goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men. Our prospects are fair and promising for a future harvest. The brethren love one another here with pure hearts, fervently,—for the truth sake which dwells in us. We lay great emphasis upon the new commandment, in our discourses to the brethren—on brotherly kindness and universal charity to all men, which is one of the new and peculiar duties of Christianity. We believe the exercise and manifestation of this grace to by more acceptable to God, and more beneficial to men, than orthodoxy new or old. Brethren at a distance are invited to visit us, and to call upon us in passing, and give us a word of exhortation.

H. ROBERTS.

"I have lost a world of time," said the learned Salmasius, on his death bed; "if I had one year more, I would spend it in reading David's Psalms and Paul's Epistles."

J. CREATH, JR.

"Happy is he who is engaged in a controversy with his own passions, and comes off superior; who makes it his endeavor that his follies and weaknesses may die before him, and who daily meditates on mortality and immortality."

JAILOR.

"Alfred, King of England, who fought fifty-six battles with the Danes, many of which were gained by his own personal courage and great example, dedicated with strict punctuality, eight hours every day to acts of devotion; eight hours to public affairs, and as many to sleep, study, and necessary refreshments. John Urich was a poor religious man, who spent eight hours of the day in prayer, eight in labor, and eight in sleep, meals, and other necessary duties."

EXTRA MESSENGER.

AUGUST, 1841.

VOLUME XI. NUMBER XII.

A SYNOPSIS OF ATONEMENT,

AS STATED BY ME IN THE PRECEDING DISCUSSION.

Brother A. Campbell had publicly invited me to a discussion of this subject with him. By advice of friends I accepted the friendly invitation, though conscious that years had despoiled me of much of that vigor of mind I might have possessed in youth. The discussion has been protracted far beyond my anticipation. Seeing no probable end of it, according to my own wish, and the wishes of many warm friends, I closed the discussion on my part, having reserved the right of giving a synopsis of the whole in an extra number. I advised brother Campbell to do the same; but for reasons, doubtless, good in his own view, he still persists in his course. I was also inclined to close the discussion for another reason; because I had known the general dissatisfaction among my aoquaintance at the lengthy and protracted discussions between brother Campbell and Mr. Skinner, on universalism; and between brother Campbell and Mr. Lynn on the operations of the spirit. The *ennui* was so great, that many passed them over without a reading. My friends still insist upon me to give the promised synopsis, and then to leave the whole matter with the public, unless circumstances should make it necessary for me to resume hereafter. I have yielded to their wishes.

I printed four numbers, which included my views on the subject of sacrifice for sin, and of atonement, of which I will give a synopsis.

NUMBER ONE.

1st. This first I design only as an introduction to the others. In this I stated what I did not believe, though believed by others. I introduced the common system, dubbed orthodoxy, from Doctor A. Clark on Lev. i, 4. He says, "The person bringing the victim for sacrifice, acknowledged, that he was worthy of death, because he had sinned, having forfeited his life by breaking the law—that he entreated God to accept the life of the innocent animal in place of his own: And all this to be done profitably, must have respect to Him, whose life in the fulness of time should be made a sacrifice for sin." This I could not believe; because many persons brought victims for sacrifice, who, according to law, were not worthy of death, and who had not forfeited their lives; as the woman after child birth—the leper—the man with a running issue, &c. Did they by this act acknowledge themselves worthy of death—that they had forfeited their lives for these things? Did they consider the death of the victim in the stead of their death? We boldly say, no. The law declares all this was done for their fleshly purification, and not for the cleansing or purifying of the conscience.

2d. I could not believe this, because sacrifice was only admitted for pardonable offences, as sins of error, ignorance, and fleshly uncleanness. The offences under the law were thus arranged, pardonable and unpardonable by law—pardonable offences were not punishable by death—unpardonable were. Therefore any one, admitted to bring a sacrifice for sin, was not by law judged worthy of death, and therefore the death of the victim could not be in the stead of his death. This doctrine I really view among the plainest truths of the Bible, and every objection I have seen or heard against it, appears to me irrelevant, and but confirms my mind more firmly in its correctness.

must refer my readers to the preceding discussion for the scriptural proofs advanced for its support.

3d. I could not believe it, beeause the Doct. teaches that the offerer, in order to be profited, must always look forward to the death of the great antitype Christ Jesus, who in the fulness of time was to be a sacrifice for sin. I believe with brother Campbell that none of the human family, from Eve to Mary Magdaline, ever believed that Jesus the Messiah would die and rise again from the dead. In this he is doubtless correct; because Paul said, they, the Israelites, could not see the end of those things to be abolished. Among the things abolished were the legal sacrifices; and the death of Christ was the end of them. The apostles themselves did not believe Christ would die, before the event proved it. The Jewish nation did not believe it; for they believed that Christ would abide forever—and to this day, to preach Christ crucified, is to them a stumbling block. The prophets, who predicted the event, did not believe the fact—for they diligently inquired what the spirit in them signified when it testified, beforehand, of the sufferings of Christ. If these be facts (and who will deny them?) how could the patriarchs, and the disciples of Moses look through the death of their sacrificed victims, to the death of Christ, which they did not believe would ever take place?

Those who lived from Adam to Moses were "without the law"—[Rom. 7, 9,] and will be judged without the law of Moses; for if they should be judged by this law, they would all be condemned. Those who lived from Moses to Christ were under the law, and shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of all hearts. If Moses' disciples before Christ, be judged by our gospel, the law of Christ, viz: that Christ died, was buried and rose again, every one would be condemned. All will

be judged by the revelation given them by God. Consequently all that believed in and obeyed that revelation in every age, shall be saved.

We often hear it said, that the people of old were saved *prospectively* by the blood of Christ. The incorrectiveness of this sentiment I have just stated.—Yet is it constantly affirmed, that all that were ever saved, were saved by this blood. How? not by faith in it, for I have shown that they did not believe in it, and therefore could not be influenced by it in any sense. If they were saved by the blood of Christ it must be, because God himself was influenced *solely* by it, and therefore that blood *prospectively* viewed by him, was the cause why he saved them. Of this we have no information in the Bible. If even an intimation is there given, it is very dark. Heb. 9, 22 is cited as proof positive. "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission." I have applied both these ideas to the law, of which the apostle was without doubt speaking. Remission never takes place before purging or purification. According to the law the person must be purified by blood, before he received forgiveness or remission. But there are a few exceptions from this general law. "*Almost* all things—therefore not all things or persons, were purified and pardoned by blood. For, Moses in Lev. 5, 1, speaks of certain transgressions of the law, and how the offerer is to be purged from them. He must bring a lamb or a kid, and the priest shall make an atonement for him. And if he be not able to bring a lamb—he must bring two turtle doves, and with the blood of these, the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin, and it shall be forgiven him. But if he be not able to bring two turtle doves, he shall bring for his offering a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering—and the priest shall take a handful of it

and burn it on the altar, and make an atonement for him, and it shall be *forgiven* him. Why then is it so confidently affirmed that without shedding of blood there *never was* remission? I have shown many cases, besides the plain case above, which plainly contradict this assertion. Therefore almost all things were purged with blood; and almost all sins were remitted by blood.

I have no where intimated that transgressors unpardonable by the law of Moses, could not be pardoned or justified in the sight of God from their moral iniquities, or sins of conscience, and saved from future punishment in hell. No: I have shewn the contrary; that the presumptuous sinner doomed to death by law, to which he must submit, without the benefit of sacrifice, can be saved from future punishment by faith, repentance and humble supplication, according to the revelation given him of God's pardoning mercy—for his own name's sake.

4. I cannot believe this system, respecting the sacrifices for sin; because the victims are represented as substitutes, and died in our place, or in our stead—and that Christ the antitype was our substitute, and died in our place, or in our stead. On no subject in theology is the present generation of Christians more divided. The old orthodox system was easily understood, though not so easily reconciled with the scriptures, which, on almost every page frowns upon it. The old system is, that God, or his law had demands against the sinful world, which demands were death temporal, spiritual and eternal—that the world was unable to pay these debts—but that Jesus became their surety or substitute, and paid those debts in our stead, and thus satisfied law—and pardon is therefore, granted to the sinner. To deny all this once was heresy of the blackest stamp—as black as to deny transubstantiation in the view of Papists. From this sys-

tem, its advocates divided into two classes, the universalists, and particulars. The former by thinking men, are thought to be the most consistent with the scheme, though far from truth.

The doctrines deduced, and deducible from this plan, are so glaringly absurd in the view of many of the evangelical orthodox that they have rejected the doctrine of substitution as taught by their fathers, and have invented others. which they themselves cannot explain, nor understand. Sometimes they use the old phraseology, and when convicted that they must hold the old system, they fly back and say, that is not their meaning, bnt something else—that Christ is a substitute in some sense; but what that sense is, they pretend not to say, To Rom. 5, 6. they fly, and on it rest the doctrine of substitution—"In due time Christ died for the ungodly." How? as a substitute? If in a battle *A* sees his brother *B*, engaged in unequal contest, alone and surrounded with many foes, he, for love to his brother *B* rushes into the midst to relieve him, but both he and his brother fall, he dies for his brother, but was he a substitute, and died in his brother's stead? So Jesus, when he saw the world under the power of sin, and hell, led captive to eternal woe by the hosts of darkness, rushed into the midst to rescue them from ruin, and died in the contest with our foes, is he therefore a substitute in the proper import of the word? Did he pay the debt of punishment in our stead? The impossibility of this is too apparent to affirm. For how could he fully pay our debt of natural death when we must all die. How could he pay the debt of eternal death, when he is alive for evermore?

These doctrines as statad in my first number, I did not believe; and the reasons why I did not I have also stated. I know well that by this avowal I have exposed myself to be ranked among the heterodox

of the world. But when men of intellect shall duly consider these subjects unsophistically, they will not be harsh in judgment. Posterity will do me the justice, I cannot expect from the present age.

—

A SYNOPSIS OF No. II.

1. In this number I stated my own views of sacrifice and atonement, with the application of the words. Atonement is defined from its true pronunciation, *at-one-ment*. My authority for this pronunciation is undisputed. I applied the word thus: The holy God and holy man were once united in close and happy union, or were perfectly *at-one*. Sin broke this union, and separated between us and our God. Jesus came to restore this union between the holy God and sinful man. How? By saving man from his sins, and making him holy again. The separation, sin, being removed, and holiness restored, the union between God and man is also restored. This union can never be effected until man is regenerated, purged from sin and made holy. God is unchangeable, and always in union with holy beings, and always in disunion with unholy beings—he was always pleased with holy beings and holy acts, and was always displeased with unholy beings and unholy acts—He always rewarded holy beings, which is called his mercy—and always punished unholy sinners, which is called his wrath. It is plain to every discerning mind, that all that Jesus did and suffered, was, not to effect any change in the mind of God, for that is perfect; but to effect a change in sinful man—to make him a partaker of the divine nature—to bring him to God—to cleanse him from all unrighteousness—to sanctify him—to wash him from his sins—to purge from sin—to redeem him from sin and death—to reconcile him to God—to pardon or justify him—to give him eternal life—to put away sin—to take it away, or bear it away. When this is effected, the *at one-ment* between the holy God, and the holy creature is effected, and not before. As there is no union between

light and darkness--righteousness and unrighteousness; so there can be no union between the holy God, and unholy man. It is plain that all this is effected in man *directly*, and not in God: yet the reverse is warmly advocated by many.

2. I proved in this 2d number, that atonement was the effect of sacrifice, both under the law and under the gospel. I will add, that sacrifice is the means of effecting not only the atonement, but also purification, reconciliation, propitiation, redemption and pardon. To this I particularly attended.

That sacrifice is the means of effecting atonement needs no labored argument to those who read the scriptures; as the offerer shall bring his offering, by which he shall make atonement for his sin. The Hebrew word *kaphar*, commonly translated atonement, I plainly shewed should literally and scripturally be rendered *to cleanse*, or purify. The translators often render this active verb *kaphar* by *to cleanse, to purify*, as I have proved. The apostle Paul translates this same verb by the active verb *katharizo* in Greek, (Heb. ix. 22) and this Greek word signified nothing else than *to cleanse* or *to purify*. The New Testament writers translate the same word *kaphar*, by the same Greek word uniformly. As in the case of lepers, Lev. xiii. it is frequently said, the priest shall make an atonement (*kaphar*) for them--and they shall be clean. Luke in this case renders *kaphar* by the same Greek word *katharizo*; as Luke iv. 27, vii. 22, xvii. 14, 18. So does Matt. viii. 2, 3--so does Mark viii. 8, 42, &c.

If then the Hebrew word *kaphar* means to cleanse, or purify, then it is plain, that it cannot apply to God: for he is undefiled and cannot be made more pure. It must apply to man and things defiled, Cleansing or purification is the first effect of sacrifice, and the proximate effect is at one-ment, for the sinner being cleansed becomes one with God and with his holy people. Let it be well remembered that this translation of *kaphar*, is the translation of inspired men, and therefore is paramount to all lexicographers and critics, and is therefore to be received with all readiness of mind. I might have added the Septuagint translation, but there is enough without it.

3. I have said that recociliation is the effect of sacrifice, and that it is *directly* effected in man, and not in God. "For God was in (by) Christ reconciling the World to himself," not reconciling himself to the world. "God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ—We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son." This is the language of the New Testament. The apostles prayed the people to be reconciled to God, and founded their argument on this fact, because he who knew no sin was made a sin-offering for us. Reconciliation (*katallagee* in the Greek) always implies a change in the person reconciled—the enmity previously existing is removed. The learned well know, that the cognates and theme of the word *katallagee*, signify a change, and so are translated, Rom. i. 23, 25, 26; Gal. iv, 20, &c. The very theme or foundation of the word is *allos* another man. Reconciliation to God is with Paul tantamount to a new creature. 2 Cor. v. 17, 18. It is no where stated in the Bible that the blood of sacrifices ever effected this change or reconciliation in God. "He is of one mind, and who can turn him."

4. I have also shown that propitiation is an effect of sacrifice, and that its meaning in the Bible is to *purify*, or *cleanse*, and therefore cannot apply to the undefiled God. Christ is the propitiation for our sins, that is, He it is that cleanses and purifies from sin. Propitiation then, cannot apple to God, but to man—defiled man. Propitiation (*hilazmos*) differs not from atonement, and the Septuagint commonly translate the Hebrew *kaphar* by *exhilaskesthai*.

Thus in the second number I proved that sacrifice under the law and gospel, was the divinely instituted means of purging and cleansing the defiled, that sacrifice in effecting this could not apply to God, but to man *alone*—That when this was effected in man, the *at-one ment* was effected between God and man; because man is now a partaker of the divine nature--and God unchangeably and eternally is in union with this nature. Can any think seriously for a moment that unholy men can be in union with the holy God?—that God can be pleased with them or their acts? We think not.

The effects of sacrifice I illustrated in this manner. "God is a sun—our sins as a thick cloud have risen between us

and our God. So say the scriptures. The natural sun shines always the same—the thick clouds do not effect the brightness of the sun; but obstruct his light and warmth from us. The removal of the cloud has no effect upon the natural sun, but on us entirely: for we are effected by his unobstructed rays, giving us light and heat. So the thick clouds of our sins separate between us and our God; and the removal of them has no effect on God, for he is the same forever, but on us; for we by this cloud are deprived of his divine, quickening, and soul-reviving influences; and therefore, must be eternally miserable in this state. But the sacrifice of Jesus removes this cloud of sins, or purifies defiled man from sin, whenever he believes and obeys the gospel. He now lives under the light of God's countenance, and enjoys the enlightening, quickening and sanctifying influences of his spirit. So speak the scriptures; and with this accords the experience of every Christian.

—

SYNOPSIS OF No III.

This is but the continuation of the same subject, to show that sacrifice is the appointed means of God, by which he purifies, cleanses and pardons the penitent believer in Jesus.

We began with Isa. liii. 4, 12. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows—He bore the sins of many." The 4th verse is explained by Matt. viii. 16, 17, by healing all that were sick, "That it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by Isaiah the propheth, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses,," i. e. He took off our infirmities, and bare away our sicknesses. Thus the New Version, edited by A. Campbell, renders the verse. In this sense it is generally received by all; I know of no dissentient. In the 4th verse the prophet uses the Hebrew word *nasa*, which Matthew translates by a Greek word *to bear away;* as the common sense af all plainly sees. This very same word *nasa* is used in verse 12. "He bore the sins of many," and is translated by Paul and Peter in their quotation of it, by the Greek word *anaphero*, which properly signifies *to bear away*

the sins of many. So it is translated by the New Version. See Heb. ix. 28, and 1 Pet. ii. 24. I shewed that God himself is said *to bear sin*, in the same sense, and it is expressed by the same Hebrew word *nasa*. But our translators have not translated the word in these cases *to bear sin*, but have rendered it *to forgive, to pardon*, or *to take away sin*. See Ex. xxxii. 32, xxxiv 8. Num. xiv. 8, 8. Josh. xxiv. 19. Job vii. 21. Ps. xxv. 18; xxxii. 1, 5; xcix. 8. Isa. ii. 9; xxxiii. 24. Hos. xiv. 2. Mic. vii. 18.

The angel, who went before the Israelites in the wilderness, is said *to bear their sins*, expressed by the same word, and in the same sense, and translated to pardon. Exodus, xxii. 21.

In the same sense, and with the same word the priesthood are said to bear the iniquity of the holy things, and of the congregation; i. e. to bear them away. Ex. xxviii. 38. Lev. x. 17. Num. xviii. 1.

I showed also that *nasa*, connected with sin, is very frequently applied to one person bearing the sin of another, when nothing more is intended than *pardon*, or *forgiveness*, and so rendered by our translators. Gen. l. 17. Exod. x. 17. 1 Sam. xv, 25; xxv. 28.

The same word is applied to the scape-goat, bearing away the sin of the congregation. Lev. x. 18, &c.

I also introduced about 30 texts more, where the word *nasa* signifies, (and is so translated) *to take away, to carry away, to bear away*.

The argument drawn from this host of scriptures, is that the orthodox interpretation of *bearing sin*, is not true. They interpret the expression *to bear sin*, to signify *to bear* the punishment due to sins—Therefore when Christ is said to bear the sins of many, it means, according to them, that he bore the punishment due to the sins of many in their stead. If this interpretation be true, why do they not say that God himself also bore the punishment due to the sins of the people? The expression, or words are the very same. It may be said that this would be unreasonable. So appears to me the interpretation, when applied to Christ. If reason must determine the correctness of the two ideas, then surely it proponderates in our favor. We have adduced very many

texts plainly and uniformly teaching our interpretation to be correct—and can one text in the Bible, fairly considered, be found to teach theirs.

If when Christ is said to bear the sins of many, it means that he bore the punishment due to the sins of many; why not say the angel in the wilderness bore the punishment due to the sins of Israel in their stead? The expression is the same. Why not say the priesthood bore the punishment due the sins of the congregation? The words are the very same. Why not also say that the scape-goat bore the punishment due to the sins of all the congregation of Israel once a year? And yet the scape-goat was not punished or sacrificed at all. Why not also say, that when one person forgave another, he bore the punishment due to his sin? The expression is still the same. Why leave the common translation of the word *nasa*, and put upon it a meaning not plainly found in the Bible—a meaning contrary to that given by the inspired apostles in Heb. ix, 28; 1 Peter ii, 24; Matt. viii, 16, 17? and contray to the New Version on those texts?

Once more, according to the orthodox interpretation as stated above, how can the sinner bear his sin? Or was his offering, or victim punished in his stead? No where in the law is the victim said *to bear sin*, therefore it did not bear the punishment due to the sin of the offerer. The victim was sacrificed or put to death; and as before proved, was put to death for sins which the law did not punish with death. Therefore the victim did bear the punishment due the offerer.

I now ask, is it safe to build and support a systen on the interpretation of one solitary text (Isa. liii, 12) which is unsupported by another in the entire Bible, but every where condemned by it? Does the law or gospel admit of the punishment of a substitute in the place of the guilty for his justification? That Christ died for (on account of) the sinner, and that the sinner is justified by his blood, are precious truths; which I have in the next number made appear. The main design of sacrifice is evidently seen in the expression of *bearing away* sins—that is removing them, as far as the east is from the west, taking them away, or cleansing, or purging them.

SYNOPSIS OF NUMBER IV.

In the preceding numbers I had particularly shown the designs and effects of sacrifice: as purification, atonement, reconciliation, propitiation, and pardon. In this number I still prosecuted the same subject, and shewed that, by the sacrifice of Christ, man is *redeemed*, bought, *purchased*, and *ransomed*.—Tit. ii, 14; 1st Pet. i, 18; Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; Hos. xiii, 14; Rev. v, 9; Rom. viii, 23; Heb. ix, 12; Gal. iii, 13; 1st Cor. vi, 20, vii, 23; 2d Pet. ii, 1; Acts xx, 28; Mar. x, 45; 1st Tim. ii, 6.

I shewed that these expressions are not to be taken literally, but figuratively. As the Lord is often said *to sell* his people, when nothing more is intended than that he suffered their enemies to prevail against them, and to lead them into captivity and distress.—Judg. ii, 14; iii, 8; iv, 2-9; 1st Sam. xii, 9. When the Lord had delivered his people thus *sold*, he is said to have *bought*, *purchased*, *redeemed*, ransomed and saved them. Exod. xv, 16; Deut. xxxii, 26; Ps. lxxiv, 2; Deut. vi, 8, ix, 26, xxiv, 18; Exod. vi, 6, xv, 2; 2d Sam. ii, 23, &c.

Mankind are represented as *sold* under sin and death—to save or redeem them from these enemies, was the great design of God in sending his Son into the world to live, die, and rise again from the dead. God himself is the Redeemer. He delivered or redeemed Israel from their enemies, and from bondage, by the hand of Moses. The same God is *now* the Redeemer or Savior of man by his Son Jesus Christ. "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and *redemption*." 1st Cor. i, 20.

It is evident to all who read the scriptures, that God redeems and saves none from their sins, but such as believe, repent and obey the gospel; for to

none else is the remission of sins granted; and remission of sins is, according to the apostle Paul, tantamount to redemption from sin: Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

There are two things from which man is redeemed without faith, repentance or obedience; i. e. the curse of the law, and the grave. The death of Jesus was the end of the law—he nailed it to his cross and took it out of the way. The Jews (for they only were under it) are delivered from that law, it being dead, wherein they were held. That first covenant "waxed old and vanished away." The law, its curse, and transgression all ceased together; for where there is no law there is no transgression, and consequently no curse. The Jews since Christ shall be judged in the last day by the gospel: "The word I speak unto you, it shall judge you in the last day."

The grave or death is the second thing from which the Lord will redeem the world, without faith, repentance, or obedience. For as in (by) Adam all die, even so in (by) Christ shall all be made alive." For the hour is coming, in which all that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of God and come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation. It is the will of God that there shall be a resurrection of the just, and of the unjust—that not one, great or small, of the human family shall be lost, or missing in the last day. The righteous shall be raised incorruptible, immortal, and in glory; but the wicked shall be raised to life, but not to an immortal life; and yet to a life of eternal existence in death—ever dying and yet existing. God only hath immortality, and to those only who seek for glory, honor, immortality, he will grant eternal life. But his immortality is not granted to the wicked, because

they sought it not; and for the same reason, the eternal life in holiness and happiness, promised in the gospel, is not given to them. There is a marked distinction between immortality and eternal existence. All mankind *now* exist, but they are mortal, or exist in death. By the will and power of God they might be supported in mortality, and live forever in mortality and misery. This appears to be the fact, as stated in the scriptures. According to the will of God, by Adam's disobedience to a positive precept, the many, the whole human family were brought under the condemnation of death. So by the obedience of Christ to a positive precept, the whole human family are brought under the justification of life—i. e. shall be raised from the dead at the last day. That positive precept given to the Son to obey, was, to lay down his life, that he might take it again; i. e. that he should die and rise again. This commandment have I received of my Father, and he was obedient unto death. To speak of immortality as pertaining to the wicked is to speak not according to the oracles of God.

I next inquired into the connection between faith and the effects of the death or sacrifice of Christ before mentioned, as cleansing, sanctification, justification, redemption, *at-one-ment*, &c. It is not barely to believe that Christ died, but that he died according to the scriptures. We must know and believe in the designs of his death, as stated in the scriptures before we can be rightly affected—before we can be cleansed, sanctified, redeemed from sin, or receive the *at one-ment*. These designs I particularly stated, as follow:

1st. To take the law, or old covenant out of the way.

2. To bring in and establish the new covenant; or to bring in everlasting righteousness to all nations.

3. To effect the resurrection from the dead.

4. To display the love, grace, and goodness of God to the world.

5. To fulfil the scriptures in the law, in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning him.

6. To give us an example to follow his steps; 1st Pet. ii, 21.

7. To condemn sin, and save the sinner, and fulfil the righteousness of the law in him; Rom. 8, 3, 4, &c.*

These designs, believed with the heart, produce the effects, or are the means of effecting purification, cleansing, sanctification, redemption or salvation from sin, with all the other effects already named, which may be reduced to one simple word, *salvation* from sin. "But after the love and kindness of God our Savior appeared" (in the gift, the life, death and resurrection of his own Son) "not by works of righteous-

* Our old brother Broaddus was offended that I had omitted the main design of sacrifice, which is that the blood of Christ was designed to expiate or purge from sin. Had he read my preceding numbers, he would certainly have seen this doctrine every where stated, and even in a few sentences after I had stated the designs in these words: "It has been proved that his blood purges, cleanses, sanctifies, washes, &c. from sin." This is the burden of all my numbers. He might have justly concluded that whatever is effected by his blood was designed to be effected, and as I had so frequently and constantly maintained, that these were effected through faith in the blood of Christ, that it was of no moment to say *effected* or *designed*. But justice I need not expect from orthodoxy. But I did expect it from brother Campbell; I had reason to expect it. He had reviewed all my numbers and must have known it—and yet instead of correcting the mistake of his old brother Broaddus, he demurs also against the omission—and after I had plainly stated to him in a subsequent letter, in substance as just above written, he still in his very last letter for July, considers it doubtful whether I believe it! Does he wish to make the world believe that I am an errorist of the blackest stamp? I hope not; I do not believe it. Yet such are the impressions made on the minds of many. It might be queried whether purification was a design or effect of Christ's sacrifice? The difference is nothing; and *ex nihilo nihil fit*.

ness which we had done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Tit. iii, 4–7.

If I understand the commonly received system of atonement, it is briefly this: That it is God that taketh vengeance, or inflicts the punishment due to sin—Upon the sinner dying in his sins, God himself inflicts the punishment; "I will repay saith the Lord." On Jesus, the sinner's substitute, God inflicts the punishment due the sinner and exempts the sinner from it; or pardons him. He now becomes propitious to the sinner. Is this the true representation of the fact? Did the serpent the Devil, and wicked men in his spirit, bruise the heel of the Savior and kill him, or did the Father? What saith the scripture? If God killed him, why charge the horrid deed to wicked men? and why punish them for it? But of this I have before said enough.

The most powerful arguments against the sentiments advanced are to call them by hard, heretical names, as Unitarianism, Arianism, &c. Though the generality of people know not the definition of these words, yet like the *caballa* of the ancients, they outweigh the scriptures themselves with those taught according to the wisdom of man: This sentiment I lately saw in the Religious Herald, the Baptist oracle of Virginia. The editor, after giving several reasons, why the Baptists cannot unite with bro. Campbell and his adherents, gives another reason, because, "Mr. C. has already formed an union with the adherents of B. W. Stone, who are baptized Arians: We could not conscientiously unite with them." Yet our conscientious brother Sands can unite with a

good conscience, with the sacrilegious who squander the goods of heaven—the money and property of God put into their hands, in pageantry and luxuries —who mind earthly things, and are the very votaries of Mammon. But the salvo is, they are orthodox. Why it is we are dubbed Arians, I cannot tell. I have disproved the charge again and again. It may be that I may have quoted the scripture, which said, "With us there is but one God, the Father—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God." I find that people who wish to maintain a standing with religious orthodoxy, must avoid the mention of all such texts; or explain them according to the exegesis of the orthodox creeds.

With many it is sufficient to say that these are mere speculations. By speculations I understand, the views of a subject not verified by fact or practice." All I have to request of friends and foes, is that they examine my Nos. and letters in this discussion; and if they find one sentiment not verified by fact—scripture fact—that they reject it; and if they find one sentiment not in strict accordance with practice and experience, let them reject it as useless. But if they honestly and candidly examine, and find the sentiments not to be speculation, but truth, they are not at liberty to reject them, much less to blaspheme them by approbrious names. I humbly ask forgiveness of all my brethren, if I have erred in spirit, diction or doctrine in this discussion, God knows it was not intended.

I have now finished the synopsis. But after reviewing, were it not for my promise, I would suppress it from the public eye. Not that I disapprove of the sentiments, but because it does not so clearly express the subjects discussed as the numbers and letters themselves do. Search the scriptures; and prove all things, and hold fast that which is good—irrespective of praise or blame of men. Brethren, farewell.

B. W. STONE.

NOTICE.

Bro. Campbell's July number came too late to be printed in My August number, and the extra was designed for another purpose. I had designed to stitch and cover the two together which is the cause of the late appearance of this number.

RELIGIOUS NEWS.

Monticello, Mo. June 24, 1841.

Bro. J. Creath, jr. to T. M. Allen writes: In 20 days at two different meetings in Shelbyville, Mo. between 75 and 80 persons were received. Also in this place 13. I am exceeding joyful in all my tribulations.

As far as I am concerned I wish the Messenger to go forward: it is doing good. But the brethren here do not like the discussion on the atonement. We fear a division, or a foundation for one in these pieces. I will do all I can for it. There is an increasing demand for it here. I wish the work to continue.

Bro. Stone:—I find my numerous engagements will not permit me to bestow that attention to the editorial department of the Christian Messenger, that I could wish. On that account I propose withdrawing my name as an assistant Editor. This step I propose taking, simply because the

public may expect more of me than I can perform---while my name occupies the place it does in your periodical. I do not wish to create expectations I cannot fulfill, and therefore, ask you not to continue my name as an assistant editor. I beg leave to assure you, that I am satisfied with the Ch. Messenger and regard it as a useful work—and will do all I can to extend its circulation, and continue its usefulness. I will write for it just as I have done, and perhaps even more than I have heretofore. I do hope that other brethren, especially in the West, will do the same, and exert themselves to extend its circulation. Wishing you health, happiness, and prosperity,

I am as ever your devoted brother in the good hope.

T. M. ALLEN.

Columbia, Mo. July 20th. 1841.

Bro. Tho. Smith writes: that at Santa Fee, a small village on a branch of Salt river, he and brother H. Thomas labored four days and obtained 21 additions—soon after brother Thomas obtained 37 more. Thence they went to Florida, and obtained 2 more---thence we went to Paris, and continued four days there and in the neighborhood and obtained 22. Thence he came to Freindship and obtained 4 more---in all 86.

Mills' Prairie Ill. May 31, 1841.

Bro. E. Goodwin writes, that since his last to me he had witnessed the addition of 31, in the bounds of his labors; that the brethren were waking up to the subject of piety all over the country.

Jacksonville Ill: Aug. 11, 1841.

DEAR FATHER STONE:

Brother Patton and myself arrived in Springfield July 3, and commenced a meeting, which continued

four weeks, during which we had 75 valuable additions in the city and vicinity. May the good Lord bless them, and save them in his everlasting kingdom.

W. M. BROWN.

Bro. N. Field proposes to publish a semi-monthly paper in Jeffersonville Ia. devoted to the promulgation of Christianity, to be called the Israelite. The terms the same as the Journal of Christianity—$2,00 in advance, or within six months, or $3,00 at the end of the year.

Bro. S. M. McCorkle, proposes to publish a monthly periodical in Springfield Mo. to be called the Alarm containing a commonsense view of unfulfilled prophecy. The work will contain 16 large imperial octavo pages, at $1;25 per-annum. The work will be commenced as soon as the subscription will justify. All letters to the editor must be post paid.

From the Christian Palladium, of July 16.

WESTERN CHRISTIANS.

In a former No. noticing some remarks of the editor of the Christian Messenger, I said "the Western Christians had gone over to the Disciples." Elder E. Harvey wishes a distinction made between those who *have* and those who have *not* left their old ground. This is right; for many of the western Christians have rejected the "reformation," so called, from its first disorganizing and chilling appearance; while others have been led from the true way by its cold speculations.

While on the subject I will just inquire, why does the editor of the Christiam Messenger treat my friendly but plain remarks on the "cause of disunion" with silence? He invited me to the correspondence, and does he *now* decline an answer to my first effort to effect the union which he professed he greatly desired? I hope he is yet an advocate of, and is willing to make at least *one* effort to re-unite his divided brethren.

Bro. Marsh; Your remarks above have really surprised me, for reasons which I shall state in the following observations:

You say yet as formerly, that the "Western Christians had gone over to the Disciples." On this charge I thought I had fully and satisfactorily answered you, by a positive denial of it—we went not one step over to them; but met them on the wide platform—tho Bible alone, on which we had long stood before, and upon which they came, having left their *old ground*—human creeds. I ask you, should we have pushed them off? Should we have stood, and looked upon them as intruders? Should we with angry frowns, and jealous spirits have lifted our warning voice against them as heretics, because some of their opinions of the Bible did not tally with our own? And yet their holy, zealous endeavors to advance the truth, and their persecutions for it, put us to shame? How would you have done, placed in a similar situation? Would you have stood aloof, and excluded them from christian union and fellowship? Why? Because of wrong opinions held by them? By what law would you have judged them? By the law of faith? or sectarianism? Do you, when you admit members into your fellowship, inquire into the minutiæ of their opinions of truth? Do you, when you unite in communion with sectarians, by this, declare that you unite with them in all their opinions? I trow not.

"Elder E. Harvey wishes a distinction made between those who *have*, and those who *have not* left their old ground." This you say is right. Please inform him that the Christians of the West, have not left their old ground—the Bible; but stand as firmly on it, as the Alleghany mountains, unmoved. That book never taught us to reject any humble, obedient believer in Jesus, even if he be called by a different name. Should I do it, would I not be endeavoring to divide Christ, and nullify his word by my faith and act? Who then has left the old ground? Those undoubtedly, who have left it so far in practice, as to reject from their union and fellowship the humble, obedient believers in Jesus. Does bro. E. Harvey do this? Let facts determine. What more do the most rigid sectarians? But he may say, I hold to the Bible alone! Yes; in word only, if in practice he acts contrary to its uniting principles.

You ask, why does the editor of the Christian Messenger treat my friendly, but plain remarks on the "cause of disunion" with silence? I was really startled at this sentence from my brother's pen. I had thought that all the causes stated by you of any weight in my mind, were fully treated by me. But, to remove all hindrances from union, I will now attend to those minor causes.

"The Christians of the east, in former years, sent messengers among those of the west, to labor to form a perfect union, and co-operation with them; but our friendly visits were not returned—our conferences were opposed, and finally, our offers for union were rejected."

If I, as one, ever heard, that brothers Badger, Hathaway, Millard, and yourself were sent by the eastern Christians for these purposes, or that they were the messengers of the churches to us, the impression is entirely obliterated from my mind. But will any

of you say, they were not received by us, and treated as brethren engaged in the same cause? You cannot. But in the second visit of one, we were not so well pleased; for he without any consultation with us, appointed a conference to be holden at Cincinnati some months ahead, at which the preachers in the West were all summoned to attend. He himself came; but none of us in the West attended the summons, because we did not acknowledge the authority. He was mortified, returned home and reported that we were opposed to conferences, &c. In truth we were opposed to them *then*, and equally so now, as they have been generally got up and managed, Such are the strong pillars of partyism. But, you say, "Our friendly visits were not returned." We were poor, and not able to bear the expense of so long a journey. Yet our brethren, Kinkade, Lane, Thomas, and others did visit you and abode long time with you.

You say, "finally our offers of union were rejected." Do, bro. Marsh, say, what union did we reject? Did we reject offers of Christian Union—the union of which the Bible speaks? No; never. Is it to reject Christian union, because we cannot unite in your district conferences– your central conferences—your general conferences, &c.—and aid in drawing up many *Resolves*, what the churches must do, and what the preachers must do, &c.

My brother, and such as think with him, may act as they see proper; but do not reject us, because we cannot act in these things with you. Do you think that we, in acting thus, have refused Christian union? What saith the scripture? Do examine.

Your old brother,

B. W. STONE.

AN ADDRESS TO MY PATRONS.

Dear Brethren: You remember that in my prospectus for the eleventh, or current volume, of the Christian Messenger, that I proposed to print 12 no's each no. to contain 32 duodecimo pages for 1 25 a volume; the whole 12 no's would make only 384 pages. But I have printed 11 no's containing 396 pages, together with this extra, which make 48 pages more than promised. I have now closed the 11 vol. and am left as yet in debt to my printers, and for printing materials. To you my brethren and friends who have promptly paid, I tender my thanks. To you who have not paid, I beseech you as brethren and friends, leave not your old servant in distress. The Post Office department has granted you the privilege of sending money for periodicals free of postage through your Post master. Do avail yourself of this privilege, and remit to me your dues however small. Do not say, another time will do as well. Remember the price was to be paid on the delivery of number 2. Let my agents and friends exert themselves for my benefit as soon as possible.

If I receive sufficient enccuragement I shall go on with another volume:—I wish every one who wishes to discontinue taking the Messenger, to let me know through their post master immediately. I wish my agents and friends, who wish the work to continue, and wish to continue its supporters, to increase their list of subscribers, and their post masters will send it without cost. My number of subscribers are smaller than I ever had; and must be increased if the work be continued. It must rest with the public, whether or not I continue another volume: I have determined to wait about two months: Within that time; it will be known, whether I shall have sufficient encouragement, by the payments for the present volume and by an enlarged subscription for the next: If this should take place, the first number of volume 12 will

appear in November, of the same size and price as the present. I request my friends not to put me to the expense of paying postage for letters and communications: none can be received hereafter unless post paid, or franked.

B. W. STONE.

P. S. If I should not publish another volume, I will return as soon as possible, the surplus money sent by my friends.

B. W. S.

—

NOTICE.

Our annual meeting will commence in Jacksonville the Friday before the 4th Lord's day of September, where we hope to see all our fellow laborers in the State and many of our brethren from far.

EDITOR.

—

Bro. J. T. Johnson, July 28th, writes that he has recently made several short trips and gathered in about 20.

—

Brother Martin Grove of Monroe, Mo. June 13, 1841, writes, The state of society is something better here, than it has been—3 or 4 additions lately, and the brethren somewhat refreshed. I hope the time is not far distant when Zion will arise and shine:

We expect in a short time to constitute a church here. I would like to hear your views in relation to the constitution of a church of Christ. Your affectionate brother in the Lord.

REPLY.

Brother Grove: I readily comply with your request in regard to the constitution of a church of Christ.

1. The foundation must be Christ Jesus, and his word. For other foundation can no man lay.

2. The kingdom of heaven, or church of Christ

is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit; consequently the members of this kingdom must and do partake of its nature. We cannot be too guarded against the evil of building on this foundation, wood, hay and stubble, which shall be burnt—everything that can be shaken will be shaken out of the kingdom—and every plant which our heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up. By constituting a large church of good and bad, we may gain the applause of man, and become popular in the world; but we gain not the approbation of our Lord. We build a church of discord, and commingle the children of Hagar and Sarah. The first are like the fruitless branches which are injurious to the fruitful and prevent them from bearing much fruit—They are ever in the way of the peace, prosperity, and spiritual growth of the church, and they obscure that light, which should always flow from the church upon the world in darkness, to direct them into the way of salvation, and to recommend true religion to their acceptance, and pursuit.

3. It is indispensible in the constitution of a church that every one that unites, should first give themselves to the Lord—This is the most solemn and pious act of our lives. We then consider ourselves not our own but the Lord's, and are bound in soul, body and spirit to glorify him—not to do our own will, but his—not my will, but thine be done, said our great pattern—our example. "Herein is my Father glorified, that we keep his commandments, and bear much fruit." When we give ourselves to the Lord, we also give him all we possess. Our treasures, our goods are not ours, but the Lord's. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof. We are only stewards of God's treasure, and bound to glorify him with our substance. How responsible our profession! We shall have to give an account of our stewardship in the last day. If we

"honor not God with our substance," by feeding and clothing the poor--by sending the word of life and salvation to the nations in darkness, as also to the destitute around us—alas! for us. How many there are, who cannot spare a dollar for these divine purposes; but can spend the Lord's treasure in rich furniture for their fine houses; on their tables groaning under the load of luxuries—on their children and themselves in superb garments, and costly jewelry. Does not the Lord see how they are wasting his goods? And will he not avenge for these things? These are they who love the world—these are but the votaries of mammon, how high soever their profession. They have their reward. O what an incubus are such professors on the church of God! What a paralysis on her endeavors to do the will of God.

4. They must first, as said, give themselves to the Lord, and after this, they must give themselves to one another, by the will of God. They must now act and live in concert, unity, and love, and be fellow-workers with God in saving the world.

5. Now, when united as a church on the foundation laid in Zion, choose your Bishop, Elder or overseer to take charge of the flock. Let him have the qualifications of the office as laid down in the scriptures, or let not the hands of the presbytery be laid upon him —then choose your deacons, men full of the holy spirit whose business is to attend to the temporal concerns of the church only; unless like Philip and Stephen, they be set apart to evangelize: Then they cease to be deacons, "for it is not meet that such should serve tables any longer, but they attend solely to the preaching of the word and to prayer.

6. Let the church duly attend to the ordinances of the house of God. I have seen an error among us, which must be corrected before it prostrates the churches and disgrace the good cause. It is this. A preacher

addresses the congregation; and afterwards gives an opportunity to such as are disposed to confess the Savior, to come forward and do it. Several come forward, he asks them, Do you believe in the Lord Jesus, as the Son of God, and Savior of sinners? Do you desire to be baptized in his name? They answer in low voice, unheard by the church. They are straight way baptized into Jesus—into the one body —become members of the church, without the consent of the church; for they had no action in the matter. The preacher who received them may be a stranger, or a novice; and how can such know but that they are receiving a horse thief or deceiver? I knew this very thing once done; two deceivers, horse-thieves were thus received and baptized in this way by a pious brother. A Bishop of a church should always attend to this business; and after the applicants have confessed the Lord, let the congregation be asked, "Can any man forbid water that this person should not be baptized"? Weighty objections may be made against his baptism, which may require time to remove, if removed at all. I have known instances of persons received, and baptized, who could not be received into the fellowship of the church. These things must be reformed.

7. The name is the last, but not the least thing I shall mention in the constitution of a church. The name of the Church should be found in the scripture, as that given by divine authority—The church by the inspired apostles was called, *the church of God, and the Church of Christ;* and the disciples were by divine authority called *Christians*, first at Antioch. To avoid division and partyism the disciples of the Lord must have one name. Some of our brethren, so clearly convinced of this, require every one that joins himself to the church to receive this name, and to be called by it alone.

May the good Lord convert and regenerate the church, and make all true believers one, Even as the Father and the Son are one, that the world may believe and be saved!

So prays your old brother.
B. W. STONE.

—

Brother Wm. Rawlins of Iowa, writes that recently there had been 13 immersed.

Brother Allen Wright of Mo. writes that very recently in Greene at two meetings 24 were immersed, and 10 in his own neighborhood, near Huntsville.

Brother J. H Cartmel of Clarksburgh Ia. writes July 28, that brother John Smith of Kentucky had a meeting of two days, and obtained 22 additions, and 7 more have been immersed since in that neighborhood. Also at two meetings held at Flat Rock in that county by brother Ringer, and O Kane 50 more were added. There is a general inquiry.

Brother J. T. Johnson has recently gathered in about 20 as he writes:

Last Lord's day brother Osborn and myself held a three days meeting at Rushville, Ill, and obtained 9 additions.

EDITOR.

—

(From the Evangelist.)

Kentucky, May, 1841.

BROTHER SCOTT:

I have been a critical student of the Bible for twenty years, and of the writings of Bro. Campbell, Stone, Scott, &c. from their respective commencements to the present. I have also been an Elder and Teacher for six years. And I think I am an observer of men and things in general; but I *know* that I am of young and illiterate Preachers in *particular*.

One thing is particularly observeable among young preachers they are too much given to the use of such

phraseology as this, 'I defy the clergy of all denominations to prove it.' 'I challange the whole priesthood on this subject." "The *whole sectarian world* is in error on this subject, and I can prove it!" &c.

However prudent it may be for *old* teachers, evangelists, &c. to use this kind of language; for young ones, it is contrary to the spirit and genuine principles of the Bible; is superlatively imprudent and disgusting.

If the young preachers were all that engaged in such a course we could get them to hold off till they could be taught some prudence. But we have another set of non-descript would-be-evangelists, if the churches would only call, send, and support them. But as it is, they ride to and fro, challenging, defying, and insulting the sects, and disgusting the world; creating, fomenting, and extending party principles, and party strifes; and making proselytes, not to the religion of the Bible, but to the party principles of their own creating.

These preachers should know that "Order is heavens's first law." And that they may be taught it; I propose a few questions for you to answer.

1. Is it the duty of the Eldership to inform every Evangelist or preacher that visits their congregation of the state of society in that vicinity?

2. Is it the duty of those Elders to tell the Evangelists *what* to teach, and how to teach it? And

3. Is it the duty of the Eldership to stop such Evangelists or preachers, if they will not act according to their instruction?

My eye may be jaundiced, but I think I see something wrong.

However I will submit the case to you, wishing you though, to lay this letter, imperfect as it is, before your readers, with the answers to the above questions.

As ever yours, PRESBUTEROS.

P. S. My real name is forthcoming, if necessary.

Shelbyville, Shelby County Mo: June 22, 1841.

Not doubting that information of the progress of the good cause will be acceptable to you and your readers, I hasten to relate what the Lord has done for us.

Brother Jacob Creath Jr., assisted by brother Hatchett from Illinois, commenced preaching here, on Saturday preceding the 5th Lord's day in May, and continued until the following Tuesday, during which the brethren were greatly comforted and edified by an able dispensation of the word of truth. But to witness the hearts of sinners melting like snow before the heating rays of the sun—to see those who had previously manifested the utmost indifference about the salvation of their souls, sheding tears of penitence to hear them to the number of thirty two confessing with their mouths the Lord Jesus—to see them "go down into the water and be buried with Christ by baptism"—and then to behold the lively expressions of joy and happiness manifested by their believing friends and relations--oh, it was a most joyful and glorious scene. If such be but a foretaste. what must heaven itself be?

Our regular meeting commenced on the Saturday next preceding the second Lord's day in June, at which time Brother Creath was met and assisted by brother Henry Thomas. The meeting continned ten days, the fruits of which are forty more additions making, in the whole 72, at the two meetings. Truly, we have great cause to "magnify the Lord" and to bless his holy name. We have had to combat strong prejudices and many difficulties, but the Lord is our trust.

This is a new county, and sparsely settled. Until within the last twelve months, the people have too frequently been taught human speculations for the gospel.

Thinking that a history of the church here may not be altogether uninteresting I will give it.

About two years ago, a few names of us (12) from different States, but having that "one faith, one hope," and having submitted to that "one baptism," determined to organize, which we did. About one year ago, we learned that brother Creath had settled in an adjoining county, about 35 miles from this place. Bro. Sullivan and myself, the church concurring, determined to visit him, and, if possible, get him to preach for us, for the benefit of those churches, which are always complaining of their languishing condition, and crying for help from their teaching brethren. I will tell what more we did besides saying, "Come, do come and preach for us" "how very glad we shall be to see you," &c. We saw he had a dependent family, we knew he could not live on "locust and wild honey," nor go dressed in "camel's hair." We, therefore, said "come and we will sustain you," and knowing the preachers had often been deceived by these general promises of support, I voluntarily executed to another brother my note for —— dollars for his benefit, with a promise to increase the sum, if his expenses should demand it, the brethren here all agreeing to bear a proportionable part. He came--he taught --you know the result: In addition to the above, much prejudice has been removed; the good seed sown, doubtless will continue to germinate, spring up, grow and ripen to the honor and glory of God.

B. W. HALL.

Bro. John Taylor, of Brown county, Ill., has lately immersed 21:

At Antioch, near Jacksonville, 7 were immersed a few days ago by brother Brown.

The prospect for a general revival in our country is good. We need only some holy, spiritual preachers

with the divine blessing, to conquer the rebel hearts of thousands in our country. ED.

OBITUARY.

Died, at her residence, in Monticello, Lewis Co. Mo., July 16, 1841, of pulmonary, and hereditary consumption, Sister Susan Creath, the wife of brother Jacob Creath, jr., aged 32 years. She died a Christian, with a hope full of immortality. She had labored more than three years under the disease that finished her earthly career. Few persons suffered more than she did during this period. She was often summoned, as she thought during this time to leave her station; but the messenger always found her ready to go—completely armed for the conflict.

O, sweet is the season of rest,
When life's weary journey is done;
The blush that spreads over the west,
The last ling'ring ray of its sun.

[Communicated.

We fully expect to continue the C. Messenger on the same plan and terms, $1 25 a volume in advance; or on the delivery of the first number. It may not appear as soon as contemplated at first. It may require a month or two longer; as I wish to procure paper, and to have some certainty of the number of subscribers before I begin. The paper cannot be gotten till my subscribers for the present volume shall pay their dues. The next volume shall be found many expositions of difficult passages of scripture. To this particular point shall much attention be paid. I invite my friends to state to me such texts as may appear unto them difficult, especially such as may tend to edification. EDITOR.

INDEX TO VOLUME XI.

	PAGE
Introduction,	1
Instruction to Postmasters,	2
Atonement—discussion of, between A. Campbell and B.W. Stone, 3, 14, 37, 73, 108, 145, 179, 218, 261, 290, 326.	
A synopsis of the whole subject in the extra.	
The kingdom of heaven,	28
The responsibility of the Church,	30
T. M. Allen's address to the churches in Missouri,	34
Religious intelligence,	35
L. J. Fleming, obituary,	36
Renunciation of Universalism, by W. Whitaker,	58
Christian Expositor, on Matt. xi. 20—25,	60
Isaiah liii.	373
Heb. vi.	387
Communication by L. Hatchitt,	
Religious news, 65, 96, 103, 137, 142, 169, 172, 215, 247, 280, 317, 351, 396	
On the name, Christian,	66, 118
Evangelizing—T. M. Allen,	99
A. McCullough to B. W. S. and reply,	125
The kingdom of Christ—J. Creath, jr.	133, 189
Prophetic calculations,	136
Hinton's history of Baptism,	139
Pomeroy on the name, Christian,	141
Baptist Banner on division of Christians,	154
Oberlin Evangelist; Christian Union;	175
The last Will and Testament of Springfield presbytery,	171
Obituary, Jesse Mavity.	180
A. Campbell—a fragment,	191
Popery in Mexico,	191
The character of Christ,	194
J. A. Gano to Heretic Detector,	196
Right of petition,	199
Christian morality,	202

C. G. Finney on anxious seats, . . 203
Pure speech, . . 204
Genius of Christianity—dialogue, . . 210
Queries, by P. Whip, and answers, . . 214
A hint to Christian parents, . . 218
B. W. S. on the union of Christians, 232, 254, 312, 330
L. Hatchitt's reflections, . . 238
Disunion of Christians, . . 241
J. W. Cox on searching the Scriptures, . 244
Query, by J. S. Robards, and reply, . 245
Proposed Christian convention, . . 247
Obituary, Nancy Howser, . . 252
Signs of the times . . 258
Roman Catholics in America, . . 259
The Jews, . . 260
Query, by T. Lyon, and answer, . . 279
Religious reform—Doct. Channing, . 334
New Creature, . . 335
Editor of Ch. Palladium to editor of Ch. Messenger and reply, . 336
Minutes of Ch. Conference, Highland, Ill. . 342
A brotherly hint, . . . 344
Doct. Wylie on sacrifice, . . 349
The inconsistency of party spirit with Christianity, 361
Who the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, L. Hatchitt, . . . 371
Indian Anecdote, . . . 380
Efficacy of infant baptism, . 383

LITERATURE
OF THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER by Barton W. Stone consists of 14 volumes, clothback binding, gold stamped, indexed and a total of 4,653 pages. It is a reprint of the famous restoration publications of this illustrious Kentucky reformer during the years of 1826-1844. #1844 (Complete Set) $125.00.

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER by Alexander Campbell. 41 volumes—from 1830 to 1870. Index in each volume. Over 600 pages in 2 color hard-cover binding stamped in gold. #1529 — $350.00

T. M. ALLEN (Pioneer Preacher of Kentucky & Missouri) by Alvin Jennings. A biography of this great man of the Restoration Period. A good reference book or just an interesting story for your enjoyment. 224 pages. #1740 — $6.95.

THE SEARCH FOR THE ANCIENT ORDER. A two-volume work on the search for the landmarks of primitive Christianity covering 1849-1865 and 1866-1906, 358 and 468 pages respectively. By Earl Irvin West. Cloth $11.50 each.

16-Page Tracts
$5 per 100 — $45 per 1,000

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL — WHO WAS HE? by James Willcutt. The man and his cause. #269.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY by Alexander Campell. The biblical and reasonable justification of honorable public religious debate. #268.

ADD-RAN COLLEGE by Don H. Morris. The late long-time president of Abilene Christian University reviews incidents that led to division in the movement. #152

THE RESTORATION PRINCIPLE by Bill Humble. Unity and strict adherence to the Bible as the pattern for life and religion. #131

Star Bible & Tract Corp.
Fort Worth, Texas 76118