On Saturday the 21st I commenced proclaiming the word in Richmond; and continued twice a day until Monday night, when Bro. Smith arrived. We united our efforts until Tuesday night. One intelligent lady confessed Jesus, and 2 others united with the church The elements were much against us here, we had rain, snow, and cold weather, but a good hearing, and we trust much good done, Bro. Gaines was with us; he resides here.

On the 3d Lords day of Nov. Bros. Wills and Lee were in Columbia. One owned, and submitted to the Lord there. The prospects are encouraging in this country—We want efficient proclaimers very much

Your Brother, THOS. M. ALLEN.

FROM KENTUCKY

Glorious Religious news just received, but too late for this No. but shall appear in our next Bro, J. T. Johnson writes Dec. 11, that he had just closed a meeting at North Middleton, and had 23 additions—at Providence a little before 9, and at Paris 11—bro. J. Roberts of New Castle writes that he has baptized the present year about 160.

GENERAL AGENTS for the Christian Messerger—Elder T. M. Allen of Columbia, and Eld Jacob Creath of Monticello, Mo. Eld. P. E. Harris of Rockville, Ia. Elder J. A. Gano of Centerville, Ky. Charles Gilliam of Jacksonville, Ill. R. Compton, p m of Mt Healthy, Ohio.

My patrons would greatly oblige me by remitting me money for the Messenger—as I shall shortly need paper, and must delay the work till I get money—my printer also needs. Let them remember that by an ordinance of the Post Office, the Postmasters are to frank all letters conveying money for periodicals.

EDITOR.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

JANUARY, 1841.

LETTER IV.—To B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE,

My dear Sir—MAY the new year be to us both the most useful and happy year of our lives! On entering a new year it is good to reconsider the past and to amend our ways. "Lord, teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts to wisdom."

It becomes necessary for the sake of new readers and to refresh the memory of the old, to glance at the points in which we have concurred, and at the points in which we differ so far in this investigation. And first at the points in which we have concurred.

1. That to "expiate," and to "pacify," and "atone for," are scriptural ideas and expressions.

2. That sacrifice is as old as the fall of man, 2500 years older than the law, and that the legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system.

3. That the legal sacrifices were for the exclusive benefit of those who were under that dispensation, and interfered not with the nature, design, or use of sacrifice as practised by all the saints from Abel to Moses.

4. That the life and death, the blessing and the

curse of the law were merely fleshly and temporal, and that therefore the virtue of its sacrifices could extend no farther than temporal life and temporal blessings. These forfeited, the law had no other blessings in store for them.

5. 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 transgressions so far as the law caused the offence to abound.

6. Salvation, then, under the law, spiritual and eternal, was through faith, repentance, and sacrifice as it was from Adam to Moses.

7. All sacrifice, altars, victims, and priests were typical, whether before or under the law; the antitype of them all is Jesus the Messiah, our sacrifice, altar, victim, and priest.

8. There never was on earth a divine system of religion without blood in it. Sacrifice, altar, and priest, are the skeleton of every dispensation.

9. That without faith and repentance sacrifice never did, never can, avail any thing. That it was in consequence of faith that Abel's sacrifice excelled that of Cain.

So far as I can understand your communication, we agree in these nine propositions. But you seem to differ from me in the following, which I shall call the *tenth:*

10. *That neither divine mercy nor human repentance, without sacrifice, is adequate to the remission of sins.*

I may misunderstand you on this point; and if I do, it is from such affirmations as the following.

1st. You intimate the errors, or, as you define errors, viz.; sins of ignorance, require blood; but that greater transgression, or what are, in contrast with simple errors, called *sins*, are forgiven without blood or sacrifice. In one sentence, that in order to remission errors require blood, and that sins did not!

2d. You intimate that there was a gospel preached to Abraham by which Jews and Greeks were justified, and that it had neither blood nor sacrifice in it. This you quote in the letter before me from an Address published by you the second time in 1821, which I never had, as far as I recollect, the good fortune to read.

3d. In your interpretation of this gospel, as you quote your address, it would seem that the Jews under the law, and the Gentiles without law, were justified by Abraham's gospel without any sacrifice or deeds of the law, regarding [as you seem to me] that when Paul said, "You are justified by faith without the deeds of the law," he meant justified by faith without blood or sacrifice. Do you make sacrifice one of the deeds of the law?

4th. You object to my strongly affirming with Paul that without shedding of blood there is now, and there never was, remission of sin to one of Adam's race. Your objection to this would seem to indicate that you teach that without shedding of blood there is remission in some cases—nay, in all, before and since the law.

5th. And finally, that there was no sacrifice or sin-offering under the law but for mere errors, or sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement. As there is some confusion in your style, some misprinting too in the copy before me on this point, as well as in some of the preceding, I hope I misunderstand you, and that when you fully explain yourself we will fully agree on these five as we agree on the nine.

I say, as we agree on the nine; for with a single exception to my proof of one of these, and I requested your objections in a former epistle on any of the points involved in them, I conclude there is a concurrence in them all. You object to my views of the faith by which Abel obtained testimony that he was righteous, rather than to the fact that God testified

of his *gifts* at the altar. You ask me how I know that Abel's offering was a sin-offering. &c. Because of the matter of it, and because of the state of mind in which it was offered. It was a bleeding lamb, and it was offered in *faith*. These are both facts. Now Cain's was neither. In matter and form they differ. Abel *believed* the promise in its two branches,

1st. That the seed of the woman was a Son of Man; and that he would avenge the quarrel by bruising the serpent's head; that *he would redeem man from sin and Satan, and that at the expense of suffering himself*. The circumstances gave to Adam's family their interpretation of the matter, and that the bruising of the serpent's head meant the bruising of Satan's power over man, is farther evident from Paul's use of the terms, Rom. xvi. 20. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, by his prophecies, as intimated by Jude, shows how greatly we moderns underrate both the knowledge and faith of the antediluvians. If you demand *a priori* proof, it cannot be given for this and many other such matters farther than I have given it; but the *a posteriori* proof is obvious; for God always required faith in the Messiah and sacrifice, never asked less from one than another. Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Melchisedec, &c. lived under the same dispensation. Abel was only the prototype, as he was the protomartyr of the economy. The seed of the woman was therefore Christ; the *bruising his heel* indicated Messiah's sufferings; the *bruising of the Serpent's head* intimated Satan's ruin. Abel believed, built an altar, and sacrificed a lamb, the antitype of which is the *Lamb slain from the foundation of the world:* I am sorry to see my brother Stone intimate a doubt on this subject.

There are some indistinct affirmations and negations between us on the sins of ignorance and presuptuous sins. You seem to conceive of nothing between these. I do not, my venerable brother,

wonder at it, inasmuch as the whole subject of the Jewish sacrifices and offerings are but little understood and very imperfectly examined by our scribes and elders. Presumptuous sins cut a person off from any institution under which man was ever placed. If a man "sin wilfully," i. e. presumptuously—"there remains no more sacrifice," &c. is as true of Christ's administration as of that of Moses. Some, with you imagine that as sin-offerings refer so often to sins of ignorance, there is no institution for any other kind of sins. Now, sir, should I grant that sin-offerings, as defined by Moses, refer to sins of ignorance alone, and to all sins of ignorance [which by the way I do not concede, [still it by no means follows that there were no sacrifices under the law for any other sins or errors than those of ignorance. This is evident for two reasons.

1st. Because the sins of ignorance for which sin-offerings are specially designed in the law, are defined to be but *one class* of said sins—namely, *sins of ignorance against negative precepts*, or, to use the words of Moses, "If a soul shall sin through ignorance against *any of the commandments of the Lord* CONCERNING THINGS WHICH OUGHT NOT TO BE DONE—and shall act against any of these." This specification shows the peculiar province of that species of sin-offerings as refering to those absolute prohibitory precepts which, if violated wittingly, constituted presumptuous sins. Of this class of precepts concerning things which ought not to be done, the Jews counted three hundred and sixty five, of which only some forty would subject a wilful transgressor to excission. Now only for transgressions of these through ignorance was that class of sin-offerings ordained.

2d. But besides those emphatically styled "SIN-OFFERINGS," there were other sin-offerings—such as the burnt-offerings, the trespass offerings, and the peace-offerings; all of which were sin-offerings; some of

them, too, for sins of ignorance against *positive precepts* of which, according to some Rabbis, they had two hundred and forty eight. But other sins besides sins of ignorance against positive precepts, are enumerated by Moses, as I before demonstrated to your satisfaction, I hope, from Leviticus, 5th and 6th chapters, 1–7. There are sins of knowledge, of doubt, and of ignorance, specified under the law of trespass-offerings —as any one may see who will impartially read the passage referred to.

With regard to the occasion of this discussion of sin-offerings, permit me to offer a few remarks. Your opposition to it seems to arise from a conviction that if we establish that sin in general were expiated by the legal, or by the patriarchal sacrifices, [*for they are different institutions*)—and especially on the principle that the victim died for, or instead of the offerer, the whole doctrine of old orthodoxy naturally follows and to this you would make it appear you have a peculiar dislike. Well, now, I have no predilection for, nor antipathy against, either old or new orthodoxy; I care not a fig how my reasonings will affect either system. The question with me is, *Is it true?* Do the Prophets and Apostles teach it? If so, I teach it. If not, I teach it not. You have been so vexed with old orthodoxy, that, like the burned child, you dread the fire. You have been scorched, and burned, and bruised by men calling themselves orthodox. Well, be it so. Still old Orthodoxy is, as I before said, more learned, more devout, more intelligent, and more practically useful than old or new heterodoxy. Both have been professedly men whose hearts never felt the love of God, and therefore both are stained with blood of human sacrifice. When in power both are intolerant, proud, proscriptive, and persecuting. This you will see fully sustained in my last number, under the caption of "A sin against Orthodoxy." It has used me very ill; but that is no reason why I should detract aught from its well founded pretensions.

I cannot now write a dissertation on burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, peace-offerings, meat-offerings, drink-offerings, thank-offerings, &c. &c. Four of these, suffice it to say, the *four first* were sin-offerings for sins of different attributes; and by these offerings once a year all the sins of the people in or under the covenant were expiated and remitted, so far as the penalties of the Jewish institute required.

Before the Jewish institution began, the saints, one and all, through faith in the promised seed, offered up sacrifice to God; and God, as in the case of Abel, Noah, Abraham, Job, testified of their gifts and justified them. They were pardoned in anticipation of "the redemption of the transgressions" to be brought in under the new, or at the close of the legal institute —of which I have something to say in its own place.

When Enoch prophesied of the last days of the Christian age, when Jesus affirmed that Abraham saw his day and was glad, and when Job, before Moses said, "I know that my kinsman [redeemer,] my *Goel* liveth, and that he shall stand upon the earth in the latter day, and that in the resurrection I shall see him;" who can limit the boundaries of faith or knowledge possessed and displayed by the patriarchal people and Jews! May we not then conclude that when the gospel was preached to Abraham sacrifice and blood were in it as well as in our gospel, whose first fact is, THE MESSIAH DIED FOR SINS *according to the scriptures.*" Isai. liii. Dan. ix. *&c: &c.* of which more fully when you develope your views of Christ's death. May you not then, my dear sir, notwithstanding all the truth which you utter concerning presumptuous sins and sins of ignorance, in which I presume, as now explained by both of us we agree; I say, may you not be too rash in affirming that "if the saints from Adam to Christ were pardoned, and purified from sins by faith in his blood, it could not have been from

any knowledge they had of it"? True indeed, they may have looked for redemption in Israel, and by the Messiah too—the son of Eve and the son of Abraham, without fully, or at all, understanding him; or by what means, or to what extent, this redemption was to be effected.

I am sorry to hear you say that one of my most prominent assertions is with you doubtful. Your words are, "Your broad assertion that no sin of any description was ever pardoned but by shedding of blood." Am I not backed by Paul? "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." You ask with confidence of a negation, "Is there one instance on record, from Adam to Christ, of one person bing justified by the blood of Christ?" You must mean, in so many words, I presume. I would also ask you how was it that Moses, when near the throne of Egypt, "esteemed the reproach of Christ above all the wealth of Egypt, and endured as seeing him that was invisible?" How was it that Isaiah said, "By the knowledge of him my righteous servant shall justify many whose iniquities he shall have borne." And Daniel, after so long a time, "shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself," &c.—"He was wounded for our transgressions," &c.—"He brought in an everlasting righteousness," &c. Do you think no one believed those things! All your questions in this section suppose unless daily offering up sacrifice the Jews could not be pardoned by blood. Cannot our sins be pardoned through faith in a blood shed two thousand years ago!

You say you have accepted "Paul's simplified plan of sacrifice," I suppose, then, you have left me Paul's complex plan! He reduces them, you say, to a few points. The points of his simplified plan are—

1st. An annual and daily remembrance of sins.

2d. The purgation of all things, including persons, for as "all things were made by him" includes all

persons, so almost all things being purged by blood, means almost all persons.

3d: "By law without shedding of blood there is no remission;" but by the gospel there is. Yet Christ has not shed his blood in vain; for those sacrifices were typical of his blood. Sin is seen, remembered and condemned by it. The death of Christ does three things in Paul's plan, as simplified;—Condemn sin, exhibit sin, and remember sin. This is the whole matter? Then come your remarks upon honoring the law, taking vengeance on the Son, and the substitution indispensable to orthodox atonement, first invented by the Catholic Archbishop Anselm in the 11th or 12th century, according to Professor Murdock. In giving the simplified plan it is presumed you intended to give not a part of it, but all. I think you have forgotten some of it, and will not regard this as your view of the whole matter till I hear from you distinctly again on the subject.

In prosecuting the development of this simplified plan you make a passing comment on the words "*to make an atonement for*," which you say, in your second number, you have proved to mean "*to cleanse, to purge*' in a figure I presume, as when the tailor says, 'I have made a coat for A. B·' he might mean '*I have warmed him.*' But, in reason's name, is making a coat and warming a person identical expressions? As much as atonement and cleansing.

By the way, Professor Murdock's reading and mine are very different. He certainly has forgotten the history of the first four centuries, else his guides and mine are very different. But, my dear sir, what have you or I to do with any professor or with "the system of orthodox atonement?" We are in pursuit of Paul's view of atonement. But I can excuse my aged and venerable correspondent when I reflect on the wars he has waged against orthodoxy in the days of his youth. Like an old acquaintance of

mine, long engaged in the border wars with the Indians, if in his old days he unexpectedly heared a rifle, he would involuntarily exclaim, "The Indians are there!" So father Stone, when he thinks of honoring the law by the wicked crucifixion of the only begotten Son of God, "who suffered the just for the unjust," he thinks of Archbishop Anselm and his orthodox atonement. All these allusions we can excuse in our aged and amiable friend, believing that as the discussion advances he will dissipate all theories, orthodox and heterodox, and come out as large as life in the language and ideas of Prophets and Apostles.

Sincerely and affectionately yours, &c,
A. CAMPBELL.

EXTRACT FROM THE BAPTIST BANNER

Can any man suppose for a moment that the present condition of Christendom is acceptable to the Savior of men? Is all this war, division, strife, animosity, and brawling, what he suffered and died for? Is the divided and separate state of the church that glorious condition for which he labored, and suffered and died? Most assuredly not. Is the present situation of the body worthy of such a head as the Lord of glory? No Christian can lay his hand upon his heart and give the affirmative answer to this. Christ gave himself for the church that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church not having spot, or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Eph. v. 26, 27. This state of the church would make a crown worthy of the head of the church; and it is in the power of men to bring it about. God has done every thing necessary for the holiness, the peace, the

harmony of the church; she must now put her own hands to the work. Let no one say that he can do nothing in it; for every individual has it in his power to do much. Let him inform his understanding thoroughly upon the means by which it is to be accomplished; then let him with firmness, prudence, and wisdom put those means into active exercise.

The body of Christ was once a united one, and in that condition gave laws to the world. It crushed every thing that opposed its progress until it was itself divided, and who can tell the mischiefs that have come from this division? Every right-minded Christian sees, feels, and hears enough of them daily, and all should earnestly set themselves to the task of bringing this state of things to a close. The Savior, in that solemn invocation to the Father, called his intercessory prayer, prayed that the "Apostles, whom the Father had given him, might be one, even as we are one," and they were come in all the glorious duties that devolved upon them as Apostles of the Christian religion. If the reader wishes to see the fruits of the union, let him consult the condition of the world before this union commenced, and compare with it the results of the undivided labors of the first preachers of the Cross. Let him consult the Acts of the Apostles and the letters to the churches, and he will see glorious fruits abounding to the glory of God, the saviour and benefactor of sinners.

Again—he prayed "not for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be *one* as thou Father *art* in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John xvii. 20, 21: This prayer was answered by the Father—the saints were one—they "walked by the *same* rule; they minded the *same* thing." The first fruits of salvation were one and indivisible, and the world fell beneath their union, peace, and holiness.

Paganism, with its millions of votaries; its hosts of priests; its lofty temples, its time-honored institutions its incorporation with policy aud law of empires, fell before the doctrine of the Cross. The union of the despised followers of Christ was irresistible, and will be again whenever it shall go forth over the earth as it did then. To this end Christians of the present day should direct their efforts. Christ walked in sufferings upon the earth for our sake, he claims a crown as his reward, and that crown is the union and happiness of his followers.

How is this union to be effected? We answer, by the teachings of the Bible, and in no other way. That book teaches the necessity of forbearance and gentleness towards one another, and we must carry out these principles if we wish to see Christians united. The question may be asked, Would you compromise a Bible truth for the sake of union? We answer, Not one, because the Bible contemplates no such union. There are items upon which men cannot differ but to the destruction of the souls of one of the parties, but these are just the matters upon which Christians do not differ generally. There are other items upon which Christians differ, and tear, and rend, and divide the body of Christ with their differences, these items have nothing to do with the salvation and enjoyment of Christians. These are the things for the destruction of which we pray, for they may be blotted from the world without making any human being the poorer from their destruction. We repeat the declaration. The basis for the union of Christians is plainly taught in the Bible, the superstructure that is built upon it may stand, give comfort to all Christendom, and for this, we confess, we have strong desires."

The following letter was written, and prepared for the press, previous to brother Campbell's, published in this number.

EDITOR.

LETTER II.

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S 3D. LETTER.

My dear brother Campbell:—I am glad to find that we appear to be approximating to each other in some of our views on the subject under dicussion; yet there are a few ideas in your third letter to which also I do object. They are contained in your seven propositions, and what follows, pages 42, 43.

Prop. 1. To the first part of this proposition I find no objection; but from the second part I must dissent. You say, "The sacrificial system was indispensable to any fallen man's approach to God." I reply; of this I have no certain testimony, nor information from the Bible. Your proof of it, that Abel offered a bloody sacrifice in faith, plainly shows that sacrifice was a divine appointment, and of great antiquity, but it does not confirm your proposition. Abel was a shepherd, and of him God required the firstlings of his flock for an offering. Cain was a tiller of the ground, and of him God required the fruit of the ground for an offering. We have as good authority to believe the one requirement as the other; for this of offering the fruits of the ground was continued in the Mosaic institution, as well as that of of bloody victims. Had both Cain and Abel offered in faith of God's appointment, would not each have been equally acceptable in their approach to God? Are we prepared to deny this?

But my brother's proof turns out to be a mere conjecture—*a may be so*, for he says, "pious Jews may, therefore, like the pious patriarch Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. &c. &c. have had views superior to the legal economy." Your argument is this—As the patriarchs Abel, Enoch,

Noah, and others, when they offered sacrifice, saw by faith the blood of the Messiah to be in future shed for the remission of sins; so pious Jews, like them may have had views superior to the legal economy they also may have seen and believed in the blood of Messiah to be shed in future for remission of their sins, in their approach to God, while those not pious under the law, could not see nor believe in it. This is taking for granted what needs proof. It cannot be proved that Abel, Enoch, or any of the patriarchs. or pious Jews had these views of the blood of Christ, or faith in that blood in their sacrifices.

Paul made no exception in Israel when he said, that "The children of Israel [pious or not] could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: But their minds were blinded." 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14. Christ was the end of the law, and we shall presently see, that it, with all its types, ended in his death. Even his apostles, who were sanctified by the truth, did not see the end of the law in its types and sacrifices till the event of his death proved it, and the Spirit at Pentecost confirmed it. We have generally admitted without a doubt, that the path of the just is as the dawning light, that shineth brighter and brighter unto the perfect day—that the first ray of divine light on fallen man, increased to the just in every succeeding age, till the sun of righteousness arose. Therefore we cannot admit that from Abel, onwards to Christ, divine light decreased.

Prop. 2: To this proposition I do not object.

Prop. 3. With this proposition in general I cordially agree: It contains the sentiments I have advocated for many years: You say, "The life and death, the blessing and curse of the law, were merely fleshly and temporal, and therefore the virtue of its sacrifice could extend no farther than to temporal life and temporal blessings. When, therefore, a Jew had forfeited these, the sacrificial law had no blessings in

store for him. Deut. xxviii. 1—68." I am glad my brother has at length conceded the point of difference between us, for you say, "When a Jew had forfeited these, (one of which is temporal life] the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for him." Every Jew, therefore, who had forfeited his life by committing sin worthy of death, had no blessing in store for him in the sacrificial provisions, therefore my conclusion is true, that the idolator, the blasphemer, the murder, &c. must die without the benefit of sacrifice. You have in this also relinquished your idea; that all sins of every class, except apostacy, were annually purged from all Israel in the great day of atonement by sacrifice. You will no longer contend, that if the virtue of sacrifice only extended to the purging away of sins of ignorance, or errors, or sins not worthy of death by law, that they could not be typical of the sacrifice of Christ; seeing you now admit that sins worthy of death were not by law permitted to be purged with blood. In your own words, "I truly admire your candor in giving up this opinion, as irreconcileable with truth." page, 44.

But my brother seems to be too precipitate in his conclusion. This is common, and hardly to be avoided when a truth first glares upon the mind. We then are apt to speak unguardedly. This you have done in saying "When a Jew had forfeited these [temporal blessings] the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for him," Now we know that many of the Jews by sins of ignorance, errors, and ceremonial defilement, forfeited many temporal blessings, as union with the congregation, the worship of God in the, sanctuary &c. yet they were admitted the privilege of sacrificing for their cleansing, by which the at-one-ment was effected between them and the congregation, and their God.

Prop. 4. This proposition contains but one idea against which I object; it is this, "That the legal

sacrifices, in order to sanctify its subjects; must be accompanied with repentance, and the previous qualifications." This is true with respect to remission of sins, both under the old and new Testament. But there are many cases in the Old Testament, where sacrifice cleansed or sanctified persons, of whom repentance could not be required; as the leper, the man with a running issue, a woman after child birth, and many others.

Prop. 5: This is admitted, without one exception.

Prop. 6. You say, "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." In a note appended you say, "David, guilty of murder and adultery, was pardoned, and certainly not without sacrifice, for without shedding of blood is no remission."

My dear brother, you may be too positive in our opinions, even to the contradiction of plain scripture declarations. You have made several declarations in this proposition indefensible by the scriptures, and apparently contrary to them; as you affirm, "That no transgression or sin could without sacrifice be forgiven." Do, my brother, read Num. xiv. 19, 20. Moses prayed for rebellious Israel thus; "Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt until now. And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word." On what grounds was this pardon granted? Not on the ground of sacrifice; but according to the greatness of thy mercy through the means of Moses' prayer. On what grounds were the captivity in Babylon pardoned, when for seventy years they offered no sacrifices, seein gtheir temple, altar, and city were in ruins? Or will you say, there were none pardoned?

On what grounds were they pardoned, for whom Solmon prayed at the dedication of the temple, 2 Chro. 6? On what grounds were those pardoned, who ate of the passover in the days of Hezekiah, not cleansed nor sanctified by sacrifice. "But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, the good Lord pardon every one, that prepareth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." 2. Chro. xxx. 19, 20. I ask again, on what grounds were the Ninevites pardoned? I might multiply cases, but one more shall suffice. On what ground was David pardoned for murder, and adultery? Not on the ground of sacrifice; for we have agreed that for a Jew who had forfeited his life by committing a sin worthy of death, that the sacrificial law had no blessings in store—and David himself, when confessing these very sins, says, "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it"—certainly implying that he had not given it. Yet my brother asserts, he was pardoned, "and 'certainly not without sacrifice, for without shedding of blood is no remission." The pardon David received was not legal nor carnal, but spiritual. This we agree was never obtained by legal sacrifices; but David obtained it of the Lord for his name's sake, or for his mercy's sake as he frequently declares. To these queries you appear to have given but little attention.

You assert again in this 6. proposition that no ceremonial defilement, however trifiling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven." This is truly the most unguarded expression I ever saw from the pen of my brother Campbell. A man under the law became unclean by touching an unclean person or thing, or even a dead body. Now I ask, was it a sinful act to bury the dead, or to touch even accidently an unclean person or thing so sinful that he must repent and offer a sacrifice for forgiveness? In such cases neither repen-

tance nor sacrifice was even required. The law in such cases is, that the person bathe in water and wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening.

Prop. 7. And last. "That the legal institution was typical. Its covenant, altar, priests victims, all were but 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."

This proposition is to me more curious than logical. Had my brother proved that the covenant, altar, priests, victims, were types and shadows of faith, repentance, baptism, prayer, and all acts of obedience under the new institution, your conclusion might have appeared logical. But if this cannot be proved, and it is thought to be impossible, then your conclusion contains more than the premises: In fact there appears to be no connection between them. I had thought that we agreed on this point, that the blood of the New institution was the object of faith, and the ground of repentance, reconciliation and obedience; and consequently of pardon. To talk of faith repentance reconciliation, obedience and pardon without the blood and resurrection of Christ, is to talk of effects without a cause. With you I certainly believe, that without the blood of the new institution, the remission of the least sin could not be obtained; for the reason already given, because none without that blood could be led to believe in him, none to repent, or be reconciled to God, and therefore none would be pardoned.

My brother does not seem to bear patiently the idea that I should call his opinion a new doctrine p. 44. Had you examined the sentence a little more closely you would have found that I did not call it a new doctrine. My words are these; this, to me, is a new

doctrine." There may be a thousand doctrines new to me, yet old and familiar to others, and they may be true. I doubt not, there may be some doctrines taught in the world, and even in the Bible, new to yourself. The imputation of new doctrines in this cavilling age, is sufficient to sink the reputation of any man. But what harm is it, to discover a new doctrine or truth in the word of God, and make it known to our fellow creatures? If there is any thing offensive in my words, you have sufficiently retaliated in your reply. For you say, "Yours is indeed a new doctrine." This is positive enough. Let us leave to our readers to determine which doctrine is new or old. My doctrine is, 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, and so obtain pardon by law. Your doctrine is, that the law admitted sacrifice for all sins of every description but one, the sin of apostacy.

My doctrine is, that sacrifice was only admitted for sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement. By sins of ignorance as by me explained, I included errors, or such sins as by law are not pronounced worthy of death. Your doctrine is, as I understand you, that if sacrifice was only admitted for such sins, it could not be typical of the sacrifice of Christ. This is what appeared to me a new doctrine. I leave this matter *sub judice*.

On page. 44 You say, "I can sympathize with you in your morbid excitement about certain terms such as *expiation*, *pacified*, *propitiation*, &c. and can bear with all good feeling your admonition about living up to my maxim about the pure speech and language of Ashdod." You cannot, my brother, sympathize with me; for I do not suffer under such a morbid excitement about certain terms, as *expiation*, *pacified*, *propitiate*, &c.; your, &c. implying others not named, as objected to, I object to no Bible

terms; I never objected to the terms *pacified* or *propitiation*, for these are Bible terms; but to the word *expiate* I have objected, because it is not once named in the Bible.

On page 45. You say, "But is *expiate* an unscriptural term? Open your Cruden's Concordance, and see the opinion of that greatest of verbal interpreters. But does Cruden, or Butterworth, or any other who have made a concordance of the scriptures, write the word expiate in their catalogue of words, and refer to the texts where it may be found in the Bible? But Cruden uses the word *expiate*. Yes, and so does he use many of those words you have renounced as the language of Ashdod. Receive the language of these greatest of verbal interpreters, and you must expunge your Chapter on the language of Ashdod.

On page 44. You ask me, "And is *atone for* an unscriptural phrase? You immediately ask, What is the difference between *atone for* and *to make an atonement for?* please explain to me, for I do not appreciate any!" And how does my brother know that I have made any difference between the two phrases? By the help of critics you have come to the conclusion that *expiate, atone, propitiate* are scriptural terms, if not found in our English Bibles, yet they are according to the Septuagint, and new Testament Greek, So I conclude, and will thank brother Stone to show me any error in this conclusion." This I view as an entire aberration from the point in hand. But I am glad my brother has made a concession in his remarks on *expiation*, from which, it is hoped, he will never recede.

"*Hilaskomai*, you say, a word found in the Greek of both Testaments, often in the old, is, by all good Lexicographers, rendered *atone, expiate, propitiate*. So Park, Green; Rob; Schre, &c. &c." This word my brother has found but twice in the New Testament, and in the Old I have found it very seldom, but once

as I remember. But its cognate *exhilaskomai* is of very frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, being generally the Septuagint translation of *kaphar*, which in our version, is rendered to make an atonement, or to cleanse. I have said, in the New Testament *hilaskomai* is found but twice, and once translated to make reconciliation for iniquity. Heb. ii. 17. According then to your criticism, it should be rendered, to expiate or purge away sin, and in Luke xviii. 13. "God be merciful to me a sinner"—according to your criticism, it should read properly, O! God, make an atonement or purification for me a sinner—that is, purge me from sin—So its cognate *hilasmos*, 1. John ii. 2, and iv. 10. translated, propitiation, means that Christ is he, that cleanses from all sins: The text in Ezek. xvi. 63 you by examination will find a mistranslation. "When I am pacified to thee, saith the Lord." You will find the word *kaphar* there in kal, or active voice, and in the perfect tense. It would then read, "When I have made an atonement or purification for thee, God is not then the person purified, pacified, or expiated, but defiled Israel. Will any Hebrew scholar deny this?

On page 47, You ask, 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 not 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 *onoeema*—one sin of ignorance—one of the errors of the people." In this we are agreed; for I have before stated, that it was God himself that took away or pardoned sin, and that the blood of the offerings was the means appointed through which he did it. Our Pedobaptist friends have frequently used your argument against baptism for remission. We do not believe say they, that all the water in the world can wash away one sin—the

least sin. We have simply answered them, that the water, or immersion in it was only the means by which God remitted sin; yet we hesitate not to say in the language of Peter, that "Baptism now saves us." So the Physicalists say to us when urging the gospel as the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth, O say they, we do not believe that all the Bibles in the world will save from one sin, the least sin. We reply that God alone is the Savior; but that he saves through the means of his word believed and obeyed. Now can these people seriously think we are such fools as to believe that the gospel or baptism can save any from sin—from the least sin, independant of God? And does my brother think that I am so ignorant as to believe, that the blood of beasts could take away even sins of ignorance or errors? Especially when I have so plainly taught the contrary in this very discussion? I have gone farther than you on this subject; I have said in my last letter, that all the blood of the universe, the blood of Christ not excepted, could not take away our sin—the least sin. His blood was only the means through which God did the work. Yet of the sacrifices of the law, we say with Paul that they sanctified to the purifying of the flesh and with John we say, the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.

On page 47. You say, "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." If to make a difference between presumptuous sins and errors, as I have done, be speculative, and imaginative, then have I been misled by Moses himself; for he makes a marked distinction between them in Num. xv. 22–32. Do, my dear brother read this paragraph again with attention, and you will see cause to retract your words. Our blessed Lord once said, "Ye do err, not kowing

the scriptures;" but had they known them, their sin must have been presumptuous, and wilful. Do we not commonly make a difference in our frequent communications with one another? You yourself say, "On reconsideration you will perceive the error," i. e. of calling yours a new doctrine. You did not charge me with committing a sin, but of error through ignorance of your meaning. Mark the difference in Ps: xix. 12, 13.

On page 47. You say, "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 add, that I was unfortunate in a former allusion to this chapter;" but you have said nothing more. I have your judgment of the matter, but you have given us no argument, upon which that judgment is formed. Let us read the whole text, "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions of the first Testament, they that are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

Two things are here stated to be accomplished by the death of the Mediator. 1st. The redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament. 2d. That the called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. The first referred to the Jews only, for they only were under the first Testament. Now, how were the transgresors of that first covenant redeemed? You wish me to mark, that the Mediator by the means of his death, did not redeem transgressors—nor sinners, but the transgressions, and sin.—Surely my brother does not believe that the death of Christ redeemed transgressions and sins and not the transgressor, nor sinner, To redeem transgressions, and sins strictly speaking is as impossible as to expi-

ate or cleanse sin. To cleanse an object, is, to purify it from defilement, but sin is all defilement in itself, and therefore admits of no cleansing. Yet we say to expiate sin; by which is meant, to cleanse the defiled person or thing from sin. So doubtless Paul meant, that the Jews were redeemed from the transgressions of the first Testament.

But how did the death of Christ redeem the Jews from the transgressions under the first Testament? His death disannulled that Testament, it put away the first and established the second. By means of his death the priesthood was changed, so of consequence the law–the first husband [the law] then died then the Jews became dead to the law, that being dead wherein they were held, being nailed to his cross—he was the end of the law in his death, and by it the first covenant waxed old, and vanished away. Christ hath redeemed us (Jews) from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us by hanging on a tree, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, and that we (Jews and Gentiles) might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Gall: iii. 13. By means of death, then, he put an end to the first Testament, or redeemed and delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we held. In redeeming from the law, of course he redeemed from the transgressions of the law, for where there is no law there is no transgression, "Mark this my dear sir." Moreover by redeeming from the law, of course they were redeemed from the curse of it

The second thing accomplished by the means of his death, is that the called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." To the Gallatians the Apostle speaks in similar language: By means of the death of Christ, the blessing of Abraham came on the Gentiles, and the promise of the Spirit. This is equivalent to receiving an eternal inheritance. I

know my brother wishes from this text to establish his opinion, that all the saints, who died before the death of Christ, were pardoned by his blood to be shed in future. To disprove this opinion, I have said enough in a former letter.

There are a few more items in your III letter, which I design to notice; but for want of room must defer at present. They shall receive due attention from your old brother, and fellow laborer.

B. W. STONE.

P. S. I am pleased to find we so cordially agree in the designs of the blood of Christ—had I only added another item, that it was designed to cleanse and purify from sin, you would have admitted that was entirely correct in all. Now my dear brother, did you seriously think that I intentionally omitted this, when I had made it the burden of my preceding numbers and letters? How often have I stated the effect of his blod in cleansing, purifying and sanctifying from sin! Doubtless, whatever was effected by his blood, was designed. Of this hereafter.

B. W. S.

UNIVERSALISTS.—The Cross and Journal says, "that 66 Universalist societies have suspended the regular maintainance of preaching, or have become defunct, in the New England states since 1830, and 25 ministers have left the Universal ministry within the last six years."

The Rev. Joseph C. Stiles, a clergyman of the Presbyterian church in Kentucky, has been suspended from his ministry, by the west Lexington Presbytery:

The following are the charges which were proved against him—

1st. Misrepresenting the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, and holding it up in his sermons, as arbitrary and tyranical.

2. Misrepsenting the synod at Hopkinsville.

3. Pursuing a course calculated to produce schism.

4. Declairing his determination to remain in his ecclesastical connexion, (contrary to a previous promise) that he might enlighten the minds of his brethren.

5. Aiding in calling a convention of ministers not of the orthodox party.

6. Aiding the session of Versailles church in persecuting the minority of said church.

7. Aiding the Rev. A. M. Campbell, in an attempt to draw off Greer's Creek Church from the orthodox party.

Four days were spent in the examination of witnesses in proof of the above charges. Mr Stiles was found guilty, and executed without benefit of clergy.

This is the same Mr. Stiles, who, awhile ago, made such a terrible SPLUTTER in Kentucky against Campbellism; for which he was extolled by the whole Presbyterian church as a second Goliah of Gath.

EXTRACT FROM THE "CHRISTIAN."

The writer of this article, after adverting to the various Baptist denominations, thus speaks of the "Christian connexion."

While these things were going on at the north and south, a great religious excitement in Kentucky warmed the hearts of some of the Presbyterian ministers to such a degree, that they formed a new Synod, called the "Springfield Presbytery:" but like Mr. O'Kelly and others, they were soon aware that all such associations and designations were unscriptural, and they therefore resolved to renounce every thing connected with their former distinguishing peculiarities as Presbyterians. Their renunciation is a curious specimen of antiquity, too good to be lost. We, therefore, publish it entire as it has come to us in "Benedict's history of the Baptist,"

"THE PRESBYTERY OF SPRINGFIELD, sitting at Cane Bridge, in the county of Bourbon, Kentucky, being, through a gracious Providence, in more than ordinary bodily health, growing in strength and size daily; and in perfect soundness and composure of mind, but knowing that it is appointed for all delegated bodies once to die, and considering that the life of every such body is very uncertain, do make, and ordain this our last Will and Testament, in manner and form following, viz:

IMPRIMIS. We *will*, that this body die, be dissolved, and sink into union with the body of Christ at large, for there is but one body, and one spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling.

"ITEM. We *will*, that our name of distinction, with its *reverend* title, be forgotten: that there be but one Lord over God's heritage, and his name one.

"ITEM. We will, that our power of making laws for the government of the church, and executing them by delegated authority, forever cease, that the people may have free course to the Bible, and adopt the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus.

"ITEM. We will, that candidates for the gospel ministry henceforth study the Holy Scriptures with fervent prayer, and obtain license from God to preach the simple gospel, &c.

"ITEM. We will, that the church of Christ assume her native right of internal government, &c.

"ITEM. We will, that each particular church, as a body, actuated by the same spirit, choose her own preacher, and support him by a free-will-offering, &c.

"ITEM. We will, that the people henceforth take the Bible as the only sure guide to heaven; and as many as are offended with other books, which stand in competition with it, may cast them into the fire if they choose; for it is better to enter into life having one book, that having many to be cast into hell.

"ITEM. We will, that preachers and people cultivate a spirit of mutual forbearance: pray more, and dispute less, &c.

"ITEM. Finally, we will, that all our sister bodies read their Bibles carefully, that they may see their fate determined, and prepare for death before it is too late.

"*Springfield Presbytery*, } (L. S.)
June 28th, 1804.

"ROBERT MARSHALL, B. W. STONE,
JOHN DUNLAVY, JOHN THOMPSON, } *Witnesses.*"
RICHARD M'NEMAR, DAVID PURVIANCE,

This is extracted from "The Christian," a valuable Monthly periodical published in St. John's, New Brunswick, by W. W. EATON.

Smithville, Lawrence County, Jan. 1st, 1840.

Dear Brother Stone-

You perhaps will recollect that something near three years since I wrote you from Smithville, Ark. rather soliciting your counsel, whether to join the Baptists or not. You admonished me to cleave to the truth. I have done so, [or what I considered truth.] The result of my labors is six congregations with some 250 members, organized on the same principles, as advocated by our brethren. I have traveled and labored till my means are exhausted, and the wants of my family call me to follow some employment for their support: O! Could you hear the abuse heaped upon me, for what I teach, and for receiving and immersing their unimmersed sectarian members, I am confident from what you have experienced you would sympathize with me.

Then, for my relief, for the sake of truth, for the sake of my persecuted brethren, for the sake of Christ, try and prevail on some able brother to come here, and travel amongst us. I have no body to solicit assistance for me; but if one will come, I will see him have plenty. The clergy say I am wrong; and I am bantering them constantly to meet me; but they will not do it. Send some one better prepared and we will push the war into the sectarians' strong holds. We shall have protracted meetings from 1st. of Sept. next, till the fall season expires.

Some of them are already appointed. Please write to me on the receipt of this. Accept my best love and prayers to God for your happiness in the decline of life, and suffer me to subscribe myself yours in hope of eternal life.

C. G. TITSWORTH.

My dear preaching brethren in Missouri, Can you hear such pressing calls from a lonely brother for help, and feel not the Spirit of affording it? Brethren Allen, Creath, Young, Lancaster, Gaines and Palmer—which of you will go? Only let one of you answer, I will go; The churches in Missouri will meet together, and help you on your journey. Bro's Allen, Wills and Palmer, the elder brethren, will call the churches together, and provide immediately for the evangelist, who may volunteer his services. Your reward in heaven shall be certainly given in due time. If Missouri cannot or will not send, I plead with my beloved Kentucky and Indiana. Come brethren to the help of the Lord; Let your evangelists come, expecting nothing. Our infant sister Arkansas may not be able to spare of her substance for their support. But my dear brethren in Arkansas help your servant Titsworth to continue in the field. A harvest of precious souls may be reaped. Amen.

Your old brother, B. W. STONE.

From the Palladium.

Freehold, N. Y. Nov. 9. 1840.

Bro. Marsh—The Lord has done great things for us in this place. Sixty one were received in fellowship with the church at Freehold and baptized one week ago last Thursday. I baptized them all in 35 minutes. Last Friday I baptized 29 more; and expect more will go forward in the same ordinance: The Christian cause never was more prosperous in this country than at the present; nor did sectarianism ever look more sorrowful. About 50 or 60 have been hopefully converted at South Westerlo—28 were received into fellowship last Saturday. A good work is going on at Hall's Hollow. Elder Call is now engaged in a meeting of days at New Baltimore. Pray for us that we may be humble and thankful in this our day of prosperity. More soon.

JOHN SPOOR.

From the Heretic Detector.

In the following tabular view may be seen, at one glance, the monthly increase amongst us, as reported by the public teachers and others. Since our last, upwards of 1600 additions have been reported to us, to say nothing of those reported to other Periodicals. We thank God and take courage. A. C.

News from the Churches.

A Table showing the accession since our last, with the names of the reporters, the time, the place, and number of persons added. ☞The Reporters are not always the public laborers.

Reporters.	Location of Churches.	Dates.	No.
J T Johnson.	Providence, Paris Ky.	Nov, 17	20
D P Henderson.	Lynnville, Jacksonville, Ill.	do 11	43
J M Mathes,	Bloomington Ia.	do 5	13
M Combs.	At various points in Ia.	do 5	75
John Smith,	Ky and Ten.	do 7	89
W Vance	Coshockton O.	do 3	8
J B New.	At various points in Ia.	do 11	117
J Philips	Gursnsey, Monroe O.	Oct. 20	100
J M Harris	At various points in Ia.	Sep.	23
E H Smith	Crow's Creek Ky. &c.	Oct. 8	23
John Mulkey	Ky.	do 15	90
T Pitt	Various points Mo:	do 10	48
J Reed	Reynoldsburg, Kenton O.	do 12	6
G W M'Reynolds	Martin Co. Ia,	Sept. 27	15
C Kendrick	Ala. and Ten.	Aug. 20	181
T M Allen	Various points in Mo.	do 20	74
J Lovelady	Platt co. Mo.	do 20	11
J Dowling	Marion co. O.	Sept. 15	50
B D Conaway	South Run O.	do 22	4
J Calahan	Various points in Ky.	do 22	49
W S Patterson	Various points in Ohio	Aug. 22	99
J A Gano	Various points in Ky	do 18	71
J Baugh	Various points in Ill.	Oct. 29	47
D Dillion	Lewis co Ky.	Nov. 29	70
J B Lucas	400		
		Total	1720

Brother Js. L. Peak writes as follows:

Palmyra, Dec. 18, 1840.

BROTHER STONE,

The churches at Monticello, Palmyra, Houston, and Shelbyville, have united and sent Bro. Creath out as an evangelist, and I believe he will be the means of doing much good for the good cause in which he is engaged—May the Lord grant him health and strength, that he may be able to declare the word of the Lord with much boldness. We are all in fellowship here and may the good Lord grant that his good Spirit may always be with us.

(From the Oberlin Evangelist.)

CHRISTIAN UNION No. 26.

THE BLESSINGS OF CHRISTIAN UNION.—CONCLUSION.

Resuming the subject I suggest;

7. *That union and love in the Church would exhibit a purer Christianity, which would honor God and the gospel of his love.* Ah, how grievously has Christianity been misrepresented and her divine authors dishonored by the antipathies and collisions of the church. This religion promised a reign of love—it has given a reign of discord. It enjoined on its friends to love their enemies. And with great ado have they refrained from absolutely hating the professed friends of their own common Lord. They were expected to pray for all men, but alas they have often been unwilling to pray with their own acknowledged brethren—heirs of the same gospel grace—fellow-travelers to the same Heaven. And have they not defaced the fair beauty of the gospel—distorted its features —eclipsed its glory—defiled its temple—belied its spirit, and even given a caricature of its image for the world to gaze at with astonishment and disgust! O Lord, how, long, how long! When shall the reign of primitive love return?

Then will the gospel spread again on wings of light, and in floods of radiant glory. And this suggests,

8. *That union, founded in love, would mightily facilitate the conversion of the world to God.* We have already said that such a union would greatly augment the disposable energies of the Church. She would then have strength to spare for aggressive action. She might call in all her forces from her civil wars and concentrate them upon the great common foe abroad. And, what is more, she would then have a heart to do it. The out-gushing of her heart of love would burst the nut-shell of selfishness, and unclench the fist of avarice, and her gold would flow like water

into the treasury of the Lord. So would her sympathies and prayers flow out like the love of Jesus for the dying. And her sons and daughters would come with free hearts and hands, offering themselves for the work, each saying "here am I, send me." They would go in the strength and the courage of union.

10. Finally, the union of the Church is called for by the terrific evils of past and present dissentions, and by the prophetic beams of glory in the general reign of peace on earth. "Christians you are not insensible to sights of sorrow and suffering: you could not look on a lacerated bleeding human being without shuddering in sympathy. See that marred, but majestic spectacle of suffering! It is the mangled form of divine Christianity—her garments rent—her sacred person wounded and life streaming out at every wound; and as she turns on us a mournful and imploring aspect, a voice from each of those wounds entreats us to unite. Shall we stanch them? Or shall our answer to her entreaty be the infliction of yet more wounds?" The world is perishing. The groans of the dead and the dying come up on every breeze. One loud and long and piercing wail for help falls on our ear—would it might touch our heart—yet help is delayed. For she who should publish peace on earth is at war on her own vitals. She who should heal others is sick unto languishing and death herself. There is balm in Gilead; but the physicians are pale and feeble, and with trembling hand they fail to administer even to their own maladies.

And must the world in its successive generations forever go down to death, and the Church forever languish with mutilated body, and heart of love, all chilled and torn in sunder? O! Brighter days are coming. Zion shall yet arise and shine in her own native beauty and loveliness. Then "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." Isai. 11: 13. A voice shall go forth from every broken

section of the great christian family—"come, and let us go speedily to pray before the Lord," and the universal response will be, "I will go also." Love will reign. All hearts will be one. God will come down and dwell among men to give them one heart and one way, and to make his name glorious.

And in heaven will be heard great voices pealing with loud anthems and saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and He shall reign forever and ever." Rev. 11. 16.

H. C.

UNION.

CHRISTIAN UNION.—We understand that a negociation is pending between the Baptists and Disciples* of Louisville, on a proposition to unite the two churches If any thing is done in the way of union, we trust it will be done in strict accordance with New Testament principles. A union to be *permanent*, must be *scriptural*. We want no half-way union, such as now exists between the Baptist, Presbyterians, and Methodists. What *we* mean by union, is a consolidation of the two churches on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; making thereby, one body--- having the one Lord for its head, one Spirit to animate it, one faith, one baptism, one hope, and one calling. Any thing short of this, is no union at all.

Journal of Christianity.

*Christians.

Mount Vernon, Ia. Nov. 26th 1840.

DEAR BROTHER STONE.

I have been Evangelizing nearly all the time since last March, and have had the happiness to witness 73 accessions to the good cause, I have just commenced for a years constant labor in this glorious

work. May the Lord crown my feeble endeavors with abundant success.

Brother Stone, if your business should ever lead you this way, do try to give us a call. We need assistance of the proclaiming brethren. Yours in the gospel bonds. ELIJAH GOODWIN.

(For the Messenger.)

Pittsfield, Ill. Dec. 19, 1840.

Brother Stone:

I wish through your paper to let the brethren know where I am, and the prospects concerning the work of the Lord. I shall confine my labors to Pike Co. Ill. this winter. The brethren appear much stired up in many places, and I find my labors not in vain among them and the world. Although I cannot see my hearers yet I have the happiness to know that many sinners are attentive to the word spoken, and are enquring into these things. I do thank the Lord that I can again raise my voice to warn sinners and comfort the saints. My days, brother Stone, are fast coming to a close, and I am determined through the blessing of God to spend what little remains of life, in causing poor sinners to cease to do evil and learn to do well. My sun of life will soon set; but am striving to be ready to meet the sun of righteousness in the morning of the great day. May the Lord keep you and me unto the day of his coming.

I have been traveling during most of the past season, in different parts of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, where I have been rejoiced to find many of the excellent of the earth striving for the crown of life, to all of whom I would say—Brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, let me beseech you by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice to him, holy and acceptable—which is your

reasonable service. Be not weary in well doing, but seek for glory, honor, immortality and eternal life. We have had joys together here, brethren, let us hold fast our confidence and hope, that none of us lose our crown, for, in due season, we shall reap if we faint not. Your brother in the kingdom and patience of Jesus. GEORGE ALKIRE.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Elder Wm. B, Hand of Pendleton Ohio, writes, "We have some Bible folks here, and others ready to lay down their paper fences, and be satisfied with salvation for walls and bulwarks. There is a congregation of Christians here numbering 40.

Bro. W. P. Payne of Ky, informs us of an addition of 23 at North Middleton recently by the labors of brethren J. T. Johnson, Rains and Adams. Bro. Payne's communication must be deferred to a subsequent number.

Bro. T. M. Allen of Mo. writes Dec. 29. This day we closed a glorious meeting at Bear creek which was commenced on the 25th. The congregations were large and attentive, and 10 volunteers were obtained in the good cause, most of whom were in the morning of life, and of the amiable and excellent of the land. In Columbia and Rocheport the appearances are cheering, several of late have been added to the church in those places.

Bro. T. N. Gaines of Mo. January 2. 1841 writes, "The Good cause is still progressing in this county (Ray.) Bro. Jacob Warrener, and myself have held several meetings during the last fifteen or twenty days in and near Camden, and have had during the time 11 confessions, and 2 additions from the Baptists. We have not room to print bro. Gaines' communication in this Number. He must wait patiently, as well as many others.

Bro. J. T. Johnson of Ky, writes Dec. 11. After giving an account of several meetings, noticed in our last, he says; "Bro. Stone, I cannot think that the parties fully believe what they preach in regard to the operations of the Spirit in conversion; because all their efforts prove the reverse. They put forth all their efforts, and then turn round and sneer at us, because we teach, that the conversion of sinners depends upon the efforts of Christians. The reconciliation was devolved on the Apostles, and by them, upon us; and the Lord will hold us responsible for a faithful discharge of duty.

Bro. J. Taylor of Mt, Sterling Ill; writes that 10 were recently added there.

OBITUARY.

The Journal of Christianity, has announced the death of our dearly beloved brother Jesse Mavity of Columbus Indiana. He departed this life the 5th day of November last. He had been a preacher of the gospel about twelve years--long enough to secure the unfeigned love and high esteem of all the dear brethren with whom he was acquainted. He was a good man, a useful man, a man deeply instructed in the word of God in a word, he was a Chrisrian. I knew him from almost his childhood, and loved him, He is called from his labors in the prime of life, being in his 34th. year; but his works follow him.

A short time before died the amiable and pious youth, William Henderson of Greene county Illinois, in the full and triumphant hope of immortality. He was the son of elder John Henderson.

We have thankfully received several very interesting communications; but must defer their publication to future Numbers. My correspondents must wait patiently. They shall not be neglected. I wish once more to say to my agents, that Post masters will frank all letters covering money for me: EDITOR

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

FEBRUARY, 1841.

LETTER III.

REVIEW OF BRO. BAMPBELL'S III LETTER.

(CONTINUED.)

Dear brother Campbell:

Hitherto our discussion has proceeded in the mild spirit of the gospel; nor do I fear that we shall depart from it, if truth be our object. If nothing more be effected by this discussion, I hope we shall convince the world of what has been deemed impracticable, if not impossible, that Christians can love one another, and dwell together in unity, and yet differ in sentiment. I hope also that we shall give an example of that moderation, and forbearance, which the scriptures teach, yet so uncommon among its professors in the present cavilling age. One thing is certain, that the Bible student will be more diligently engaged to understand the important things concerning which we write. But to the subject.

Page 46, I had said, "Those sins purged with blood came under one general name—*errors.*" You immediately ask, "And what were the sins purged without [blood]?" I have plainly shown what sins were purged by blood under the law; and I have as plainly shown what sins were not purged with blood by the law--But what sins, say you, were purged