Bro. Gano writes from Centerville, Bourbon County, Kentucky, the 21st. January 1841. I was in Paris on the 3d. Lord's day in December, and the meeting was continued by either bro. J. T. Johnson and myself up to Christmas night; 5 additions; during our sojourn among them. Saturday morning bro. Johnson left for Caneridge, and I for Millersburg,--here I continued until the next Thursday evening, bro. J. Irvin with me from Lord's day evening--20 confessed the Lord, 2 united by letter--and one reclaimed --bro. Ricketts came on Thursday evening from Caneridge, and informed us they had gained 6 converts there." T. M. A.

OBJTUARY.

Died at the residence of her father, in Sangamon County, Ill. Nancy Howser, consort of W. Solomon Howser, on the 27th, day of February, A. D. 1841, after a protracted illness of some six or seven months, which she bore with Christian fortitude and resignation. She embraced the Christian religion at an early age, and lived a pious and examplary life, and those that knew her longest, loved her best. She has left a disconsolate husband and one child, and a large circle of friends and relations to mourn her premature death, and their irreparable loss. But they have this consolation, that she left in the triumphs of faith in the religion of Jesus Christ, her Redeemer. She was entirely resigned to the will of her heavenly Father, although her suffering was great, yet she was never heard to murmur. "Jesus can make a dying bed, feel soft as downy pillows are." She was born in Shelby County, Kentucky, on the 19th, day of November, A. D. 1814, and removed with her father to Illinois, in 1835.

Bro. J. T. Johnson writes, March 4. 1841, that a meeting just closed at Mayslick, the fruits of which were 81 additions—more fully in the next number.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

APRIL, 1841.

VOLUME XI. NUMBER VIII.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

LECTURE II.

(CONTINUED.)

John xvii. 20. 21. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, even 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.'

On this text I delivered four lectures.

I. Who they are, for whom Christ prayed.

II. What that union is for which he prayed.

III. The means by which it is effected.

IV. The happy consequence of such union.

The 1st I have already considered, and it is believed, that I have made it evident, that true believers only are those for whom Jesus directly prayed. I have shown that three things constituted true believers. 1st. The means: They believe through the word of the Apostles: 2d. The object; They believe on me, and These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God. 3d. The effects; That they might be one, and that they might have life through his name. I now proceed to

II. What that union is for which he prayed.

1. He did not pray that all that professed to believe in him might be one; because all that profess to

to believe, have not true, unfeigned faith—the faith of God's elect. To pray that such might be one with obedient believers, is the same as to pray, that light and darkness might be one—that righteousness and unrighteousness might be one—that the children of the bond woman, and the children of the free woman might be one. This would be impossible: such union would be like that of iron and clay—it is not desirable—it is inadmissible by the head of his Church: for all fruitless trees, must be cut down—the chaff must be winnowed away. The fruitful trees, and the pure wheat only, are to be preserved. The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God—the bond children must be cast out—they shall not be co-heirs with the free: Such unhallowed union has too long disgraced the church; weakened her energies—obscured her glory, and withered her influence. It is the strong hold of sectarianism—a bulwark against Christian union—a heavy weight on Zion's wheels—a gnawing worm on their vitals—the bane of christianity.

2. Neither did our Lord pray, that all the parties as such, might be one. All the parties are one in a general sense. Their scriptural name is, Babel, or confusion. Who in this day of light and inquiry, is so blind, that he cannot read the inscription plain and legible in the fore head of the Church so called? Who so uncandid as not to acknowledge that the christian world is all in confusion—in Babylon? Who so destitute of piety as not to long for the restoration of Zion? Who so callous as not to weep over her desolation? Who so deaf as not to hear the inviting, warning voice of God, "Come out of her my people, lest ye be partakers of her sins and of her plagues? Who so disobedient as to slight the divine command? And who so pusillanimously dumb as not to raise his warning voice to his fellows?

While the various sects retain their jarring creeds

—their different yokes—their various standards—their party names, and especially their sectarian spirit, and unbelieving members, is it possible that any bond could make them one, according to the prayer of Jesus? Yet in Babylon—yet in the great city of confusion, we acknowledge [however painful and humiliating the acknowledgment] that God's people are, and long—long have been, and will contiue to be, 'till they become convinced of the fact. Till we receive this conviction, we shall not regard the voice of God as directed to us, Come out of her my people—we shall never make one exertion to obey that voice, by leaving the devoted place. Some may boast that they have clean escaped from the city of abominations. I fear I have not yet seen any of this happy number. Many of late have made exertions to leave the city; but they are so much infected with her spirit, and burdened with her wares, they make slow progress, advancing a few steps, and retrograding as many.

3. The union for which the Savior prayed, is, that all believers might be one, even as the Father and Son are one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee that they also may be one in us. Some affirm that the Father and Son are one substance, one individual being. Even should this be true, yet we are sure that our Lord did not pray that believers should be one in this sense—that they should all be one individual being or substance. If we can ascertain what that union is between the Father and the Son, we can easily ascertain the union of believers, for which the Savior prayed. This we will now attempt to do.

1. The Father and Son are one in character. "He that hath seen me, says Jesus, has seen the Father; for the Father dwelleth in me, and I in him." We ask, What of the Father do we see in the Son? Not the substance of the Father, we are sure; "For no man hath seen God at any time, or can see him.'

But we see the image of the invisible God--the express image[*characteer*, character] of his person [tees hupostasioos of his substance.] It is then the character of God, the glory of God shining in the face of Jesus, or God manifested in the flesh, we see when we see Jesus. The character of the Father and Son being one, and believers beholding this character or glory of God shining in the face of Jesus, are changed into the same image from glory to glory. All that love, compassion, benevolence, mercy, grace, goodness, faithfulness, truth, &c. which we see continually flowing from the hands, the lips and acts of Jesus are, but God's character manifested in the face, or flesh of Jesus. In and by Jesus is the Father plainly declared, and made known. If ye had known me, ye would have known the Father also. How can we know the Father but by the Son? For no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. This character of the Father and the Son appears to flow from that intimate union, described, by the Father being in the Son, and the Son in the Father; and this same character is formed in all believers by their being in the Father and Son, and the Father and Son in them. The believers become partakers of the divine nature. Stupendous grace! A worm of the dust united with the Father of the universe! And consequently with the Son and with all holy beings! They are holy as God is holy—righteous even as he is righteous—pure even as he is pure—good and merciful, even as he is—meek, gentle, obedient, patient, forgiving as was the Son. What christian on earth would not respond a hearty *Amen* to this prayer of Jesus?

2. They are one in Spirit. The Father loveth the Son, and the Son loves the Father—The Father peculiarly loves the saints, and so does the Son—The Father loved the world, and gave his Son to be their Saviour—the Son, also loved the world, and gave himself a ransom for all. So believers are of one spirit. They all love the Father and the Son, and manifest that love by an unreserved obedience to all his commandments—they love one another with a pure heart fervently--they also love all mankind and like the Savior, weep over their miseries, and pray for them, and sacrifice their worldly substance for their good--to save them from ruin.

3. The Father and Son are one in operation, in the works of creation, providence and redemption, God created all things by Jesus Christ, and without him was not any thing made that is made; whether they be things in earth, or things in heav —whether they be visible or invisible, whether they be angels, principalities or powers. In the works of providence they are one. I, said Jesus, give unto my sheep eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hands. My Father who gave them me is greater than all, neither shall any pluck them out of my Father's hands. I and my Father are one--one in our love, and providential care of the sheep. So were they one in the great work of Redemption. One heart, one mind, one purpose one will to redeem man, was both in the Father and in the Son. "Lo I come to do thy will, O God." Hence the saints ascribe their salvation to him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever. So believers are one in the same benevolent operation of saving the world. They are "workers together with God"--they co-operate with God and one another in all divine means, ordained of God to effect this great end. They regard not their own things, [exclusively] but, also the things of others. They divide their substance with the poor and needy --the widow and the fatherless; nor do they withdraw the hand of mercy from giving the means of sending the gospel to the world in darkness.

If all were thus one, the world would soon believe

in Jesus and be saved. O Zion, arise and shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee. Then shall the Gentiles see thy light and flow unto thee---and they seeing thy good works will glorify our Father, who is in heaven.

(TO BE CONTINUED)

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

By special request of Elder J. V. Himes, Editor of the Signs of the Times, the following notice is given of his paper. The Subject to which it is chiefly devoted is highly important and should be examined with prayerful attention. The Signs of the Times affords the best facilities of obtaining a knowledge of the second coming of Christ, of any paper now published.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

This paper is designed to illustrate the predictions of the holy prophets, and of Jesus Christ, and his apostles; particularly in relation to the second advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the establishment of his everlasting and glorified kingdom on earth. It will advocate the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven at hand; exhibit the signs of the times, of the near approach of the son of man in his kingdom. At the same time others, who hold different views such as a' temporal millenium, the return of the carnal Jews, to Palestine,-and a long spiritual reign before the personal coming of Christ, will have opportunity of presenting thir views fully, and fairly; or of controverting the opposite sentiments.

This is the first and only newspaper in the nation, that is devoted to the support of the doctrine of the advent near. It was started about one year since, without a single subscriber. The experiment has proved successful. Circumstances thus far, have shown that such a periodical was needed. We have received much greater enouragement than was anticipated. In addition to a good list of paying subscribers we have received high recommendations of the paper from several public bodies.

The editor has secured able and learned writers on the prophecies to aid him, by which he hopes to make the next volume more acceptable, and useful than the last.

The II. volume, will be commenced in March 1841. *Conditions are one dollar per year, on the receitp of the first*

No. None may expect a second, (unless by mistake) without complying with the terms. All communications should be addressed (POST PAID) *to J. V. Himes, Boston Mass.*

We only ask the patronage that our humble sheet demands, and of the *truly honest*; for we can only hope to benefit *such* by our labors. Will all such, favorable to our enterprise, give us the aid that duty demands.

THE EDITOR.

ROMAN CATHOLICS IN AMERICA.

Boston, October 29. 1840.

MESSRS EDITORS.—We have some news from a distance concerning ourselves andjother parts of our country, which your readers may like to see. It comes to us in the May number of the "annals of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith" for 1840; printed at Lyons, in France. From the annual "compte rendu" of the French Society of the Faith, it appears that the following sums were expended in 1839, in sustaining Roman Catholic missions in the United States, viz:

Paid to theLazarists; for the missions in Missouri and Illinois, the Seminary, and the College (Francs. of St. Marie des Barrens, - - - - -	7,000	
Outfit of Missionaries who left in 1839 to join those missions - - - - -	9,333	30
To the Jesuits, for missions in Missouri and New Orleans, - - -	15,000	
Ditto in Kentucky, - - -	6,000	
There were also sent to my Lord Ecclertor, Archbishop of Baltimore, - - - -	7,327	
To my lord Loras, Bishop of Dubuque,	52,827	
To my lord Pursell, Bishop of Cincinnati, -	39,827	
To my lord Fenwick, Bishop of Boston, -	20,327	
To my lord Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia,	20,327	
To my lord Hughes, acting Bishop of New York,	831	50
To my lord Miles, Bishop of Nashville, -	26,827	
To my lord Flaget, Bishop of Bardstown,	21,409	
To my lord Hailandiere, Bishop of Vincennes;	65,827	
To my lord Rosita, Bishop of St. Louis,	20,327	
To my lord Blanc, acting Bishop of Natches,	10,827	
To my lord England, Bishop of Charleston,	13,827	
Outfit of missionaries to Detroit,	4,000	
	341,843	80
Or, estimating 5 francs at 93 cents,	$63,582	70

This is what was sent by one Society, and does not include the money furnished by the "Leopold Foundation," and from

other sources. I have given the titles of the Bishops, word for word, as in the original. The "College of Ste. Marie des Barrius," is so called by mistake. A letter from "my lord Rosota,' Bishop of St . Louis, to the Secretary of the Central Council at Lyons, mentions the consecration of the church of St. Mary at the Barrons, 80 miles from St. Louis, and the Seminary there.
(N. Y. Observer.

THE JEWS.

There seems to be a movement among the Continental Jews in relation to the late events in the East. The following is the concluding paragraph of address to the Jews, published in Der Orient, a German newspaper:

"People of Jehovah, raise yourselves from your thousand years' slumber! Rally round leaders!—Have really the will; a Moses will not be wanting. The rights of nations will never grow old; take possession of the land of your fathers, build a third time the temple of Zion, greater and more magnificent than ever. Trust in the Lord, who has led you thr ough the vale of misery thousands of years. He also will not forsake you in your last conflict."

FOREVER.—" Who can paraprhase upon the words forever and ever? said the dying Newton. Yes, who can paraphrase upon them? What mathematician can number their years? Whose imagination so vivid as to stretch onward to that day when eternity shall have run its cycles? Alas! the imagination tires in the task; the mathematician is lost in his computations, and the mind faulters as it gazes into that dread abyss. Well might the dying free-thinker, as he was hovering upon its borders, exclaim, Oh, eternity! eternity! who can discover the abyss of eternity? What countless ages, for ever wasting, but never told and yet how near they roll! Their waves dash upon the shores of time at our very feet; and soon, Oh soon, we launch upon their shoreless bottom. Sinful man, art thou prepared to number the hours which make up that vast eternity to which you are hastening? Time-surveying professor art thou prepared to traverse those trackless paths which know no termination, forever? Awake, O thou that sleepest, and gird thyself for the Journey, Time is but a meteor's gleam: a single inch; and then eternity stretches onward to the judgment, and from the judgment, still onward, forever and forever.—[Western Rec.]

LETTER V.

REVIEW OF BRO. CAMPBELL'S VI LETTER.

PAGE 219.

Dear brother Campbell:

You complain of confusion with respect to the numeration and titles of our letters, but in the spirit of candor, you have attributed it to the true cause. It is a small matter, and we may console ourselves, that our books are paged, and reference can be made to the page, if not to the number of our letters. This you call your first suggestion to me on some points of order.

2. Your second suggestion is, That instead of my replying to your fourth letter, I printed a new letter on a new subject. My dear sir, did I not promise that I would review all your objections against my views from the beginning of this discussion, after I had finished publishing my four numbers on atonement? This promise I was fulfilling as fast as I could without filling up the Messenger with this subject. While you were writing your fourth letter I was examining the first part of your third. Had I passed over the latter part of your third letter, and proceeded to examine your fourth, you might more justly have complained that I had neglected to notice your strongest arguments. You suggest to me the propriety of a regular reply to each of your letters. This very thing I have labored to do, and by a little attention you will be convinced of the fact. Instead of replying to your fourth letter, you say, I have printed a new letter on a new subject. If you will examine that new letter of mine, you will find that it is a direct reply to the latter part of your third letter. If any thing in it is new, it was elicited by your previous remarks.

3. But my brother appears hard to please; for at one time my subjects are new and again they are old; for you add a third suggestion, that I am fighting over

the battles which, some 30 years ago, I waged against Kentucky orthodoxy. If I still retain the views I had 30 years ago, if true *then*, are they less true *now*? And have they lost their power, if urged against the same orthodoxy whether in Kentucky, Illinois, or Virginia? But you suggest that I am doing this instead of coming to an understanding among ourselves on what the scriptures teach on atonement. How, my dear brother, shall we ever come to an understanding among ourselves unless we plainly state our views? Must we have a uniformity of faith before we can understand each other?

Under your third suggestion, you seem to blame me for stating and proving that the blood of the Lamb of God is the means appointed of God, by which he cleanses and forgives the penitent, obedient believer; and that this truth I promised to make appear; and in order to do it, I filled several pages of the Messenger, with references to the Hebrew *nasa;* and the Greek *anaphero*. You then say with double admiration, "And who of us doubts or denies this!!" And I ask, Who said this doctrine was doubted or denied by any of us! Am I forbidden to state and prove nothing but what we all believe? Or must I state what I know you doubt and deny, and thus provoke contention? My brother, I write not only for ourselves, but for others also. What doctrine is more worthy to be proved than the one just stated above? You think that these Hebrew and Greek words are not called for in this discussion; I think differently, and view the right understanding of these necessary to the right understanding of the doctrine, and the many texts in connection with it. But you tell us that you have not introduced these words. Is this given as a reason why I should not? Remember, my brother, I lead in this discussion, and have liberty to introduce what appears to me relevant to the subjects discussed.

Page 220. You say "That the blood of Christ is

the means of pardon, we both agree, and you need not prove it." Strange! Need not prove any proposition in which we agree! But you ask, "In what way is it the means of pardon? This you have not yet shown"—Not yet shown, brother Campbell! How then did you know that we agreed in this? You must mean, I have not shown it as you believe it. I have been explicit in stating my views on this subject again and again in my letters to you. But avaunt points of order and let us take up this subject, "In what way is the blood of Christ the means of pardon? In your own language, "Come up to this point frankly and explicitly, brother Campbell. The brethren and community desire to understand us clearly on this great subject."

I will state a few propositions, which will not be denied by any believer in the scriptures.

1st. It is God that pardons or justifies. Forgiveness is an attribute of his nature, and impenitence is the only bar to its exercise.

2d. He pardons only true penitents. Except ye repent ye shall likewise perish—Repent and convert, that your sins may be blotted out.

3d. Faith in Jesus that lived, died and rose again leads to repentance—how? Because in these the benevolence, mercy, goodness and love of God to man are manifested. The wonderful works done by Jesus in life were designed to lead the people to repentance; hence they were upbraided because they repented not. He farther says, that if these works had been done in Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom, they would have repented long ago, and received forgiveness. It may be asked, what connection is there between those works and repentance? I answer; those works produce faith in him as the Messiah, the Son of God, and Savior of the world. This believed raises the soul to God, from whom they see boundless love, grace and goodness to the world, bursting forth in the gift

of his Son to be their Savior. This goodness of God leads to repentance. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This same love, goodness and grace are pre-eminently seen in the death and resurrection of Jesus. This the scriptures every where testify. Faith in his blood and resurrection opens to our view the infinite source of God's love, goodness, benevolence and grace to the world, and leads us to repent. "They shall look on him whom they have pierced, and mourn." "God hath reconciled us to himself by the death of his Son."

4. When the sinner is thus brought to repentance, and to consequent obedience, he is pardoned. Will any doubt or deny this? Brother Campbell, am I not now sufficiently explicit? You may now complain, and say again, Who doubts or denies this? Let me now ask, Does not brother Campbell deny it? Or at least, doubt it? 1st. You say, my illustration of this doctrine is ambiguous and irrevelant. In my third number, page 93. this illustration is found. You say, "You introduced it for one purpose, and then commanded us to apply it to another. The first sentence is; How the death of Christ bears away our sins, or takes them away, I will endeavor to illustrate by a figure; and at the end of the figure, you tell us: this figure is introduced only to show what principle leads to repentance and forgiveness—the goodness of God." Had my brother considered, that taking away sin, bearing away sin and forgiving sin meant the same thing, as I had abundantly proved in the whole of that letter he would have seen no ambiguity in the whole illustration. Our readers are invited to read the illustration. But, say you "In the six pages of Hebrew the Greek references, as well as in the illustration, the grand point is strangely forgotten—overlooked." So my brother may think; my only answer is, that our

readers are requested to examine that number for themselves. I fear not their decision:

On page 221. You say, "The difficulty is not about the necessity of his death in order to reconciling us to God; but it is about the necessity of his death in order to God's pardoning us." Why not come frankly and explicitly to the point, and say, the difficulty is about the necessity of his death in order to reconciling, pacifying, placating, or propitiating God, or making him propitious in pardoning us. If this be not your sentiment, I have misunderstood you, and should be glad to be correctly informed by my brother; but we shall see in the sequel of this, your 5th. letter, whether you do avow the very sentiment. You ask "Would you have one to believe that you make our repentance, or reconciliation to God, the only reason why he should forgive us?" You may expect a negative answer; but despite of the contrary faith of Christendom, I answer, God forgives none under the new dispensation; but such as repent, believe and obey the gospel, through the name of the great Mediator, who lived, died, and rose again for our justification. Now, brother Campbell, does the New Testament show any other ground of pardon or reconciliation to God? If it does, do show it for our good. If there be no other ground of pardon there, then why ask such a question?

Again; on the same page you state what you think to be the philosophy of my atonement. 1st. The death of Christ is to be contemplated merely as a proof of God's goodness—2d. That his goodness perceived in the death of his Son induces to repentance; 3d, and this repentance superinduces the pardon of sin. Hence the only necessity for the death of Christ to have occurred, is its superior fitness to produce repentance, which of itself alone, when called into being, constrains forgiveness." I will

examine this your view according to the numerical order.

1. "The death of Christ *merely* a proof of God's goodness." Can my brother Campbell after reading my letters say, that I have taught that the death of Christ was *merely* (only) a proof of God's goodness? Our readers will determine this matter for themselves. Among other designs of his death; I have, according to scripture, said that it was a manifestation of his love, goodness, grace and mercy. Do you doubt or deny this? No; you have expressed your full agreement with it.

2. That his goodness perceived in the death of his Son induces [leads] to repentance." Now I ask, Does my brother doubt or deny this? Does any one doubt or deny it! I boldly avow the sentiment in the face of the world.

3. "And this repentance superinduces the pardon of sin." Exactly so: God will according to promise pardon every repenting sinner—who also believes and obeys the gospel. Does brother Campbell doubt or deny this? If he does not, Why make this statement as the philosophy of *my* atonement, and not his own? And why should he come to the following conclusion; i. e.

4. "Hence the *only* necessity of the death of Christ is its superior fitness to produce repentance, which of itself alone, constrains forgiveness." This is acknowledged a legitimate inference from your premises; all depending on the little word *merely*. This being incorrect the inference is also incorrect. This reminds me of the present controversy of being justified by faith *alone*. You say, "Brother Stone you must be explicit on this point else we shall be greatly misunderstood, if not traduced by our opponents." Now, brother Campbell, you will acknowledge that I am explicit on this point, *te judice*. If I am misunderstood, it must be by those whose religious system is directly between their eyes and my views, who cannot, and will not see any thing beyond their own. If *traduced* by our opponents, they must show a more excellent way, before their traducements can effect the peace of my mind:

On page 221 and 222. You have written a remarkable sentiment which I will transcribe and examine. You say, "For my part, I will stand up before the universe of God, not only in affirming, but in attempting to prove, that the death of Jesus Christ our blessed and only Lord, was, and is, and evermore shall be, as necessary to demonstrating the justice as the goodness of God in forgiving sin. To unite mercy and justice in forgiving the sinner, was, in my view, the supreme end of God's *sparing* not his own Son; and I trust on this vital point there will be no difference between us. Come up to it frankly, and explicitly, brother Stone."

Yes, my brother, I will come up to it; and let me invite you also to come up to it; and let us not shuffle from it until we have fully examined it. Now I will in the first place ask my brother to make good his affirmation, and produce his scriptural proof, that the death of Jesus *was*, *is*, and *evermore* shall be as necessary to demonstrating the justice as the goodness of God in forgiving sin. 2. Prove from the same source, that to unite justice and mercy in forgiving the sinner, was the supreme end of God's sparing not his own Son. As you are so confident of these affirmations as true, I too wish to be equally confident if they are true. Affirmations as loud as thunder are no arguments to convince my mind; but I acknowledge they are with many as strong as sacred writ. You have the majority of the christian world on your side, and can safely affirm. Please, brother Campbell, come up to these points frankly and explicitly. It will be expected from you. You call your affirmations *vital* points. By *vital* do you mean essential?

I will now examine your remarks upon the criticisms I introduced on the Hebrew word *nasa* translated *to bear*, in your English Bible. With regard to this word I proved to your satisfaction, that when it is connected with sin, it means to bear away sin, --to take away sin—to remove it, or to forgive it. See page 88. You think the word has many different acceptations. This was never doubted or denied by me; all, who know the Hebrew, know this. But, remember, brother, my position is, that the word *nasa* connected with sin, means generally, if not universally, to bear away sin or to forgive it. My proof is positive and undeniable. So the word is translated by the Septuagint; and by the New Testament writers, and confirmed by your own version, as I showed in number 3. page 88. Scores of references to the word *nasa* unconnected with sin, is not in point. But you say, You can produce numerous and clear instances of its denoting—to bear sin in a vicarious manner to bear punishment &c. &c." I am sorry my brother has omitted to refer us to some of those *numerous* instances, where *nasa* connected with sin, means as he says. It would have produced more conviction in my mind, than scores of assertions, But I must wait till you shall produce them. As to your remarks on the Greek word *anaphero*, I am not concerned. I have only given your own version of the word in those texts, where *nasa* was translated by it.

Page 223. In conclusion of your remarks on *nasa* you say, "I will only add that your reasonings and inductions on *nasa* leave Isai liii, 4, 11--12, as it was"--(I am glad of it, for I never wished to remove it.) You proceed "If, indeed this whole chapters do not teach that Messiah did not suffer for us the just for the unjust." [Pray, brother Campbell, who doubts or denies this? I do not. You understand that he, as a substitute, suffered a vicarious

punishment, or in our stead, I understand he suffered on account of us---on account of our sins.] You proceed—'that he bore our sins, and bore them away.' I never denied that he bore our sins, as a descendant from Adam according to the flesh, as all Adam's children do. He took flesh and blood such as the children had, not immortal flesh and blood, for then he could not have had a fellow feeling of our infirmaties, nor could he have died--but he took flesh and blood such as the children had, that he might die and though death destroy him that had the power of death &c. If you mean that he bore our sins in this sense, we shall not contend. But the new Testament writers when quoting this passage in Isaiah give a different meaning, in which we have agreed. You add "that he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities." Yes; on account of our transgressions and iniquities. But if I understand you, he was wounded and bruised as our substitute —the punishment he suffered was vicarious, and that the Father himself inflicted the wounds and death upon him, For you add; 'He was stricken of God, and afflicted for our offendings---that it pleased Jehovah to bruise him, to put him to grief---(All this we do as firmly believe as brother Campbell, but not with the same interpretation. His interpretation is that the Father literally bruised and killed his own Son, as he plainly states in the next paragragph. If he actually killed his own Son, why should the Jews and Gentiles be condemned and punished for the deed? If God actually moved or influenced them to do it, does this mend the matter?

Let us examine the texts adduced by you. You quote the verse wrong. It reads: "Yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted." The preceding verses declare that he was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, despised and rejected of men. The world seeing him thus sorrow-

ful and afflicted, began to conclude as Job's friends did of him, that he was a bad man, and that for this reason they esteemed him as stricken and smitten of God and afflicted. They esteemed him also as a false witness, a devil; but this conclusion was false; and so in the case above. But you say "It pleased Jehovah to bruise him and put him to grief." Did Jehovah actually bruise him? Did he actually take vengeance on him as the substitute of sinners? Did he give a permit to the Jews to do it? No: for then they could not be guilty! He only suffered it to be done, or he did not interpose to prevent it. God is often said to do things, when he did not interpose to prevent them, or when he suffered them to be done. Thus it is said, that the Lord tempted David to commit sin in numbering Israel---And Job said that the Lord had taken away all he possessed, and the Lord meant it for good that Joseph's brethren sold him to the Egyptians; yet the fact show that God had no active agency in these things, but barely suffered them to be done by our adversary, the devil. Yet he determined to overrule all for his own glory, and his people's good. So it is a fact that Satan put it into the heart of Judas to betray Jesus, and that wicked man instigated by Satan committed the horrid deed.

One more text you quote to prove that the Father himself killed his Son, Zech: xiv, 7. Mat, xxvi, 31. "Awake, O sword against my shepherd—smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones." Now it is evident that the wicked is the Lord's word. Psalm. xvi; 13—and that he smote the shepherd in the same manner as he smote the little ones; for to turn his hand upon the little ones, signifies to smite or slay them. See Acts xiii, 11. 1 Sam. xxiv, 12. Deut. xiii 9. *and passim.* Can we suppose that God's hand was actually turned upon the little ones to persecute them

to death? No: It was the wicked who did it. But this subject I have before noticed.

My dear brother, I may have misunderstood you in your view of Isai 53, and what you have connected with it. If I have do please to set me right. This you can do by giving a catagorical answer to a few queries.

1. Do you believe that Jesus Chrst was the substitute of sinners in the plain, proper, and theological sense of the term?

2. Was the punishment inflicted on him vicarious, or in the stead of sinners, in the theological sense of the expression?

3. Did God himself actually inflict this punishment on his Son? Or did he take the vengeance on the Son himself, which was due to us? And for this reason pardoned the sinner, from Abel onward to this day?

4. Did God after having thus inflicted this vicarious punishment on his Son, become propitious,—or was he by this propitiated, placated, or reconciled to show mercy and forgiveness to sinners?

What you have said of system-mongers, with a squinting at me, may pass without remark. But it is well known who has made a system of late. You appear to be a little warm against me for asking a few questions, as the following; Does law or justice admitt of such substituted punishment? What law or what justice? You evade giving an answer to these queries, by asking others entirely irrelevant; as "Does the law or justice admit of the punishment by death of an innocent person?' Yes; brother Campbell, I unhesitatingly answer, the law and justice of God admit it. Witness the millions of infants that have suffered death by various casualities, as in the deluge, the slaughter by Herod &c. But did they suffer as substitutes? Did they suffer a substituted punishment? In the room of whom did they suffer? To whom were their sufferings imputed for pardon, or who released

from suffering? Come up, brother Campbell, frankly and explicitly to this point.

My letter is too long already; I must defer the review of your VI letter to another number.

Your fellow laborer in the kingdom of our Lord.

B. W. STONE.

LETTER VI.—TO B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE-

My dear Sir:—Your recent reviews of matters one year old, are so far in your rear, and so far off date, that neither myself, nor many of my readers, will be able to see where they strike. Neither does your No. I. touch any point in discussion. As to how the discussion commenced, I refer our readers to your letter of November, 1839, and to my reply in February following. They will be found in pages 21 and 68, vol. 4, 1840. The next item in the first review is upon my style of speaking of Christ crucified: I give it too much consequence, and speak too extravagantly of it, you seem to think. But my style, or your style, is no argument; and our brethren desire argument and evidence on this subject. You except to my saying that Christ crucified is the most transcendant mystery in the dominions of God—that the death of Christ is interwoven with all the designs of the universe—that it is the consummation of all wisdom and prudence, &c. &c.

Paul may, or may not, have authorized me to use those identical words; still I feel that he justifies my style. He says, "Great is the mystery of godliness!" '*God was manifest in the flesh*;' &c. What mystery can surpass this? "All things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Is not the death of Christ interwoven with all the designs of the universe? Angels

desire to look into this deep and wonderful scheme. 'In him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" —"In him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are deposited." "He is the wisdom and the power of God." "He upholds all things by the word of his power." 'God will gather all things together in him, both in heaven and in earth.' He is 'the Alpha, and the Omega, the First and the Last.' If my sayings are not sustained by these, and many such, let them be repudiated. "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

As to the imperfect and incorrect quotation from the "*Christian System*" to which you allude, it is a matter to me of no moment. If any one doubt the sense of the passage, I refer him to the first edition of the work. These, my dear sir, are very small matters. The phrase expresses my view in the sense of its own context—not in the context in which you happened at first to place it.

In your second review you recur to your peculiar and favorite acceptation of the active trasitive verb *kaphar*, *to cover* with blood or water, and metonymically *to cleanse*. Your argument from this word is precisely that of the Paidobaptists on the word *immerse*. Dr. Beecher, Jun. says that *baptize* signifies to *purify*, and a thousand others go for *washing cleansing*, *&c.* because such are sometimes the effects of immersion. But they greatly err as philologists, as logicians, and as Christians in substituting a metonomy of the effect for the cause, and making the apple the definition of the word *tree*. The lad who would define the term *tree* by saying it meant an apple, would be quite as learned a philologist in the case, as he who would say that the term *baptize* means to cleanse, to wash, or to purify. If a man should be immersed in mud, who would say that he must be clean, because the word *immerse* means to cleanse! This is no speculation, as you very good humoredly

answer some of my gravest points, calling them "a speculation"—"ingenious speculation." But really I am a little surprised at your mode of interpreting and applying such words as *kaphar* and *nasa*, &c. Still there is nothing gained on your selection of meanings: for we sometimes speak of *vindicating* and *justifying* God; and might, in the same latitude, speak of cleansing and sanctifying him. Indeed, the scriptures of truth speak of justifying and sanctifying God, and use these terms as active transitive verbals —"That thou mayest be justified when thou judgest" —'sanctify the Lord God in your hearts'—'I sanctify myself,' said Jesus, &c. But what say the Lexicons and Concordances on this word *kaphar*? *Do they sustain you?* They show that 'to cover' is the original and radical sense of this very common verb; that the *covering of the ark* is called *caphporeth*, a derivative from *kaphar*. The Arabic shows its ancient and common acceptation by the verb *kafara*, to hide, to conceal; so does the Syriac and the Chaldea, as our best Lexicons demonstrate. It is rendered, as you say, by the Septuagint *hilaskesthai*, to expiate; and by John, *hilasmos*; and among all the Greek writers, sacred and profane, no religious word is more definitely clear and express that this one. It is found, Dan. ix. 21; Heb. x. 4; John ii, 2; and indicates propitiation, expiation, atonement. In Genesis vi. 14; it is first found indicating the cover of the ark. In xxxii it is rendered *appease*; but indicates, 'I will cover myself from the anger of my brother.' See Parkhurst on its various acceptations; all of which, down to the Hebrew and Greek *ransom*, and to the Arabic and Turkish *caphar*, or tax on travellers, show that it means any thing that hides, conceals, and consequently appeases, reconciles, and propitiates. So that among ten or a dozen figurative meanings of the word, *cleanse* is but one. So wide are its figurative applcations, but we find it including the

cypress tree, and the pitch which shuts out the light and covers from the water.

Now I pray, Father Stone, not to send us away into foreign countries and ancient times and languages, old as the flood, to decide the bearings of the sacrifice of Christ upon the throne of God, and the conscience and character of sinners.

I object, brother Stone, as much to your manner of quoting my words, as to your use of Dictionaries translations. You say under item 7th of your review, "Its scriptural meaning is purification;" and and then you make me agree to it by saying, "With this my brother accords, page 24, where he says propitiation or purification is also an effect of atonement." Now I ask, in the fair and veritable construction of language, are you justified not merely in saying that its 'scriptural meaning is purification,' but in using the above sentence to show that I so understood it. Then may I say in reply, its scriptural meaning is pitch,' and with this brother Stone accords, for he knows and will admit that it is so found in Gen. vi. 14!

Many of our readers might pore over these criticisms a lifetime, and be as wise on the subject when dying as when being born. I put it to your good sense if we had not better keep to the English and common sense. After reprobating my making atonement the cause, and purification, reconciliation, propitiation, &c. the effects of it, you come to the same conclusion yourself. You very justly say, "I really begin to doubt whether I understood you when you speak of so many things being the effect of atonement—as propitiation, purification, expiation. You must mean in these cases, by atonement, the victim by which the atonement was made." You are perfectly right, my dear sir, in this conclusion. And if you had suspected it sooner, you might have saved the most part of your present review.

I presume the majority of Christendom calls the death of Christ *the sacrifice, the atonement, the ransom.* I never suspected that either in the current language of Protestants, or in the sacred style of the book of the New Covenant, I could be misunderstood in calling the death of Christ either the atonement or the reconciliation, viewed as a cause of our reconciliation to God, or of his being well pleased with us.

When Paul says, that "we have received the atonement," or reconciliation, by Christ, does he only mean that we are reconciled to God by Christ, or that by him has come to us the reconciliation, viz: that which does reconcile us to God, and which makes it just and honorable for him to be propitious to us. The Apostles' style in other places indicates the latter to be his meaning. Heb. ii. 17. he says, 'He made atonement, or reconciliation, for the sins of the people"—That this is the meaning of the original term, all classic Greek, all synagogue Greek, all ecclesiastic Greek amply testify. And what is all this but saying as he does in another place—"Once has he appeared in the end of the world *to put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself"! Sin was in the way—"sin lay at the door," and prevented the friendly intercourse of the parties; but he came and took it out of the way. It was just as much in God's way of showing mercy, as it was in our way of receiving it.

I cannot see how your figure or analogy between a cloud and sin, and wind and blood, reaches this case at all. The wind that removes the cloud, you say, "produces no effect on the sun;" neither does it on the man! But the removal of the cloud shows to man the sun. Well, does it not also show man to the sun! It effects the one just as much as the other. And here I am sorry to see you for the first time unequivocally say that "the blood of Christ had

no effect on God." Will you please attempt to reconcile this singular saying with Paul, Rom. iii. 25, 26. "Whom God has set forth a propitiatory, through faith in his blood, (a covering, or mercy-seat,) to declare his justice in remitting past sins," &c. "To declare (cotinues the Apostle) at this time his justice —that HE MIGHT BE JUST and the justifier of the believer," &c. You have, then, no faith in Christ's blood as affecting God, but only as affecting men! But this declaration, singular though it be, is excelled by one at the close of the preceding paragraph. You say, "By faith, repentance, and obedience, we are reconciled to God, sanctified, washed, and purified from all sin." Now I had been accustomed to teach that none but the reconciled could acceptably obey God. But you make obedience, equally with faith and repentance, a condition of personal recon. ciliation. Now, strange as it may appear, I cannot think your words definitely convey your ideas on this subject; *for surely you have faith in Christ's blood!* Now the person who has no use for Christ's blood, but to be reconciled by it, can have no faith in it; for why should he rely upon the death of the Messiah, as it can have no effect upon God!

Having yourself suspected the reason of your misconception of my placing reconciliation, expiation, purification, &c. &c. as the effect of atonement; it is unnecessary for me to prove that I am right in the sense for which I contend for it. You agree with me. The death of Christ is a sacrifice, the effects of which, believed, are expiation, purification, reconciliation, justification, sanctification, &c. You say you "hope the evidence to be given will be more convincing than the one you have adduced as a sample—viz. that things which cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned, such as the tabernacle, the altar, &c. &c. "These things, you inform me, are all said to be reconciled, but never atoned." Your

not observing that I use *atone* as the translation of *hilasko*, and *reconciliation* as the translation of *katallagee*, was no doubt, my dear sir, the cause of your thus representing me; which, without the slightest intention on your part, amounts to a misrepresentation. Now an altar cannot be reconciled, but it may be atoned in the sense contended for.

Brother Stone, I blame not you, but your memory, for this presentation of my views on this point. The time was no doubt, that you knew, that *in every place*, without a single exception, where reconciling the sanctuary, altar, place, &c. &c. is spoken of *katalasso, to reconcile, is never found;* but *hilasko, to atone, to propitiate, occurs in every place.* So that my sample is perfectly correct. You forgot that I had the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint before me while you were thinking of the English!

I am greatly delighted to see that the "*Christians*" of New England are reforming in their views of the death of Christ, although some of those of the West are yet tenacious of their old speculators. The "Christian Herald," of New Hampshire, has furnished some excellent articles on this subject, from the pen of my friend Elder P. Russel.—While one of its Editors is madly violent in oppossing us in some points—rather, in grossly misrepresenting us—another of them has seasonably introduced the subject of the atonement, and read a good lesson to his brethren East and West on this momentous subject. In the present essay, as I have nothing further of any importance to notice, I will give an extract from Elder Russel's No. II. on the atonement.

Among other ends of Christ's death, brother Russel says, "But the main design, the primary, and principal objects had in view in the death of the precious Lamb of God—a design to which all others are subordinate, and around which they revolve as the grand attracting centre of the plan of salvation,

was, that *he might become a sin-offering for us*, and by his blood cleanse us from all unrighteousness, and render it possible for God to maintain his law, vindicate his authority, and at the same time be "the justifier of him that believeth." But as this point will need more extended proof and illustration than we can well give in this number, we will leave this point till another week."

Now, my venerable Father Stone, if you will give us a few more reviews one year after date, I will set about giving you some defences from your 'Christ brethren" of the East. As I am leaving home for some two or three months, and as I may not see your reviews during my absence, I leave an essay on atonement from brother Russel, of the Christian Herald, instead of a formal reply to your reviews.

Sincerely and devoutly yours, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

QUERY.

Query, by brother Thomas Lyon of West Lebanon, Indiana.

Can a person attend to the ordinance of baptism by immersion, and not be born of the Spirit.?

Answer. We fear thousands have been and are still immersed, who have not been born again, or made new creatures neither before, nor after baptism. But we suppose the querist means; Is a person scripturally authorized to be immersed, before he is born of theSpirit; or musthe be born of the Spirit before he can be legally immersed? That a very great change must be effected in the sinner before he is to be immersed, is too plain to admit of dispute. He is changed from an unbeliever to a believer; from an impenitent sinner to a real penitent—from a disobedient sinner

to an obedient one—from an unconverted sinner to a converted one—from being ashamed to confess Jesus, to be bold to confess him before heaven and earth. These things are indispensable perequisites to baptism. Some may call them regeneration, or being born of the Spirit, or by other names, but all must confess that they constitute a great change. For whoso believeth that Jesus is the Son of God is born, or begotten of God, and whoso is thus born or begotten, does repent, and reform, or turn from the service of sin to God—he will manifest his faith and repentance by obedience to all God's commandments, among the first of which is baptism. I will never consent to baptize a person destitute of these things; and I heartily wish that all would go and do likwise.

B. W. STONE.

Centreville, Bourbon Co. Ky, March 18; 1841.

Brother Stone:—On the day before yesterday I reached home from Mason county, where have been laboring most sucessfully in the cause of Christian Union and in persuading sinners to turn to the Lord. Brother J. T. Johnson and myself commenced our labors there on the 20th ult. at Mayslick—up to the morning of the eighth day, 81 persons had rallied to the standard of Immanuel, acknowledging no book as authoritative but the Bible;—many were from the Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists, the great majority from the world; and more intellectual and moral worth I never knew gathered into the church at one time—having to leave the house we proceeded on to Washington, here the cause was languishing, and much prejudice against us. For five days we jointly labored with them, two came from the world and four from the Baptists to unite with us;

I then left for home, Brothers Johnson and Ricketts, still continuing there. On the next Lord's day the 7th inst, I met them again at Mayslick—bro. Johnson was unfortunately hurried away by the illness of his wife. We kept up our meeting until Friday morning, during which thirteen more came forward to unite—We then proceeded on to Maysville, where we continued our exertions until Sunday night; four there confessed the Lord; brother R. C. Ricketts was with us throughout, and brother Callerman part of the time at Mayslick; one hundred and five in all volunteered in the good cause during our stay in that county. I feel since my return much worn down but hope soon to be restored—May the Lord grant that our increase in goodness may keep pace with our rapid increase in numbers! And may the elder professors every where become examples of piety and devotion to the younger! And if any should not, may the young converts by their holiness and piety shame them into better living.

Try and be at Lexington, the 2d. day of April, if you possibly can; much is depending—I am ever.

Yours, &c. J. A GANO.

This meeting mentioned by brother Gano to be in Lexington, is to be a convention of all denominations of Christians in order to a general union of Christians. We long to hear of the result. But "In great attempts it is glorious to fail."

EDITOR.

Brother Martin Scott of Big Grove, Dewitt, Ill, writes March 10, 1841. The Church at this place numbers 40, and is destitute of a preacher.

[He wishes my views on the following subjects];

1. Are preachers now-a-days called of God to preach the gospel—

2, Is it sectarian for a christian preacher to be laboring to constitute a christian church in the same neighborhood, where a church of Christ exists already, who are willing to receive all that believe and obey the gospel without regard to a diversity of opinion?

Query 1: As this subject is considerably agitated in the present day, I will pay particular attention to it. I will enquire, How were the apostles called and sent of the Lord to preach and baptize. Were they called and sent vocally by the Lord, or by inward, divine impressions? None will deny that the Lord called and sent the twelve Apostles 'vocally,' and not [illegible] divine impression. Mat. x. 1—5. "And when he [illegible] unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them [illegible] ainst unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of diseases—These twelve Jesus 'sent forth,' and commanded them, &c. Hence we learn that the twelve were called and sent by an audible and outward voice of Jesus.

But Judas fell—another must fill his place. Read Acts 1: and we shall be taught how Mathias was called and chosen to fill the place of Judas. In answer to the prayers of the 120 the Lord disposed the lot to fall on Mathias. He was not called by any words of the Lord, nor by divine impression on his mind, or any revelation made to him, further than the divine disposition of the lot, all will grant.

How was Paul called? Read Acts 9—and you will find that the Lord was manifested to him miraculously, and that he was called and sent by him to preach through the instrumentality of Ananias, whom the Lord sent to Paul with his commission.

I think there are none, who will contend that they are called and sent by the Lord Jesus, as were his fourteen apostles. None now will contend that they were called by an audible voice—or that they miraculously saw the Lord in a vision, like Saul of Tarsus, and were vocally addressed by him.

The word apostle is a Greek word [Apostolos] which literally signifies sent; and so translated by our translators. John xiii. 16. The servant is not greater than his Lord, nor he that is sent [apostolos] greater than he that sent him:

The scriptures speak of two classes of Apostles—one sent by the Lord, and the other by the church. The first is styled an apostle of Jesus Christ—a called apostle of Jesus Christ—not of men, nor by man—See the introduction of Paul's and Peter's epistles.

The second class are the apostles of the church, called and sent by the church; such are called Messengers, 2 Cor. viii, 23. "Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my

partner, and fellow helper concerning you: or our brethren be enquired of, they are the Messengers (apostolous, apostles) of the churches." Phil. ii, 25. Unless a person be ordained, and sent by the church with epistles of commendation, he ought not to be received.

Have we any account of any that were called and sent, as the fourteen apostles were and the seventy? Have we any intimation in the New Testament that the divine purpose is, that none shall preach but such as are thus called and sent immediately by the Lord?

Matthew ix, 37. is introduced to prove that the Lord calls and sends forth laborers. "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest." This prayer was answered; for immediately he sent forth the twelve, and soon after the seventy others. But after he left the world, do we expect to be called and sent by divine voices, signs and visions? Does he not call and send through the instrumentality of the church?

But it is said, We do not believe that he calls and sends by an audible voice, or by visions; but by impressing the weight of souls on the mind, and an earnest longing for their salvation, with a hearty desire to call them to repentance. If this be all that is meant by being called and sent, I shall never oppose the sentiment, for none but such ought to preach. But where is the Christian, male or female, filled with the Spirit, that has not these impressions? Are they therefore all called to preach? If not; How shall it be determined who is, and who is not? Is this determination to be left with the person alone, or with the church? If with the person alone, anarchy ensues—the world would be filled with ignorant, enthusiast preachers, and the word, and ordinances of heaven disgraced. If the church alone is to determine who is called to preach, they may reject the man, whose heart burns with zeal for the cause, and send one, who is a man of learning, and eloquence, yet with an iceberg heart. This is too often done. Let the Epistle to Timothy and Titus be read carefully, and we shall be at no loss to determine this subject.

I have found through a long, and tried life, that the man who is most clamorous for being called and sent, has generally the least claim to such a call. He knows that unless he can make the people believe that he is called of God, he can have no influence by any thing else, unless (vox and preterea nihil) can influence them

But it is said, the Lorp calls sinners to religion—Yes, "Unto you, O men, I call, and my voice is to the sons of men." And this common call becomes effectual to them that obey it.

On this subject I have already given any thoughts in a few numbers back, to which I refer you.

With regard to your second query, I answer, that such conduct I view as sectarian in the fullest sense.

B. W. STONE.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

Smithville, Lawrence county, A'k. March 4th, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE:—

Some remarks are solicited from you on the following: John the Harbinger was sent to the Jews, and not to the Gentiles. All Jews rejected the counsel of God against themselves by not being baptized, consequently could not receive the Spirit, or discern the kingdom that was to be within the people, which Paul says, is righteousness, peace and joy in the holy Spirit, without baptism for the remission of sins. As this faith in Christ and baptism into repentance prepared them for this Spirit and kingdom, hence Peter on Pentacost said repent and be baptized for the remission of your sins, &c. and made the gift of the Holy Spirit consequent on faith, repentance and baptism. But on turning our attention to the Gentiles we notice they were not called on by John to be baptized, of course could not reject God's counsel, when he gave them none on the subject, not having then baptism between them and the gift of the Holy Spirit, which they received through faith without it, and if Gentiles once received it through faith without baptism, why not receive it yet? Where is a Gentile commanded to be baptized, before he receives the Spirit.

C. G. TITSWORTH.

REPLY.

DEAR BROTHER:—

That the Jews rejected the counsel of God, by not submitting to John's baptism is plain—but your inference admits of doubt, "consequently they could not receive the Spirit, till they were baptized for remission of sins. I ask my brother, Did those Jews who did submit to John's baptism receive the spirit at their baptism by John? It is no where said—For the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus had not ascended to heaven, where he received this gift for men. This promise of the spirit was to be received after the death and resurrection of Jesus through faith, repentance and baptism. After his resurrection the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was broken down and the same commission was given to the apostles to preach the same gospel to all the world, Jew and Gentile, and to baptize them into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; and the same promise of the Holy Spirit was made on the same conditions of repentance and baptism—for the promise is to you (Jews) and to your children your posterity and to all that are afar off (the Gentiles) even as many as the Lord our God shall call (all to whom the gospel shall be preached.)

You ask, 'Where is a Gentile commanded to be baptized before he receives the Spirit? I answer in Acts viii. 26. The Eunuch was a Gentile. So was Lydia, the jailor, in Acts 16.

B. W. STONE.

PROSPECTUS.

C. F. R. SHEHANE, proposes to publish by subscription, a volume of about *three hundred* pages of his own composition. The first part will contain more than twenty Discourses on various religious and literary topics, embracing among others the following subjects, viz: 1: The exaltation of Christ to universal dominion. 2. The fall and rise of Israel. 3. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. 4. The The Bible doctrine of election and reformation. 5. The Bible meaning of the end of the world. 6. Infidel objections answered. 7. Remarks on Dr. A. Clark's confession of faith. 8. Observations on some of Lord Brougham's writings. 9. Animadversions on Dr. Dwight's sermons and God's decrees. 10. The similarity between 'Calvinism' and 'Mohammedanism! 11. The liberty of the American Press both just and beneficial to society. 12. Religious freedom.

The second part will contain about *three thousand* lines of his poetry written at various intervals from 1832 to 1840.

TERMS.

The volume, if encouraged, will be neatly printed in New York, beautifully bound in figured Muslin,

lettered with gold leaf, and furnished to subscribers at $1 per copy, payable when delivered. Those who may wish such a book are requested to address the publisher, (Post-free at Greenville Court house, South Carolina, as soon as may be convenient.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Alton, Madison County, Ill. March 20, 1841.

Dear Brother,--The cause of Christ is gaining ground in this section; we were visited in Feb. by brothers Cherry and Owen, they succeeded in organizeing a congregation, composed of about 50 members on the New Testament: There was a Congregation here before, but they were not living up to the New Testament rules. Since that time four have been immersed, and the prospect is good for more.

Yours in great haste, but remain your brother in Christ.

ELIJAH CRAIG.

To B. W. Stone.

N. B. The Church here is called "Church at Wood River" they wish to be visited by the Teaching Brethren; their Elder is by the name of Richard Humphrey.

E. C.

Alton, March 15, 1841.

Brother Stone;- Since I saw you last Summer at Quincy, I have had the pleasure of baptizing 7, of which number are two of my own children. The times are encouraging. We meet every first day and break bread, and continue in the Apostles doctrine, and in the fellowship and in prayers. We request the preaching brethren to call, and aid us in the work.

Yours in hope of eternal life.

R. HUMPHREY.

Washington, March 4th, 1841.

Brother Stone,

Brother Gano and myself have just held a protracted meeting at Mayslick, of 7 days. It seemed as if the whole country would yield. We obtained 81 additions; and the prospects were fine for as many more, but for the Baptist meeting which prevented our continuance. Brother Ricketts the Evangelist was with us.

I never saw a greater victory achieved in the same time. We obtained some additions from the Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists.

We have reached a new crisis in Kentucky. The pious of all parties are now deeply engaged in investigating these important matters. The people are destined to lead their preachers. And the Baptists have it in their power to advance the cause a hundred fold and do themselves eternal honor. May the Lord bless them in the effort.

You shall hear from me again. Most affectionately remember me to Sister Stone and family—

Yours truly,

J. T. JOHNSON.

Brother J. A. Powel of Athens, Ill. writes Feb. 7. 1841. The good work of the Lord is progressing. There have been some additions to the churches during the winter. May the Lord prosper his cause!

Brother V. Harlan of Ohio, Dark, Co. March 25th, 1841, thus writes--

Dear Brother Stone:—In our religious progress we have our bitter with our sweet. Opposition and sectarian prejudices run high; yet, bless the Lord, many very many, are waking up from their slumbers to an examination of the scriptures; and the result is

that for the last eighteen months, about 150 have been added to the congregation here; more than two thirds of which were new converts. Many of the brethren and sisters are warm in the good cause, greatly desiring to know the whole truth, and to walk in the same. May the Lord bless you and his faithful servants every where. Farewell.

Bro. R. Humphrey of Alton, Ill Ap. 12, 1841.

Brother Stone;

Since I last wrote you, our congregationon Wood River has baptized 7, restored 3 to fellowship, and 6 from the Baptists have united with the church. The brethren seem to grow strong, and sinners listento the truth with much interest. We request our preaching brethren to lend their aid to the work amongst us.

—

I have just returned from a conferential meeting of the Christians at Highland, Pike Co. Ill. A number of preaching brethren, and others were present. Many important subjects were discussed with ability and in the christian Spirit—great unanimnity was manifested, and an uncommon degree of christian union; preaching and other religious exercises were kept up during the meeting—the fruits of which were seven additions to the church, and the saints were much revived. The minutes of the conference will appear in the next number. B. W. S.

—

A few days ago I received some valuable communications from brother T. M. Allen. I intended them to appear in this number, but had put them away so carefully, that I have despaired ever to find them. I hope brother Allen will replace them in my possession as early as possible. One thing I distinctly remember, that brother Boone, of Fayette, Mo. had recently, within six weeks, baptized, and added to the hchurch in that town between 80 and 90.

B. W. STONE.

THE

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

MAY, 1841.

VOLUME XI. NUMBER IX.

LETTER VI.

REVIEW OF BRO: CAMPBELL'S VI LETTER.

Dear brother Campbell:

You yet complain of my irrelevance to the point in discussion. In this I stand not alone; for of all, with whom you have publicly discussed any theologic al question, I find similar complaints. I have imputed it to the superiority of your logical acumen, with which few can compete. All who know me, know that I am a plain matter-of fact-man, and always endeavor to communicate in the plainest style. You must bear with me a little longer, and then I hope we shall close our friendly discussion, and labor more abundantly in reforming the hearts and lives of our readers.

On page; 9, in your first letter, you made a number of assertions, to which I objected, as speculations; (a word you did not like) as that the death of Christ is interwoven with all the designs of the universe —that Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the moral dominions of God—that it is the *mainspring* of all heavenly impulses—that it is itself the consummation of all wisdom and prudence. From my remarks on these speculations, page 109, you are brought to doubt their propriety; and yet endeavor to establish them by scripture; as "great is the mystery of Godliness, *God was manifest in the flesh.* All things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist—in