthe) by a holy angel to send for thee.'

Heb, viii, 5 'Moses was admonished of God (kechrematistai) when he was about to build the Tabernacle.'

Heb. xi. 7, 'By faith, Noah being warned of God (chrematistheis of things not seen as yet,'

Heb. xii, 25. 'For if they escaped not, who refused him that spake (chrematizonta) on earth,' The Greek word here is rightly rendered by some as meaning, him that spake, or delivered an oracle on earth, This was by divine appointment all agree.

Romans vii. 3. 'If then while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called (chrematisai) an adultress.' It is well known that divorces were admitted under the law of Moses. Wives receiving a divorce from their husbands might marry another, while her first husband was living, and not be called an adultress. On this case the Savior thus speaks, Matthew v, 31--32, 'It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement. But I say unto you that whosoever marrieth her that is divorced committeth adultery, and causeth her to commit adultery. No divine admonition or oracle was given under the law forbidding a divorced woman to marry another husband, and of calling her an adultress, if her first husband was alive; but now under the new institution, she shall be by divine appointment or oracle, called an adultress.

These are all the places in the New Testament where the word *chremavaizo* occurs. By these the signification of it appears to me fixed. If so. Then Paul and Barnabas called the disciples Christians by divine admonition or appointment.

One more idea I will suggest from the text, Acts xi. 26. It is evident that Paul and Barnabas called the disciples Christians

first in Antioch. They either did it by divine direction, and admonition, or appointment, or they did it without such inspiration, judging it the most appropriate name to unite Jew and Gentile believers in the one body of Christ. If they gave the nam by divine direction or inspiration, we are bound, and dare not reject it for any other. If they gave it with their own Judgment of its propriety, shall we not pay more respect to their judgment, than to reject it, and take the very name they rejected? Had they given this name Christian without revelation, or divine admonition, would they not have informed us, as in similar cases? Apostolic precepts and practice are our examples, from which we are not allowed to depart. Let every man take heed, lest he err from truth.

2dly Another argument in defence of the name Christian, as the most appropriate family name, is, that the disciples of Christ are so called in the apostolic writing, as well as by Luke, the author of the Acts of the Apostles. Besides the text already considered, (Acts xi. 26) Luke informs us that 'Agrippa said to Paul, almost thou persuadest me to be a *christian*" Acts xxvi 28. Peter says, 'If any man suffer as a *chrstian*, let him not be ashamed.' 1, Pet, iv, 16. 'If ye be reproached for the name of *Christ*, happy are ye.' 1 Peter iv, 14. 'Do they not blaspheme that worthy name, by the which ye are called; or, as your version has it 'do they not blaspheme that worthy name, which is named upon you.' This is, doubtless, the most correct. James ii. 7. And thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith.' Rev. ii. 13. 'Thou hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name. Rev. iii. 8. Now it is well known, that the edicts of the persecuting Cesars, were to cut off and exterminate the Christians. When the Christians were apprehended, they were individually asked by their judges, are you a Christian? Those who held fast the name, and boldly affirmed they were christians, were cut off by death: But those who denied the name—denied they were christians, (as some did through fear) were dismissed, and absolved from punishment. Eusebins' account of the trial of Martyrdom of Polycarp before the Proconsul, elucidates this subject. Polycarp answered him (the proconsul) "Here freely, I am a Christian." "The proconsul commande the Badle, in the midst of the theatre, thrice to ery; Polycarp confesseed himself a christian· At which saying; the multitutude both of Jews and Gentiles, inhabiting Smyrna. shouted with a great rage: This is that Doctor of Asia, the father of the christitian, &c "In this rage they hurried him to death Euseb. Leb; 4 page 64, 65.

3dly My third argument is drawn from Eph. iii. 14-15 "For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ of whom the whole family of heaven and earth is named' From the grammatical construction of the sentence, it is evident hat the relative *whom* refers to the last antecedent Christ,

Therefore the whole family in heaven and on earth, is named after him. This family in heaven and earth we understand to be believing Jews and Gentiles, See Eph. i. 10. Coll. i. 20.

Lest I swell my remarks beyond what I intended, several other arguments of weight in my mind are omitted. If those already adduced be good, the necessity of more is superseded. I will attend to a few objections, and submit the subject to the candid public.

Obj. 1st Brother Campbell contends that the designation of *disciples* is more ancient than Christian, and should be retained in preference.

Ans. The name of Abram was more ancient than Abraham; so was the name of Sarai more ancient than Sarah, and the name of Jacob more ancient than Israel; yet God in his wisdom saw it proper to change those more ancient names Abram, Sarai and Jacob into Abraham, Sarah and Israel. Had they rejected the name God had given them, and said, We will be called by our former name, because it is more ancient—Would this be deemed a good argument? Would it not argue insubjection and disobedience? Would they not be judged as sinners? So when God's people were formerly called *disciples*, and he in his wisdom changed that name into *Christian*, Is it good reason—is it justifiable to say, the name *disciples* is more ancient, therefore I will retain it in preference to every other? Would it be correct reasoning to say, The Old Testament with its institutes, is more ancient than the New; therefore I will retain the Old in preference to the New? We think not; because God has abolished the Old, and brought in the New, established on better promises.

Obj. 2. He, [bro. C—] says, Luke wrote his Acts some 30 years after the ascension. Now in his writingswhich give us at least 30 yeas history of the primitive church, the word *Christian* occupies but twice, used only by the Antiochans, and by king Agrippa."

Ans, We grant all you have said here, except that the the word *Christian* was used by the Antiochians. We have no account of the word *Christian* as ever used by them. Doct. Parkhurst, very hostile to the name *Christian* as a family name of divine appointment, uses against it the same arguments that you do, and thinks that the Antiochians who imposed the name, were the wicked part of them, and that it was done by way of contempt. You do not go thus far, but leave the matter in doubt whether they were the wicked or righteous part, or all the Antiochians together, who used the word *Christian*. It is to me plain, as stated before, that Paul and Barnabas only used the word, in their application of it to the disciples at Antioch, as I have before stated.

You farther say, "No disciple, as far as Luke relates ever spoke of himself or brethren under that designation *Christian*. I grant, no disciple ever spoke of himself as a *Christian*—and you will grant that no disciple ever spoke of himself as a *disciple*, after the change of the name.

You proceed, "Luke and other intelligent men call them often *brethren* and disciples, but never *Christians*." You ought to have excepted Paul and Barnabas and Agrippa.

It is true that the word *Christian* occurs but twice in the Acts of the Apostles and but once in the apostolic writings. But I ask, How often does the word *disciple* occur in all the Apostles' writings? Not once. Does not this prove that the name *disciple* was no longer used by the Apostel after the name *Christian* was given? But if it appears strange that Luke, who wrote the Acts of the apostles 30 yeaas after the ascension, should use the word *disciples* frequently, and the name *Christian* but twice, after the change of names; how much more strange will it appear, that Moses, who wrote the history of Jacob 200 years after the Lord had changed his name to Israel, though he used the word *Jacob* many scores of times, yet never used Israel *once* till the day of Jacob's death, about 70 years after his name was changed?

As to your objection to 'our name' being *Christian*, because you have been anticipated Unitarians having taken it before you, and as to your preference to *disciples of Christ*, because it is unappropriated, I regard as excrescences of a wild stock, which cannot be too soon plucked away, and the very root destroyed. It is hard, if not impossible to repudiate names and opinions as terms of fellowship, without establishing a party, and a party standard of doctrines, by which uniformity of faith may be effected, This has been too long tried for us to hope for success. I have long since given up the idea as chimerical and unscriptural; I shall in my old age never attempt it; and while I live, I shall endeavor to dissuade all with whom I have influence, from such a procedure. If any people bearing the name *Christian*, have by their conduct abused that worthy name, I will endeavor to disabuse it by a holy life, and never reject a good because it has been abused. In doing so I should reject Christianity itself; for alas how long it has been abused in the world.

My dear brother, *I* and many others, may have misunderstood you; yet it is too evident that you have a great antipathy to Unitarians, I profess not to be one: yet if I were, your hard remarks would be a shield against the weapons of truth when wielded by you. In this, we think, you have deviated from your first attempts at reformation.

To preach the word in the spirit, irrespective of the confusion of tongues, is the best way to convince and save the world. If we wish a large party, we must do as the parties do, try to beat down every thing but ourselves. By these means, we may make a great party; but would they be better or more holy than others? Dear brother, our reformation needs reforming. We have the form of truth, but have we as a people the power and spirit of it? Let us labor without discouragement to have this effected, and our reformation will be a blessing to the world. The practice of truth is more efficacious than the profession of it, to recommend it to the acceptance of the world.

Farewell. B. W. STONE.

COVETOUSNESS.

I cannot discover an adequate cause for covetousness. What should move a man to undergo trouble, anxiety and disquietude, in laying up money, not for himself, but another, perhaps a profligate, or even an enemy? If therefore attribute the passion to the folly of man; which, we see, may some times rise so high as to make some misers actually starve themselves. Avarice in such a degree, is a shocking disease; and properly compared to that dropsy, wherein the more a man drinks, the more thirsty he grows, and the sooner he dies. Nay, this disease is like witchcraft; for the miser does not possess his money, but his money possesses him. Hence, though covetousness be an odious failing, it seems characteristic of man, as a creature that does not know himself.—*The Reflector:*

The Messenger will be published the last week in every Month. EDITOR

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

BY BARTON W. STONE,

AN ELDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST;
ASSISTED BY
Elders Thō's M. Allen and Jacob Creath, Jr. of Missouri.

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

VOL. XI.] JACKSONVILLE, ILL. NOV. 1840. [NO. 3

ATONEMENT NO. IV.

Brother Campbell,

In my last number I was still prosecuting the subject of the death or sacrifice of Christ, showing its effects on believing sinners. I was particular, perhaps unnecessarily so, in showing the effects of the Levitical sin-offerings, and of the offering of Christ Jesus, on man and things; yet to set the subject in as clear a light as I can, I will add a few things more from the same source—the Bible.

Another effect of the blood of Christ on man, is, that by it, man is *redeemed*, *bought*, *purchased*, or *ransomed*. Tit. ii. 14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity." 1. Peter i 18 "Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot." Eph. i 1. 7. Col. i 14. "In whom we have redemption in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins," Hos. xiii. 14: "I will *ransom* them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death." Rev. v. 9. "For thou wast slain and hast *redeemed* us to God by thy own blood"—not from God: Rom. viii. 23; Hebrews ix. 12, Gal: iii. 13.