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

him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily—In him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are deposited—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 Omega, the first and the last." My dear sir, What have these texts to do with your assertions? I can see no coincidence, and verily think, that any other texts would have answered as well. Let any unprejudiced mind examine the texts with their context, and will he find any proof of your assertions?

On page 273, you say, "In your second review, you recur to your peculiar and favorite acceptation of the active transitive word *kaphar* to *cover* with blood or water, and metonymically to cleanse." My peculiar acceptation! Where or when have I accepted this definition of the word? It is *not* my acceptation, and very far from being a favorite one with me. I have shown that its literal, and scriptural definition is to cleanse when connected with sacrifice for sin. Had I accepted this *peculiar* definition, I should have contradicted Paul; for I have proved that he defined this very word *kaphar* by the Greek word *katharizo*, to purge or cleanse: never to cover, Heb. ix, 22. "Almost all things by the law are purged with blood." This same word *katharizo*, and on the same text your favorite Parkhurst defines to cleanse, or purify. This same word and on the same text, your version has it, to cleanse. Then Paul, Parkhurst, and yourself agree with me that *kaphar* is an active transitive verb, and literally (not metonymically) to cleanse. Our translators, as I have proved, have given the same translation of the word very frequently, and the Septuagint commonly. But our trunslators have not once translated the verb *kaphar* by to *cover*. Is it my peculiar and favorite acceptation of *kaphar*, to cover with blood or water? It is not; for the word is frequently used and so translated, to purge or

cleanse, and this too without either blood or water. See Exod. xxx, 15, 16, and xxxii. 30. Num. xvi, 46 47, and xxxi; 50, &c.

On page 274. You are surprized at my interpretation of the words *kaphar* and *nasa*. With respect to *kaphar*, when connected with sacrifice, I interpret it to cleanse or purge, and have the highest authority on earth for it, as just shown above. Surely this should not surprize my brother, especially when to his own written authority I have appealed. This acceptation of the word I proved beyond fair debate in my second number. After you had read it, you expressed no surprise; but said, "I see in all you have said little or nothing from which to dissent." Page 26. Here was approbation.

Your surprise must arise form my applying the word to men and things *defiled* ONLY, and not to the undefiled and holy God; nor to his holy law. This you plainly see is a death blow to your system, and now you are surprised at my acceptation of the word *kaphar*; for if we admit that it when connected with sacrifice, signifies *to cleanse* or *purge*, as the New Testament writers do, then it cannot apply to God, to cleanse or purify him. And yet! you do apply it to him; for you say "We sometimes speak of vindicating and justifying God; and might in the same latitude, speak of cleansing and sanctifying him." Yes, my brother, we can, and do vindicate and justify God from all the hard speeches of ungodly sinners against him. We do the same for our innocent friends when calumniated by their enemies. But is this a justification from crimes they have done, or because they are defiled by sin? No. But can we in the same latitude say we have cleansed and sanctified them, when they were innocent and undefiled? But you say, Indeed the scriptures speak of justifying and sanctifying God, and use these terms as active transitive verbs—as; that thou mayest be justified

whenthou judgest--sanctify the Lord God in your hearts. Was this a justification of God from guilt? Was this a sanctification or cleansing of God fro m defilement? No. How then can the se expressions apply to him in the same latitude as they do to the guilty and defiled sinner? But we are speaking of the active verb *kaphar*. Is this word used in those texts adduced by you? This is the point.

The definition of sanctification is, either to make holy, or to set apart for a holy use. To *sanctify* the Lord cannot mean the first; for he cannot be made more holy, more pure; it must and does mean the second; that we must sanctify him, or set him apart in our hearts, as the only proper object of our religious service, love and worship. When Jesus said, "I sanctify myself," he doubtless meant, I set apart myself to finish the work I came to do. Indeed, my brother, if we are in error, such proof from a man of such acknowledged learning, knowledge and goodness, is calculated to confirm us in that error.

On page 274. You say, "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 common verb; that the covering of the ark is called *kaphoreth*, a derivative from *kaphar*, The Arabic shows its ancient, and common acceptation by the verb *kafara* to hide or conceal; so does [do] the Syriac and Chaldea, as our best Lexicons demonstrate." My dear sir, my authority for my definition of *kaphar* to cleanse, or purge, is paramount to all the Lexicons and Concordances on earth—it is revelation itself to which we must all succumb. I have just touched at this subject above, but will be a little more particular in order to set this matter forever at rest that the verb *kaphar* connected with sacrifice, signifies *to cleanse, to purge*, and not once in the Bible is it rendered to cover. This I shall first prove from the scriptures.

1. Heb. ix. 29. "Almost all things by the law are *purged* with blood"—as the tabernacle—the altar —the woman after child birth—the leper—the man with a running issue—and every pardonable transgressor. In all these cases the word *kaphar* is used, and translated *to make an atonement*. Now the inspired New Testament writers mention these same cases, and universally render *kaphar* by the Greek word *katharizo*, and its cognate *katharismos*, the primary and only meaning of which is, to cleanse or purify, but never, in any case, *to cover*. No Grecian will deny this. In this all the Lexicons sustain me. This would appear to be sufficient authority, but I add—

2. That the word *kaphar* signifies to cleanse or purge, I argue from the translation of king James' translators, See number II, page 17, 18. Here have I proved that the translators rendered *kaphar* to clean[illegible] but in no case have they rendered the word to [illegible]er literally or metonymically.

3. The Septuagint by all is acknowledged good authority. They, as before proved, commonly, if not universally translate *kaphar* when connected with sacrifice by *exhilaskesthai*, which all Greek scholars know, never signifies to cover; and which word I have proved signifies to cleanse and purify; and you yourself render it to *expiate*.

You complain of my manner of quoting your words, and to my use of dictionaries and translations. I am not convicted yet of any error in these things; not even by what you have preferred as a wrong quotation of mine. I had said that the Greek word *hilasmos* signified purification, and said, With this my brother accords, page 24 where he says, "propitiation or purification is also an effect of atonement." You deny that this is a fair and veritable construction of language; I contend it is, and appeal to all good grammarians. You proceed, "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." I admit that *kaphar, not hilasmos* is thus rendered in this one text, and will farther grant, that if I were to render the noun wherever it occurs by pitch, the reading would be ridiculous. I admit also with you that the word may signify to cover metonymically, though not once in the Bible so translated. What says Paul? What say the New Testament writers? What say the Septuagint? What say King James' translators? I have proved that they all translate the word *kaphar* by a word which no where signifies to cover. All your references to the word, as meaning to cover, and all Parkhurst has made, have no relation to the subject of our discussion; because no one of them is connetced with sacrifice, and in fact, not one of them is translated to cover. As you say, your Hebrew Bible and Lexicon are before you, please examine them, and conviction of the truth of my assertion will be the result.

You wish and pray me to quit languages as old as the flood. Why? Because the generality of our readers do not understand me. Of this I have heard no complaint: Ought we not to endeavor to inform their ignorance, and not suffer them to die in it?— But you add, I put it to your good sense, if we had not better keep to the English and common sense. Did brother Campbell think of this, when he gave the world a new version of the New Testament, with many critical notes on the original language? And will he blame me for giving a new version of but a few words from the Hebrew and Greek, and confirming that version by indisputable authority from the inspired apostles and prophets? I claim equal privilege with himself. I know my version stands much in the way of orthodoxy; but this is not my fault.

On page 274. "You say; After reprobating my

making the atonement the cause (of purification, reconciliation and propitiation,) and purification, reconciliation propitiation &c the effect of it, you come to the same conclusion yourself.' What an inconsistent creature must I be! after laboring so long, and successfully too; to prove that atonement, purification, and reconciliation were the same; then afterwards to agree that atonement is the cause of these, and that these are only effects of it, I had said that your view must be that the victim itself by which the atonement was made, was called the atonement, and that if it were so, I should agree, that purification, reconcilation, &c, were the effects. who would deny this? you avow this to be your meaning: Now, I ask my brother, by what authority do you call the victim for sacrifice, the atonement? I cannot find it in the Bible neither in the types nor antitype. If you can, I should be glad you would show me where. But you appeal to the majority of Christendom. This authority all weighed in the ballance together, is not with me equal to one plain bible text. But for what purpose do you appeal to the majority of Christendom? Is it to prove that the victim for sacrifice is called the atonement? This is the point. No: but to prove another thing, denied by nobody, to prove that they called the death of Christ *the sacrifice, the atonement, the ransom.* Now I am persuaded that all plainly see the difference between a victim, and the sacrifice of the victim; and all will grant, that the sacrifice of Christ is the cause of atonement, reconciliation, and purification. Now if you call the sacrifice the atonement, and say that atonement is the effect of it, then you make the atonement both the cause and effect of itself. We should be careful of blinding metonomical and literal interpretations of truth. Christendom may be justified in calling the sacrifice of Christ the atonement *metonymically*, but literally it is the effect of it.

On p. 276. You saythat the death of Christ is a cause of our reconciliation to God, and of his being well pleased with us. This I hope all Christendom will grant; for who will deny with the Bible in his hand, that we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son. And who will deny that when we are reconciled to God, *then*, and not till *then*, God is well pleased with us? not before, for he is angry with the wicked every day!—But is it, brother Campbell, any where stated in the Bible, that the blood of Christ is the *direct* cause of God's being well pleased with us? This is the point to which I have often called your attention, this is the point to which I wish you to come up. This is the great point of difference between us, and must be settled with better proof than the fallible assertion of Christendom.

Set us hear your scripture proofs that the death of Christ had a *direct* influence and effect on God to make him propitious to us, and well pleased with us.

On pa. 276. You introduce Rom 5. 10, 11. 'For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation." That man is the person *directly* reconciled to God, this text declares in terms too plain to admit of doubt, and is abundantly confirmed by the same apostle 2 Cor. v, 18, 19, 20—that the means of our reconciliation to God, is the death of Christ, none can deny—and that this means produces this effect by faith in his blood, will readily be admitted by all. Yet my brother expresses a dark sentence on the word reconciliation, as "that which does reconcile us to God, and which makes it just and honorable for him to be propitious to us." This meaning, whatever it may be, you tell us indicated by Heb: ii, 17. "He made an atonement or reconciliation,

for the sins of the people." You add, "That this is the meaning of the original term, all classic Greek, all synagogue Greek, all ecclesiastic Greek amply testify." On this permit me to make a few remarks.

1. If this be the meaning of all the various classifications of Greek, why did not our brother render it so in his version of the New Testament? There he translates the words in Heb. ii, 17—"in order to expiate the sins of the people." Here the sufferings of the high priest are solely confined to expiate sins, or cleanse from sins—and these were the sins of the people. They had *direct* no effect upon God to expiate or cleanse from, and make him propitious, but upon the people.

2. The rendering you have just given of thetext, "he made an atonement, or reconciliati for the sins of the people" is not a just translation of the Greek words, *hilaskesthai tas hamartias*. You well know that *hilaskesthai* is an active transitive verb, and signifies to cleanse, or as you have it, *to expiate*. This action must pass upon the object *tas hamartias*, *sins*, and therefore must read, to cleanse or expiate sins. In your reading above, you have no object for the active transitive verb, and have to introduce the proposition for to govern the object.

3. You have admitted that atonement and reconciliation are the same; and therefore atonement is not the cause of reconciliation, nor reconciliation the effect of atonement. Thus we are brought to an agreement again.

You immediately introduce Heb. ix, 26, to prove your position, that the, reconciliation in Rom. v, 11 applies to God, to make it just and honorable in him to be propitious to us. The text is, "But now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared *to put away sin* by the sacrifice of himself." Your exposition of this is new indeed—for you say, "sin was in

in the way—*sin lay at the door* Gen. iv 7. 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." Page 276. On this novel interpretation I will make a few remarks.

1. In your version of the New Testament you sometimes, and very properly, render the word *hamartia*, *sin*, a sin-offering—as 2 Cor. v 21: "He hath made him to be *sin*, you properly read it, a *sin-offering*. And in Heb. ix. 28. "He will appear the second time without sin," you read it without a *sin-offering*." This is McKnight's translation; and he translates the verse immediately in connection (26) in the same way. Why you did not follow him in this instance also I can see no reason—you have also given in your new version of Heb. xiii. 11. The same; as "The bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary *for sin*—you read it. "as a sin-offering."

2. You try to establish your novel idea by Gen. iv, 7—God speaks to Cain, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? But if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. By this you represent sin as lying in the way of all friendly intercourse between God and man. Now my brother does know that as the Greek *hamartia sin* sometimes is taken for a *sin-offering*—so the correspondent Hebrew word *hetta* or *hettath* sin, is very frequently taken for sin-offering Exo. 29. 14. But the flesh of the bullock—thou shalt burn without the Camp, it is a sin-offering *hettath* the same word as is used in Gen 4. 7.—See also Lev 4. 3. Exo 30, 10. &c where the word for sin-offering is *hettath*.—So Dan 9. 24. "To make an end of sins' means, to make an end of sin-offerings; so Hos; 4. 8. They (the priests)eat up the sins of my people; means, they eat the sin-offerings of my people. Now when the Lord says to Cain, "*If* thou doest not well *hettath*, a sin-offering is lying at the door, there lies a lamb, a goat, or bullock, go, take it, and sacrifice it unto me as did Abel your brother, aud you shall be accepted as he was. Do, sir, as you have your Hebrew Bible and Lexicon before you, turn up Parkhurst on the word hettath, and hear him, read his comment on Gen. iv, 7, and you will forever relinquish yours. In conclusion he says, "As for the the expression of *sin lying at the door*, it is (to speak modestly) a very strange one, and hardly sense; though I am aware that it is become not uncommon in English, I suppose from this very mistranslation in Genesis."

3. I have no objection to the idea that sin prevents that friendly intercourse between us and God. But where is sin? not lying at the door, but in us and not in God. To remove it from us, is to remove the cause of separtion between us, and God, and of course the friendly intercourse and union are restored between us and our God. This is the doctrine for which I have been contending, throughout this discussion, and to illustrate it I borrowed the prophets, figure of sins as a cloud separating between us and God. A cloud obstructs the light and heat of the natural sun from us, but has no effect upon the sun itself light and heat remain the same. When the cloud is removed, the rays of the unchanged sun flow to us, and bring to us their enlightening--quickening, and cheering influences. The figure and application are plain and easy. Yet my brother strangely thinks, that the wind that removes the cloud, affects the sun as much as us—or without the figure, that the blood of Christ that removes our sins, affects God as much as us. If any will think so, I cannot help it—to their own master they stand or fall.

Now because I, for want of evidence, say that I do not believe that the blood of Christ had any direct effect on God so as to propitiate him to us, you

are very sorry, and wish me to reconcile this with Rom. iii, 25, 26, as this is your strong hold, to which you, and the orthodox constantly resort; and as you have not designed to notice my former remarks on it; I will now endeavor to be more explicit. I will acknowledge that you have at my suggestion omitted two words *own* and *also* contained in your new version of this verse, against which I objected, because they were not in the Greek text. As I expect to write no more on this subject forever---on the subject under discussion between us, I hope for indulgence in my prolixity.

Rom. iii. 25,26. I will give your version of the text page 277. "Whom God hath 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 at this time his justice--that he might be just, and the justifier of the believer."

1. From the old typical mercy seat, God declared his will and truth, to his people, and from it communicated to them his blessings. So from the true mercy-seat Christ Jesus, he declares his will to the world; for God spake by his Son, and from, or by him communicates his favors to them that believe and obey the gospel.

2. What does he declare from the true mercy-seat especially? You say, his justice. Our translators, McKnight, and a host of others, say, his righteousness. You alone of all known to me render it *justice*. Though the word dikaiosune is used near one hundred times in the New Testament, it is not once translated justice, but uniformily righteousness. You very often in your version translate the word *justification*, as, therein is the jusfication of God is revealed. Against this translation I have no objection. It fully inclueds my views of the truth intended. The righteousness or justification of God, is that plan of God justifying by faith without the deeds of the Mosaic

Law. This plan is revealed by Jesus Christ in the gospel in all its clearness and fulness. True, it was witnessed by the law and the prophets; for it is written there,"' the just by faith, shall live.' This plan of justification was but obscurely taught bythe prophets; but they did teach it and from their writings the apostle introduced it as, a witness to induce the Jews to believe the truth.

3. For what purpose does he declare his right eousness, or justification? This is the important point of inquiry: the justification declared is, that God will freely pardon or graciously justify every one that believes in Jesus—that if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.—But the objection is, how can he be just in justifying and pardoning the guilty without the deeds of the law? We believe says the Jew, that God has required us to be circumcised and to keep the whole law, or we cannot be saved; nor justified. Now says Paul, (v, 19)We know that whatsoever the law saith it saith to them who are under the law—therefore the law speaks to the Jew only, for they only are under it; and not to the Gentiles, for they are not, and never were under the Mosaic law. The Jews under the law were guilty as were all the world. Therefore, v 20, by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight, who sees the defiled heart and conscience. For by the law is the knowledge of sin, and therefore by the law none can be justified. But says Paul, v 21, there is a justification without the law made manifest--and this justification is witnessed by the law and the prophets, even by Abraham, David, and all who of the faith of Abraham--they were all justified without the works of the law. Chap: 4, 1--14. Now this justification is by faith in Jesus Christ, and is to be preached and offered to all, both Jews and Greeks and is actually possessed by all that believe.—This

is the justification God declares to the world, by or from Jesus Christ the true mercy seat—Will the Jew yet say, how can he be just in justifying without the law of Moses? Paul will ask, how was he just in justifying Abraham who lived before the law? In the same way he is just in justifying the Gentiles who believe in Jesus, as well as the Jews. He has declared it, and who shall reply against God? Every act of God is in accordance with every attribute of his nature, who will deny it?

To declare God just, and to make him just, are two distinct ideas. The first I receive, and the second, I think, my Brother receives; for you introduce this text to prove that the blood of Christ so affected God, that he can now be just in justifying the believer. That this is your meaning, you add; Then you have no faith in Christ's blood as affecting God but only as affecting men! You speak correctly; for faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God and that word has no where said it to my understanding.

On pa 277 you object to the order in which I have placed faith; repentance, obedience &c. Here I may have erred; but in this I refer you to your observations made to a "precise brother." In conclusion, permit me to wonder at you, when on the same page you say; Now a person who has no use for Christ's blood, but to be reconciled by it, can have no faith in it! What no faith in it? and yet be reconciled by it! Strange! Can he be reconciled to God by it without faith in it! You add as a reason of this strange sentiment, for why should he rely upon the death of the Messiah, as it can have no effect upon God! your conclusion must then be, that none are Christians, who do not believe that the blood of Christ has such a mighty effect on God, as to make him propitious, to appease or pacify him, to turn away his wrath, and please him—or in the language of

the poet, 'to turn his wrath to grace.' Take heed, my dear brother, lest your zeal for an untenable dogma become as intemperate as that of many, who deny your claims to Christianity, because you hold, in their view, doctrines subversive of true Religion.

You express much delight that the Christians in the east are opposing my views on atonement. Not all are opposing; for the Palladium, their best and most popular paper, is transferring to its pages, my numbers in the present discussion. My dear sir, should the world oppose, as brother Russell has done, by transcribing Buck's theological dictionary on this article, atonement, I stand unmoved by such attacks. At your request I will publish his number when it shall appear in the Harbinger; but I expect to pay no attention to it myself. Others may. One brother is enough for an old man at the same time.

Your old brother in the bonds of peace and love,

B. W. STONE.

(From the Millenial Harbenger.)

ATONEMENT—BY RUSSELL.

The sufferings and death of the Son of God are every where in the scriptures spoken of, or referred to as the procuring cause of our salvation. His 'BLOOD,' the emblem of his agony and death, is said to 'cleanse us from all sin ' and 'without the shedding, of blood,' we are told,' there is no remission.' That the sufferings and death of the Messiah are a *sine qua non* in the plan of salvation, can be denied by none, who honestly believe the Bible to be the only infallible standard of christian faith. But there are those who are disposed to undervalue the atoning sacrifice of the Lamb of God. Instead of attributing the pardon of sin and eternal blessedness to the *death* and mediation of Christ, as the procuring cause, they

dilate upon the mercy of God, forgetting the testimony of Jesus when he said: 'No man cometh to the Father but by me.' They acknowledge that Christ died and rose again, but this death and resurrection, are not a *sine qua non*, absolutely, in the very nature of things, indispensable to the pardon and final salvation of sinners. They say Christ died for us as Gen. Warren died for his country,–that wicked men murdered the Messiah, that he fell a martyr to the truth, and that he deservedly stands at the head of that illustrious troop of martyrs, who have cheerfully in every age, sealed the truth which they loved and preached, with their blood.–Against this low, Socinian God-dishonoring view of the sacrificial offering of the Lamb of God, we enter our solemn *protest*. And the following are some of our many reasons.

1. To represent the death of Christ as only *martyrdom*, is equivalent to deny that Christ is the Saviour of sinners. If he dies as a murdered victim of the wrath of men, a martyr and nothing more, then he does not any more than Stephen or any other holy man of God who has died for the truth, procure by his death and sufferings, our salvation. How then is he a *Saviour?* By his example and teachings only; and this is the sentiment usually entertained by Unitarians. According to this sentiment Christ may be *a Saviour*, but he cannot be THE SAVIOUR, 'the only name given under heaven, among men whereby we must be saved.' He is a Saviour as the prophets and apostles were Saviours. They taught the truth, and most of them died for the truth, and they were instrumental of bringing thousands to the knowledge and service of the Living God. Is this all that Jesus has done for us? then he stands on a level with good men, if indeed this Socinian notion would not degrade him much below them, some of the luminaries of the church. If Christ is a Saviour only because he preached the truth and died

as its witness, then Paul and Peter far excelled their Lord as saviours; they were longer and more successful in their ministry. They were indefatigable and most successful preachers of righteousness some thirty or forty years; but his ministry could not have been more than three years and a half.--They planted many churches and received many thousands of happy converts, but Christ is supposed to have made but a few hundreds, some suppose one hundred and twenty disciples—up to the time of his ascension. They both died happy and willing martyrs to the gospel; and according to the hypothesis of our Socinian Doctors, Christ has done no more. It appears evident, therefore, if Christ is a Saviour only by virtue of his example and teachings, and not by virtue of an atoning sacrifice, that he is not the SAVIOR of the world, but only *a savior*, one among a multitude of Saviors. How appalling, may we not say, how blasphemous is this sentiment to the soul of him who loves the Son of God as the "propitiation--*ilasmos* atonement for our sins, and not ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world?" 1 John ii, 2.

2. This view of the death of Christ impeaches both the wisdom and goodness of God. In all the works and appointments of Jehovah we behold order and congruity, the best means employed to accomplish the best ends. But if the death of the Holy, dearly beloved and only begotten Son of God was not indispensably necessary as an expiatory sacrifice, where is that wisdom which always secures the best ends by the best means? How can wisdom be seen in "sparing not his only Son, but giving him for us all," to die the most agonizing, ignominious death? Did the truth need a martyr's blood to attest its heavenly origin and its power to save? Where were the prophets? Many of them had been sawn asunder, had been stoned, and wandered about in sheeps

skins and goats' skins, were afflicted and tormented. Would not this answer? Where was John the Baptist? His head had been presented to Herod in a charger. His blood had borne witness to the truth. Behold Stephen, James, Peter and Paul. These are mortals. They must die, and they are all ready to seal the truth with their blood. Why then must Jesus, the immaculate Son of God become "exceeding sorrowful even unto death."—It was not necessary to bear witness to the truthfulness of Christianity. There were witnesses enough already. Why then does God make such a sacrifice? Why pay such an exorbitant price? Why sacrifice the most precious blood in the universe, if the honor of the divine law can be maintained and souls redeemed without it? And where the *goodness*, to say no more of the wisdom of God, in permitting his dearly beloved Son in whom he was always well pleased, to endure so much undeserved and unnecessary sufferings? We are sinning mortals and deserve to die; but this cannot be said of the Lamb of God. He was holy, harmless, separate from sinners. He merited not the displeasure of his heavenly Father; and if his Father so far withdrew his divine protection from his only Son, as to give him up unnecessarily into the hand of a murderous rabble,—if he so far closed his ears to the cries of his Dearly Beloved, as to leave him to be mocked, scourged, buffeted and crucified, *where*, heaven and earth ask with distrust and amazement, WHERE IS THE GOODNESS OF GOD? Let such a sentiment as this obtain, and the universe would revolt and withdraw its allegiance from a throne too weak and too indifferent to protect the loyal and innocent:

3. We object to the Socinian views of the atonement, because the Scriptures attribute our salvation to the death and mediation of Christ, but not to the death of any others who have died martyrs. Now

if Christ died as a witness to the truth only, fell by the hands of his enemies, if such a death could have anything worth naming to do with our reconciliation to God, we should find our salvation referred not to the death of Christ alone, but to all the saints who have sealed the truth with their blood. It is frequently said that the liberties of our country were purchased by the blood of our fathers. Gen. Warren is much distinguished for the part he took in that perilous struggle. But no one thinks of attributing the liberties of his country to the death of Warren. We speak and think of him only as one among many who suffered or died to deliver their country from the infatuation of Great Britain. But when we come to the Records of our faith we find no one of all the sufferings and martyred saints, sharing with Christ the honor of redeeming us to God by their blood. The language of the word of God is: "All we, like sheep, have gone astray * * * the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all." * * "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." * * "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed." We are said to be justified by his blood,' and when enemies 'we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,' and by his 'blood we are said to be cleansed from all sin;' and the redeemed in heaven are represented as ascribing their salvation to the death of Christ. In their choral songs, they say: 'Thou art worthy to take the book and open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, tongue and people and nation.' Isa. 53—3 6. Rom. 5—9 10. Rev. 5 9.

4. We protest against the Socinian views of the atonement, because they imply that the death and sufferings of Christ were all inflicted upon him by

his enemies, which is not true. This sentiment is not only implied by the hypothesis that the blessed Redeemer died only as a martyr, but it is fully and frequently expressed by those who stumble at the cross. That the enemies of the Savior laid wicked hands upon him, and were engaged in crucifying him when he made his soul an offering for sin, is true but that they had power to take away his life, or that they inflicted the mighty aggregate of his sufferings is not true. Hear the prophet Isaiah on that point

"It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief, when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands," Isa, 53. 10. Hear the testimony of the Faithful and true witness. "I lay down my life that I might take it again: NO MAN TAKETH IT FROM ME, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." John 10—27, 18.

Besides, if the death of Christ was wholly inflicted by his enemies, what mean those dreadful agonies in the garden when no man was near? There we behold the Lamb of God prostrate on the ground, in the deepest mental agony. So intense were his sufferings that he was bathed in a bloody sweat, and exclaimed, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.' This agony which seems to have been the most dreadful which he ever endured, was not inflicted by the hands of wicked men. To say it arose fromthe apprehension of the near appoach of his murderers, is to charge the holy Jesus with a most deplorable imbecility and cowardice. There is another difficulty here which is worthy of serious consideration It is this: If the death of Christ was a death inflicted only by his enemies, his sufferings must have been *physical*. Men can kill the body but cannot kill the soul. But how was it when the Lord Messiah died?

Was his death confined to the body? Hear his dying groans. 'My SOUL is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.' Matt. 26: 38. Mark 14. 34. 'He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his SOUL an offering for sin.' Isa. 53: 10. Here then the soul of Christ is represented as *suffering death*, being made an 'offering for sin.' But we cannot see how wicked men could make the SOUL of Christ an 'offering for sin.'

5. We will name one more objection to the hypothesis under consideration, and leave this subject for another occasion. It is this: If Christ died only as a martyr, he died the most ingloriously of all Christian martyrs. It is a distinguishing trait in the death of those saints who have fallen by the hand of violence, as witnesses for the truth, that they have been wonderfully, almost miraculously sustained in the dreadful conflict. Read the history of the death of Stephen. How calm! How heroic he falls asleep! He bends his knees in prayer—he sees heaven open; and wrapt in beatific vision he prays for his murderers, commends his spirit to Jesus and falls asleep! Look at the apostle Paul. He died a martyr at Rome during the reign of Nero.—Hear the triumphant notes which he raises, as he nears the scaffold. I am now ready to be offered; the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the Righteous Judge will give me in that day, and not me only, but all who love his appearing. Look into the book of Martyrs, and see how calm and triumphantly these saints who have fallen by wicked hands, have fallen asleep. With their last breath they have smiled upon their enemies and cried, 'Welcome the cross of Christ.' 'Welcome eternal life.' But when we contemplate the Redeemer in his death and sufferings, behold what a contrast! He is

overpowered with mental agony. Before his enemies approach him, he falls agitated upon the ground and shrieks out—'My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death.' He sweats, as it were, great drops of blood, falling to the ground, and ejaculates: MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME!

Why is the Lamb of God agitated? Why so swallowed up in view of death, if that death is only the death of the body? Is Jesus afraid to die? Does he shrink from the prospects of the eternal world? No—blessed be God, he is himself the Resurrection and the Life. The secret of this overwhelming agony is, 'HIS SOUL WAS MADE AN OFFRING FOR SIN.' Isa. 53: 10. More hereafter. R.

NOTICE.

At brother Campbell's request I have printed Elder Russell's discourse on atonement. In it I find nothing different from what I have already noticed in the present discussion between brother Campbell and myself, except a few ultra-orthodox expressions, which have unguardedly been slipt into the discourse—as for instance, That the death and resurrection of Christ, are the *sine qua non* of pardon and salvation.

Query. How then were the saints pardoned and saved from the beginning, before the death and resurrection of Christ, seeing they did not believe that he was to die and rise again? This death must solely affect God, and not man according to brother Russell. He considers the following doctrines to be low, Socinian and God-dishonoring, and enters his solemn protest against them. 1st. That Christ died for us as Gen. Warren died for his country. Query.

And who, but himself, ever denied or protested against this truth? Gen. Warren died for us from love of his country; did not Christ die for us from love to us? Gen. Warren died to save us from our enemies; did not Jesus die for the same purpose? Thus far the analogy holds good with all, except brother Russell and yourself. 2d. He also protests against this plain scriptural fact "that wicked men murdered the Messiah"—this he calls God-dishonoring; and will my brother Campbell endorse it? I know brother Russell acknowledges that wicked men did partly inflict the death, but that God united in the horrid deed! 3. He also protests against this, "that Christ fell a martyr to the truth? And will brother Campbell protest also against this, and call it *God-dishonoring?* You two must be alone on this subject; for I know of none who have ever ventured to deny it before—I grant, that this was not the only design of his death, and will join with you in protesting against this exclusive sense. Against this doctrine brother Russell's discourse is directed. I wish him success heartily in combatting this exclusive sense of Christ's death.

But why should brother Campbell publish this piece against this low, Socinian, God-dishonoring, doctrine? Did he think—could he think that it applied to me, in the sense stated by brother Russell? So our readers must think, seeing you have endorsed the sentiment. To them it is left to judge. I think it is time now to close this discussion, seeing fair debate cannot be had.

I shall in my next give a synopsis of my views on the atonement, as stated in this discussion, without reference to yours. I leave for you to do the same, to give a synopsis of your views without any reference to mine. Let the world read and judge. If we begin to contrast, and compare our views in our synopses, it may renew the discussion. I wish us

all to unite in the greater work of reforming and regenerating the church, and of saving the world.

May the Lord bless my beloved brother.

B. W. STONE.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

LECTURE III.

By a comparison of the present state of Christianity with what it once was, all are brought to the conviction that we are yet in the apostacy—under the reign of the man of sin—yet in Babylon—yet in the wilderness. All the sects see the propriety and necessity of reformation, and christian union, and profess a great desire for them, and make stong cries and supplications for their speedy return to Zion. Yet, strange! Whenever an attempt is made to effect them, all the parties rise up against it, and oppose the abettors of the good work. The reason is, that the means proposed by those reformers impinge upon their party schemes, and strike a death blow at their party-union. This is the history of every reformation from John the Baptist to the present time. At first the people gladly heared John, the great reformer, and flocked to his baptism, but when he had fully developed the plan of reformation, they were offended, and opposed with violence the scheme. So it was with the greatest reformer on earth, the Lord Jesus. At first the multitudes flocked to his ministry, and were urgent to crown him king; but when his plan of reformation was understood by them, they opposed and crucified him. So of the reformation of Wickliff, Huss, Luther, Wesley, and of the present century.

Various plans have been introduced by honest, good men to effect this disirable, and desired object:

Christian union; bnt they have all failed. It is worth while to inquire into these plans, and into the reasons why they have failed.

1st. The first plan to unite the divided Christians was introduced in the beginning of the fourth century bythe council of Nice. This plan was, to have a creed, or a system of doctrines made by the collected wisdom and authority of that council, to which all must subscribe, and from which none must depart, on pain of earthly and eternal anathemas.—The plan, we acknowledge, is plausible; and this has kept the Catholics united until now. But is their union, christian union? A Catholic was once asked, What did he believe?—he replied, I believe what mother church believes. And what does mother church believe? She believes what I believe. And what do you both believe?—We both believe alike. Here is a specimen of Catholic union. Who is so blind as not to see, and so ignorant as not to know, that this Nicene creed confirmed and perpetuated the division of the Christians then existing, and made slaves and hypocrites of millions more, who rather than undergo the anathemas threatened, subscribed what they did not believe, and slavishly rejected light lest they should be converted, and treated as heretics. This plan of the old mother has been followed by all the sects to this day with the same spirit and with similar success. Can this be heaven's plan to unite in one, his scattered people? No; No; fact itself proves its fallacy.

Some who are opposed to a large creed-book as a plan of union, yet plead for the necessity of a few *essential* doctrines to be embodied, as a bond of union. But who shall determine what these essential doctrines are? Suppose it possible that every member of the church on earth were together, and all agreed upon three or four doctrines as only *essential*, and that these only shall be tests of Christian union—

Would they all honestly agree that, should increasing light convince them that the doctrines received were wrong, they would still retain and defend them? Would they, or could they bind their posterity to believe and receive them? But these things are impossible. No formulary of doctrines can unite the Christian world—If it can unite a party—that union is only partial, and of short duration—it is a union of disunion, for unless we give up the right of thinking, and implicitly believe as the Catholics do, such creeds are vain.

2. Many in the present century have seen, and many begin to see, that all such creeds are in the way of christian union; and that to support them, is to support a limb of anti-christ. Thousands from this conviction have abandoned them all, and cast them to the moles, and to the bats, and have taken the Bible alone, as the sole rule of faith, and practice. This is commendable, and a long stride from Babylon. But will this effect Christian union? alas! we have to acknowledge the reverse. Thousands in this day have made this public profession, and are as much disunited in Christian love, and co-operation, as other sects—They have no written creeds, but they make their unwritten opinions of the Bible truths, the tests of union. As long as opinions of truth are made tests of union, all our boasting, that the Bible alone is our Religion, is vain.

3. The Bible alone *in heart* believed, and in the spirit obeyed, is doubtless the means of Christian union. Who will deny? It must be first, *with the heart believed*—believed *with all the heart.* To believe with the heart, is, to be affected and influenced by the truth believed; and to obey it in the spirit, is, to do it with the full, true and sincere determination, and resolution of the spirit, not only to cease to do evil, but to learn to do well—to depart in heart and life from every thing forbidden, and in heart and life

to do every thing commanded.—With such God meets, and blesses them--He meeteth him that worketh righteousness—their sins are blotted out—they receive the Holy Spirit, and experience seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord—they are born of God, and therefore love God, and one another, and this love casts out fear, and is the cement of Christian union.

Now we will inquire particularly what we are to believe and do in order to christian union not only union in spirit, but in the one body also: 1st. We must believe this humiliating truth, that we are in Babylon, in confusion—scattered in the dark and cloudy day.—Babylon is but another name for pride and confusion. Read its origin in the early age of the world. A tribe of men, inflated with pride, determined to build a tower, that should reach to heaven, in order. that their *great* name might flow down the stream of time, and live forever. But God confounded their language, they could not understand each other—they could not co-operate, and therefore they divided, and separated in different squads abroad. Who does not see the analogy? Is Rome, *Baylon? yes;* she is doubtless the mother of harlots—all nations are drunk with the wine of her wrath—that wine which excites to wrath, persecution, and death, those who are made drunk by it. From this learn, who drinks of Babylon's wine. In Babylon are God's people groaning in bondage, and longing for deliverance. This humiliating truth we must believe, or we will never make one exertion to come out of her. Believe the truth, and obey it; Come out of her my people—Come out from among them, and be ye separate saith the Lord, and I will receive you—Arise and depart hence; for this is not your rest; because it is polluted; it shall destroy you with a sore destruction. Before Jerusalem's destruction, the christians were warned, and escaped the ruin. So are

you now warned—fly immediately, and listen not to the lullaby, all is well.

Throw off your party yokes, which unite the parties—as such. Take not the yoke of Moses, but, Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, says Jesus. Under his yoke we shall be united, and our energies be one, to effect the mighty work of saving the world. The yokes of Moses and Christ could not be worn together at the same time and by the same people of old—nor can a party yoke be worn with the yoke of Christ. Leave your party standards, and rally under the standard of heaven. See you that white throne, with one sitting on it, surrounded with a rainbow, and an immense company of raptured worshippers? That is our king—that ensign, waving on the spirits' breeze, is heavens standard. To it repair, and learn, and do the lessons which will be taught you there by the infallible Teacher from heaven. He will teach you that you must love one another with a pure heart fervently—to deny yourself, and take up your cross daily, and follow him—he will teach you, not to look on your own affairs, but also to the interest of others–that you and all you have are his, and must be devoted to the great work of salvation; that you must not mind earthly things, nor set your affections on them- not to be conformed to the world—to lay up treasures in heaven, not on earth; to take the lowest seat, and to esteem others better than yourselves, as did Jesus, who esteemed us more than glory, ease and life. Here you have no abiding place, but are as strangers and pilgrims seeking a better country. You must leave your party distinctions, and party names, and be contented with that given by divine authority—Christian. For doing all this, and all the holy precepts of heaven, you will be hated and persecuted by the world, and especially by that part of it, who have a name to live, but deny the power—for the children of the bond woman always did, and always will persecute the children of the free woman, The world is ripe to persecute, if they had an object, such as will be presented by the regeneration of the church. My brethren, listen not to those teachers, who say, the time for Christians to unite is not yet come; and that you should live longer in disobedience to God's holy commandment, by living in disunion, which is, says Paul, carnal; and to be carnally minded is death. No longer by your conduct, counteract the prayer of Jesus, that they all may be one. The Lord will raise up leaders full of the Holy Spirit, to direct the faithful. My beloved, believe not every spirit but try the spirits whether they be of God, for many false prophets are gone out into the world. Mark them which cause divisions among you, contrary to the doctrine ye have heard, and avoid them—Do not think the Mormons only are intended; would to God they were the only ones—but they, who divide Christians, contrary to the doctrine of the old gospel, are the people intended, irrespective of their high profession of christianity. O Lord, restore thou Zion to her ancient glory, and make her a blessing to the World. Amen.

In my next and last lecture, I shall show the glorious effect of Christian Union—that the world may believe in Jesus.

B. W. STONE.

(FOR THE MESSENGER)

Randolph, Mo. April 11, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE—

I proceed to drop you a few lines, conveying intelligence of the progress of the good cause in this section. Within about five weeks past I have immersed 40 persons upon a confession of their faith,

and the prospect still flattering as at first; but I am nearly exhausted at present, but still intend to labor continually as long as I can. O, that there were more faithful and devoted laborers in the field! The cause of the Bible would soon triumph, if aided by the godly behavior of its professors. O, that the brethren would walk worthy of their vocation! what an impetus to the good cause! How irresistable the argument in favor of the Bible! O brethren, much depends upon the character you sustain before the world; live holy, righteously and Godly in this present world. This is essential to the advancement of the cause you profess to love, as well as to the securing of your own eternal interest.

May the Lord bless all the holy brethren.

ALLEN WRIGHT.

Clay County, Mo: April 13th, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE----

I would not have troubled you at this time with a communication, but I am now at brother Payne's, with the 9th volume of Mr. Wesley's works before me, and finding some things there in, which I humbly conceive would benefit the Methodists of this day—particularly some of their clergy, who spend much of their time in preaching and writing salvation, pardon, remission, &c. without obedience to the ordinance of baptism, and ever warning the community not to trust to the obedience of faith for pardon, I say, under these circumstances, to refresh their memory occasionally, by quotations from old father Wesley, might answer a valuable end--therefore I have concluded to send you the following extracts, which I think will require the ingenuity of the Bishop to *spiritualize*, and *twistify*, so as to make it appear that Mr. Wesley attached less importance to baptism than we do; nay, he has gone farther:—But let the

Book speak for itself. In his Treaties on baptism, vol. ix, pages 157,8, in answer to the question, 'what are the benefits we receive, by baptism?' He says "The first of these is the washing away the guilt of original sin by the application of the merits of Christ's death; That we are all born under the guilt of Adam's sin;—and that all sin deserves eternal misery, was the unanimous sense of the ancient church, as it is expressed in the 9th article of our own." So he goes on to prove that all need pardon, and says, it is given through Christ; for says he, "In virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death are applied to us in *baptism*" Eph. v, 25, 26. "He gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of water, by the word"—namely, "in baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification"—and then he notices the prayer of the church for the delivery of the baptized from God's wrath, &c.

His answer is, 2. "By baptism we enter into covenant with God—into that everlasting covenant, which he hath commanded forever—that new covenant which he promised to make with the spiritual Israel, even to give them a new heart and a new spirit; to sprinkle clean water upon them, (of which the baptism is only a figure) and remember their sins and iniquities no more"—hear it "remember their sins and iniquities no more."

3. "By baptism we are admitted into the church, and consequently made members of Christ its head."

4. "By baptism, we who are by nature children of wrath, are made the children of God, and this *regeneration* (mark it well, 'this *regeneration*') which *our* church in so many places ascribes to *baptism*, is more than barely being admitted into the church; though commonly connected therewith, being grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are the children of God by adoption and grace! Mr. Wesley then

adds "this is grounded on the plain words of our Lord John iii, 5. "Except a man be born of the water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." By water then as a means of baptism; we are regenerated, or born again, whence it is also called by the Apostle "the washing of regeneration.' 'Our church therefore' says, Mr. Wesley, 'ascribes no greater virtue to baptism, than Christ himself has done"!

We will close for the present, lest our extracts be too long. If you think they merit a place in the Messenger, you can insert them.

Your brother in the good hope.

J. P. LANCASTER.

Smithville, Ark. April 5th, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE:—

Since I last wrote to you, there has been something upward of 30 additions to the congregations where I labor. About one week since, we had a precious time of refreshing from the presence of our Lord. The aged and infirm in body seemed to possess the vigor and health of youth—the young, to have attained to manhood—the middle aged stood about right. We took to ourselves the whole armour of God, and while we (in our language) laid our shoulders to the wheel, the work went on gloriously. Dear brother, we have many brethren and sisters here that we expect to mingle with, in our King's upper and better country. This glorious hope revives our courage by the way.

O that the brethren may be found faithful, walking worthy of the vocation wherewith they are called, in all lowliness, meekness, in long suffering, forbearing each other in love, endeavoring to keep the unity og

the spirit in the bond of peace, always remembering that, if the spirit is absent the body is dead.

Grace mercy and peace be multiplied to you and all kindred spirits in the Lord. Farewell.

C. G. TITSWORTH.

Grandview, Edgar County, Ill. May 4th, 1841.

DEAR BROTHER STONE—

I will now inform you of the progress of the cause of the blessed Redeemer in this section of the State. I baptized 30 from the time I saw you in September to December, I then remained at home through the winter, and recommenced on the first of April to proclaim the good news. In my tour to the churches at Darwin, Henderson, and Palestine, we had 11 additions. All that is wanting is, for the brethren to let their light so shine that, others beholding their good works will be constrained to glorysy their Father in heaven. I am happy to state that their walk is drawing the attention of the world, who have been disgusted with the modern religion, which consists in loud professions, and towards others proscription, and that of the most denunciatory character. But blessed be the name of the Lord! Many of the first class of the sects are coming out. I am certain there is more concern manifest among them now than I have ever known before, and all that is wanting is for the brethren to stand firm, always abounding in the work of the Lord. That this be the happy disposition of all who possess his name is my prayer in Jesus.

Yours in hope of a blissful immortality.

WILLIAM TICHNER.

OBITUARY.

Our esteemed Elder, Alfred Lagow, of Palestine has fallen a sleep in the Lord after an illness of 7 days. Brother Lagow was of the most exemplary

character, and an able teacher. I was with him the most of the time of his illness; and I never witnessed such composure in any person before. On Saturday evening before he died, we were convinced that he would shortly expire. I took his hand, as I sat by the side of his bed, I observed to him; brother Alfred, you are going to leave us; he replied, do you think so, I answered yes. He said well brother, the Lord's will be done, and not mine. No terror the prospect begets! I am not mortality's slave! he then requested the brethren to come into his room he then narrated the course he had pursued since he had obeyed the Lord. I will state one thing. He observed; Brethren, you see me here in this weak condition, ready to leave you all, I request you, weep not for me! Were the Presidency offered to me this moment with health, this my present situation would be my choice. No higher honor, no greater joys have I wished than to be an humble follower of the Lord Jesus. He then called his companion and his his little boy, and said to his wife, Ellen, I leave you for a short time, but the Lord is your husband. He will never leave you nor forsake you. It is not necessary for me to give you a minute detail, suffice it to say he was a man of a strong discerning mind, and had a splendid education; and the best of all, a devoted follower of the Redeemer, never can the loss of any brother cause more regret, or a citizen more sorrow. He died on the last Lord's day in April, 1841. W. T.

Boone County, Mo. April 15, 1841.

BROTHER STONE—

A church has recently been organized in the city of Booneville, by brothers Lancaster and Boone of 12 or 14 members—I was there last Lord's day, with brothers Smith and Boone; we had two additions. The

next day we went to Fayette, where two others confessed and obeyed the Lord—which make 80 that have been added to the church since brother Boone united. In haste, your brother,

T. M ALLEN.

Brother J. T. Johnson May 5, writes that he had just returned from Madison county, K'y, 10 additions were made. He says, the harvest is great, and the laborers are few. We pray the Lord to inspire all the brethren to exert themselves in supporting those who are in the field, and those who may be sent out. The preachers of the denominations treated our affectionate overture for union with contempt. None of them but Doctor Fishback attended. We have to fight the battle alone. May the Lord grant us the victory.

Brother J. A. Gano writes: Brother J. Rogers and myself closed a meeting at Antioch, 20th April; the fruits of which were 8 souls.

DIVERSITY OF OPINION.

I willingly concede to every man what I claim for myself—the freest range of thought and expression; and am perfectly indifferent whether the sentiments of others on speculative subjects coincide with, or differ from my own: Instead of wishing or expecting that uniformity of opinion should be established, I am convinced that it is neither practicable nor desirable, that varieties of thought are as numerous, and as strongly marked, and as irreducible to one standard, as those of bodily form; and that to quarrel with one who thinks differently from ourselves, would be no less unreasonable than to be angry with him for having features unlike our own. *Ladie's Booh.*

FREEDOM OF INQUIRY.

Let not the freedom of inquiry be shackled. If it mutiplies contentions amongst the wise and virtuous, it exercises the charity of those who contend. If it shakes, for a time, the belief that is rested only upon prejudice, it finally settles on the broader and more solid basis of conviction. *Ladies' Book,*

(From the Journal of Christianity.)

THE CAPTIVES ARE FREE.

Praise and glory be to the God of JUSTICE! The Supreme Court of the United States has been led by his invisible hand to give its sanction to simple *justice.* The intelligence was brought by the following letter from the venerable John Quincy Adams the senior counsel in the case, addressed to a member of the committee acting on behalf of the captives of the Amistead:

"Washington, March 9th, 1841.

DEAR SIR:

The captives are free! The part of the Decree of the District Court, which placed them at the disposal of the President of the United States to be sent to Africa, is reversed. They are to be discharged from the custody of the marshal—*free.*

ERRATA.

Page: 297, for *direct* no effect, read *no direct effect:*
" " for proposition for, read preposition *for.*
Some errors in punctuation, please correct:

EDITOR.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

JUNE, 1841.

VOLUME IX. NUMBER X.

ATONEMENT—*No. VII.*

To B. W. STONE.

Dear Brother Stone—My absence from home on a laborious tour of two and a half months, has interrupted the consecutive order of my replies, and has placed you on my pages one month in advance of me. The advanced stage of the present number on my arrival at home leaves not sufficient room for a full reply to your Review of my 3d Letter, or your No. VII. While I regret the very immethodical manner in which this correspondence proceeds, and the consequent unintelligibility of much of the matter introduced, I am indeed glad to hear you so fully avow in your postscript to your No. VII. that you did not designedly leave out the enumeration of the designs and uses of Christ's death, that of taking away sin. I sincerely thought you did so in not including it in your summary. But it seems you thought that in your previous essays it was fully stated. Whether or not may be disputed; but since you now admit that "*his blood cleanses, purifies and sanctifies from sin*" and that "*whatever was effected by his blood was designed,*" I gladly place it in your synopsis of the designs of his death. I do assure you again that I rejoice in this avowal, because of the conclusions which many were beginning to draw from the ambiguity thrown over the whole subject of the *scripturality* of your views on this grand and vital subject, by your omitting it in your enumeration of the designs of Christ's death.