

ATONEMENT.

An Exchange between
BARTON W. STONE *and* ALEXANDER CAMPBELL
in *The Millennial Harbinger*, 1840-1841.

ATONEMENT No. I

June 1840

JACKSONVILLE, *Illinois*, March 30, 1840.

Brother Campbell--

LAST evening I returned from Missouri, after an absence from home of five weeks. I see in your Harbinger for February last, a friendly invitation to me to correspond with you on a number of religious subjects, which you have named. The same thing you communicated to me privately some weeks before. I then answered you that [[@Page:243]] I would take the proposal by you under consideration; but suggested to you my fears that, though we might discuss those points in a perfect Christian spirit, yet the minds of the people might be withdrawn from humble piety and devotion, to strife, contention, and division. My friends persuade me that such fears will never be realized. I have consented to comply with your invitation, though I am conscious that years have despoiled me of much of that vigor and strength of mind I may have once possessed.

All the subjects you have proposed are but so many fractions of one common denominator, which I shall call the atonement. To this they all refer.

You "affectionately solicit from me an essay on sin, and sin-offerings, scripturally setting forth the import of these terms in sacred writ."

1st. With respect to sin. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii. 4. "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." James iv. 17. From these two texts it is plain that sins are of two classes--sins of commission, and sins of omission; into which two classes, it is believed, that all are resolvable. To treat of the tendency, and evil effects, and of the awful consequences of sin, is another subject, to which reference may hereafter be made in the progress of these numbers.

2dly. Your second inquiry is respecting sin-offerings. With regard to the victims offered for sin, as lambs, bullocks, goats, and the great antitype, the Lamb of God, there can be but one sentiment in the Christian world--and that these victims for sin were offered to God, admits of no doubt. But the purpose, why these offerings were made to God for sin, has been, and yet is variously set forth by good, but erring men. Their discrepant, jarring systems on this subject, has long been the fruitful soil of discord, strife, and division.

Doctor A. Clark, on Lev. i. describes the purpose, end, or design of sacrifices or offerings for sin, thus: "By the imposition of hands, the person bringing the victim acknowledged, 1st. The sacrifice as his own. 2d. That he offered it as an atonement for his sins. 3d. That he was worthy of death, because he had sinned, having forfeited his life by breaking the law. 4th. That he entreated God to accept the life of the innocent animal in place of his own. 5th. 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." From the 3d, 4th, and 5th items of this paragraph I must dissent, for the want of evidence, and because they stand in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures. The law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin. Sins of ignorance, and ceremonial defilement, only admitted of sacrifice for purification. Therefore the death of the victim could not be in the stead of the death of the offerer, seeing his sin did not require his death. But the Doctor says farther, that the offerer, in order to be profited, must have respect to Him whose life in the fulness of time should be made a sacrifice for sin. I know it is a common opinion that the Israelites under the law always looked through their sacrifices to Christ the Lamb of God, who died on Calvary, without which view they could not be profited.-- Paul thought differently: he declared that the veil was on their heart, [[@Page:244]] that they could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished. Now the thing abolished is sacrifices, and Christ was the end. Did they see this end in their offerings? Did the Jewish nation believe that Christ was to die? No: for when he taught them this truth, they said, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever." Christ crucified to the Jews was always a stumbling block, and is to this day to that unhappy people. The disciples of Jesus themselves could not believe that Christ was to die and rise again, till the facts proved the truth.

From these remarks it is evident that the Doctor, and all who think as he does, are mistaken. The design of the legal sacrifices was not to deliver from death, but to purify and cleanse the offerer, and thus make an *atonement* or reconciliation between him and his God and the congregation--before this purification was effected by sacrifice, he was separated by his sin and uncleanness from the fellowship of the congregation, not being permitted to enter the tabernacle and worship with them there.

This perfectly accords with the inspired views of the great commentator on Moses, Heb. ix. 22. "And almost all things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission." One exception of the "all things purged with blood" by the law, is, the person guilty of a sin worthy of death he must die without mercy under two or three witnesses--by the law there is no remission without shedding of blood, and as he is debarred by law from an offering for his sin, if he is forgiven, his forgiveness is not by sacrifice, or shedding of blood. Why does my brother Campbell so confidently assert that "without shedding of blood there *never* was remission of sin"? *Christian System*, page 37. Was every moral transgressor under the law, and before the law, cut off by death, unforgiven? Though condemned by law to certain death, could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all, and as did many others recorded in the scriptures?

There are others who view the purpose or design of sin-offerings to be for reconciling God to us; so the Methodist Discipline states, that the death of Christ reconciled the Father to us. As this assertion is destitute of all scripture testimony, and as enlightened reason fails to lend her aid in its support, I pass it by as a relic of unauthorized tradition, probably taken from heathen mythology, or pagan customs. The pagans offered human as well as brute sacrifices for the purpose of appeasing or reconciling their angry gods to them; but this cannot be the design of divine sacrifices, whether under the Old or New Testament.

I am sorry my brother Campbell has very similar views with those just stated. You say, "Sacrifice atones and reconciles. It propitiates God and reconciles man. It is the cause, and these are its effects on heaven and earth, on God and man." *Christian System*, page 36. The sacrifice of Christ then, in your opinion, has an effect on heaven--on God, to *propitiate* him to man. "To propitiate is to appease one offended, and to render him favorable." *Webster*. Do, brother Campbell, point us to the scriptures that say that sacrifices either under the Old or New Testament, were ever designed to propitiate God, or that such an effect was ever produced or effected on him. This, to me, [[@Page:245]] would be more convincing than volumes of speculations and philosophic reasoning from uncertain premises. Indeed, I think my brother has advanced a few steps farther than any other system-maker, when you say that "every sin wounds the affection of our heavenly Father," and that the death of Christ "soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." *Christian System*, page 48, 49.

This is a strange *speech* to me; but if this be the doctrine or language of the Bible, do show it to us. Till then I shall be silent.

Others think that Christ by his death or sacrifice "magnified the law and made it honorable." Isaiah xlii. 21. Whether this text has any reference to Messiah is very doubtful. The context is against the idea. But admitting that the Messiah is intended, is it said that the law was magnified and made honorable by his sacrifice? Is there one hint of this in the text?--in the Bible? I can clearly see how he magnified the law and made it honorable, in his exposition of it in Matth. v. There he shows how spiritual, how extensive it was, extending from the sinful act to the very fountain of sin in the heart--he made it honorable in submitting to be made under it, and fulfilling every jot and tittle of it. Had it been a bad, dishonorable law, he would not have done it such honor. Did he, as the substitute of sinners, suffer the punishment which the violated law required of sinners in their stead, and thus pay their debts, that pardon might be granted consistently with the honors of law? By what inspired writer is this taught? I cannot find.

I have only hinted at the different theories current on the subject of sin-offerings, none of which can I receive without better testimony than I have yet seen. This I have done to prepare the way to state my own. For another number I must reserve that exposition. My avocations are many, and therefore I may be prevented from sending my communications regularly. Try to exercise patience with me. I have introduced a few sentiments of yours from your *Christian System*, in order that you may, if possible, establish them by plain scripture, and not in the wisdom of words. If they be found true, I shall joyfully receive them. May the Lord direct your mind and pen to the edification of the saints!

B. W. STONE.

A. C.'s REPLY TO B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE,

Dear Sir--I MOST cordially concur in opinion with those brethren who have persuaded you that your fears were groundless, or would "never be realized," concerning the discussion of those points which you called for, under date of your letter of November 11, 1839, published page 21st of the current volume. The discussion of any of the grand elementary principles of the remedial or evangelical economy, "*in a truly Christian spirit*," never can, in my judgment, "withdraw the minds of the people from humble piety and devotion to strife, contention, and division." Shall those who love truth and peace fear that this love of peace and of truth, if fully developed, will issue in strife or impiety! [[@Page:246]]

When in your kind epistle of November 11th, you asked me for my definition of a *Unitarian*, and assured me that you denied the name, though often applied to yourself, and urged me to say whether I "designed to co-operate with Trinitarians against Unitarians," &c. I felt it my duty to make the proposition alluded to in your letter of March 30th. I have done so in the full persuasion that the contemplated discussion is not only expedient, but necessary, and that it can be so managed as to disabuse the public mind of injurious prejudices both against you and myself. You have long disavowed Unitarianism, and I have also disavowed Trinitarianism and every other sectarianism in the land; and therefore that morbid state of feeling elicited by these partizan wars about the polemical abstrusities of metaphysical abstractions, which, in its excessive irritability, forbids the scriptural investigation of the great points which have been so often distorted and mangled on the racks and wheels of party discord and proscription, should have no abiding in our minds, much less prohibit a scriptural examination of the facts, and precepts, and promises, on which these unhallowed theories have been reared.

The fear of irritating these old sectarian sores has, I verily opine, kept the minds of many brethren and of the public in suspense, if not in comparative darkness, upon the greatest questions in this earthly world. There is no subject so vital to man as the death of Christ.--The designs of his death are interwoven with all the designs of the universe, and are replete with the temporal, spiritual, and eternal destinies of man. Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the moral dominions of God. Its power is the mainspring of all heavenly impulses, and it is itself the consummation of all divine wisdom and prudence. As all earthly waters arise from the ocean and descend to it, so the deep and the high counsels of God issue in this mysterious fact and emanate from it.

The subjects to which I invited your attention, my venerable brother--viz. Sin, Sin-offerings, Sacrifice for Sin, Atonement,"¹ &c. you very justly regard as terminating in what is usually called *the atonement*, or as all summed up in it. True, the doctrine of what is usually called "the atonement" is made to include the whole; but I designed no trite nor common-place examination of this subject, as it issues from the fiery furnace of sectarian zeal and bigoted devotion. I wish to explore the scriptural roots and grounds, the remote and the immediate connexions, bearings, and designs of "*the blood of the New Institution*."--I am glad, therefore, that you have so promptly advanced to the subject, and I most sincerely supplicate the FATHER OF LIGHTS to subdue our spirits and to imbue them with the holy spirit of the gospel of [[@Page:247]] Christ; that, with all piety, benevolence, Christian meekness and

¹ Page 82, vol. iv. [247]

mildness, we may examine this great subject--so necessary to right conceptions of God, of Christ, and of ourselves.

You properly begin with *sin*. Its existence, nature, and tendencies gave birth to the redemption that is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Wrong conceptions of this thing necessarily cast their penumbra over the Bible, and obscure all its golden treasures. I object not to your definition of *sin*, so far as it goes. You give us the word of the Lord for sin, as a violation of a law, and a neglect of it--commission of wrong, and omission of right. Your quotations are apposite and striking. I will only add a definition in *fact*. There are definitions by words, and definitions by facts. Sin is the cause of death; or "*the wages of sin is death*," is verbal; but when we see Satan lose heaven, Adam lose Eden, and millions of infants lose life, we have a definition in fact, that death follows sin as the shadow follows the substance standing in light. Sin, then, is a mortal thing. Death is in it. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." I emphasize on this, because of its bearings upon all bloody sacrifices--upon sin-offerings--upon the havoc of life under the Patriarchal and Jewish institutions.

2d. On sin-offerings as presented to God, all cordially harmonize; but, you say, not so on "*the purpose*" of them. You then review Doctor Adam Clark, and dissent from his conclusions. He is public property, and you have a right to lay on your warrant. I shall not dispute your right. You pronounce three of his conclusions, in your opinion, as in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures. Of course his friends will pronounce your conclusions in these three points, as, in their opinion, in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures; and thence we have Dr. Adam Clark and Dr. B. W. Stone as affirmative and negative; and their friends all take their station accordingly.

But you are led to express some important conclusions which involve some great scriptural facts, of which I am not so sure. These are:--

1. "Sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement only admitted of sacrifice for purification." These sins you do not consider as deserving of death; and therefore you conclude that "*the death of the victim could not be instead of the death of the offerer*"--"seeing," you add, "his sin did not require his death." Your view, then, is, that the law made no provision for any sins but those of ignorance or legal defilement--that these were not mortal sins; and consequently the sin-offerings of the law saved no one from death. Nay, you assert that "the law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law to offer a victim for sin." These are very important propositions, and deeply penetrate the whole subject of sin-offerings.--[[@Page:248]] If legal atonement or expiation was made only for sins of ignorance or legal defilement, then they could not be typical of the death of Christ, else the death of Christ expiates only sins of ignorance. I must then conclude my brother Stone has expressed himself obscurely, or I have misconceived his meaning; for certainly he

admits that the legal sacrifices were types of the true; and that the true sacrifice expiates more than sins of ignorance: for surely brother Stone believes that all manner of sins, excepting one, may be forgiven, because the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from *all* sin. There is a radical mistake here: I trust it is in my misconception of your meaning.

But is it a *fact* that the legal sacrifices and offerings expiate sins of ignorance only? Read Leviticus vi. 1. "If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in trade, or in a thing taken away by violence, or has deceived his neighbor, or has found that which was lost, and *lieth* concerning it, and sweareth falsely in any of all these things that a man doeth sinning therein, then it shall be because he has sinned and is *guilty*; he shall make restitution, add one-fifth to it, and bring his offering to the priest; and the priest shall make an atonement [an expiation] for him; and it shall be forgiven him for any thing that he has done in trespassing therein." Do you call these "sins of ignorance or legal impurities?" or do you consider that there was no expiation or atonement made for them? I have been in error for many years if these were sins of ignorance or legal impurities, or if the law had no sin-offerings but for such sins as you have enumerated. I agree with you in differing in some points from Dr. Clark; but I cannot go quite so far as you go in these three items. But I have to do with Moses and Paul, and not with our erudite Doctors living or dead.

There is but one character for whom the law and for whom the gospel makes no purifying sacrifice. This is the man who presumptuously despised Moses and the Holy Spirit, or who renounces either dispensation. One of us may have mistaken this case. You say, "The law admitted *no person* worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin." You might have said, 'The gospel admits *no person* who, under it, has forfeited his life by despising or renouncing it, to any forgiveness through Christ's sacrifice;' for to such Paul says, "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; but the mistake, as it appears to me, consists in making out of a single case, or class of character, a general law against wilful transgressors. Hence you conclude that wilful transgressors of law, or those who sinned wittingly under the law, could [[@Page:249] find no sin-offering. This would, indeed, be a complete annihilation of the typical character of all the Jewish sin-offerings; and would, so far as it goes, exclude the hope of forgiveness through the antitypical sin-offering every person who had sinned wittingly or wilfully in any matter against God or man. I especially request your views of Lev. vi. 1-7., and more especially I call your attention to the great annual and national expiation minutely detailed Lev. xvi. In this chapter we are told most unequivocally that when the priest laid his hands upon the scape-goat he was to confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the scape-goat; and

again, the goat shall bear upon him "*all their iniquities*;" and again, "the priest shall make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from *all your sins*." "This shall be an everlasting statute to you to make an atonement for the children of Israel for *all their sins* once a-year." But I will not exhaust this subject at one effort, especially as I may have misunderstood you. Your allusions to, the "*Christian System*," and quotations therefrom, shall all be considered in due time. I shall be exceedingly thankful to you, my aged and venerable brother, to examine that work with the utmost care, and to point out to me any ambiguous or erroneous expressions in it, as I may probably soon be called upon to *stereotype* it. The demand for it is very great, and I have had the most flattering intimations of its usefulness to the public from numerous and eminent quarters of the professing world.²

Give me leave to add, that I concur most sincerely with you in your objections to the Methodistic notion of sacrifices reconciling God to us. There must be some great obscurity in my style if you could infer from any thing I have ever written, that I entertain such an idea. When I speak of sacrifice as propitiating or pacifying the Divine Father, (a scriptural idea truly,) I intend no more, as I have explained myself, than opening a way in which his favor might shine forth. The opening of a vent for water to flow is making it to flow: so the opening a way for God to be propitious, is making him propitious, in all propriety of language--as appears to yours, most sincerely and affectionately,

A. CAMPBELL. [[@Page:250]]

B E T H A N Y, VA. *JULY*, 1840.

ATONEMENT--*No II.*

IN my first essay on sin-offerings I stated that the Christian world were divided on the design, end, or purpose of them. The overwhelming majority of Christians have placed their whole effect on God, on his law and justice, and on his government;--on

² An involuntary misquotation, and consequent misrepresentation of my views, appears in one of your principal quotations from page 49. You put a clause in page 48 with one in page 49, and startled me no little, as no doubt you will have done every other reader. You make me say that "the death of Christ soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father. p. 48, 49." Whereas I say, "The death of Christ *in bringing many sons to glory*, soothes and delights," &c. A very different idea truly! You make me say of a subject abstractly, what I say of it only in connexion with its consequences. The difference between these two forms of expression would jeopardize any man's life in many courts civil and ecclesiastic. I am aware you did not intend such a thing. In none of the three instances in which you have quoted the C. S. am I understood as I intended, or, as I think, my language indicates. This I attribute to your writing so immediately after your return from Missouri, before you had time to weigh the periods from which you quoted. [250]

God, to reconcile and propitiate him to sinners--on his law and justice, to satisfy their penal demands against them, in the person of their substitute on his government, to make it honored and respected in the universe.

Others, while they acknowledge these to be the designs of sin-offerings, yet do not confine their effects on God, his law, and government, but also acknowledge that they are designed to produce a moral effect on man, as to reconcile him to God, to purge and cleanse him from sin.

In my first number I said that I could not believe that sin-offerings were ever designed to produce such effects on God, his law, justice, or government, because it was not so declared in the Bible, and I cannot believe any thing as unerring divine truth but what I find there: if sin-offerings are designed to produce these effects, and this doctrine is taught in the Bible, why do not the advocates of it plainly refer us to the book, chapter and verse where it is taught. Let them not substitute vain philosophy, far-fetched inferences and the wisdom of words for the doctrine of God.

I do not, wish to be understood as denying that such effects are produced on God, his law, and government by sin-offerings, but that I cannot believe them for want of divine evidence; and I might add, because this doctrine seems, to me plainly to contradict many things taught in the Bible, and to be condemned by matters of fact. But of these hereafter. [[@Page:289]]

I will now endeavor to state my own views of sin-offerings, their end, and design. I agree with all Christians that the great design of sin-offerings is to make an atonement. Though the sin-offering itself may be called the atonement, yet it is so called because it is the means of effecting an atonement or reconciliation. More than thirty-seven years ago I defined atonement to be *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation. The authorities, then adduced, it is believed, have never been seriously impugned, nor denied. Not long since I have seen the same definition given by high authority, as Calmet's Dictionary, enlarged and edited by Robinson, Theological Professor at Andover. On the word they say--

"We have evidently lost the true import of this word, by our present manner of pronouncing it. When it was customary to pronounce the word *one* as *own* (as in the time of our translators) then the word *atonement* was resolvable into its parts, *at-one-ment*, or the means of being *at-one*, i. e. reconciled, united, combined in fellowship. This seems to be precisely its idea, Rom, v. 11--Being (to God) reconciled, or *at-one-ed*, we shall be saved by his (Christ's) life, by whom we have received the *at-one-ment*, or means of reconciliation. Here it appears the word atonement does not mean a ransom, price, or purchase paid to the receiver, but a restoration of accord, which is,

perhaps, the most correct idea we can affix to the term expiation, or atonement, under the Mosaic law." See also J. Brown's Dic. Bib. on the word.

In order that we may see clearly the application of this definition of atonement, I will introduce a few 'propositions from the "Address" long since published.

1st. There did exist, and does exist, and will forever exist a close and intimate union between God and all holy beings.

2d. There did exist a close political union under the law between God and Israel, while Israel continued politically holy and ceremonially clean.

3d. Nothing but sin and uncleanness ever broke this moral or political union between God and his creatures. "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God." Isai. lix. 2.

4th. Whatever removes the separation between God and his creatures, restores the union between them.

5th. The blood of beasts, slain in sacrifice under the law, removed the political or ceremonial separation between God and Israel, and restored the union between them.

6th. The blood of Christ under the New Testament removes the moral separation between God and believers, and restores the union between them. [[@Page:290]]

7th. God's holy nature cannot be in union with man's unholy nature. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 16. But when man is cleansed and washed from sin by the blood of Christ, then, and not till then, are God and man united, reconciled, or *at-one-ed*.

8. The *at-one-ment*, reconciliation, or union between God and his creatures, either under the law or under the gospel, never took place before the person or thing defiled was cleansed or purged by the blood of a sin-offering.

9. There is an awful separation between God and the fallen world. Man's sin and wickedness is the cause. God is holy, just, and good--man is unholy, unjust, and wicked;--God is light--mankind is darkness. How can natures so discordant be united? Either God must change into the temper and spirit of man, or man must change into the temper and spirit of God. The first is impossible; therefore man must be changed or lost from God forever. To effect this very end was the Son of God sent by the Father of mercy, who lived, died, and rose again for our justification. His very ministry was that of reconciliation, (or *at-one-ment*;) "for God was in, or by, Christ reconciling (at-one-ing) the world unto himself"--"God hath reconciled (at-one-ed) all

things unto himself by Jesus Christ"--"We are reconciled (at-one-ed) unto God by the death of his Son."

From the remarks it will be seen that the primary design of the blood of sin-offerings, both under the Old and the New Testament, is, to purge or cleanse from sin and defilement, whether moral, political, or ceremonial; and the proximate effect is *at-one-ment*.

The Apostle Paul says, "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood." Heb. ix. 22. Let us inquire what those things were which were purged with blood, how they were purged, and what was the effect of this purging.

1. The altar was one of the things purged with blood. Ezek. xliii. 18-26. "And he said unto me, These are the ordinances of the altar--thou shalt take of the blood thereof (a young bullock) and put it on the four horns thereof (the altar) and on the four corners of the settle, and upon the borders round about. Thus shalt thou *cleanse* and *purge* it; and on the second day thou shalt offer a kid of the goats, without blemish, for a sin-offering; and they shall *cleanse* the altar as they did *cleanse* it with the bullock. When thou hast made an end of *cleansing* it, seven days shalt thou *purge* the altar, and *purify* it." Moses describes the same thing in nearly the same language, Lev. xvi. 18-20. "And he shall go out unto the altar, and make an *atonement* for it, and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the goat, and put it on the horns of the altar round about, and *cleanse* it, and hallow it from the [[@Page:291]] uncleanness of the children of Israel. And when he hath made an end of reconciling the altar," &c.

Dr. J. Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says, "The word atonement is always in the Old Testament, rendered from some tense, or noun derived from the root *kaphar*; nor is there any Hebrew word we translate *atonement*, but what comes from that root."

Now with respect to the case of purging the altar, we have remarked that Moses and Ezekiel were describing the same thing in nearly the same words. The altar was defiled by the uncleanness of the children of Israel. It must be cleansed or purged. How? Ezekiel says, "Thus (by the blood of a bullock) shalt thou cleanse and purge (*kaphar*) it." Moses says, "He shall make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for it." Again Ezekiel says, "Seven days shall they *purge* (*kaphar*) the altar." Moses says, "Seven days shalt thou make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for the altar." Exodus xxix. 37. Again, Ezekiel says, "When thou hast made an end of *cleansing* it (the altar)." Moses says, "When thou hast made an end of *reconciling* (*kaphar*) the altar." The effect, then, of this blood was to cleanse, to hallow, to sanctify, and to make the altar most holy; or in the language of Paul, it was to purge the altar. As this effect is described by *kaphar*, frequently

translated *to make atonement*, and *to reconcile*, we conclude that *to make atonement*, *to reconcile*, and *to purge*, are synonymous, all expressed by, or translated from, the same word *kaphar*.

The word *kaphar*, it is believed, is as frequently translated *to purge*, or *cleanse*, as *to make atonement*. Let the attentive reader turn to the following texts, and where he finds *cleanse* or *purge* in those texts, they are so translated from the Hebrew *kaphar*. Num. xxv. 33; 1 Sam. iii. 16; Psalm lxxv. 3, and lxxxix. 9; Prov. xvi. 6; Isai. vi. 7, and xxii. 14, and xxvii. 9, and the texts quoted above.

Would it not be better always to translate the verb *kaphar*, when connected with sin, as the New Testament writers have done, by the Greek word *airo*, with its compounds, which is rendered *to purge*, *to cleanse*, *to take away sin*; than by translating it *to make atonement*, or *to reconcile*?

2. Another thing cleansed with blood is a leprous house. Lev. xiv. 52, 53. "And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird; but he shall let go the living bird, and *make an atonement (kaphar)* for the house; and it shall be clean." How much more intelligibly would it read, 'And *purge* the house, and it shall be *clean*?' as the Psalmist, li. 7, "*Purge* me with hyssop, and I shall be *clean*."

3. The tabernacle of the congregation, the holy place, as well as the altar, were cleansed in the same manner. Lev. xvi. 16, 19, 20. [[@Page:292]] "And he shall *make an atonement (kaphar)* for the holy place; so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation."--"And when he hath made an end of *reconciling (kaphar)* the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar."--"Thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and cleanse the sanctuary. And the priest shall take of the sin-offering, and put it upon the posts of the house: so shall ye *reconcile (kaphar)* the house." How preferable would be the translation of these texts, to substitute the word *purge*, instead of *to make an atonement*, or *to reconcile*. This is Paul's rendering.

Let the reader examine the following texts, and all doubt will be removed. When he reads in these texts, *to make atonement*, *to reconcile*, the Hebrew word is *kaphar*. Lev. vi. 30, and xvi. 27, and viii. 15; Ezek. xl. 15, 17, 20; Dan. ix. 24; Lev. xii. 7, 8, and xv. 15, 30, and xvi. 30; Num. viii. 21; Lev. ix. 7; Lev. xiv. 19, 20, 21, 29, 31.

4. In these texts it will be seen that the people were also cleansed from their sins and uncleanness by their offerings for sin. Forgiveness always accompanies atonement, or purging, if it be not the same thing. Lev. iv. 20. "And the priest shall make an *atonement (kaphar)* for them, and it *shall be forgiven them*." See also Lev. iv. 26, 31, 35, and v. 10, 13, 16, 18, and xix. 22; Num. xv. 25, 28. So intimately

connected are purging and remission, that they are often expressed by the same word *kaphar*. 2 Chron. xxx. 18, 19. "The good Lord *pardon (kaphar)* every one of them--though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary." See also Psalm lxxviii. 38; Jer. xviii. 23; Deut. xxi. 8. "Be *merciful (kaphar)*, O Lord, unto thy people--And the blood *shall be forgiven (kaphar)* them." Deut. xxxii. 43. "He will be *merciful (kaphar)* unto his land and people." To be merciful unto, means to forgive. Heb. viii. 12, and x. 18.

Thus have I shown the design of the sin-offering under the law, to be, *purging* or *cleansing* from sin and uncleanness. When the person or thing is thus purged by the Lord through the means of sacrifice, then is God, his law, and government pleased, or reconciled with the person or thing thus cleansed, without any change in himself, his law, or government, because they were always pleased and satisfied with purity. The whole change has taken place in the person defiled. Now the *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation, is effected between God and man.

In my next number I will write an essay upon the sin-offering of Christ, our great High Priest.

B. W. STONE. [[@Page:293]]

LETTER II.--To B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

My dear Sir--YOUR second epistle, dated April 10th, one week after the first, treats of the *design* of sacrifices. Sacrifice could, as a matter of course, reach no farther than the sins for which it was offered. If offered only for one class of sins, it could only in its design reach that class. Much, then, depends on forming a correct estimate of the sins for which it was offered. I showed, as I conceive, in my last, that sins of ignorance and legal uncleanness were not the only sins expiated or purified by the Jewish sacrifices; that all the sins of the whole nation of Israel--all their iniquities and transgressions, were annually taken away by sacrifice.

In your first letter you stated that the design of the legal sacrifices was "not to deliver from death, but to purify and cleanse the offerer." Do you think that there was legal sanctification without legal salvation in the ancient sacrifices? 'A man's sins might be forgiven through sacrifice, provided they deserved not death; but if they merited death there was no sacrifice for them!' Have you not thought, my dear sir, that this looks somewhat like the Romanist classification of sins into venal and mortal.

The venal only were pardoned through sacrifice! The mortal were beyond the saving power of the law. Sins of ignorance, therefore, must be considered in the light of venal offences--not as moral guilt. Lev. v. 17. declares that "if a soul sin and commit any of those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandment of the Lord, though he knew it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." Follows it not, then, that if any of the things forbidden in the commandments of the Lord incurred death, though done ignorantly, the appointed sacrifice obtained forgiveness or release from that penalty? Even in the case of Job's friends, before the law was given, sacrifice saved from the wrath of God. The Lord said to Eliphaz, "My wrath is kindled against thee and thy two friends: therefore, take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering, and my servant Job will pray for you: for him will I accept, lest I deal with you after your folly." They did as commanded, and escaped.

In the case of one only legally polluted by the contact of a dead person, presuming to come into the congregation, death was to be inflicted; but if he had the ashes of the red heifer mingled with water sprinkled upon him, he might, without danger of death, enter the congregation at the time appointed. A still stronger proof that there was [[@Page:294]] atonement in the law saving men from temporal death, is found in Numbers xvi. 48. "And the Lord spake to Moses, saying, Get you up from this congregation that I may consume them in a moment; and they fell upon their faces. And Moses said to Aaron, Take a censer and put fire in it from the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly and make an atonement for them; for there is wrath gone out from the Lord: the plague is begun. And they made an atonement for the people, and he stood between the dead and the living, and the plague was stayed." The sequel may show the importance I attach to establishing the fact that the atonements of the law did save men from the penalties of that law, even from death, excepting in the single case of a presumptuous violation of the covenant or renunciation of it. And under the Christian economy the sacrifice of Christ extends not as an atonement to any that despise or renounce Christ.

But the Divine explanation of the reason why the Most High commanded *blood* to be used upon the altar, appears to my mind to banish all ambiguity both from the style of the Mosaic institute and from the Christian mind on the whole subject of atonement as taught both in the law and gospel. Sin is the forfeiture of life; or, what is the same thing, divinely expressed, "death is the wages of sin"--"the soul that sins must die." Now, says God, "I have given you *blood* upon my altar to make an atonement for your souls; because THE LIFE is in the blood"--for your life I accept blood, which is the life of the victim. I accept its life *instead* of yours. To quote his own words--"For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: FOR IT IS THE BLOOD THAT MAKES AN ATONEMENT FOR THE

SOUL." Again he adds, "Blood is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life of it." Levit. xvii. 11-14.

If I understand your second letter, you and I agree that atonement is but the means of reconciliation; that atonement is the *cause*, and reconciliation the *effect*, though you are not so clear upon the subject as I could wish; but, perhaps, on a fuller explanation of the subject, we may perfectly harmonize on this great topic. I, like you, have all my life, divided the word *atonement* into three syllables--*at-one-ment*. But I do not on that account exactly understand you when you make it mean simply *reconciliation*. *At-one-ment* is the making, or that which makes at one, those who were not one; and *reconciliation* is *made one*. Figuratively we often put the *effect* for the *cause*, and the *cause* for the effect; but when we discuss a subject for the sake of understanding it we come to the literal and leave the figurative. Therefore the atonement and the reconciliation are just as different as [[@Page:295]] the two Greek words *hilasmos* and *katallagee*--the former means atonement as the cause, and the latter means reconciliation as the effect. While I readily own that either reconciliation or atonement may by a metonymy of the effect for the cause, or of the cause for the effect, be used indiscriminately, originally, literally, and properly, atonement (*hilasmos*) is that which *makes* one, and reconciliation (*katallagee*) is *made one*. The one is the cause--the other the effect. If this be doubted, we have a superabundance of evidence to offer. I shall, however, suggest only one fact at present, viz.--*that things that cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned*--such as the tabernacle, the altar, and their furniture. These are susceptible of atonement, but not of reconciliation, in the legal and proper sense of these words, as any one may see by examining only the book of Leviticus, particularly the 16th chapter.

Purification or expiation is also an effect of atonement, as well as reconciliation. In this sense atonement was made for the altar, the sanctuary, and almost all things are by the law purified by blood.

Propitiation or pacification is also an *effect* of atonement. So we find it applied to God, Ezek. xvi. 63. "When I am *propitiated* (*exhilaskesthai*,³ common version, *pacified*) to you for all that you have done, saith the Lord." So prayed the publican--"God be *propitious* to me a sinner." Hence we find the *hilasmos* twice in the first epistle of John applied to Christ's blood--*the propitiation for our sins*. Messiah, as foretold by Daniel, will make *propitiation* for iniquity.

Do I misconceive my brother Stone when I interpret his views of atonement as excluding the idea of propitiating or pacifying our heavenly Father? I know that he

³ I have quoted from the *Septuagint*; but, by opening your Hebrew Bible, you will find it in your favorite *kaphar*. [[@Page:296]]

repudiates the idea of effecting a change in God--of changing him from an enemy to a friend. So do I. But still I say God *repents*, is *propitiated*, and *pacified*, and even *reconciled* to us. But the effects of sacrifice, or atonement, so far as the propitiating of God is contemplated, is more appositely set forth in the Bible than in any other book in the world, in the memorable effect of Noah's sacrifice upon God himself. Let us, Father Stone, turn over and read it:--"And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar. And the Lord *smelled a sweet savor*; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." "*The Lord smelled a sweet savor*" not before, but while he sacrificed. Such was the effect of Noah's (the temporal saviour) sacrifice on God. And, in the same style, that learned [[@Page:296]] Hebrew, our Apostle, has spoken of our Saviour. "Christ," says he, "has given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a *sweet smelling savor*." This is what I mean by propitiating God. This *sweet smelling savor* is to God. It is a sweet and pleasing odor to him, on account of which he can be propitious to us. When then, you, brother Stone, ask me what I mean by sacrifice atoning or propitiating God, I refer you to the effect produced on him by Noah's sacrifice, by Christ's sacrifice--appositely, though pleonastically, expressed by Paul, "for a sweet smelling savor." Christ's sacrifice Godward, and not manward, was then for a sweet smelling savor--pleasing, propitiating, reconciling God to man.

With all your precision and caution, brother Stone, on this subject, I find you come to my conclusions in my very words: for at the close of your second epistle you say, "*Then* is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person or thing thus cleansed." You then place yourself under the reprobation of your own censure when you ask me, letter first, "Do, brother Campbell, point us to the scriptures that say that sacrifices, either under the Old or New Testament, were ever designed to propitiate God, or that such an effect was ever produced or effected on him." After this you add, that you think I "have advanced a few steps farther than any other system-maker." Well, I am glad to be in such good company as that of brother Stone, who concludes with me--*then*, and not till then, of course--"*then* is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person," &c. &c.

You were, my dear sir, driven into *hypercriticism*--to being righteous overmuch at the time you wrote your address, by the violence of men of that hard-mouthed age which refused bit, and bridle, and curb; you were driven, if not past Jerusalem, a little beyond the beautiful gate of the Temple. You had men of strong prejudices, and not much biblical science, to contend with; and who were determined to drive with a wooden wedge and mallet the barbarous scholastic jargon of old Nicene trinitarianism down your throat; and, therefore, I do not wonder at your conscientious fastidiousness concerning terms and phrases which they may have misapplied. I have felt a good

deal of your embarrassment, and know experimentally many of your difficulties. I appreciate fully your critical display of the use of *kaphar* and its derivatives, and see in all that you have said little or nothing from which to dissent. But you strangely in all this seem to overlook the very point in discussion, and Which you ultimately have to concede, that *sacrifice has an effect upon God*. You appear to deny this in the commencement, but you cannot but admit it in the conclusion. [[@Page:297]]

Now methinks the matter can be greatly simplified thus:--Sacrifice is atonement or propitiation as respects God; purification as respects sin; reconciliation as respects the human heart; justification as respects the sinner's conscience, and redemption as respects his person from all the penal consequences of sin. Atonement is, therefore, a grand cause; of which the prominent effects are, propitiation as respects God; purification as respects sin; reconciliation as respects the sinner; justification as respects his guilt; sanctification as respects his pollution, and redemption as respects his actual personal deliverance from sin in all its consequences. You seem, my dear sir, to labor on one point, as though it were with you a great difficulty. You seem desirous to make sacrifice affect only man. You have no doubt been horrified at some of the representations like that quoted from the Methodist Discipline about Christ's reconciling God to man. The more intelligent of that community believe with you that God the Father sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world from his own benevolence, and that the atonement was in the divine nature and judgment necessary to justify God in justifying ungodly men--"that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." It propitiated God in no other way than as it opened a just and honorable way for his grace to be exercised, or as it gave him a justifiable reason to be propitious. No intelligent professor of the faith imagines that God was incorrigible, cruel, antagonistic, full of vengeance, and inimical to fallen man; and that his Son our Lord was more compassionate and merciful, and came to quench the fire of his wrath, to placate his ire. Such Pagan notions are neither the faith nor the opinion of any of those denominated evangelical. A few ultras of former days may have so reasoned; but such spirits are too antique for the nineteenth century.

Your own views of sin-offerings, as detailed in your 2d epistle, are clearly expressed. You say, "The great design of sin-offering is to make atonement." But you make atonement only equivalent to reconciliation. But it means more in the Bible than the reconciliation of a sinner to God, therefore, until you more fully explain yourself, I object to your definition as *defective*. The design of sin-offerings is, indeed, to make reconciliation by making a propitiation for our sins, and by making it both just and merciful on the part of God to forgive us. But I wait your explanation of the various items on which I have commented. As I see you have sometimes misconceived me, it is possible I may have misunderstood you. Meanwhile I remain, as ever, yours in the kingdom of the Messiah,

ATONEMENT. *No. III.*

September 1840

Brother Campbell,

BEFORE we proceed to publish No. II., which is in your hands, I wish you to print the following remarks immediately before that number, in order that we may be understood as we progress.

You object to the proposition I made, "That the law admits no person worthy of death, or who has forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin--and that sins of ignorance, and ceremonial defilement only admitted of sacrifice for purification; therefore, the death of the victim could not be in the stead of the offerer, seeing his sin did not require his death."

Can you deny the first part of this proposition? If you do, please to produce the scriptural testimony for my benefit, and for that of our readers. You dissent from the second part of the proposition for the [[@Page:387]] following reasons:--1st. "If legal atonement, or expiation, was made only for sins of ignorance, or legal defilement, then they could not be typical of the death of Christ, else the death of Christ expiates⁴ only sins of ignorance." And does not my brother C---- believe that all those sacrifices, offered for sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement, were not typical of the death of Christ? This, to me, is a new doctrine. But, as you say, we have to do with Moses and Paul, to Paul we appeal. Let us read Hebs. 9th and 10th chapters, and without doubt you will be convinced of your error.

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

I answer: Those sins mentioned in Lev. vi. 1. were not mortal sins, or sins that subjected the sinner to death; and therefore a sacrifice was admitted, and an atonement made for his sins. Hence my conclusion is good, that the death of the victim could not

⁴ Do, brother C----, let us use a pure speech, or Bible language: *expiate* is of Ashdod. Webster defines it, *to atone for, to make satisfaction*. [388]

be in the stead of the offerer's death, seeing his sin did not require his death. To this point my mind was turned when I wrote the sentiment. 2dly. Those sins, purged with blood, come under one general name of *errors*. Heb. ix. 7. But into the second went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and the *errors* of the people. 3dly. Paul says, "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sin." But they did take away *errors*, therefore there is a marked distinction between sins, and errors, according to Paul. The sacrifice offered by the priests can "never take away sins"--but they took away errors, or sins of ignorance; therefore, Paul did not consider these as sins subjecting the transgressor to death. The legal sacrifices did not purge the conscience--did not make him who did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; they only sanctified to the purifying of the flesh. Heb. ix. Now can we, my dear brother, in the face of such authority, say that the legal sacrifices could, and did take away sins--*all their sins*, whether moral, political, and ceremonial? 4th. Paul to the Romans and Galatians labors this point to show the Jews that by the deeds of the law no person could be justified in his sight--that they were justified by faith without the deeds of the law. How can you reconcile your doctrine with this?

3dly. You refer me to Lev. xvi., in proof of your position that legal sacrifices did take away sins--*all their sins*. To this let us attend. "And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and [[@Page:388] confess over him *all the iniquities* of the children of Israel, and *all their transgressions* in *all their sins*, putting them on the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness, and the goat shall bear upon him *all their iniquities* unto a land not inhabited, and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." And you add, "The Priest shall make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from *all your sins*. This shall be an everlasting statute to you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for *all their sins* once a year."

You emphasize the expressions *all their sins*, *all your sins*, and *all their iniquities*, in proof of your position that sins of all descriptions are intended. I observe, first, that the scape-goat, that bore all their iniquities, was not sacrificed, or slain; therefore, the scape-goat does not bear them away by blood; no, not one of them. Their iniquities were purged with the blood of sacrifices, which were offered, at the same time. 2d. The expressions *all their iniquities*, *all their sins*, did not include sins of every description, for reasons already stated; because "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins," &c. 3d. Again, Paul commenting on the transactions of that same great day of atonement, speaks thus: Heb. xi. 7. "But into the second went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the *errors* of the people." *All their iniquities*, *all their sins*, he includes in the general term *errors*. The original word

translated *errors*, is *agnoeemata*. Now every Greek Lexicon, which I have seen, defines this word, *an error, sin of error, or ignorance*. Parkhurst, Greenfield, and Schre. This is the only definition given; and, indeed, the derivation of the word confines it to this. No word is better defined.

You yourself admit that *all their iniquities* did not include all *sins*; for you say, "There is but one character for whom the law, and for whom the gospel makes no purifying sacrifice. This is the man, who presumptuously despised Moses and the Holy Spirit, or who renounces either dispensation." This sin, then, is an exception. But, brother C., you will admit that this "one character" includes all idolaters, Deut. xvii. 7.--all blasphemers, Lev. xiv. 10.--all sabbath breakers, Exod. xxxv. 2.--all disobedient children to parents, Exod. xxi. 15, 17. Deut. xxi. 18.--all murderers, Exod. lxxxi. 12.--all adulterers, Lev. xxi. 10, 11.--all manstealers, Exod. xxi. 16.--all false witnesses, whose testimony went to convict of a capital crime, Deut. xix. 16--all presumptuous sinners, Num. xv. 30, 31. All these classes of sinners were despisers of Moses, and were to die without mercy under two or three witnesses, without the privilege of sacrifice. The [[@Page:389] passage in Lev. vi. 1. I have long considered difficult to be reconciled with Moses and Paul on the law of sacrifice; if what I have written be insufficient to clear the difficulty, it devolves upon you.

Your concluding remarks are to me unsatisfactory. You say, "When I speak of sacrifices as propitiatory, or pacifying the Divine Father, (a scriptural idea truly,) I intend no more, as I have explained myself, than opening a way in which his favor might shine forth. The opening a vent for water to flow, is to make it flow; so opening a way for God to be propitious, is making him propitious, in all propriety of language."

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

offended justice; and that the death of Christ satisfied law and justice, and opened the door of mercy, that it might flow to the world. Let this be established by the divine scriptures, and I yield to the old orthodoxy.

I thank you for the honor you have done me in requesting me to give your "Christian System" a careful examination, and privately to propose to you my objections, previous to its stereotyped edition. This I will gladly do as I may have opportunity. Do not hurry the work, for I do believe you will see good reasons for correcting a few inaccuracies.

Yours in warm affection,

B. W. STONE. [[@Page:390]

LETTER TO B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

My dear and much respected Sir--YOUR favor before me reverts to the beginning; and, glancing at numerous points, teaches the necessity of doing one thing at a time, and of doing it well. Your questions and remarks on the legal sacrifices call for a more distinct enunciation of my views on the legal system. Permit me, then, with a reference to your demand, "Do I deny that the law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin"--I say, permit me in reference to the question to lay down a few propositions:--

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

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

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

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

Prop. IV. But until a man had forfeited these, the legal sacrifices accompanied with repentance, and the previous qualifications, had power to remit all the penalties of that institution, to sanctify its subjects, and to save them from the consequences of transgression. See Lev. vi. 1-7.; xv. 31.; Num. xix. 13.

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

Prop. VI. That no transgression or sin, even that of ignorance, or of mere ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven. No repentance, nor amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission.⁵

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

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

My remarks on your second proposition, viz.--"That legal atonement was made only for sins of ignorance, or legal defilement," you seem to have misunderstood, if I may judge from the question you ask. You did not note my words accurately. You pass by the word *only*, on which my question turns. You call it a new doctrine, &c. On reconsideration you will perceive the error.

⁵ In reference to the 5th and 6th propositions it must be stated, that even when precepts of the second table had been violated, and the covenant so far broken; yet if the transgressor truly repented and forsook his sins, he was pardoned through sacrifice. For example, David, guilty of murder and adultery, was pardoned; and certainly not without sacrifice: for without shedding of blood there is no remission. [392]

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

I can sympathize with you in your morbid excitement about certain terms--such as *expiation*, *pacified*, *propitiate*, &c., and bear with all good feeling your admonition about living up to my maxim about the pure speech, and the language of Ashdod. I know the reasons of this peculiar sensitiveness on certain terms. It is, believe me, my venerable brother, unhealthy: for in the same breath of complaint against the [[@Page:392] word *expiate* as unscriptural, you use the still more unscriptural terms "victim," "ceremonial defilement," &c.--to which terms I make no objection.

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

Permit me also, my respected brother, to suggest for your reconsideration a few objections to some points in this letter. Touching a certain matter you request me to read Heb. 9th and 10th chapters, and you say, 'without doubt I will be convinced of

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

Through my delightful musings on this epistle I have come to the conclusion that the reformation has lost much by the unhappy controversy which has made us all so sensitive on sacrifice, atonement, [[@Page:393] expiation, &c. &c. I am fully persuaded there are some very erroneous opinions and much ignorance among us on the subjects treated of by Paul in this epistle. Therefore I the more cheerfully responded to the call of my venerable brother Stone to discuss some of these subjects. And I earnestly importune the *Father of Lights*, that, with all candor and Christian feeling, these great questions may be reconsidered, and that our brethren may be more enlightened on the Epistle to the Hebrews. But from this episode to return.

You say, "Those sins purged with blood" (and what, I ask, were the sins purged without blood!) "came under one general name--*errors*. Heb. ix. 7." My dear sir, is not this building a castle on one stone! The word rendered *errors*, on which you descant, is found but *once* in the whole New Testament. You reason as follows:--The blood of bulls and goats could not take away *sins*; but they could take away *errors*! This, of course, you would not call speculation! This blood, you repeat, did take away *errors*; but these errors, you admit, are sins of ignorance. And does my brother Stone teach that the blood of bulls and goats had virtue to expiate sins of ignorance--*errors*; but no virtue to expiate other sins. From this I do, indeed, wholly dissent. I do not believe that all the blood of all the animals on earth, were it all poured out at the foot of one altar, could take away one *anoemea*--one sin of ignorance--one of the errors of the people. I do, moreover, regard the contrast between sins and errors to be purely speculative and imaginative. If I am called upon I will prove it by a list of quotations, in which those *errors* are called *sins*; and, as such, it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could atone for, expiate, or cleanse from one of them.

Brother Stone, you will perceive, then, that you have also mistaken me as much as I presume you have Paul, when you ask, Can I say "that the legal sacrifices did take away all their sins?" I never said so, only in the sense of my third proposition. No *sin*, or *error*, ever was taken away, *but as respected temporal blessings and curses*, by all the blood shed from the foundation of the world, except that of

the SLAIN LAMB OF GOD. Hence *the transgressions* forgiven, *as respected all legal penalties*, in those who obtained the earthly Canaan, were *redeemed or expiated as respected God and conscience by Jesus Christ*. Might I ask you, my dear sir, to read and consider again Heb. ix. 15. Mark these words--"The Mediator" Jesus, *by means* of (his own) *death for the redemption of transgressions*, not transgressors--not sinners, but sins--committed by *the called* under the first or former Testament.

You appear to me equally unfortunate in a former allusion to this chapter, Letter I. page 245. You quote Heb. ix. 22. "And almost all [[@Page:394]] things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission." Here are two propositions--a general one and a universal one. The one respects *things*--the other respects *persons*. The general one is, "*Almost all THINGS are purged with blood*"--the universal one is, '*Without shedding of blood there is no one pardoned, or there is no REMISSION.*' You say, one exception of the "almost all *things* purged with blood," is the *person* guilty! A hint to the wise is sufficient.⁶ I trust you will not again ask, Why does my brother Campbell so confidently assert without shedding of blood there never was remission! Does brother Stone teach that *errors* were forgiven through blood, and *sins* without it! Or what means this question--"Could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all?" And was Abraham saved by faith, without blood, without sacrifice--by faith and works, without a sin-offering! Surely my brother forgot himself here. Abraham worshipped always through blood; hence Jesus said, "Abraham *saw my day and was glad.*" I have not many objections to your remarks on Lev. xvi. concerning the great national atonement. That concerning *errors* and *sins* in contrast is already noted. Two things are taught in the slain goat and the scape goat--*forgiveness* and *forgetfulness*. "Their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more." They were borne away into the land of forgetfulness by the scape goat; but they were first atoned for by the slain goat.

You wish to find some exception to the "all sins" and "*all iniquities*" atoned for, and would make my words concerning a certain character countenance your conclusions. But the character to which I allude was not that day in that congregation. "The man that despised Moses' law," and renounced his mediation, is not by me regarded as one of that immense host, all of whose sins were that day expiated. So that your conclusion receives no countenance from my words.

You ask me another important question near the close of your letter. "Is propitiating and pacifying the Divine Father a scriptural idea?" The language is divine, and of course the idea also. Our heavenly Father is said to be *against evil*

⁶ By the way, this is a remarkable verse. There is no exception to a universal rule.--*Without shedding of blood there is no one pardoned.* This is not ALMOST *all things*; but it is universal--NO REMISSION. [395]

doers--to be *angry, incensed, provoked*--and to be *pacified, pleased, &c.* See a notable example of this style Ez. xvi. 63. "When I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done"--"Many a time turned he his anger away"--"His anger endureth but for a moment"--"He retaineth not his anger for ever," &c. You can add to these many such sayings. Now Jesus is called OUR PEACE. He is the PRINCE OF PEACE. At his annunciation it was [[@Page:395] shouted from heaven, "Glory to God! Peace on earth and good will among men!" &c. This language authorizes the idea that although God is immutable and benevolent, gracious and merciful, and full of compassion, still because of our iniquities he is spoken of as above; and in reference to such bold and correct imagery Jesus Christ is called a Mediator, our peace and propitiation, our mercy-seat; and God set him forth in this style to justify him in showing mercy to sinners. But of all this in its proper place.

As to your allusion to old orthodoxy, I have only to remark, that I go neither for *orthodoxy* nor *heterodoxy*, but for *orthopraxy*. Still I think "old orthodoxy" is just as learned, as respectable, as pious and moral a thing as young heterodoxy. But I advocate neither. I do not adopt nor reject tenets because of nick-names, fashionable or unfashionable. And I am glad that in this, as in a thousand other points, you cordially concur with

Yours with much esteem and affection,

A. C.

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

A. C.

ATONEMENT--*No. IV.*

October 1840

Brother Campbell,

IN my last number I was still prosecuting the subject of the death or sacrifice of Christ, showing its effects on the believing sinner. I was particular, perhaps unnecessarily so, in showing the effects of the Levitical sin-offerings, and of the

offering of Christ Jesus, on man and things; yet to set the subject in as clear a light as I can, I will add a few things more from the same source--the Bible.

Another effect of the blood of Christ on man, is, that by it, man is *redeemed*, *bought*, *purchased*, or *ransomed*. Tit. ii. 14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity." 1 Peter i. 18. "Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Eph. i. 7.; Col. i. 14. "In whom we have redemption in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Hos. xiii. 14. "I will *ransom* them from the power of the grave, I will *redeem* them from death." Rev. v. 9. "For thou wast slain and hast *redeemed* us to God by thy own blood"--not from God. Rom. viii. 23.; Heb. ix. 12.; Gal. iii. 13. 1 Cor. vi. 20. & vi. 23. "Ye are *bought* with a price." 2 Peter ii. 1.; Acts xx. 28. "Feed the church of the Lord, which he hath *purchased* with his own Wood." Matth. xx. 28.; Mark x. 45. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a *ransom* for many." 1 Tim. ii. 6.

These expressions have been taken literally by many, as in commercial affairs, a *quid pro quo* in scholastic style. They are not to be understood in the preceding texts literally, but figuratively, as we shall show by the scriptures. God is often said to sell his people for their iniquities; when nothing more is intended than that he suffered their enemies to prevail against them, and bring them into bondage and distress. Judges ii. 14. "And the anger of the Lord waxed hot against Israel, and he *sold* them into the hands of their enemies round about." See also Judges iii. 8; iv. 2, 9.; 4 Sam. xii. 9. When the Lord had delivered these people thus *sold*, he is said to have *bought*, *purchased*, *redeemed*, and *saved* them. Exod. xv. 16. "Fear and dread shall fall upon them, till the people pass over, O Lord, till the people pass over which thou *hast purchased*." Deut. xxxii. 26. "Do ye thus requite the Lord? O foolish people, and unwise! Is he not thy Father that has *bought* thee." Ps. lxxiv. 2. "Remember thy congregation which thou *hast purchased* of old." Deut. vi. 8. "The Lord has brought you out with a mighty hand, and *redeemed* you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt." Deut. ix. 26. & xxiv. 18.; Exod. vi. 6. & xv. 2.; 2 Sam. ii. 23. Thus God's creatures are in the New Testament said to be *sold* under sin; and those thus sold, when freed are said to be *delivered* and *redeemed* from sin, *bought*, *purchased*, and *ransomed*, or *saved*. Rom. vii. and references.

These expressions mean nothing more than deliverance and salvation; so Moses understood them, and certainly he is the best interpreter of his own language: Exod. iii. 8. "I am come down to *deliver* them out of the hand of the Egyptians." Exod. xiv. 30. "Thus the Lord *saved* Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians," &c. So the Prophets understood those expressions. Mich. iv. 10.; Jer. xv. 20; Isai. l. 2.; Ps. cvi. 8, 10.; Neh. ix. 27, *et passim*. And so did the New Testament writers. Acts vii. 34.;

Romans xi. 26. This sense of the words is used in common parlance. Thus we say, Our liberty or salvation from British oppression was *purchased* by the blood of our fathers. No one understands by this expression that our fathers literally gave their blood to Britain as a stipulated price for our redemption.

We will now inquire--1st. Who is the *redeemer*, the *buyer*, the *purchaser*, the *ransomer* of the people? All will say, that God by the hand of Moses redeemed and purchased Israel from Egyptian bondage. Ps. lxxviii. 35., with the references above. Under the New [[@Page:465] Testament the same God is the Redeemer by his Son Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. i. 30. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and *redemption*."

2d. From what does God *redeem* by his Son? I answer in the language of the scriptures already cited, he redeems from all iniquity--from our vain conversation--from the curse of the law, and from death and the grave.

3d. By what means does God by Christ deliver, or redeem us? I answer, By the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of the great Mediator Christ Jesus. This was the will of God, which will Jesus executed, and by which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. Heb. x. 7-10.

God redeems none but such as believe, repent, and obey the gospel; for to none else is remission of sins granted; and Paul teaches that redemption and remission of sins are tantamount expressions. Eph. i. 7.; Col. i. 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Therefore none are redeemed from sin but the obedient believer.

There are two things from which we are redeemed without faith, repentance, or obedience; which are, the curse of the law, and the grave. The Jews (for they only were under the law) were redeemed from the curse of the law by the death of Jesus on the cross; for by this the law received its fulfilment and end. Christ was the end of the law--he nailed it to his cross, and took it out of the way. The Jews are "delivered from that law, it being dead wherein they were held"--that covenant waxed old and vanished away. As this was effected without faith, so is redemption from the grave; for all, the good and evil, shall rise again from the dead. By the one offence, or by the disobedience of one man, Adam, the condemnation to death came upon all; so by the righteous obedience of one, Jesus Christ, the justification to live again, or to rise from the dead, comes upon all. Rom. v.

Another inquiry of importance naturally rises from these premises: What connexion is there between faith, and all those divine effects of the blood of Christ

before mentioned; as cleansing, sanctification, justification, redemption, &c.? I answer, To believe in Christ crucified, is not merely to believe that he died on Calvary; for a person may believe this, and weep at a pathological description of the tragical scene, and yet his heart remain unsanctified from sin. The same person might weep at the description of Emmet's death, if a Curran were the orator. The quantum of religion would be equal in both cases; that is, none at all; unless sympathy be called religion. We must [[@Page:466] know the designs of the death of Jesus before we can be rightly affected by it. To believe therefore aright in Jesus Christ crucified, is to believe in the designs of his death. Of these designs I will now inquire.

1st. One design of his death was, to take the law or old covenant out of the way: Eph. ii. 13, 15.; Col. ii. 14.; Rom. vii. 1-6; Heb. viii. 13. & x. 9., &c. The last pointed to Christ, and the glory that should follow. When he died and rose again, he became the end of the law--it was fulfilled, and died with him--the priesthood was changed, then of necessity, there was also made a change of the law. The law being dead and vanished away, of course its curse and transgressions are also removed; for where there is no law there is no transgression, nor curse. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix. 15. The middle wall of partition is broken down between the Jew and Gentile. Eph. ii. 14.

2. Another *design* of the death of Jesus was to bring in and establish the New Testament, or to bring in everlasting righteousness to all the nations of the world. Gal. iii. 8-14. "Christ has redeemed us (Jews) from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, (by dying on the cross)--That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Now the blessing of Abraham was the gospel, preached to him 430 years before the law; which gospel is, that "in thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Before his death he forbade his disciples to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; but after his death and resurrection he gave them a new commission--to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. Now "where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force when men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Heb. ix. 16, 17. A man may make his last Will and Testament years before his decease, in which he bequeaths certain portions of his estate to his children; but they have no right to the bequests while the father lives; but as soon as he, the testator dies, every legatee has a full right to the bequeathed inheritance. So while Jesus the testator lived, the blessings bequeathed in his last Will and Testament to the Gentiles could not be given to them; but after he died every creature of the human family has a right to all the blessings of the everlasting covenant. But, alas! how many, like Esau, sell

[[@Page:467] their birth-right to such a rich inheritance for one morsel of vanity! Yet let all know that the New Testament is dedicated by blood, and now in full force.

3d. Another design of the death of Jesus was to effect the resurrection. "I lay down my life that I might take it again"--i. e. 'I die that I may rise again': "as Jesus died and rose again, even so them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." When he rose from the dead, he wrested from the hands of death and the grave those keys which would forever have locked the grave upon all the dead--there would have been no resurrection to all eternity. When he died and rose again, the bondage through fear of death was removed--then by his own blood he passed from the worldly sanctuary through the veil into the holiest of all, into heaven itself, and consecrated for us a new and living way to follow him there. Now, like holy Stephen, we look into heaven, and rejoice in the hope of immortality.

4th. Another design of his blood is to display the love, grace, and goodness of God to the world. Rom. v. 8. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that when we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." 1 John iii. 16.; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.; Heb. ii. 9., &c.

5th. He died and rose again also to fulfil the scriptures that were written in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning him. Luke xxiv. 26, 44. "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me." "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"--The Prophets predicted his death, burial, resurrection, and ascension to glory. To these the Apostles appealed in proof of Christ being the Messiah--and in these they laid the foundation of the Christian's faith.

6th. Another design of his death was for our example. 1 Peter ii. 21. "For Christ hath also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps." Heb. xi. 2.

7th. Another design of his death is to condemn sin, and fulfil the righteousness of the law in us. Rom. viii. 3, 4. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin (*perei hamartias, for a sin-offering,*) condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in (not *for*) us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." In the text, instead of *for sin*, I have rendered it *for a sin-offering*, according to your version, and king [[@Page:468] James' translation of Heb. x. 6, 8. The propriety of this the learned will not dispute. The law pointed out duty, but was too weak in its motives to have it performed--it could not purge the conscience--it could not make perfect--it could not justify--it was not possible for it to

take away sin. While the subjects of the law were groaning in bondage, and writhing under the galling yoke, God in pity and love sent his only begotten Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for a sin-offering, in order to effect two grand purposes--to condemn sin, and save the sinner.

Christ dwelling in flesh condemned the world by his perfect righteousness, as did Noah of old. He condemned the world especially by his death, or offering for sin. Jesus, the most perfect, spotless, holy, lovely being the sun ever looked upon, was hated, defamed, persecuted, condemned, and slain by the wicked under the influence of sin--they hated him without cause--they persecuted him for righteousness' sake--they slew him because their own deeds were evil, and his righteousness--they were the servants of sin, which reigned over them and in them, and instigated them to cry, "Away with him, away with him, crucify him, crucify him!" The horrid deed was done. Now who in heaven, or in the intelligent universe, but must condemn sin, the author of this wickedness? Jesus was the very image and character of God. In hating him, sin also hated the Father--in persecuting and putting him to death, sin has shown what it would do, had it power--it would instigate its servants to persecute and destroy from the universe the God of all--would annihilate his throne, and chase to eternal destruction all holy beings in heaven and earth--it would fill the universe with pain and misery, and cause the clouds of desperation forever to brood over all.

The Jews at Pentecost, when convinced that Jesus whom they crucified was the Son of God, were convinced of sin, and cried out, What shall we do? The malignity and evil of sin are pre-eminently seen in the cross. There too we see God's hatred to sin; for in order to destroy it, he spared not his own Son from death, but freely delivered him up for us all--that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver us from bondage through the fear of death.

By Christ dwelling in the likeness of sinful flesh, and being a sin-offering, God also fulfilled the righteousness of the law in us--i. e. he sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts by the Holy Spirit given unto us--to us who believe and obey the gospel; or who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

These glorious truths the blood of Jesus speaks; for it has a voice, [[@Page:469] and "speaketh better things than the blood of Abel." But the scriptures give his blood the voice: for without the scriptures we had not known the designs of the blood. The word and blood speak the same things, and are confirmed the one by the other. *The New Testament in my blood* is the same New Testament in the word, and the same effects are attributed to each. John xvii. 17; Gal. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, &c.

Thus have I shown the designs of the death of Christ, and the divine effects of it on man. It has been proved that his blood purges, cleanses, sanctifies, washes, and purifies from sin--that by it sin is put away, borne away, taken away--that by it we are justified, pardoned, redeemed, ransomed, bought, purchased, delivered and saved from sin--by it we are propitiated, or saved from enmity, reconciled, and *at-one-ed* to God. By it--I need not repeat all I have written in this and the preceding numbers. All these effects are the work of God in us and for us, by the means of the sacrifice of Christ; and obedient believers only are the subjects of them. All are obliged to admit that what I have said on these points is true. But they think that the virtue of the sacrifice extended even to God *directly*, so as to reconcile, to propitiate, and pacify him to sinners, to satisfy the demands of the broken law and offended justice, &c. Let these be proved to be the designs and effects of Christ's sacrifice on God, his law, and government; let them be proved from scriptures, the source whence I have drawn all my proof, and I shall be among the first to receive them. Reason, philosophy, the traditions of fallible men, and sophistry will avail nothing with me; yet I am well assured of their power on a certain class of men. The text in Romans iii. 24, 25., the refuge of all the reputed orthodox shall be hereafter considered. Yet even admitting that something was done, that God could be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus; yet that something is not declared, nor is it stated that it was effected by sacrifice.

I deny not that something might have been done to produce the effect on God as just mentioned; yet that something I find not revealed; and I dare not be wise above what is written. There has been, and yet is a great deal of conjecture and speculation afloat on this unrevealed something, which I do consider repugnant to the plain scriptures of divine inspiration; yet he that believes the declaration of God from his mercy-seat Christ Jesus, that he can be just in justifying the ungodly, that believe in Jesus, and acts according to divine direction, that person will not be condemned, though he may not understand *the how* God can be just when he justifies the believer. If I admit not this, I should have gloomy presages of the world's future condition.

B. W. STONE. [[@Page:470]

LETTER III.--To. B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

My dear Sir--THAT the words *redeemed, bought, purchased, ransomed, &c.* are used figuratively, or only in part of their signification, when applied to Jews and Christians, is not only admitted, but affirmed by all intelligent men, whether orthodox

or heterodox, Unitarian or Trinitarian, Old School or New. I have met with only one or two cavilling spirits that sought to take them commercially--who asked, To whom did Jesus pay the price of man's redemption? But it is nevertheless true that Jews and Christians have been literally bought, ransomed, &c. With the greatest propriety the Lord said to the Jews, "I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." Isaiah xliii. 3. "Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom." Job xxxiii. 21. In the same sense "the son of man came to give himself a ransom for many--for all, to be testified in due time." The Lord as truly gave to destruction the first-born of Egypt for his first-born Israel, as ever a General gave a thousand talents for his captive soldiers. And we have not been redeemed by silver and gold; but nevertheless we have been redeemed by the blood of Christ, and have been "bought with a price"--not, indeed, with all the forms of a commercial transaction in mercantile style; but still as really and truly *bought, ransomed, redeemed, &c.* Such is the Bible style, and as such you very justly adopt it as apposite and authoritative. Your illustration is a good one--"Our liberty and salvation from British oppression were purchased by the blood of our fathers." We did not pay to Britain so many men for our liberty; and yet had these fathers not been men of courage and patriotism, and given up their lives to the demands of George III., our country had not been redeemed. Their lives were a part of the price of our redemption. And had not Jesus died for our sins and given himself a ransom for many, no one could have been redeemed from sin, for reasons fully declared in the Bible.

Jesus has redeemed us both *to* and *for* God--not only *for* him, but *to* him. You have quoted proofs of both. God appointed him a Saviour and Redeemer, and also accepted him as such. "*He spared not his own Son*" when his benevolence and his justice demanded the sacrifice. On this point also there is no difference.

By what *person* we are redeemed, from what evils, and by *what means*, are also matters on which we seem to have the same understanding.

There is, perhaps, a shade of difference in our acceptation of the word *redemption*--if, indeed, you mean to say that redemption and remission of sins are tantamount expressions. They may be nearly [[@Page:471] so in one or two places; but certainly they are not naturally, necessarily, nor scripturally tantamount expressions. Redemption, as a generic term, includes remission of sins; but remission of sins does not include redemption in reason or scripture. The body is *redeemed* as well as the soul; besides, a person may be redeemed who needs no pardon. But of this again.

There is another verbal difference (perhaps it is not much more than verbal) in the next section. You say, "There are two things from which we are redeemed," (not pardoned!) "without faith, repentance, or obedience--the curse of the law and the grave." While the latter may be freely granted, the former may be doubted. The Jews

only were under the law, you properly observe; consequently the curse of that law in all its fulness hangs over all them out of Christ. But he was made a curse for us, so far as hanging on a tree is a curse according to what was written. But was simply dying on a tree "the end and fulfilment of the law"? Was Christ the end of the law simply in the manner of his death? You quote from Romans vii. "The Jews are delivered from the law, it being dead wherein they were held." But it does not so read in my Greek Testament. It is, according to Mill, Bengelius, and Griesbach, "We being dead wherein we were held or tied to the law." We, not the law, have died, being buried and raised again in baptism. This is, however, a very subordinate matter, and I hasten to the burthen of your letter.

You say, and very justly, "To believe in Christ crucified is not merely to believe that he died on Calvary, but to believe in the *design* of his death." This is the very point to which I am glad that you have so directly come. You have wisely gone into it more fully than any other. I will therefore consider, and I wish our readers to consider all that you have said on this point with profound attention.

There are, in your view, *seven* distinct designs in the death of Christ. These are--

1st. To take the law out of the way. 2d. To bring in the New Testament. 3d. To effect the resurrection. 4th. To display the love of God. 5th. To fulfil the scriptures. 6th. To afford an example. 7th. To condemn sin and fulfil the righteousness of the law in us.

So far as you have gone all Christendom goes, orthodox and heterodox. Some will differ from you in the explanations you give, and in the application of the scriptures you quote; but that these seven are designs of Christ's death, all will admit. But that they are *the* designs, demands a very serious doubt.

To these I beg leave to add one of all-absorbing interest to my mind, viz.-- To *expiate sin*. "Now once in the end of the world has he appeared to expiate sin;" or, as you prefer it, "to put away sin by [[@Page:472] the sacrifice of himself." This, with me, is the great design of all the designs of the law, of the prophets, of the types, of the incarnation of THE WORD--"the *Word* that was made flesh," and obtained a body that he might as a priest have somewhat to offer. How you came to forget this, my good and venerable brother, I conjecture not. But that this is the paramount object of Christ's death, I doubt not you will, on recollecting yourself, cheerfully admit. "That Christ was once offered to *bear the sins* of many--that he *appeared* in a body to *put away sin*--and that after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins*, he sat down on the right hand of God, having *perfected forever* them that are sanctified," are the very burthen of the epistle to the Hebrews.

Indeed, this is the import of the law and the gospel. Daniel said, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to restrain the transgression--to make an end of sin-offerings--to make a propitiation or reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness," &c. And Paul said, "By his own blood he obtained an everlasting redemption." These two passages are one in sense.

The *everlasting righteousness* of Daniel and the *eternal redemption* of Paul are, in my judgment, two names for the same thing. Daniel said, In seventy weeks an everlasting righteousness shall be brought in; and Paul says, Having by his own blood obtained an everlasting redemption he sat down.⁷ An eternal redemption is a redemption that is forever availing, which needs neither addition nor repetition. This is the foundation of an *everlasting justification*. Redemption in this sense is the cause--justification the effect. Sin-offerings are ended because reconciliation for iniquity is made, and a justification perfect and complete is brought in. The order is sin-offering, redemption justification. The three are perfect; but the two last spring from the first. But here I must pause for the present.

Brother Stone, I am just set down in my chair, after an absence of two weeks, in attendance at our Ohio annual meetings. Your letter was received and partially printed in my absence, and I had written this much of my reply before I discovered that your third letter has never appeared in our pages. I informed you of its loss, and until I this moment received your note of the 1st instant, (September,) I did not know but that Letter IV. (having come in my absence) was your Letter III. Had not the form containing a part of your letter been printed off, and some of my reply in type, I should have laid it all over for a month. Any thing material in this transposition maybe rectified again.-----Sincerely and affectionately yours,

A. C. [[@Page:473]

ATONEMENT--No. IV.

January, 1841

Brother Campbell--I WILL preface the following remarks with an extract from my "Address," 2d edition, 1821.

⁷ For us to not In the Greek text. It is an awkward, uncalled for, and deceptive supplement. [473]

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

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

You admit that "one of us may be mistaken in this case." Yes, my brother, one of us is certainly mistaken, unless you in the class of presumptuous despisers of Moses, include idolaters, blasphemers, murderers, and all those characters mentioned above. But you confine the presumptuous despisers of Moses to those "who renounce his dispensation." Such are apostates from his laws and government.--These we acknowledge are presumptuous despisers of Moses; but are not idolaters, murderers,

and all those classes named above, also presumptuous despisers of Moses? To the law we appeal--Num. xv. 30. "But the soul that doeth aught *presumptuously* the same reproacheth the Lord, and that soul shall be *cut off* from among his people, because he hath *despised* the word of the Lord and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall be utterly cut off." 2 Sam. xii. 9, 10, the Lord says, "Wherefore hast thou *despised* the commandment of the Lord to do evil in his sight? Thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite, and hast [[@Page:13] taken his wife to be thy wife. Now, therefore, the sword shall never depart from thy house, because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy wife." Here we are plainly taught that the Lord and Moses are despised, presumptuously despised, when their commandments are presumptuously broken to do evil.

Moses in the chapter just quoted, Num. xv., very plainly arranges sins into two classes--sins of *errors* or ignorance, and *presumptuous* sins, ver. 22. "If ye have *erred*, and not observed all these commandments, then it shall be, if aught be committed by *ignorance*, without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the congregation shall offer a young bullock--and the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation--and it shall be forgiven; for it is *ignorance*."--Verse 27. "And if any soul sin through *ignorance*, then he shall bring a sin-offering, and the priest shall make an atonement for that soul that sinneth ignorantly, and it shall be forgiven him." Verse 30. "But that soul that doeth aught *presumptuously* shall be cut off." Is this soul directed as those are who erred or sinned ignorantly, to bring a sin-offering and obtain pardon? No: they must be cut off--utterly cut off. The reason why those who erred and sinned ignorantly had the privilege of sacrifice and pardon, is plainly stated--because it was ignorance; evidently showing that none but such transgressors had this privilege granted them. Verse 31. But who are those that sin presumptuously? Those that despise the word of the Lord, and hath willingly broken his commandments. Compare Deut. i. 43. Exod. xxii. 14. Deut. xvii. 12, 13.

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

the New Testament. Presumptuous or wilful sin is that which is committed knowingly and willingly, with the full consent of the mind. [[@Page:14]

That many saints lived from Adam to Christ is evident--that their sins were pardoned, and pardoned through faith, and not by the deeds of the law, is true as far as we are informed; but that they were justified by the blood of law sacrifices, looking through them by faith to the blood of the great antitype to be shed in future, I must reject for reasons stated in my first number on Atonement. If they were pardoned and purified from sin by the blood of Christ, it could not have been by faith in the blood, or from any knowledge they had of it. It could therefore have no direct influence or effect on them to reconcile them to God, or lead them to repentance--that whole virtue, influence, and effect of his blood, must have been directly on, or in God himself; who by it was so affected that he was pacified, propitiated, or reconciled, and the honor of his law and government so well sustained that he granted pardon and favor to sinners. Of all this we have no account in the scriptures.

My dear brother, are you not inconsistent when you state that "the legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system;" that this institution extended no farther than to temporal life and blessings; and yet that the old saints in the patriarchal age, as Abel, Shem, Noah, &c. received spiritual pardon and spiritual blessings through their sacrifices? The reason you assign is because they *may have had* views superior to the legal economy. *May have had* is no argument that they really had superior views, so that they thought their sacrifices saw the blood of Christ to be shed in future, when the Israelites under the law could not see it. How do you know whether Abel's offering was a sin-offering, or a thank-offering? Why was Abel's offering accepted and Cain's rejected? Not because Abel's was a sacrifice of blood, and Cain's was not; but because Abel offered in faith. Faith in what? In the blood of Christ to be shed 4000 years after! Of this you, my dear brother, are as ignorant as myself. Do read the 11th chapter of the Hebrews, and understand the faith by which the elders obtained a good report. In all the instances of faith there recorded, do you find one that had the blood of Christ as its object? Do read again the last chapter of Job, and see whether the sin pardoned there was not wholly an error, or sin of ignorance; and this pardon not by faith in the blood of Christ. You think David, in the case of Uriah, was pardoned by sacrifice. Once more read this case in Psalm li., and you will see your mistake. David says, "For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it." This shows that he had not given it, because his sin admitted not of sacrifice. As to God smelling a sweet savor from the sacrifice of Noah and others, nothing more is intended than that God was pleased with his obedience and piety. But of this more fully hereafter. [[@Page:15]

Your broad assertion that no sin of any description was ever pardoned but by shedding of blood, is very doubtful. Was it by blood of any description that pardon

was granted to those, Num. xiv. 19, 20? How were the Israelites pardoned in Babylon for seventy years? Not by blood of victims; for their temple, altar, and all were in ruins, and sacrifices must be slain at the temple. How were those pardoned who were not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary? 2 Chron. xxx. 18, 19. How were these pardoned who were led captive into foreign lands? Read 2 Chron. vi. 34, 20. Is there one instance on record, from Adam to Moses, of one person being justified by faith in the blood of Christ? Not one. Is there one case of such justification from Moses to Christ? Not one. It is easier to assert than prove.

Paul's simplified plan of sacrifice I have accepted. He adduces them to a few points. 1st. By them a remembrance of sin was made every year, and we may say correctly, every day. No ravenous unclean beast or fowl was admitted for sacrifice; the sight of such dying could excite in the mind of the worshipper no pity nor compassion. But the innocent and clean beasts and fowls were only required.--When the offerer saw these innocent animals writhing in agony and death, he then was made to remember sin, and saw its effects--misery and death. Had not sin entered into the world, death had been unknown. These dead works, or works of death, were considered by Israel as the foundation of repentance. Heb. vi. 2.

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

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

4th. These sacrifices were typical of the blood of Christ. Did the innocent lamb suffer death for sin--sin not its own? And in this, is not sin in its evil nature bringing misery and death, seen and remembered? So in the innocent Lamb of God is sin in all its horrors seen, [[@Page:16] remembered, and condemned. Sin instigated the powers of earth and hell to hate, to persecute, and kill him." "Away with him--crucify him, crucify him," was the voice of sin in the mouths of wicked men, his servants. Satan put it into the heart of Judas to betray him. The wicked slew him, and to them is the crime charged. God did not kill him, nor instigate others to the horrid act, nor did he league with hell and the wicked world in the wicked deed. Now a question arises,

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

Who took vengeance on the Son? The orthodox say God did it--himself poured out the vials of his wrath on the head of his Son. If Jesus was the substitute in the law, room, and stead of sinners, then the Lord must take vengeance; for he it is who takes vengeance or inflicts punishment on the wicked; therefore he must on the substitute of the wicked. This is indispensable in the system of orthodox atonement; and yet we have just seen that God did not crucify or slay his Son, but the wicked did it. What, then, becomes of the system? It must be sheer speculation, infinitely foreign from truth, though long sanctioned by human authority from the Catholic Archbishop Anselm in the eleventh or twelfth century, down to the present day. Before his day, according to Professor Murdock, we cannot find this doctrine of substitute punishment taught by any.

Brother Campbell, I shall after this attend to my original plan. In my next two numbers I shall publish the 3d and 4th numbers on [[@Page:17] Atonement, which have been sent you some months ago; the 3d you inform me is mislaid and cannot be found. After I have published these numbers I will then take a general and particular review of your objections against my views of this doctrine, and consider particularly your own.

As ever yours in love,

B. W. STONE.

October 1st, 1840.

LETTER IV.--*To. B. W. STONE.*

BROTHER STONE:

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

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

1. That to "expiate," and "pacify," and "atone for," are scriptural ideas and expressions.
2. That sacrifice is as old as the fall of man, 2500 years older than the law, and that the legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system.
3. That the legal sacrifices were for the exclusive benefit of those who were under that dispensation, and interfered not with the nature, design, or use of sacrifice as practised by all the saints from Abel to Moses.
4. That the life and death, the blessing and the curse of the law were merely fleshly and temporal, and that therefore the virtue of its sacrifices could extend no farther than temporal life and temporal blessings. These forfeited, the law had no other blessings in store for them.
5. But until a man had forfeited these, the legal sacrifices accompanied with repentance and the previous qualifications, had power to remit all the penalties of that institution, to sanctify its subjects, and to save them from the consequences of transgression, so far as the law caused the offence to abound.
6. Salvation, then, under the law, spiritual and eternal, was through faith, repentance, and sacrifice, as it was from Adam to Moses.
7. All sacrifice, altars, victims, and priests were typical, whether
[[@Page:18] before or under the law: the antitype of them all is Jesus the Messiah, our sacrifice, altar, victim, and priest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5th. And finally, that there was no sacrifice or sin-offering under law but for mere errors, or sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement. As there is some confusion in your style, some misprinting too in the copy before me on this point, as well as in

some of the preceding, I hope I misunderstand you, and that when you fully explain yourself we will fully agree on these five as we agree on the nine. [[@Page:19]

I say, as we agree on the nine; for with a single exception to my proof of one of these, and I requested your objections in a former epistle on any of the points involved in them, I conclude there is a concurrence in them all. You object to my views of the faith by which Abel obtained testimony that he was righteous, rather than to the fact that God testified of his *gifts* at the altar. You ask me how I know that Abel's offering was a sin-offering, &c. Because of the matter of it, and because of the state of mind in which it was offered. It was a *bleeding lamb*, and it was offered in *faith*. These are both facts. Now Cain's was neither. In matter and form they differed.

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

There are some indistinct affirmations and negations between us on the sins of ignorance and presumptuous sins. You seem to conceive of nothing between these. I do not, my venerable brother, wonder at it, inasmuch as the whole subject of the Jewish sacrifices and offerings are but little understood and very imperfectly examined by our scribes and elders. Presumptuous sins cut a person off from any institution under which man was ever placed. If a man "sin wilfully," i. e. a. presumptuously--"there remains no more sacrifice," &c. is as true of Christ's administration as of that of Moses. Some, with you, imagine that as *sin-offerings* refer so often to sins of ignorance, there is no institution for any other kind of sins. Now, sir, should I grant [[@Page:20] that sin-offerings, as defined by Moses, refer to sins of ignorance alone, and to all sins of ignorance, (which by the way I do not concede,)

still it by no means follows that there were no sacrifices under the law for any other sins or errors than those of ignorance. This is evident for two reasons:--

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

2d. But besides those emphatically styled "SIN-OFFERINGS" there were other sin-offerings--such as the burnt-offerings, the trespass-offerings, and the peace-offerings; all of which were sin-offerings; some of them, too, for sins of ignorance against *positive precepts*; of which, according to some Rabbis, they had two hundred and forty-eight. But other sins besides sins of ignorance against positive precepts, are enumerated by Moses, as I before demonstrated to your satisfaction, I hope, from Leviticus, 5th and 6th chapters, 1-7. There are sins of knowledge, of doubt, and of ignorance, specified under the law of trespass-offerings--as any one may see who will impartially read the passage referred to.

With regard to the occasion of this discussion of sin-offerings, permit me to offer a few remarks. Your opposition to it seems to arise from a conviction that if we establish that sins in general were expiated by the legal, or by the patriarchal sacrifices, (*for they are different institutions*)--and especially on the principle that the victim died for, or instead of the offerer, the whole doctrine of old orthodoxy naturally follows; and to this you would make it appear you have a peculiar dislike. Well, now, I have no predilection for, nor antipathy against, either old or new orthodoxy or heterodoxy: I care not a fig how my reasonings will affect either system. The question with me is, *Is it true?* Do the Prophets and Apostles teach it? If so, I teach it. If not, I teach it not. You have been so vexed with old orthodoxy, that, like the burned child, you dread the fire. You have been [[@Page:21] scorched, and burned, and bruised by men calling themselves orthodox. Well, be it so. Still old Orthodoxy is, as I before said, more learned, more devout, more intelligent, and more practically useful than old or new heterodoxy. Both have been professedly men whose hearts never felt the love of God, and therefore both are stained with blood of human sacrifice. When in power both are intolerant, proud, proscriptive, and persecuting. This you will see fully sustained in my last number, under the caption or "A Sin against Orthodoxy." It has

used me very ill; but that is no reason why I should detract aught from its well founded pretensions.

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

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

When Enoch prophesied of the last days of the Christian age, when Jesus affirmed that Abraham saw his day and was glad, and when Job before Moses said, "I know that my kinsman (redeemer,) my *Goel* liveth, and that he shall stand upon the earth in the latter day, and that in the resurrection I shall see him;" who can limit the boundaries of faith or knowledge possessed and displayed by the patriarchal people and the Jews! May we not then conclude that when the gospel was preached to Abraham sacrifice and blood were in it as well as in our gospel, whose first fact is, THE MESSIAH DIED FOR OUR SINS *according to the scriptures*." Isai. liii. Dan. ix. &c. &c. of which more fully when you develop your views of Christ's death. May you not then, my dear sir, notwithstanding all the truth which you utter concerning presumptuous sins and sins of ignorance, in which I presume, as now explained by both of us, we agree; I say, may you not be too rash in affirming that "if the saints from Adam to Christ were pardoned, and purified from sins by faith in his blood, it could not have been from any knowledge they had of it"? True, indeed, they may have looked for redemption in Israel, and by the [[@Page:22] Messiah too--the son of Eve and the son of Abraham, without fully, or at all, understanding him; or by what means, or to what extent, this redemption was to be effected.

I am sorry to hear you say that one of my most prominent assertions is with you doubtful. Your words are, "Your broad assertion that no sin of any description was ever pardoned but by shedding of blood." Am I not backed by Paul? "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." You ask with confidence of a negation, "Is there one instance on record, from, Adam to Christ, of one person being justified by the blood of Christ"? You must mean, in so many words, I presume. I would also ask you how was it that Moses, when near the throne of Egypt, "esteemed the reproach of Christ above all the wealth of Egypt, and endured as seeing him that was invisible"?

How was it that Isaiah said, "By the knowledge of him my righteous servant shall justify many whose iniquities he shall have borne." And Daniel, After so long a time, "shall Messiah he cut off, but not for himself," &c.--"He was wounded for our transgressions," &c.--"He brought in an everlasting righteousness," &c. Do you think no one believed those things! All your questions in this section suppose that unless daily offering up sacrifice the Jews could not be pardoned by blood. Cannot our sins be pardoned through faith in a blood shed two thousand years ago!

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

1st. An annual and daily remembrance of sin.

2d. The purgation of all things, including persons; for as "all things were made by him" includes all persons, so almost all things being purged by blood, means almost all persons.

3d. "By law without shedding of blood there is no remission;" but by the gospel there is. Yet Christ has not shed his blood in vain; for those sacrifices were typical of his blood. Sin is seen, remembered, and condemned by it. The death of Christ does three things In Paul's plan, as simplified:--Condemn sin, exhibit sin, and remember sin. This is the whole matter? Then come your remarks upon honoring the law, taking vengeance on the Son, and the substitution indispensable to orthodox atonement, first invented by the Catholic Archbishop Anselm in the 11th or 12th century, according to Professor Murdock. In giving the simplified plan it is presumed you intended to give not a part of it, but all. I think you have forgotten some of it, and will not regard this as your view of the whole matter till I hear from you distinctly again on the subject. [[@Page:23]

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

By the way, Professor Murdock's reading and mine are very different. He certainly has forgotten the history of the first four centuries, else his guides and mine are very different. But, my dear sir, what have you or I to do with any professor or with "the system of orthodox atonement?" We are in pursuit of Paul's view of atonement. I care as little for what is "indispensable to orthodox atonement" as for what is indispensable

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

Sincerely and affectionately yours, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

ATONEMENT--No. V.

February 1841

Brother Campbell--IN my No. II. I was endeavoring to prove that sin-offerings under the law were the means appointed by God of purging, cleansing, and forgiving pardonable sins and ceremonial uncleanness, and thus reconciling or *at-one-ing* the person to God. In this No. I. I will show that these types were all fulfilled in the great Antitype, "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." The blood of the offered Lamb under the law, purged (*kathairo*) or took away the sin of him who offered it; it was the means appointed by which the purifying was effected. So the blood of the Lamb of God is the means appointed of God, by which he-purges, cleanses, and forgives the patient obedient believer. This I will now endeavor to make appear.

We will begin with the Prophet Isaiah, liii. 4. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." This is explained by Matthew viii. 16, 17. "When the evening was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils, and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the Prophet, saying, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." By this it is understood [[@Page:59] that he took, or carried them away, or removed them. I have introduced this text in order that we may understand the true meaning of the Hebrew word *nasa*, translated in this 4th verse, "he hath borne our griefs"--that is, has borne them away. Thus have you rendered the Greek word in your version of the New Testament, [Matth. viii. 17.] "He hath carried

off our infirmities," In the same sense it is said in Isaiah liii. 12. "He bore [*nasa*, *bore away*] the sins of many." This the Septuagint translates by the Greek word *anaphero*, which same word you in your version rightly translate *bear away*; as in Heb. ix. 28. "Even so Christ, being once offered to *bear away* the sins of many;" and 1 Peter ii. 24. "Himself *bore away* our sins in his own body on the tree."

You then agree with me that the word *nasa*, connected with sin, means *to bear away*, *to carry off*, or to take away, sin--to remove it, or to forgive. This will farther appear from the following arguments:--

1st. God is frequently said to bear sin in the sense stated above, and this is so expressed by the same Hebrew word *nasa*. This cannot mean that he bore the punishment due to sin, as many explain the phrase "to bear sin;" therefore the Septuagint and king James' translators have given the word *nasa* a different rendering, translating it "to forgive, to pardon, to take away" sin; as in the following examples:--

Exodus xxxii. 32. "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive" [*nasa*; Sept. *aphiemi*.] This translation of the Septuagint, *aphiemi*, all Greek scholars know, when connected with sin, signifies to forgive.

Exodus xxxiv. 7. "The Lord God--keeping mercy for thousands, [*nasa*; Sept. *aphairo*.] iniquity, transgression, and sin." The Septuagint translation, *aphairo*, is rendered by our translators *to take away*. See Luke i. 25.; x. 42.; xvi. 3.; Rom. xi. 22.; Heb. v. 4, 11.; Rev. xxii. 20, &c.

Num. xiv. 8. "The Lord is long suffering--forgiving [*nasa*; Sept. *aphairo*] iniquity and transgression."

Psalms xxv. 18. "Forgive [*nasa*; Sept. *aphiemi*] all my sins."

Psalms xxxii. 1. "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven," [*nasa*; Sept. *aphiemi*.]

Psalms xxxii. 5. "Thou forgivest [*nasa*; Sept. *aphiemi*] the iniquity of my sin."

Psalms lxxxv. 2. "Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people," [*nasa*; Sept. *aphiemi*.]

Isaiah xxxiii. 24. "The people shall be forgiven [*nasa*; Sept. *aphiemi*] their iniquity."

Hosea xiv. 2. "Take away [*nasa*] all iniquity."

Micah vii. 18. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth [*nasa*] all iniquity!"

Joshua xxiv. 19. "He is a jealous God: he will not forgive [*nasa*] your transgressions, nor your sins."

Job vii. 21. "And why dost thou not pardon [*nasa*] my transgressions?" See also Numbers xiv. 9.; Ps. xcix. 8.; Isaiah ii. 9, &c.

2d. That *nasa*, connected with sin, means to pardon, to remove, or take away sins, is farther evident from Exodus xxiii. 21. "Behold I send an angel before thee--provoke him not, for he will not pardon [*nasa*] your transgressions." [[@Page:60]

3d. The priesthood are said to bear iniquity, which is expressed by the same word *nasa*. Exod. xxviii. 38. "And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear [*nasa*] the iniquity of the holy things." The Septuagint renders the word *exhairo*, which commonly means to bear away, to put away, to remove. So have you translated the word in your version, Matth. v. 29.; 1 Cor. v. 2, 13, &c.

Lev. x. 17. "Wherefore have you not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it to bear [*nasa*] the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." The Septuagint translation of the word is *aphairo*, which, as shown before, signifies *to bear away, to take away, to pardon*. So king James translators, and your version, commonly render the word: Luke i. 25.; Rom. xi. 27.; Heb. x. 4.; Rev. xxii. 19, &c.

Num. xviii. 1. "And the Lord said unto Aaron, Thou and thy sons, and thy father's house with thee, shall bear [*nasa*] the iniquity of the sanctuary, and shall bear [*nasa*] the iniquity of your priesthood." Paul's comment on the word *nasa*, or bearing the iniquity of the tabernacle and congregation, is decisive; Heb. ix. 22. Here he explains it by *purging*--as, "Almost all things by the law are *purged* with blood, the tabernacle, the congregation," &c. Indeed, Moses, in the verse quoted above, explains it *to make atonement for them*; and this, as I have proved before in No. II., signifies to purge or cleanse from sin or uncleanness. See also Num. xviii. 23.

4th. That *nasa*, connected with sin, signifies *to bear away, to pardon, to forgive*, is farther evident from the following texts:--

Gen. i. 17. "So shall ye say unto Joseph, Forgive [*nasa*] the trespass of your brethren, and their sin; and forgive [*nasa*] the trespass of the servants of the God of thy father."

Exod. x. 17. "Pharaoh said unto Moses, Forgive [*nasa*] my sin only this once."

1 Samuel xv. 35. "Saul said unto Samuel, Pardon [*nasa*] my sin."

1 Samuel xxv. 18. "Abigail said unto David, Forgive [*nasa*] the trespass of thy handmaid." In these two last verses the Septuagint translation is *hairō*, which, connected with sin, is, I think, always by our version, and yours, translated *to take away*. John i. 29.; 1 John iii. 5., &c.

5th. That the word *nasa*, in connexion with sin, signifies to bear away, appears plain from Lev. xvi. 22. "And the *scape*-goat shall bear [*nasa*] upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited." None will dispute that it bore away their iniquity.

6th. How frequently is it said of the transgressors of the law, 'They shall bear [*nasa*] their iniquity.' If their iniquity was pardonable by law, then they must offer a sin-offering; by which means their iniquity was borne away, or pardoned through the priesthood. "Wherefore have you [the priests] not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place! God hath given it to you to bear [*nasa*; Sept. *aphairo*] away the iniquity of the congregation." But if their sin was unpardonable by law, the transgressor must bear his own sin, or bear it away by suffering death himself, as in the case of a murderer. Num. xxxv. 31-32. "Moreover, ye shall take no satisfaction [*kaphar*, *atonement*,] for the life of a murderer, who is guilty of death; but he shall be surely put to death--so shall ye not pollute the land wherein ye [*@Page:61*] are; for blood it defileth the land, the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." And Lev. xxiv. 15.

Yet because these murderers, blasphemers, idolaters, adulterers, &c. could not have the privilege of sin-offerings or sacrifice, by which their sins might be purged, borne away, or pardoned by law, or that they might be freed from the suffering of temporal death; yet we are not to suppose that all these persons were doomed to suffer eternal death in the future world, without mercy or forgiveness; for such of them as truly repented were forgiven by the great God of the universe, not by the law of Moses, but by the law or covenant of Abraham. Ezek. xviii.; John viii. 3-11, &c.

7th. That the common meaning of the word *nasa* is to take away, to carry away, to bear away, I refer to the following texts, in which the word is so translated in our English Bibles:--

Gen. xlvii. 30.; Exod. x. 19.; Lev. x. 4.; Num. xvi. 15.; 1 Sam. xvii. 34.; 1 Kings xv. 22., and xviii. 12.; 2 Kings xxiii. 4.; 1 Chron. x. 12.; 2 Chron. xiv. 13., and xvi. 16.; Job xxiv. 10., and xxvii. 20.; and xxxii. 32.; Eccles. v. 15.; Isai. viii. 4., and xv. 1., and xi. 24., and xli. 16., and lvii. 13., and lxiv. 6.; Ezek. xxix. 10., and xxxviii. 13.;

Daniel i. 16., and xi. 12.; Hosea i. 5., and v. 14.; Amos iv. 2.; Micah ii. 2.; Malachi ii. 3., and many others.

I have been thus particular on the word *nasa*, *to bear sin*, to show how weak, how inconclusive, and unfounded is the argument drawn from Isaiah liii. iv. 12. "He bore the sins of many." It cannot mean that he bore the punishment due to the sins of many. The arguments above forbid the idea. Can we think that God himself bore the punishment due to sin? or that the angel in the wilderness bore the punishment due the sins of the congregation? or that the priesthood bore the punishment due the sins of Israel? Or one man bore the punishment due the sins of another? or that the scape-goat bore the punishment of all the sins of Israel, when it was neither slain nor suffered any thing? The pardonable sinner must bear away his own sin by the blood of the offering. So is the will of God.

No one will affirm that either God, the angel, the priesthood, ever bore the punishment due to the sins of Israel. Why, then, will they affirm that Christ bore the punishment due to the sins of many, when the very same word and expressions are also applied to God, to the angel, to the priesthood, and others? Besides, this same expression of Isaiah respecting Christ, is fully explained in the New Testament, to mean *to take away*, *to bear away*; and so have you translated the word in your version, as seen above; and so has Thompson, and Taylor, the Hebrew critic, and Dr. Doddridge, and a host of others. I have wondered why divines, leaving the plain explanation of the word in Isaiah liii., as given by Christ and his Apostles, should yet be continually pressing that chapter in support of the imputation of sin, and vicarious punishment in the sense of the Westminster Divines. Is it safe to build a system on an exposition of one text, which is unsupported by another passage in the entire Bible? And which text is explained by divine authority to have a different meaning from that they attach to it?

The doctrine of vicarious, or substituted punishment, is the [[@Page:62] fundamental of orthodox divinity. Where, brother Campbell, shall we find the term *substitute* with application to Christ? Did he, as such, satisfy the demands of law and justice against the sinner, and reconcile or propitiate God to a sinful world? Does law or justice admit of such substituted punishment? Where is it required, or found in the Bible? The contrary appears to be plainly taught in Deuteronomy xxiv. 16.; 2 Kings xiv. 6.; 2 Chron. xxv. 4.; Jeremiah xxxi. 30.; Ezekiel xviii. Could a holy and righteous law be satisfied and pleased with the wicked--the most wicked and lawless act ever committed--the death of the innocent Saviour by the hands of wicked men? If the claims of law and justice against the sinner be death temporal and eternal, and if Jesus suffered the penalty against us, is he not yet suffering eternal death? Or has an endless thing come to all end? If the penalty be temporal death, why have the world yet to suffer it? If the debt of suffering be folly

paid by the substitute, where is grace seen in the pardon of the debtor! Many such inquiries will pass in the mind of the diligent inquirer, who will not be satisfied with the *ipse dixit* of uninspired man.

How the death of Christ *bears away* our sins, or takes them away, I will endeavor to illustrate by a figure. In the early settlement of Kentucky a colony resided on the border of that country, continually exposed to the bloody incursions of the Indians. In this colony was a man of marked benevolence and goodness: he was wealthy, and had a care over all, that none should want the necessaries of life. He had a son, the very image of himself. Among them also lived a man of opposite character--of marked malevolence and wickedness. He hated this good man and his son, and endeavored to injure them in their persons, property, and character, though of their beneficence he shared in common with others. A banditti of Indians passed by, and apprehended this wicked man, and hurried him off to the wilderness. The good man with pain and sorrow heard the news: he called his son and told the distressing situation of his neighbor. My son, will you at the exposure or sacrifice of your own life, rescue him? I go, father; and instantly started--found the trace--rapidly pursued, and overtook them. He saw the trembling wretch bound to a tree, and the pile of wood around him ready to burn him, and the Indians preparing to dance to his shrieks and cries. The son rushes to the tree, cuts with his tomahawk the cord that bound him: in an instant the man flees and evades the torture. But the son is apprehended and burnt.

The wicked man now sees the great love and goodness of the father and of the son. He is convinced of his sins against them, and repents; he hates his sins, and his hatred to the good man and his son is slain, taken away--he is reconciled. He feels constrained to go to the father, confess his sins, and plead forgiveness. He goes weeping, humbly confessing his sins, and asks forgiveness. I forgive you, said the father joyfully, well knowing when he gave his son that nothing else could save the poor man, destroy his enmity, and reconcile him. Surely it was the love and goodness of the father and his son, and this love seen in the death of the son, that effected this great change in the man--that brought him to repentance, and consequently to forgiveness.

Now what effects did the death of the son produce in the father? [[@Page:63] Did it produce in him love, favor, or good will to the wicked man? No: these were in him before. Did it dispose, or make him more willing to pardon him? No: he was always willing to pardon him whenever he repented or came within the sphere of forgiveness. It had no direct effect on the father; it *directly* effected the wicked man to a change and repentance; it *indirectly* effected pleasure and joy in the father at the change and repentance *directly* effected in the man by the death of his son.

The application to our heavenly Father and to his Son is easy, and shows how repentance, forgiveness, redemption, sanctification, and the beating away of sin, are effected by love to the believing obedient soul. This figure is introduced only to show what principle leads to repentance and forgiveness--the goodness of God.

I will further remark, that forgiveness, and grace, or favor, are eternal attributes of God; they are therefore not effected in him by any thing in the universe. They, like every other perfection in him, flow to the proper object. Now the proper object of for is a penitent soul. As you say, the favor of God is like water damned up--a way must be made for it to flow, or it must remain damned up. Now I say that the impenitence of the sinner is the dam that prevents the forgiveness of God to flow to him. As soon as he repents the dam is removed, and God's forgiveness flows to him. An impenitent sinner is never pardoned. The grace of God flowed in the gift of Christ to the world; and the great work of Christ is to bring mankind to repentance or reconciliation. "Whom God has exalted to give repentance and remission of sins"--and "God was by Christ reconciling the world to himself." This was the ministration of the Apostles, and this the great design of the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus, which they every where preached. Faith in the gospel begets repentance, and forgiveness flows. Christ therefore has removed the dam which prevented the forgiveness of God flowing. The dam, the obstruction, was in the breast of the sinner, not in God. The death of Christ influences the sinner alone, but produced no *direct* effect on God.

We are directed to forgive, even as God forgives. But whom are we to forgive? "If thy brother repent, forgive him." "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us." Now if God will not forgive us till the claims of law and justice are fully satisfied by a substitute--then, as we are to forgive even as God forgives, we must not forgive till all legal and just claims are satisfied by our debtor, or his substitute or surety. Is this forgiveness at all? But as our surety has paid our debts, are we not indebted to him? How, then, can he forgive us, even as God forgives, till the debt is paid to him? We or another substitute must pay it. And yet we remain in debt to the second substitute, and so on forever. In fact, on this plan there can be no forgiveness forever. How unlike to this is the forgiveness of God! See Matth. xviii. 24.; Luke xv., *et passim*.

The government of God is the true model of all good civil governments among men. Mercy is always vested in the Executive by the supreme law of the land. Though a man be condemned to death by law, yet it is in the power of the Executive to forgive him, or remit the penalty. This is done when the Governor is assured by respectable [[@Page:64] petitioners for his pardon, that they believe he is penitent. Is this pardoning act against law? No! it is done according to the supreme law of the land. And is the law of God against his promises? Is not mercy in him from eternity? What

shall hinder him from pardoning the penitent? Man by feigned repentance may deceive man, but God, who knows the heart, cannot be deceived.

In my next I will notice your objections to my views from the beginning.

B. W. STONE.

LETTER V.-To. B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

My dear Sir--PERMIT me, with all respect for your superior years, to make a few suggestions on some points of order:--

1st. The numeration and titles of our letters are out of order. For example, the first article in your November *Christian Messenger*, is a letter to me, titled "*Atonement--No. IV.*" The next article is my letter to you, titled "*Letter III.--To B. W. Stone.*" The next is your letter to me, titled "*Atonement--No. III.*" In this way receding, a few more essays and you will get back to No. I! This, in my optics, is all confusion. Neither we, ourselves nor our readers can refer to any of these essays with accuracy or intelligibility. I may be to blame for so much of this as arose from the loss of your third article. But I move an amendment. I have therefore placed at the head of these articles their proper caption, and intend to do so hereafter.

2d. It also appears to me that there is a series of letters on hand without any connecting thread of argument: for example, instead of replying to my Letter IV., printed in your last, you print a new letter on a new subject. In this way we might print each a score of letters and develop no point, except how far we agreed or disagreed upon one of the most vital points in the Bible. True, you inform us at the close of your last, that you intend in your next to notice my objections to your views "from the beginning." I suggest to your experience whether a detailed and regular reply to each letter would not be better than a wholesale replication once in a long time.

3d. With all deference I would add a third suggestion. You sometimes seem to be fighting over the battles which some thirty years ago you waged against Kentucky orthodoxy, instead of endeavoring to come to an understanding among ourselves on what the scriptures teach on atonement. For example, at the close of the first paragraph of your last letter you say, "So the blood of the Lamb of God is the means appointed of God, by which he cleanses and forgives the penitent obedient believer."

"This," you add, "I will now endeavor to make appear." But who of us doubts or denies this!! Then come six pages of your Messenger filled with references to the Hebrew *nasa*, and the Greek *anaphero*, in proof that *nasa* signifies not to bear punishment of sin, but to bear sin away, to *forgive* it. This affects the questions debated by you thirty years ago, but is not called for in the present discussion. I have not introduced either *nasa* or *anaphero* into this investigation. But all this seems to me irrelevant to any thing yet between us; for whether correct or incorrect, it demonstrates [[@Page:65] not *in what way* the blood of Christ is the means of pardon. That it is the means of pardon we both agree, and you need not prove it. But *in what way* is it the means of pardon? This you have not yet shown, and your six pages of criticisms and references reach not this point at all.

4th. Hear me once more upon your illustration, as also partaking somewhat of the same ambiguity and irrelevance. You introduced it for one purpose, and then command us to apply it to another. The first sentence is, "How the *death* of Christ *bears away* our sins, or takes them away, I will endeavor to illustrate by a figure;" and at the end of the figure you tell us, "This figure is introduced only to show *what principle* leads to repentance and forgiveness--the goodness of God." Unless you mean the death of Christ bears away our sins by bearing repentance to us, I can see no relevancy between the introduction and application of your figure. May I be permitted to add, that in the six pages of Hebrew and Greek references, as well as in the *illustration* which follows them, the grand point is strangely forgotten or overlooked. The difficulty is not about the *necessity of his death in order to reconciling us to God*; but it is about the *necessity of his death in order to God's pardoning us*. Would you have one to believe that you make our repentance or reconciliation to God the only reason why he should forgive us! One might suppose that the drift of your letter before indicated the following to be the philosophy of your atonement:--The death of Christ is to be contemplated merely as a proof of God's goodness--that his goodness perceived in the death of his son, induces repentance; and that this repentance superinduces the pardon of sin. Hence the only necessity for the death of Christ to have occurred, is its superior fitness to produce repentance, which of itself alone when called into being constrains forgiveness. And would you have any one to think that Christ's death occurred simply to demonstrate God's goodness; and that this demonstration occurred simply to induce repentance, and that repentance alone superinduces forgiveness? Brother Stone, you must be explicit in this point, else we shall be greatly misunderstood, if not traduced by our opponents. For my part, I will stand up before the universe of God, not only in affirming, but in attempting to prove, that *the death of Jesus Christ our blessed and only Lord, was, and is, and evermore shall be*, AS NECESSARY TO DEMONSTRATING THE JUSTICE AS THE GOODNESS OF GOD IN FORGIVING SIN. To unite mercy and justice in forgiving the sinner, was, in my view, the supreme end of God's *sparing not* his own son; and I trust on this vital

point there will be no difference between us. Come up to it frankly and explicitly, brother Stone; the brethren and the community desire to understand us clearly on this great subject.

After the pains you have taken in this long epistle to enlighten the community upon *nasa* and *anaphero*, it will be expected that I should write something less than six or sixty pages indicative of my views. Allow me, then, to make a few remarks on the inductions you have laid before us. Time was when such array did intimidate your old antagonists, and awe into acquiescence the uneducated and speculative community. But in this more sceptical and inquisitive age we may concede all, at least much, of what you have advanced, (and [[@Page:66] certainly I, for one, do,) and yet contend that it positively and actually avails nothing at all as respects the great point at issue.

That *nasa* is often rendered as you say, is unquestionably true; but just as true it is that if there be any word in Hebrew or Greek that imports or could import bearing sin as a burthen, a load, and suffering under it and for it, or as a punishment; these are the words that can and do express it.

I need not inform one of your learning that *nasa* is found hundreds of times in the Hebrew Bible; and that, in the judgment of our most learned biblical critics and lexicographers, it is found in more than *twenty-five* different acceptations. Nay, you know that it is one of the most extensive roots in the Hebrew language. If I were to go into the detail, I shall engage to produce numerous and clear instances of its denoting *to impose heavy burdens, to load beasts, to impose grievances, taxes, and usury, to bear sin in a vicarious manner, to bear punishment, &c. &c.*; and from these facts, which can be fully substantiated from the Hebrew Bible, of what value is the induction which you have been at pains to collect? *Anaphero*, too, is only found ten times in the Greek Testament, and in half of these, at least, it is incapable of the translation you give it. Please consider Heb. vii. 27., where it occurs twice, and cannot signify *to bear away*; and also xiii. 21.; as well as 1 Peter ii. 5. and 25. Consult also James ii. 21. I will not, unless compelled by the high regard I have for your learning and your virtues, go into these inductions; for surely our numerous readers would not thank us for our pains.

I will only add, after requesting you to brush the dust off your Parkhurst Hebrew Lexicon, and if you choose to refresh your memory, you may look into Roys, (not a work of high authority, except as a concordance,) and you may find from one to two hundred occurrences of this interesting word, diverse from those you have given. I say, I will only add that your reasonings and inductions on *nasa* leave Isaiah lii. 4, 11, 12, as it was. If, indeed, this whole chapter do not teach that the Messiah did suffer *for* us, the just *for the unjust*--that he both bore our sins, and bore them away--

that he was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities, stricken of God, and afflicted for our offendings--that it pleased Jehovah to bruise him, to put him to grief, and to make his soul an offering for sin--it can prove, it does prove, nothing at all.

Speculators and system-mongers, unable to make these scriptures tally with their notions of justice and expediency, have contended against the language of Apostles and Prophets as figurative and far-fetched, and sought to substitute for the doctrine of the Spirit a vocabulary of their own, more agreeable to their respective theories. I fear some may imagine a squinting of this sort in some remarks of yours, as the following:--"Does law or justice admit of such substituted punishment?" What law, or what justice? In return I ask, *Does law or justice admit of the punishment by death of an innocent person?* My dear sir, we have many very imperfect logicians among system-makers as well as in other classes of society. They dash on Scylla while steering from Charybdis. We see the divine law impinged when something impinges our theory of God's justice; but we do not see that while we are protecting the *law* we are dishonoring [[@Page:67] the *character* of God by imputing to him the sacrifice of his Son most unjustly and cruelly. For, mark what I say, *if the Messiah, God's Son, did not die under the imputation of sin, as a sin-offering, and for us sinners, all the logicians in America will not convince me that it was just to suffer him to die at all.* And who allowed his death! Was he not delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God? He asked to be *spared*; but God *could not spare him and save man*; and therefore he submitted, saying, "*Not as I will, but as thou wilt.*" "He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all."--"Awake," said Jehovah, "O sword, against my Shepherd--against the man that is my fellow--smite the Shepherd, and let the sheep be scattered." We know who has applied this to the Father and the Son.

I have weighed the above italicised proposition, and am sorry to discover that it does not seem to have impressed its momentous weight upon your mind. Why, my dear sir, if God's only and well beloved Son could be murdered according to prophecy, by his counsel and foreknowledge, by his own immutable will, without any sin done by him or imputed to him, who could feel safe in the universe of God, though innocent as Jesus, and pure as the throne of Jehovah? When, then, you ask, "*Does law or justice admit of such substituted punishment!*" remember what the denial of it implies and involves. I ask, Do law and justice admit of the punishment by death of an innocent person! Nay, what moral law justifies the suffering of an innocent person? Every demurrer against the imputation of sin with whom I have debated, is stricken dumb just at this point. Any one that can show me the justice and the law of reason that sanctions the death of those dear innocents whom Herod slew, whom God has slain in the deluge, in Sodom, Egypt, and Jerusalem, that he slays every day by the scythe of death, I will in return show to him the justice of substitution and imputation-

-I will justify the death of the Messiah as a sin-offering by all the facts, documents, and reasons by which he justifies events innumerable, occurring still in the fortunes of every family in the observation of every man of sense and reflection.

As I have not now room for a full exposition of my views on this subject, I must defer till another moon. Meantime, my dear sir, I will send you this, *in proof*, a month before the number appears, that you may have time to explain yourself before the next number be due. Come up to the points now elicited, and leave the Westminster Divines and your orthodox opponents to themselves. We have the Bible, and that is enough. Our brethren are anxious for the full examination of this whole subject.

As ever, yours,

A. C.

A T O N E M E N T--*No. VI.*

REVIEW OF LETTERS, FIRST AND SECOND.

March, 1841

Dear brother Campbell--I HAVE finished the four numbers on the Atonement which I at first designed to publish. I now proceed to notice your objections and arguments against my views, in the order in which they are written. I shall commence with our first and second letters, and shall always quote from the Messenger in order to avoid confusion.

1st. In the very commencement of your first letter to me I was startled indeed. You say, "I most cordially concur in opinion with those brethren who have persuaded you that your fears were groundless, or would never be realized, concerning the discussion of those points which you called for, under date of your letter of November 11, 1839, published page 21 of the current volume." Did I, brother Campbell, ever call upon you for a discussion of those points? I never seriously thought of such a thing till yourself suggested, and publicly invited me to it. You have certainly mistaken me; for such an idea cannot be found in the letter alluded to above, as you will see by re-examining it. I wish to remove from the minds of our readers the idea of vanity and fondness for debate, as attaching to my character, now when I am on the verge of the grave. Those things commonly attach to youth, and dotage.

2d. On page 247 you have made a number of assertions respecting the death of Christ, which would require volumes to attempt to prove, and as many to defend. 1st.

"That the death of Christ is interwoven with all the designs of the universe. 2d. That Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the moral dominions of God. 3d. That its power is the mainspring of all heavenly impulses. 4th. That it is itself the consummation of all wisdom and prudence. 5th. That the deep and high counsels of God issue in this mysterious fact, and emanate from it, "as all earthly waters arise from the ocean and descend to it."

Whence my brother got all this information, I cannot conceive; certainly not from the divine revelations we have received. They are too high for my limited intellect to grasp, and too deep to fathom. How do we know "all the designs of the universe"? Countless millions of them may exist in the Infinite Mind never yet developed, and may not be for endless ages to come. How, then, can we know that the death of Christ is interwoven with them all? How little do we know with certainty of his revealed designs in our little speck of creation! How can my brother say that Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the moral dominions of God? Can we measure the full extent of those dominions, and know all the mysteries in them, to enable us to make the comparison? How can we know that the power of the death of Christ is the *mainspring* of all heavenly impulses? Is it the mainspring to move God to be propitious to men? Is it the mainspring that moved God to create angels and worlds? Is it the mainspring to move angels to worship their Maker? Can we safely say, "that it is the consummation of all wisdom and prudence?" [[@Page:113] The *ultimatum*--the very end of wisdom, that can rise no higher, and progress no farther! My dear brother, humility becomes us, poor, little, ignorant things. Often in your answers to my essays, you kindly apologize for me. I am bound to reciprocate the kindness. Your mind has been called to so many subjects of importance, that you have neglected to examine this old relict of your faith received by tradition of your fathers, and therefore have unguardedly expressed it. I cannot for a moment think that you, by this speculation, designed to forestall the sentiments of our readers.

3d. On page 250 you apologize for my misapprehension and misquotation of an expression in your "Christian System," pages 48 and 49, which I quoted in my first number. I cannot see that I have either misapprehended or misquoted you; but am glad to hear you disavow the sentiment I apprehended from the expression. The words in your "Christian System" are, "In bringing many souls to glory, it soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." My quotation is, "The death of Christ soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." Your quotation of it is, "The death of Christ in bringing many sons to glory, soothes and delights," &c. If there be a misquotation of your "Christian System," which of us is guilty? It may be you quoted from the first edition; mine is from the second. Yours cannot be from the second edition. Yet I cannot conceive how you could be so startled at my quotation, that every sin wounds the affection of our

heavenly Feather, and that the death of Christ soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father, when you so strenuously contend that his death *propitiates* him. I can see no difference of ideas in the expressions. Your language is strange, and might lead your less informed readers to conclude that the Father's wounds were soothed and healed by blood. Many such yet devoutly sing--

"Rich were the drops of Jesus' blood,
That calm'd his frowning race,
That sprinkled o'er the burning throne,
And turn'd his wrath to grace."

I know you spurn the ideas stated in this language, yet I cannot see how you can avow expressions conveying the same idea, as that the blood of Christ propitiates.

REVIEW OF LETTER II.

4th. The burden of my second letter is, to prove that the verb *kaphar*, translated to make an atonement, signifies to purge or cleanse, and that this was the design of sin-offering. This sentiment you do not deny nor oppose *directly*; for truly our translators, and Paul, the commentator of Moses, have set this matter beyond dispute, or fair debate, as I have shown in Letter II.

5th. I will also state another idea which may have escaped the penetrating mind of my brother. It is this, that the Hebrew word *kaphar* is an active transitive verb, and, according to all grammatical rules, must have an object upon which the action passes. Now, this object cannot be, God; for *kaphar*, the active verb, signifies to cleanse. [[@Page:114] This action of cleansing cannot pass on the object God; for he is undefiled, and needs no purification. For the same reason, the action of cleansing cannot pass on the holy law, nor on the government of God, because they are pure like their author. When, therefore, we so frequently find this expression, "He shall take a lamb, or goat, and make an atonement for his sin"--we should read it, He shall cleanse himself [not God] for or on account of his sin; the object of the action *cleanse* being plainly understood. Unless his sin be purged or cleansed, the political union between the defiled sinner, and his God, and the congregation, is broken; but when he is purified, the union, or at-one-ment, is restored between them.

6th. The same ideas hold good with respect to the word *reconciliation*. It is translated from the same word *kaphar*, and therefore signifies the same as at-one-ment; and the ideas just stated as attaching to at-one-ment, equally attach to reconciliation. They are one, and not that at-one-ment is the cause of reconciliation,

and reconciliation the effect of at-one-ment, as my brother asserts, and thinks that in this I agree with him. I am sorry to disagree with a dear brother; but in this I am obliged to dissent. Nor can I conceive how you took up the idea of my believing that reconciliation was the effect of atonement, when, throughout the second letter, I was laboring to establish the idea that they were one. You must have gotten the idea from the quotation I made from Calmet, page 290, to show that atonement meant at-one-ment. In the quotation are these words, "By whom we have received the at-one-ment, or means of reconciliation." I quoted this, not as approving the divinity, but for establishing the meaning of a word.

7th. The same ideas contained in the 5th and 6th items, also apply to propitiation. Its scriptural meaning is purification. With this my brother accords, page 296, when he says, "Propitiation or *purification* is also an effect of atonement. So we find it applies to God, Ezek. xvi. 63. 'When I am propitiated (*exhilaskesthai*, com. version, *pacified*) to you for all that you have done, saith the Lord.' So prayed the publican--'God be merciful to me a sinner.' Hence we find the word *hilasmos* twice in the first epistle of John, applies to Christ's blood--*the propitiation* [*purification*] *for our sins*; Messiah, as foretold by Daniel, will make propitiation [*purification*] for iniquity."

8th. How you can make propitiation and purification the same, and to be the effect of atonement, I cannot see; and still it is more strange that you should say that these apply to God, and adduce Ezek. xvi. 63. as proof. Upon your own definition of *propitiation*, as meaning purification, it evidently follows that the effect of atonement is to purify God himself. I do not impute to you the idea, but to your language. My brother must know that the word *exhilaskesthai*, which you have quoted from the Septuagint, is the very word by which uniformly they translate the Hebrew *kaphar*, and which our translators have rendered to make atonement, to reconcile and cleanse, Num. xxv. 33, &c. properly, to cleanse or cover, which are active transitive verbs.

9th. God is represented by the Psalmist as "a Sun and a Shield." The natural sun shines invariably and unchangeably the same, and gives light, life, and comfort to all, creatures on earth. A dark cloud [[@Page:115] intervenes, and obstructs the enlightening, warming, and quickening rays of the sun from us. But this cloud has no effect on the sun--he still unchangeably pours forth his undiminished rays of light and heat; but the cloud obstructs them from us--they cannot penetrate it; and as long as that cloud remains we are cut off from all influence of the sun, and must be miserable. So God is a sun, and shines invariably and unchangeably the same, for the light, life, and comfort of all holy beings. But our sins, as a thick cloud, have risen between us and our God, and obstructed the rays of light, life, and comfort from flowing to us; and in this miserable situation we must remain forever, while that cloud of sin

remains. Whatever removes this cloud, removes the separation between us and our God, and takes away the obstruction of his divine rays of light, life, and comfort, and restores them to us again. Now where, or in whom, does the obstruction exist? Not in God, all must agree; but it exists entirely in man.--Jesus came into the world, sent by the Father to remove this obstruction to his love, grace, and mercy flowing into the sinner. This has Jesus done by his life, death, and resurrection; for his blood cleanseth from all sin. By faith, repentance, and obedience, we are reconciled to God, sanctified, washed, and purified from all sin.

10th. Suppose while the natural cloud obstructed the rays of the natural sun from falling on us, a wind should arise and dissipate the cloud. We then would say, the wind has restored to us the light and heat of the sun, and caused it to shine again for our comfort. This would not be true in philosophy, for the wind produced no effect on the sun--it only removed the obstruction of its rays to us. So the blood of Christ had no effect on God, but only removed our sin, which obstructed his divine rays from shining into us. So may we say, that God is at-one-ed, reconciled, and propitiated to us by the blood of Christ. But with whom is he at-one-ed, reconciled, and propitiated? Is it with the unchanged impenitent sinner? Impossible, for the holy nature of God can never be at-one-ed, reconciled, or propitiated to the unholy nature of man--there must be an eternal enmity between them; nor could all the blood of the universe effect such a union. But God was always, and will forever be, in union with his own divine nature; and when we, through the blood of Christ, become partakers of the divine nature, we become one with him, and he one with us. In this sense God may be said to be at-one, reconciled, propitiated, and pacified to us, when we are changed into his divine nature, without any change in himself. The whole change is effected in us. Is it any where in the Bible stated that God was atoned to the impenitent, irreconciled, disobedient sinner? How, then, does my brother so strenuously contend that the atonement, which he believes is effected in God by the blood of Christ, is the *cause* of the reconciliation *made* in man?

11th. My brother's criticisms and speculations on the difference between the words *atonement* and *reconciliation*, are novel, and entirely unsatisfactory to my mind. I view them perfectly arbitrary, and unsupported by one divine writer in the Bible. Our translators have rendered the words atonement and reconciliation uniformly, if not universally, from the same Hebrew word *kaphar*. In the New Testament they have translated the Greek word *katallagee*, atonement and reconciliation, invariably. It seems never to have entered their minds [[@Page:116] that there was a difference of meaning in the terms, or that one was the cause, and the other the effect, as you have stated, page 296.--There you say, "Originally, literally, and properly, atonement (*hilasmos*) is that which makes one, and reconciliation (*katallagee*) is made one. The one is the cause, and the other is the

effect. If this be doubted, we have a superabundance of evidence to offer." My dear brother, I do most sincerely doubt it, and greatly need that superabundant evidence. But I will wait patiently till you shall give it. I do hope that the evidence to be given will be more convincing than the one you have adduced as a sample, viz. "*That things which cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned*"; such as the tabernacle, the altar, and their furniture. Surely my brother has forgotten that these very things are said to be reconciled, but never atoned; for the word *atoned* is not once named in the Bible. What this your argument has to do in support of your strange proposition, I cannot see.

12th. I really begin to doubt whether I understand you, when you speak of so many things being the effect of atonement--as purification, or expiation; propitiation, or purification, page 296. You must mean in these cases by atonement, the victim by which the atonement was made. If this be your meaning, we are agreed. I have formerly admitted that the victim for sacrifice might be called the atonement; but as I find it not so called in the Bible, I have dropt the idea, and advise you to do the same. If by atonement you mean the effect of sacrifice, and believe that atonement, expiation, propitiation, and purification, are synonyms, how can you say that they are effects of atonement? As well might you say that atonement is the effect of atonement. Your mind appears to be a little confused, as you think mine once was.

13th. On the same page 296, you say, "Do I misconceive my brother Stone, when I interpret his views of atonement as excluding the idea of propitiating or pacifying our heavenly Father?" I answer, You have not misconceived me, as you will see in the remarks above. I do hope, brother Campbell, that I have misconceived you; for you say, page 297, "Well, I am glad to be in such good company as that of brother Stone, who concludes with me *then*, and not till *then*, of course--'*then* is God, his law, and government pleased, or reconciled with the person,' &c. &c." Yes, *then*, and not till *then*, is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person, &c. This I acknowledge to be my language. In this, you say, I conclude with you. I am glad of it; yet this conclusion as yours I have never seen nor known, till you have here expressed it. I had always before thought your conclusion different. Had the sentence been fully quoted, our readers would have better understood our agreement. The person of whom I was speaking was sanctified, cleansed, and made holy--*then*, when made holy or sanctified and reconciled to God--*then*, and not till *then*, is God pleased and reconciled to him. The same idea I have fully stated on the preceding page. Does brother Campbell thus conclude? If so, why does he say that I must ultimately concede that sacrifice has an effect on God? p. 26. In conclusion of the present letter, I ask my dear brother Campbell, where in the scriptures is atonement, reconciliation, or propitiation ever said, to be directly effected in God by blood of sacrifices?

[[@Page:117]

May the Lord lead us into all truth! As ever, your old and loving brother,

B. W. STONE.

LETTER VI.--To. B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

My dear Sir--YOUR recent reviews of matters one year old, are so far in your rear, and so far off date, that neither myself, nor many of my readers, will be able to see where they strike. Neither does your No I. touch any point in discussion. As to how the discussion commenced, I refer our readers to your letter of November, 1839, and to my reply in February following. They will be found in pages 21 and 81, vol. 4, 1840. The next item in the first review is upon my style of speaking of Christ crucified: I give it too much consequence, and speak too extravagantly of it, you seem to think. But my style, or your style, is no argument; and our brethren desire argument and evidence on this subject. You except to my saying that Christ crucified is the most transcendent mystery in the dominions of God--that the death of Christ is interwoven with all the designs of the universe--that it is the consummation of all wisdom and prudence, &c. &c.

Paul may, or may not, have authorized me to use those identical words; still I feel that he justifies my style. He says, "Great is the mystery of godliness!" *'God was manifest in the flesh,'* &c. What mystery can surpass this! "All things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Is not the death of Christ interwoven with all the designs of the universe! Angels desire to look into this deep and wonderful scheme. "In him dwells all the fulness of the godhead bodily"--"In him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are deposited."--"He is the wisdom and the power of God." "He upholds all things by the word of his power." "God will gather all things together in him, both in heaven and in earth." He is "the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last." If my sayings are not sustained by these, and many such, let them be repudiated. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."

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

In your second review you recur to your peculiar and favorite acceptation of the active transitive verb *kaphar*, to cover with blood or water, and metonymically to *cleanse*. Your argument from this word is precisely that of the Paidobaptists on the word *immerse*. Dr. Bucher, Jun. says that *baptize* signifies to *purify*, and a thousand others go for *washing*, *cleansing*, &c. because such are sometimes the effects of immersion. But they greatly err as *philologists*, as logicians, and as Christians in substituting a metonymy of the effect for the cause, and making the apple the definition of the word *tree*. The lad who would define the term *tree* by saying it meant an apple, would be quite as learned a philologist in the case, as he who would say that the term *baptize* means to cleanse, to wash, or to purify. If a man should be [[@Page:118] immersed in mud, who would say that he must be clean, because the word *immerse* means to cleanse! This is no speculation, as you very good humoredly answer some of my gravest points, calling them "a speculation"--"ingenious speculation," But really I am a little surprised at your mode of interpreting and applying such words as *kaphar* and *nasa*, &c. Still there is nothing gained on your selection of meanings; for we sometimes speak of *vindicating* and *justifying* God; and might, in the same latitude, speak of cleansing and sanctifying him. Indeed, the scriptures of truth speak of justifying and sanctifying God, and use these terms as active transitive verbals--"That thou mayest be justified when thou judgest"--"Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts"--"I sanctify myself," said Jesus, &c. But what say the Lexicons and Concordances on this word *kaphar*? *Do they sustain you?* They show that "to cover" is the original and radical sense of this very common verb; that the *covering of the ark* is called *kaphporeth*, a derivative from *kaphar*. The Arabic shows its ancient and common acceptation by the verb *kafara*, to hide, to conceal; so does the Syriac and the Chaldea, as our best Lexicons demonstrate. It is rendered, as you say, by the Septuagint *hilaskesthai*, to expiate; and by John, *hilasmos*; and among all the Greek writers, sacred and profane, no religious word is more definitely clear and express than this one. It is found, Dan. ix. 24; Heb. x. 4; John ii. 2. and indicates propitiation, expiation, atonement. In Genesis vi. 14., it is first found indicating the cover of the ark. In Genesis xxxii. it is rendered *appease*; but indicates, "I will cover myself from the anger of my brother." See Parkhurst on its various acceptations; all of which, down to the Hebrew and Greek *ransom*, and to the Arabic and Turkish *caphar*, or tax on travellers, show that it means any thing that hides, conceals, and consequently appeases, reconciles, and propitiates. So that among ten or a dozen figurative meanings of the word, *cleanse* is but one, So wide are its figurative applications, that we find it including the cypress tree, and the pitch which shuts out the light and covers from the water.

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

I object, brother Stone, as much to your manner of quoting my words, as to your use of Dictionaries and translations. You say under item 7th of your review, "Its scriptural meaning is purification;" and then you make me agree to it by saying, "With this my brother accords, page 296, where he says propitiation or purification is also an effect of atonement." Now I ask, in the fair and veritable construction of language, are you justified not merely in saying that its "scriptural meaning is purification," but in using the above sentence to show that I so understand it. Then may I say in reply, 'Its scriptural meaning is pitch;' and with this brother Stone accords, for he knows and will admit that it is so found in Gen vi. 14!

Many of our readers might pore over these criticisms a lifetime, and be as wise on the subject when dying as when being born. I put it to your good sense if we had not better keep to the English and common sense. After reprobating my making atonement the cause, and [[@Page:119] purification, reconciliation, propitiation, &c. the effects of it, you come to the same conclusion yourself. You very justly say, "I really begin to doubt whether I understand you when you speak of so many things being the effect of atonement--as propitiation, purification, expiation. You must mean in these cases, by atonement, the victim by which the atonement was made." You are perfectly right, my dear sir, in this conclusion. And if you had suspected it sooner, you might have saved the most part of your present review.

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

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

I cannot see how your figure or analogy between a cloud and sin, and wind and blood, reaches this case at all. The wind that removes the cloud, you say, "produces no

effect on the sun;" neither does it on the man! But the removal of the cloud shows to man the sun. Well, does it not also show man to the sun! It affects the one just as much as the other. And here I am sorry to see you for the first time unequivocally say that ,the blood of Christ had no effect on God." Will you please attempt to reconcile this singular saying with Paul, Rom. iii. 25, 26. "Whom God has set forth a propitiatory, through faith in his blood, (a covering, or mercy-seat,) to declare his justice in remitting past sins," &c. "To declare (continues the Apostle) at this time his justice--that HE MIGHT BE JUST and the justifier of the believer," &c. You have, then, no faith in Christ's blood as affecting God, but only as affecting men! But this declaration, singular though it be, is excelled by one at the close of the preceding paragraph. You say, "By faith, repentance, and obedience we are reconciled to God, sanctified, washed, and purified from all sin." Now I had been accustomed to teach that none but the reconciled could acceptably obey God. But you make obedience, equally with faith and repentance, a condition of personal reconciliation. Now, strange as it may appear, I cannot think that your words definitely convey your ideas on this subject; *for surely you have faith in Christ's blood!* Now the person who has no use for Christ's blood but to be reconciled by it, can have no faith in it; for why should he rely upon the death of the Messiah, as it can have no effect upon God!

Having yourself suspected the reason of your misconception of my placing reconciliation, expiation, purification, &c. &c. as the effect of atonement; it is unnecessary for me to prove that I am right in the sense for which I contend for it. You agree with me. The death of Christ is a sacrifice, the effects of which, believed, are, expiation, purification, reconciliation, justification, sanctification, &c. You say you "hope the evidence to be given will be more convincing than the one you have adduced as a sample--viz. that things which cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned; such as the tabernacle, the altar, &c. &c. "These things, you inform me, are all said to be reconciled, but never atoned." Your not observing that I use *atone* as the translation of *hilasko*, and *reconciliation* as the translation of *katallagee*, was no doubt, my dear sir, the cause of your thus representing me; which, without the slightest intention on your part, amounts to a misrepresentation. Now an altar cannot be reconciled, but it may be atoned in the sense contended for.

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

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

Among other ends of Christ's death, brother Russel says, "But the main design, the primary, and principal object had in view in the death of the precious Lamb of God--a design to which all others are subordinate, and around which they revolve as the grand attracting centre of the plan of salvation, was that *he might become a sin-offering for us*, and by his blood cleanse us from all unrighteousness, and render it possible for God to maintain his law, vindicate his authority, and at the same time be "the justifier of him that believeth." But as this point will need more extended proof and illustration than we can well give in this number, we will leave this point till another week."

Now, my venerable Father Stone, if you will give us a few more reviews one year after date, I will set about giving you some defences from your "Christian brethren" of the East. As I am leaving home [[@Page:121] for some two or three months, and as I may not see your reviews during my absence, I leave an essay on Atonement from brother Russel, of the Christian Herald, instead of a formal reply to your reviews, which I request you to place upon your pages.

Sincerely and devoutly yours, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

A T O N E M E N T--No. VII.

To A. Campbell

April 1841

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S THIRD LETTER.

My dear brother Campbell--I AM glad to find that we appear to be approximating to each other in some of our views on the subject under discussion; yet there are a few

ideas in your third letter to which also I do object. They are contained in your seven propositions, and what follows, pages 391, 392.

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

But my brother's proof turns out to be a mere conjecture--*a may be so*; for he says, "Pious Jews may, therefore, like the pious patriarchs Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, &c. &c. have had views superior to the legal economy." Your argument is this--As [[@Page:156] the patriarchs Abel, Enoch, Noah, and others, when they offered sacrifice, saw by faith the blood of the Messiah to be in future shed for the remission of sins; so pious Jews, like them, may have had views superior to the legal economy; they also may have seen and believed in the blood of Messiah to be shed in future for remission of their sins, in their approach to God; while those not pious under the law, could not see nor believe in it. This is taking for granted what needs proof. It cannot be proved that Abel, Enoch, or any of the patriarchs or pious Jews had these views of the blood of Christ, or faith in that blood in their sacrifices.

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

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

Prop. 3. With this proposition in general I cordially agree. It contains the sentiments I have advocated for many years. You say, "The life and death, the blessing and curse of the law, were merely fleshly and temporal, and therefore the virtue of its sacrifice could extend no farther than to temporal life and temporal blessings.--When, therefore, a Jew had forfeited these, the sacrificial law had no blessings in store for him. Deut. xxviii. 1-68." I am glad my brother has at length conceded the point of difference between us; for you say, "When a Jew had forfeited these, (one of which is temporal life) the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for him." Every Jew, therefore, who had forfeited his life by committing a sin worthy of death, had no blessing in store for him in the sacrificial provisions; therefore my conclusion is true, that the idolater, the blasphemer, the murderer, &c. must die without the benefit of sacrifice. You have in this also relinquished your idea, that all sins of every class, except apostacy, were annually purged from all Israel in the great day of atonement by sacrifice. You will no longer contend, that if the virtue of sacrifice only extended to the purging away of sins of ignorance, or errors, or sins not worthy of death by law, that they could not be typical of the sacrifice of Christ, seeing you admit that sins worthy of death were not by law permitted to be purged with blood. In your own words, "I truly admire your candor in giving up this opinion, as irreconcilable with truth." p. 392.

But my brother seems to be too precipitate in his conclusion. This is common, and hardly to be avoided when a truth first glares upon the mind. We then are apt to speak unguardedly. This you have done in saying, "When a Jew had forfeited these (temporal blessings) the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for him." Now we [[@Page:157] know that many of the Jews, by sins of ignorance, errors, and ceremonial defilement, forfeited many temporal blessings, as union with the congregation, the worship of God in the sanctuary, &c. yet they were admitted the privilege of sacrificing for their cleansing, by which the at-one-ment was effected between them and the congregation, and their God.

Prop. 4. This proposition contains but one idea against which I object. It is this, "That the legal sacrifices, in order to sanctify its subjects, must be accompanied with repentance, and the previous qualifications." This is true with respect to remission of sins, both under the Old and New Testament. But there are many cases in the Old Testament where sacrifice cleansed or sanctified persons, of whom repentance could not be required; as the leper, the man with a running issue, a woman after child birth, and many others.

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

Prop. 6. You say that "no transgression or sin, even that of ignorance, or of mere ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven. No

repentance, nor amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission." In a note appended you say, "David guilty of murder and adultery, was pardoned, and certainly not without sacrifice; for without shedding of blood is no remission."

My dear brother, we may be too positive in our opinions, even to the contradiction of plain scripture declarations. You have made several declarations in this proposition indefensible by the scriptures, and apparently contrary to them; as you affirm, "that no transgression or sin could, without sacrifice, be forgiven." Do, my brother, read Numbers xiv. 19, 20. Moses prayed for rebellious Israel thus:--"Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt until now. And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word." On what grounds was this pardon granted? Not on the ground of sacrifice; but according to the greatness of thy mercy through the means of Moses' prayer. On what grounds were the captivity in Babylon pardoned, when for seventy years they offered no sacrifices, seeing their temple, altar, and city were in ruins? Or will you say there were none pardoned? On what grounds were they pardoned for whom Solomon prayed at the dedication of the temple, 2 Chron. vi? On what grounds were those pardoned who ate of the passover in the days of Hezekiah, not cleansed nor sanctified by sacrifice. "But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary. And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah; and healed the people." 2 Chron. xxv. 19, 20. I ask again, on what grounds were the Ninevites pardoned? I might multiply cases, but one more shall suffice. On what ground was David pardoned for murder and adultery? Not on the ground of sacrifice; for we have agreed that for a Jew who had forfeited his life by committing a sin worthy of death, that the sacrificial law had no blessings in store--and David himself, when confessing these very sins, says, "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it--certainly implying that he had not given it. Yet my brother asserts, he [[@Page:158] was pardoned, "and certainly not without sacrifice, for without shedding of blood is no remission." The pardon David received was not legal nor carnal, but spiritual. This we agree was never obtained by legal sacrifices; but David obtained it of the Lord for his name's sake, or for his mercy's sake, as he frequently declares. To these queries you appear to have given but little attention.

You assert again in this 6th proposition that no ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven." This is truly the most unguarded expression I ever saw from the pen of my brother Campbell. A man under the law became unclean by touching an unclean person or thing, or even a dead body. Now I ask, was it a sinful act to bury the dead, or to touch even accidentally an unclean person or thing, so sinful that he must repent and offer a sacrifice for forgiveness? In

such cases neither repentance nor sacrifice was even required. The law in such cases is, that the person bathe in water and wash his clothes, and be unclean until the evening.

Prop. 7th, and last. "That the legal institution was typical. Its covenant, altar, priests, victims, all were but shadows of good things to come, through a greater and more perfect tabernacle; therefore, faith, repentance, baptism, prayer, and all acts of obedience, without the blood of the new institution, cannot obtain the remission of the least sin in the universe of God."

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

My brother does not seem to bear patiently the idea that I should call his opinion a new doctrine. p. 392. Had you examined the sentence a little more closely you would have found that I did not call it a new doctrine. My words are these: "This, to me, is a new doctrine." There may be a thousand doctrines new to me, yet old and familiar to others, and they may be true. I doubt not there may be some doctrines taught in the world, and even in the Bible, new to yourself. The imputation of new doctrines in this cavilling age, is sufficient to sink the reputation of any man. But what harm is it to discover a new doctrine or truth in the word of God, and make it known to our fellow-creatures? If there is any thing offensive in my words, you have sufficiently retaliated in your reply: for you say, "Yours is indeed a new doctrine." This is positive enough. Let us leave to our readers to [[@Page:159] determine which doctrine is new or old. My doctrine is, that the law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin, and so obtain pardon by law. Your doctrine is, that the law admitted sacrifice for all sins of every description but one--the sin of apostacy.

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

On page 392 you say, "I can sympathize with you in your morbid excitement about certain terms, such as *expiation*, *pacified*, *propitiation*, &c. and can bear with all good feeling your admonition about living up to my maxim about the pure speech and language of Ashdod." You cannot, my brother, sympathize with me; for I do not suffer under such a morbid excitement about certain terms, as *expiation*, *pacified*, *propitiate*, &c.; your &c. implying others not named, as objected to. I object to no Bible terms; I never objected to the terms *pacified* or *propitiation*, for these are Bible terms; but to the word *expiate* I have objected, because it is not once named in the Bible.

On page 393 you say, "But is *expiate* an unscriptural term? Open your Cruden's Concordance, and see the opinion of that greatest of verbal interpreters. But does Cruden, or Butterworth, or any other who have made a Concordance of the scriptures, write the word *expiate* in their catalogue of words, and refer to the texts where it may be found in the Bible? But Cruden uses the word *expiate*. Yes, and so does he use many of those words you have renounced as the language of Ashdod. Receive the language of these greatest of verbal interpreters, and you must expunge your chapter on the language of Ashdod.

On page 393 you ask me, "And is *atone for* an unscriptural phrase? You immediately ask, What is the difference between *atone for* and *to make an atonement for*? please explain to me, for I do not appreciate any!" And how does my brother know that I have made any difference between the two phrases? By the help of critics you have come to the conclusion that *expiate*, *atone*, *propitiate*, are scriptural terms, if not found in our English Bibles, yet they are according to the Septuagint, and New Testament Greek. So I conclude, and will thank brother Stone to show me any error in this conclusion." This I view as an entire aberration from the point in hand. But I am glad my brother has made a concession in his remarks on *expiation*, from which, it is hoped, he will never recede.

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

Testament, being generally the Septuagint translation of *kaphar*, which, in our version, is rendered to make an atonement, or to cleanse. I have [[@Page:160] said, in the Now Testament *hilaskomai* is found but twice, and once translated to make reconciliation for iniquity. Heb. ii. 17. According, then, to your criticism, it should be rendered to expiate or purge away sin, and in Luke, xviii. 13. "God, be merciful to me a sinner"--according to your criticism, it should read properly, O! God, make an atonement or purification for me a sinner--that is, purge me from sin. So its cognate *hilasmos*, 1 John ii. 2., and iv. 10., translated *propitiation*, means that Christ is he that cleanses from all sins. The text in Ezek. xvi. 63., you by examination will find a mistranslation. "When I am pacified to thee, saith the Lord." You will find the word *kaphar* there in *kal*, or active voice, and in the perfect tense. It would then read, 'When I have made all atonement or purification for thee, God is not then the person purified, pacified, or expiated, but defiled Israel. Will any Hebrew scholar deny this?

On page 394 you ask, "And does my brother Stone teach that the blood of bulls and goats had virtue to expiate sins of ignorance--errors, but no virtue to expiate other sins? From this I do not wholly dissent. I do not believe that all the blood of all the animals on earth were it all poured out at the foot of one altar, could take away one *onoema*, one sin of ignorance--one of the errors of the people." In this we are agreed; for I have before stated that it was God himself that took away or pardoned sin, and that the blood of the offerings was the means appointed through which he did it. Our Pedobaptist friends have frequently used your argument against baptism for remission. We do not believe, say they, that all the water in the world can wash away one sin--the least sin. We have simply answered them, that the water, or immersion in it, was only the means by which God remitted sin; yet we hesitate not to say in the language of Peter, that "baptism now saves us." So the Physicalists say to us, when urging the gospel as the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth--O, say they, we do not believe that all the Bibles in the world will save from one sin, the least sin. We reply that God alone is the Saviour; but that he saves through the means of his word believed and obeyed. Now can these people seriously think we are such fools as to believe that the gospel or baptism can save any from sin--from the least sin, independent of God? And does my brother think that I am so ignorant as to believe that the blood of beasts could take away even sins of ignorance or errors? Especially when I have so plainly taught the contrary in this very discussion? I have gone farther than you on this subject; I have said in my last letter, that all the blood of the universe, the blood of Christ not excepted, could not take away our sin--the least sin. His blood was only the means through which God did the work. Yet of the sacrifices of the law, we say with Paul, that they sanctified to the purifying of the flesh; and with John we say, the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.

On page 394 you say, "I do moreover regard the contrast between sins and errors to be purely speculative and imaginative. If I am called upon, I will prove it by a list of quotations, in which those errors are called sins." If to make a difference between presumptuous sins and errors, as I have done, be speculative and imaginative, then have I been misled by Moses himself; for he makes a marked distinction between them in Num. xv. 22-32. Do, my dear brother, [[@Page:161] read this paragraph again with attention, and you will see cause to retract your Words. Our blessed Lord once said, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures;" but had they known them, their sin must have been presumptuous and wilful. Do we not commonly make a difference in our frequent communications with one another? You yourself say, "On reconsideration you will perceive the error"--i. e. of calling yours a new doctrine. You did not charge me with committing a sin, but of error through ignorance of your meaning. Mark the difference in Psalm xix. 12, 13.

On page 394, you say, "Might I ask you, my dear sir, to read and consider again Heb. ix. 15. Mark these words: The Mediator Jesus by means of his own death for the redemption of transgressions, not transgressors--not sinners, but sins committed by the called under the first or former Testament." You add that I was "unfortunate in a former allusion to this chapter; but you have said nothing more. I have your judgment of the matter, but you have given us no argument upon which that judgment is formed. Let us read the whole text--"And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions of the first Testament, they that are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

Two things are here stated to be accomplished by the death of the Mediator. 1st. The redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament. 2d. That the called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. The first referred to the Jews only, for they only were under the first Testament, Now, how were the transgressors of that first covenant redeemed? You wish me to mark that the Mediator, by the means of his death, did not redeem transgressors--nor sinners, but the transgressions, and sin. Surely my brother does not believe that the death of Christ redeemed transgressions and sins, and not the transgressor, nor sinner. To redeem transgressions, and sins, strictly speaking, is as impossible as to expiate or cleanse sin. To cleanse an object, is to purify it from defilement; but sin is all defilement in itself, and therefore admits of no cleansing. Yet we say to expiate sin; by which is meant, to cleanse the defiled person or thing from sin. So doubtless Paul meant, that the Jews were redeemed from the transgressions of the first Testament.

But how did the death of Christ redeem the Jews from the transgressions under the first Testament? His death disannulled that Testament: it put away the first, and established the second. By means of his death the priesthood was changed: so of consequence the law--the first husband [the law] then died; then the Jews became

dead to the law, that being dead wherein they were held, being nailed to his cross--he was the end of the law in his death, and by it the first covenant waxed old, and vanished away. Christ hath redeemed us (Jews), from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us by hanging on a tree, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, and that we (Jews and Gentiles) might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith. Gal. iii. 13. By means of death, then, he put an end to the first Testament, or redeemed and delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held. In redeeming from the law, of course he redeemed from the transgressions of the [[@Page:162] law, for where there is no law there is no transgression. "Mark this, my dear sir." Moreover, by redeeming from the law, of course they were redeemed from the curse, of it.

The second thing accomplished by the means of his death, is that "the called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." To the Galatians the Apostle speaks in similar language: By means of the death of Christ, the blessing of Abraham came on the Gentiles, and the promise of the Spirit. This is equivalent to receiving an eternal inheritance. I know my brother wishes from this text to establish his opinion, that all the saints, who died before the death of Christ, were pardoned by his blood to be shed in future. To disprove this opinion, I have said enough in a former letter.

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

B. W. STONE.

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

B. W. S.

From the Christian Herald.

ATONEMENT--By ELDER 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 General 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 out many reasons:-- [[@Page:163]

1. To represent the death of Christ as only *martyrdom*, is equivalent to denying 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 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 SAVIOUR of the world, but only *a Saviour*, one among a multitude of Saviours. 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 sheep's skins and goat's 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 [[@Page:164] 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 is 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, and 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 any thing 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. General 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 suffering 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 to 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. liii. 3-6: Rom. v. 9, 10: Rev. vi. 8.

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 [[@Page:165] stumble at the cross. That the enemies of the Saviour 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 this 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. liii. 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 x. 17, 18.

Besides, if the death of Christ was wholly inflicted by his enemies, what mean those dreadful agonies in the garden when no mortal was near? There we behold the

Lamb of God prostrate on the ground, in 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 from the apprehension of the near approach of his murderers, is to charge the holy Jesus with almost 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." Matth. xxvi. 38. Mark xiv. 34. "He hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his SOUL an offering for sin." Isa. liii. 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 in 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; not me only, but all who love his appearing." Look into the book of Martyrs, and see how calm and triumphantly those saints who have fallen by wicked hands, have fallen asleep. With their last breath they have smiled upon their enemies and cried, "Welcome the [[@Page:166] 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 OFFERING FOR SIN." Isa. liii. 10. More hereafter.

R.

A T O N E M E N T--No. VII.

To B.W. Stone

May 1841

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 of 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.

But it will be asked, What, then, Is this controversy about? What the points in discussion! Is this *design of Christ's blood* to cleanse from sin, essential to the remission of sin at all? It is essential in some cases only, or in all cases? I do not understand you. I have said, "*The sacrificial system was indispensable to any fallen man's approach to God.*" You oppose this. You say I have not proved it. Well, still you have one door of escape open. Perhaps you intend to say *you can* prove it, but I *have not* proved it. True, indeed, I did not allege the evidence you adduce in proof of that proposition. My proof is [[@Page:234] quite of another sort. It is logically

whatever proves the two following theses:--1st. *The death of Christ is the sacrificial system perfected in one sacrifice.* 2d. *That sacrifice is, was, and always will be, indispensable to any fallen man's approach to God.* The allusions to Abel, Enoch, Noah, &c. were not relied on as proofs of these theses.

If any one admit that it is or was necessary in one case, it is indispensable in every case. If God can honorably forgive one sin, and accept one sinner without sacrifice, he can do so in every case. I contend that the whole Bible teaches sacrifice, faith, and repentance as essential to forgiveness. God cannot forgive sin, any sin of any transgressor, without these. If it is proved that it is necessary in any one case, it is necessary in every case; for whatever justifies God in forgiving one sinner, will justify him in forgiving every other sinner. If it be true philosophy that because heat and moisture are essential to the germination of one grain of wheat, they are essential to the germination of every other grain of wheat in the universe; so if the blood of Christ be essential to the remission of one sin, it is necessary to the remission of every other sin. I am not now attempting, nor will I hereafter attempt the proof of any of these propositions, until an issue be formed on some of them. I am specially desirous to be understood on the vital question--the necessity of the blood of Christ to the remission of sins.

Whether in the way of reprisals, or jocosely, my venerable brother, in referring to my third proposition, has said, "I am glad my brother has at length conceded the point of difference between us; for you say, when a Jew had forfeited these, one of which is temporal life, the sacrificial law had no blessing in store for them." From what motive this is alleged I judge not; I only say, I have conceded nothing in this for which I ever contended--not even the shade of a thought. When a man has forfeited his life under any law, moral, ceremonial, or judicial, that law cannot give him life. But I do not say that a sacrificial system, in prophecy or in history, may not do that for him which that violated law could not do!

But the circumstances which introduced such *concessions* (!) give quite a different version to the matter. I am contending against a theory that required blood for the remission of minor offences, and dispensed with it in great offences. That is the naked point divested of all foliage. Brother Stone admits blood and sacrifice for simple errors, but will have the great offences--such as murder and adultery--forgiven without blood or sacrifice! If I mistake you, my dear air, it is a venal sin--a simple error of the head--and I shall be thankful to have a definite proposition or issue from your pen on this subject.--Thou you will comprehend my "candor in giving up an opinion"! [[@Page:235]

As I note only the main points, or notice the chief misapprehensions, I hasten to the 6th proposition. I have asserted in one sentence that "*no repentance nor*

amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission." This I reaffirm as my full conviction. My brother Stone supposes he has found a few exceptions; but so long as there was, besides the special sacrifices for special occasions, and the various trespass offerings under the law, one annual sacrifice, one great annual sin-offering, for "an EVERLASTING STATUTE to MAKE ATONEMENT for the children of Israel"--FOR, ALL THEIR SINS, once-a-year, it is illogical and inconclusive to cite a hundred or a thousand sins forgiven when this atonement is not mentioned.

If I prove baptism in one or two instances to have been by authority preceded by faith and repentance, should a Paidobaptist bring up a hundred instances in which neither are noted, I say it is idle and inconclusive. That such has been established once, twice, or three times, is enough in all logic and good sense forever. So I say to my venerated father Stone: When I adduce two such broad and clear authorities as, "*Without shedding of blood there is no remission,*" and "*This shall be for an everlasting statute to you [Jews] to make an atonement for all your sins once-a-year*"--could you adduce a thousand instances of remission without any allusion to these, you have done nothing at all--nothing more than the ingenious and sophistical Paidobaptist, that tells of Lydia, Cornelius, and Stephanas, with their households, in opposition to a profession of faith and repentance as prior to immersion.

The most unguarded saying you have ever heard from brother Campbell is, that "NO SIN of ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven;" but *you* have made it unguarded, not *I*, by a new version: you read it, *No ceremonial defilement, &c.* You make no difference between a sin of ceremonial defilement, and an accidental touch of a dead body! But this is not exactly trifling, though very near to it.

The radical difference (I begin to suspect) between our views on this point is sketched by yourself in an effort to neutralize my 7th proposition. You say, "Without the blood of the new institution the remission of the least sin could not be obtained, because none without that blood could be led to believe in Christ, to repent, or to be reconciled to God; and therefore none could be pardoned." Then you affirm, if I understand you, that *the blood of the new institution is necessary to pardon--only so far as it is necessary to faith and repentance!!* This being true, "atonement for sins," "expiation of sins," "reconciliation for iniquity," "purification of sins," "redemption of transgressions," [[@Page:236] "bearing our iniquities," "becoming a sin-offering for us," "a propitiatory to declare his justice that he might be just in justifying the ungodly," &c. &c. are all phrases without meaning.

To say that Christ died for our faith, is more consistent and intelligible than to say he died for our sins. He died for our repentance, is more rational than he suffered the just for the unjust. He bare our faith in his own body on the tree, is, therefore, the true

version of he bore our sins in his own body, &c. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the infidelity of the world. The glorified saints then, indeed, should change their language, and sing, 'Thou has redeemed us to God by thy blood, giving faith, and hast washed us from our sins in the laver of faith obtained by thy blood,' &c. I will not, until I hear from you, farther expose the massacre which such an interpretation would necessarily make of a thousand passages of scripture. I trust you will prove that I have misunderstood you, and that this is not your meaning. The minor points of the present epistle will fall in my path in the sequel.

Sincerely and affectionately yours through *the blood*, not through *the faith* only, of the everlasting institution,

A. CAMPBELL.

A T O N E M E N T--*No. VIII.*

To A. Campbell

June 1841

LETTER III.

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S THIRD LETTER--CONTINUED.

Dear brother Campbell,

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

Page 388, I had said, "Those sins purged with blood came under one general name--*errors*." You immediately ask, "And what were the sins purged without [blood?]" I have plainly shown what sins were purged by blood under the law; and I have as plainly shown what sins were not purged with blood under the law. But what sins, say you, were purged without blood! I again answer, Not one sin of any class

was purged without blood according to law. But, that I may be understood--those sins, unpardonable by law, and not allowed to be purged by blood according to the law, and yet to the penitent sinner were purged and forgiven by God, according to the law of faith without the deeds of the law of Moses. Can my brother deny this? Lev. xxvi. 40, 46.

Page 389, I had said that "the blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sins;" but it did take away errors, sins of ignorance, and pardonable offences. You reply, "And does my brother Stone teach that the blood of bulls and goats had virtue to expiate sins of ignorance, errors, but no virtue to expiate other sins?" Yes, brother Campbell, I thus teach, being instructed out of the Law and the Prophets, and by Paul the Apostle. But you May remember that I acknowledge this blood to be the means through which God expiates or purges from all such sins. [[@Page:248]

You again recur to Hebrews ix. 27, to establish your assertion, that without shedding of blood there never was remission. It becomes necessary now that we fully investigate this text, "And almost all things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission." "Here, (you say,) are two propositions--a general one, and a universal one. The one respects things--the other respects persons. The general one is, that--Almost all *things* are purged with blood--the universal one is, that without shedding of blood there is *no one pardoned, or there is no remission.*" Now, neither you nor I are fond of scrap text preaching or writing, without the connexion with the text; it may be tortured, as is frequently done, to speak what the Spirit never designed. That Paul referred to legal blood alone to the purifying and remission of sins, is plain from the whole connexion. The law of Moses was the subject of his discourse. "This is still more evident by adverting to the law itself. Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35, &c. "The priest shall by blood make an atonement (*kaphar*) for him, (or cleanse or purge him,) and it shall be forgiven." The Septuagint constantly translate the Hebrew *kaphar* by *exhilaskomai*, which you acknowledge has the same meaning. If what I have written in my second number be not sufficient to prove that *kaphar* signifies to purge from sin, I will add a few more texts: Ps. li. 7; liii. 3; Isai. i. 25; vi. 7; xxii. 14; xxiv. 9; Ezek. xxvi. 1; 1 Sam. iii. 14; Prov. xvi. 6; *cum multis aliis.*

In your general proposition you exclude persons from being purged with blood by law, and emphasize THINGS as only purged by blood. Now, my dear sir, this appears to me directly in contradiction to the scripture facts stated above. Is it not also contrary to your oft repeated idea, that men, guilty of all classes of sins, one sin excepted, were purged with the blood of sacrifice? Does not my brother know that the word *panta, all things*, includes persons as well as things? Read John i. 3; Acts xiv. 15; 1 Cor. i. 28; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 16, 17; Heb. i. 2, 3, &c. I understand Paul in this text to mean simply, that almost all things, persons as well as the altar, tabernacle, &c. by the law,

were purged with blood; and indeed, by the law, without shedding of blood, there was no cleansing, or purging, and consequently no remission or taking away of sin.

On page 245, I asked, "Could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all?" You reply, "And was Abraham saved by faith, without blood, without sacrifice--by faith and works, without a sin-offering. Surely my brother forgot himself here." If I have, I will thank my brother to bring to my remembrance where it is written that Abraham was saved by blood--by sacrifice. I can find where he believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness, or justification. But you say Abraham always worshipped through blood; hence Jesus said, "Abraham saw my day, and was glad." Does this prove that he always worshipped through blood? Does this prove that he saw that Messiah, who he believed would come in the latter days, should die? Was he by faith in this blood reconciled to God and saved? I would further ask, Were not the Apostles sanctified, or clean through the word or truth before the death of Christ? Did they become clean by faith in [[@Page:249] the blood of Christ, when they did not believe he would die! But you believe that the patriarchal law of sacrifice was the same as that of Moses. If so, we agree that it extended only to temporal life and temporal blessings, and not to spiritual justification and salvation. I requested my brother in a former letter to re-examine the 11th chapter of Hebrews, and see if the faith of one of the elders had the blood of Christ as its object.

I would remind my brother of an expression, frequently used by him, which he will in a moment acknowledge to be very improper. It is this, "But the sins were first *atoned for* by the slain goat" page 395. Sins *atoned for* will very well agree with the old system, which insists upon a full satisfaction being made for sin by a substitute suffering the full penalty due the sinner; but it will not agree with what we both admit to be the meaning of *kaphar*, or *exhilaskomai*, to cleanse, purge, cover. &c. It would be very awkward to say, *sins cleansed for, purged for, covered for*. The word *for* is no part of the word *kaphar* or *exhilaskomai*, but it is a preposition, 'ol' in Hebrew, and 'peri' in Greek, which are generally translated *for* or *on account of*, thus to make an atonement for sin, means to cleanse the person or thing defiled on account of sin. This criticism, though it be considered of small moment, is of great importance in this discussion, as you will acknowledge.

You quoted Leviticus xvi. to prove that all the sins and iniquities of Israel were cleansed by blood and borne away by the scape-goat, on the annual day of atonement; and you again introduce it on page 395. You excepted one class of sins from being cleansed by blood on that day. The man who despised Moses' law; he must die without mercy--without the benefit of sacrifice, under two or three witnesses. Heb. x. 28. Now I have proved that the sin of despising Moses' included many classes of sins, and was not confined to that one class, which renounced his dispensation. Why you

have singled out this one class as the only one excluded from the benefit of sacrifice, I cannot see any good reason. Paul said without exception, "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Let us once more, in order to set this subject at rest, inquire more fully, who are those that died without mercy, or sacrifice. Lev. xxvi. 15-43. But if ye *despise* my statutes, and abhor my judgments, so that ye will not do all my commandments, but that ye break my covenant; I also will do this unto you. Then follow the curses to verse 43, and the reason again given why these curses came upon them--"because they *despised* my judgments, and because their soul *abhorred* my statutes." To commit murder and adultery, was to despise the word of the Lord, or the law of Moses. 1 Sam. xii. 9. To give all the proofs of this subject would only be a repetition of what I have already written. To this I refer you. From these premises I conclude that the despisers of Moses' law, all wilful presumptuous sinners, as the idolater, murderer, &c. were excluded from the benefit of sacrifice on that day of atonement.

But you say the character to which you allude, the despiser of Moses, i. e. the Apostate, was not in the congregation on that day. How does my brother know this? Might I not with equal propriety [[@Page:250] say, that none of the despisers of Moses, as the idolater, the blasphemer, &c. were there? I certainly believe with you that such characters were not there, unless clandestinely, because by law they had been previously put to death. Suppose a man under the law had been convicted of murder, or any other crime worthy of death, did the law allow any respite from the execution? If it did, does it say how long the judges may defer the execution? If no time be specified, might not Mercy say, Let it be deferred till the annual day of atonement, when his sin, and all others, shall be purged away by sacrifice and forgiven? Thus would the penalties of the law be evaded. Or, if those sins worthy of death could be purged by sacrifice, and such transgressors were allowed this privilege, would not every one make that sacrifice rather than suffer death? Thus again would the law be stript of its penalties, and license given to sin. I think we should let this subject rest.

On page 395 you quote a query by me proposed to you: "Is propitiating and pacifying the divine Father, a scriptural idea!" My brother has evidently misquoted my words: they are, "Is propitiating and pacifying the divine Father *by sacrifice*, a scriptural idea truly." page 390. You have left out the leading idea, *by sacrifice*, which I designedly emphasized. The scriptures nowhere say, that he was pacified or propitiated by sacrifice. But you think differently, and introduce again Ezek. xvi. 63. "When I am pacified (*kaphar*) towards thee for all thou hast done." I ask again, Is it said in this text, that God was pacified by blood! I have before disposed of this text, I hope to your satisfaction, that it should read, 'When I have made an atonement or purification for thee, or when I have purged thee.' To prove your position that God is

pacified, you introduce those classes of texts where it is said, "To turn away his anger--his anger endureth but for a moment--many a time he turned away his anger." My dear sir, are these things said to be effected in him by blood? Again you say, in order to establish your proposition, that "Jesus is called our PEACE." I find these words in Ephesians ii. 14, 15. But this has reference only to the peace which he established between Jew and Gentile, when by his death he removed the law, which had created the enmity between them. He is our peace in another respect, because by the same means he reconciled both Jew and Gentile to God in one body. Surely this is a very different idea from that of removing the anger and enmity from the mind of God against sinners, and producing peace there towards them; and all this by blood.

I will grant that God may be said to be pacified, to be pleased, &c. But I ask, With whom is he pacified and pleased? Is it with the impenitent sinner? Impossible: his holy nature must oppose sin. With whom then is he pacified and pleased? Surely all will say, With the penitent holy soul only; because God's holy nature is always pleased and pacified with holiness. I admit also that this pacification is effected between God and the penitent sinner by the means of Christ's blood. But this means has no direct effect on God to pacify him to the sinner; if it had, it must effect a mighty change in him--an hour before he was angry with the sinner, and not pacified to him; but as soon as the blood of Christ was shed, his anger was [[@Page:251] turned away--he was pacified, though the sinner remained unchanged. Can my brother believe this? "We are reconciled to God by the death of his Son;" but not that God is reconciled to us by his death. "God was in [by] Christ reconciling the world unto himself"--not himself to the world.

On page 396 you say, "Jesus Christ is called a Mediator, our peace and propitiation, our mercy seat, and God sent him forth in this style to justify him in showing mercy to sinners." I had always thought that Jesus Christ was God's mercy seat, and not ours. The text to which you refer reads thus, "Whom (Christ) God hath set forth to be a propitiation (mercy seat) through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26. It is agreed on all hands that *hilasterion* in the Greek text should be rendered propitiatory, or mercy seat. So have you rendered it in your version. Now the mercy seat under the law, was the covering of the ark containing the testimony, from which mercy seat God delivered or declared his oracles or words, and granted his favor to Israel through their High Priest The antitype of which is Jesus Christ--he is the true mercy seat, from or by whom God speaks, and shows mercy to the world. One declaration he makes from this seat is, that he can be just when he justifies him that believeth in Jesus. This idea is very different

from the one you have given, "that God sent him forth to justify himself in showing mercy to sinners."

Of these verses in your former editions of the Testament you have given Macknight's version; but in your last you have altered it according to what you deemed most proper. Thus you translate them--"Whom God hath set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of his own justice in passing by the sins, which were before committed, through the forbearance of God, for a demonstration, also, of his justice in the present time, in order that he may be just when justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus." I think my brother took greater liberty in this translation than the Greek text fairly admitted. You have rendered the word *dikaisoune*, justice.--Though this word is found near one hundred times in the New Testament, it is every where translated *righteousness* in our version; and, I believe, in your version it is in every other place rendered *righteousness*. You have added the word "own" to justice, which is not in the text. You have also added the word "also" in verse 26, which gives an entirely different idea from that communicated without it, as is apparent to every reader. The righteousness of God, which he declared from his mercy seat, Jesus Christ, is his plan of justifying the sinner through faith. This is the proposition made by the Apostle in the first chapter of the Romans, and continued through all the argumentative part of the epistle. But as my brother intimates that in its proper place he will speak more fully on this text, I will patiently wait.

Grace, mercy, and peace be with you!

B. W. STONE. [[@Page:252]

To. B. W. STONE.

Brother Stone--WE are discussing the greatest question in the world--*For what did the Messiah die?* He died for no sins, or for his own sins, or for our sins. Of this trilemma we both choose the last. We affirm that "he died for our sins according to the scriptures."--But it is said that many affirm in words, but deny in fact, that Christ died for our sins; and you and I both admit that it is possible to affirm the words, while denying the fact, in any proposition. It is essential, then, that while affirming the words, we do not deny the fact, that Christ died for our sins.

Hence it is that I fear some of our readers will conclude that you teach that Christ died for our faith rather than for our sins, inasmuch as you avow the *reason* of Christ's death to have been, "Because none without that blood could be led to believe in him,"

and consequently to repentance and remission. Will they not conclude that you make the death of Jesus no more a sin-offering than the death of Stephen or of Paul. They were martyrs to the love of God to man, and gave such evidence of their sincerity as to superinduce faith in all who gave them a candid hearing, that they were true and honest-hearted men. In what sense, then, I beseech you to tell, did Christ die for our sins, in which Stephen did not die for them? They were both witnesses of what they saw, heard, and believed. But was there atonement, reconciliation, or redemption in the blood of Stephen or of Paul? And is there not all these in the blood of Christ!

He died for our sins *according to the scriptures*. And in what sense did the scriptures teach a death for sins? To produce faith and repentance? No! They offered in faith, not to produce faith: they offered as penitents, not to be led to repentance. When the iniquity of Israel was by the hand of the Priest laid upon the victim, was it to produce faith in the sufferer, or in the God that doomed this innocent creature to suffer, or was it for the typical putting away of sin? Doubtless it was for taking away sin in a figurative sense, that we might by the type understand how Christ took away our sin in the literal and true sense.

But you, even in your last letter, above quoted, intimate that while no sin of any class was purged without blood; and that while the blood of bulls and of goats had virtue to take away errors, sins of ignorance and pardonable offences, and no virtue to expiate other sins; yet "those sins unpardonable by the law, and not allowed to be purged by blood according to the law, were to the penitent sinner forgiven by God according to the law of faith, without the deeds of the law;" thereby [[@Page:253] making the blood of bulls and of goats virtually adequate to purify from some sins; and faith, without blood, as all-sufficient to purify from those sins which animal sacrifice could not reach; as blood, without faith, was to the removal of pardonable offences. I wish some one, more ingenious than I, may be able to put a better construction on the 2d and 3d paragraphs of the preceding letter. Now had you added that such sins above described were pardoned by God according to the law of faith, without the deeds of the law, *through the great sacrifice of Christ*; then, indeed, I could have reconciled you and Paul without any difficulty; but as it is, it will require one much mightier than I to effect a reconciliation between you and Paul.

If I understand you correctly, the death of Christ, as a sin-offering, had no virtue, any more than the blood of bulls and of goats, to take away sin from any one who died before him. Faith and repentance, without the blood of Christ, availed to the remission of Abraham, and to the remission of all who died from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to Christ, who have obtained pardon. As for infants, they were saved, if saved at all--without faith, repentance, circumcision, sacrifice, or any thing else, but naked justice. They died because of Adam's sin; had none of their own; and, therefore, needed not faith, repentance, circumcision, sacrifice, or mercy from God. As persons

of discrimination might, perhaps, draw this conclusion from what you have written in this discussion, I give it form and utterance, that, if possible, you, may scatter the mist from our eyes.

Indeed, if you make Christ's death for sin to mean no more than death for faith, or as a means to faith, follows it not inevitably that the death of Christ effected nothing essential to the salvation of all mankind before he was born; and nothing to the salvation of mankind now, only so far as the adult and educated portions of the race are made acquainted with his death as a means to faith, which is a means to penitence, which is a means to reconciliation, which is a means to forgiveness, which is a means to salvation. Just as miracles are necessary to faith in things supernatural, so is the blood of Christ to a full persuasion that God loved the world! If this be all that is meant by Christ's dying for our sins, I confess I should not feel an infinite obligation to the Messiah, though perhaps a greater obligation than to Paul or Peter. He has loved me and driven himself for me only in a higher degree than the Apostles and Prophets who sealed their testimony with their blood.

Brother Stone, you make blood a means of pardon in some cases only, and the death of Christ no essential means of pardon, except in some cases that have since that event occurred. Abraham was saved [[@Page:254] without it; and you ask, "Were not the Apostles sanctified and clean through the word he had spoken to them, before he died?" You give to the death of Christ no retrospective character, no indispensable efficacy in its bearing either on God or man. It is merely a fuller proof and clearer demonstration of the love of God; but not a demonstration of his justice in passing by sins committed under a former economy. So I yet understand you. And here I may as well, as at any other time, notice your critique on Rom. iii. 25, 26.

You seem to object to the new version of this passage. First, to the substitution of *justice* for the term *righteousness*; and in reprobation of that fact add, that "in the New Testament it is every where translated *righteousness* in our version." But how is it in the Old? This you probably did not examine, else in your usual candor you would have told your readers (and justified me by assuring them) that generally where we have the English word *justice* in the common version we have the word *dikaiosune* in the Septuagint: such as when David says, "*Justice* and judgment are the habitation of thy throne;" and "I have done judgment and *justice*;" and where Solomon says, "When thou seest the perverting of *justice*," it is the same word so often used by Paul in the epistle to the Romans, and which is found almost a hundred times in the New Testament. But there is another fact you would have told them had you only thought of it--viz. that the word *justice* is not in the common version of the New Testament at all; and if the idea of justice be at all in the New Testament--(and if it be not, is it not a singular fact!!)--I say, if the idea of *justice* be in the Christian scriptures at all, it is found in the word *dikaiosune*, in this place most appositely, in my opinion,

rendered *justice*. And is not the old English term *righteousness* equivalent in all cases to the term *justice*, though sometimes rather awkwardly expressive of it!--When Daniel foretells "an everlasting righteousness" as being introduced by the Messiah, the seventy Hebrews use Paul's favorite *dikaioisune* found 36 times in the Epistle to the Romans. It must then depend always upon the good sense and judgment of the translators whether in the version it shall be read *righteousness*, *justification*, or *justice*. I was then authorized by every law of interpretation, and by the indisputable meaning of the word, to render it *justice*, Rom. iii. 25, 26, and which I doubt not, when all party prejudices shall have slept in the tomb of oblivion, will be universally admitted as the most correct and happy version of that most important passage ever given. But while I say this, I would not be understood as intimating that it materially differs from the common version. Indeed, I regard the common version as sufficiently just and faithful to the original in this particular, though neither so clear nor striking as the New. [[@Page:255]

You also demur to the insertion of *own* before *righteousness*, and yet agree with me that it is *his own* righteousness or justice that is spoken of! Now so long as we agree that it is God's righteousness that is spoken of, why demur at making this as plain as possible to our readers? But you complain of *also*, as giving an entirely different idea from that in the text, or from a version without it. Your words are, "You have also added the word *also*, in verse 26." This is not the fact. It is Macknight's version, not mine. This I am aware is an oversight of yours; for, brother Stone, I know you would be the last man in the world to assume or assert a false fact. I agree with Macknight that this supplement is fairly implied, and that clearness demands it. The sins of two dispensations are clearly spoken of, both here and in Heb. ix.; which two passages have, as far as human language is capable of definitely expressing any ideas, in the clearest and most forcible manner expressed the true necessity of Christ's death as a sin-offering--To justify. God before the universe, to sustain the dignity of his throne and government in the sight of all pure and holy beings, *in passing by* the sins committed under two testaments--of law and of favor; of which I have much to say, should we ever meet at Romans iii. 25, 26, and Hebrews ix. 13, 14, 15.--of which, at present, there is some doubt.

That the Messiah's death had aught to do with the remission of sins committed before that event, is, I know, an idea repudiated by all the elder speculators of the Arian, Socinian, and Unitarian schools.--Therefore all their critics object to the most natural and obvious versions of these passages. I therefore regret that my brother Stone, who does not fraternize with them in their theories, should, to his own disadvantage, *appear* to prefer their construction; of which, however, I have not full evidence that he does. I hope, then, he will throw of all ambiguity on this subject.

I know, indeed, that the unfortunate representations of the Messiah's death as for faith, and not for sins--as a means of repentance, rather than a means of purification, propitiation, or expiation, savors, in appearance, of those ideas. Still I will not gravely assail them as your ideas until you more fully and explicitly avow them.

I will not, brother Stone, enter into a war of words with you or any brother, while we have so many *things* of great value in discussion.--True, words must occasionally be subjects of discussion; but as seldom as possible is my intention. Your renewal, then, of the question about "all things" purged by blood, as including both persons and things, is not disputed by me. I stand to all I have written on the difference between the two propositions--concerning persons and [[@Page:256] things; for, indeed, that *ta panta* may include both persons and things, militates nothing against it. "All things" often means both persons and things; but "all persons" does not mean all things and all persons: and this is enough for me. "To atone for," and "to make atonement for," are with me identical expressions. Now anxious though I be to please brother Stone by using words as he does, I cannot go so far as to repudiate the phrase "*to atone for*" till he explains to me the difference between the contraction and the scriptural phrase "*to make atonement for*," of which it is but the mere contraction. In the name of reason, why so morbidly sensitive on this, and not on a thousand other phrases found in your essays, never found in any version of the New Testament? Show, then, that to make atonement for a person or for a sin, differs from to atone for sin, or for a person; and, if possible, I will gratify this peculiar taste in my venerable correspondent.

You sometimes seek to confound me with a question which is fatal to your scheme, or which places you in a light before the public in which I never before contemplated you. You ask me once and again, "Did the pious Jews and Patriarchs become clean by faith in the blood of Christ when they did not believe that he would die?" Well, then, in return I ask, *Did the Jews and Patriarchs believe in God to their salvation without the knowledge of the death of Christ*, which you say is essential to faith; for, with you, the death of Christ is essential to forgiveness only as it is essential to faith!!! Your question is suicidal to your scheme, but confirmatory of mine; because the death of the Messiah justified God in forgiving Jews, patriarchs, infants, &c. in all past ages, whether they believed in the sacrifice of the Messiah or not: for, says Paul, "God has set him forth a propitiatory, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past"--"for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament." Thus your question, when properly answered, demonstrates the scriptural propriety of my interpretation, and the scriptural impropriety of that which is opposed to it.

In like manner your appeal to Hebrews xi. vacates and annuls all your reasonings about the death of Christ as a means of faith: for as you very justly demand, "Had the

faith of one of the elders (Heb. xi.) the blood of Christ as its object?" Consequently their faith, and the model faith of Abraham, needed not the death of Christ as a means, or cause, or object; and with this you have fully settled the controversy about the design of Christ's death; conclusively showing that it was to affect God's government, rather than merely to enable persons to possess purifying faith. There are various other questions and points in your epistles, which, were I severally to notice, would operate in [[@Page:257] the same direction with these. I have neither room nor need for them just now, and will reserve them for other exigencies. Meanwhile I pray you to reflect on one point--that the forgiveness of sins on repentance in the Old Testament always presupposes sacrifice, as certainly as baptism in the New Testament always presupposes faith, whether named or not.

In all benevolence, I remain, &c.

A. CAMPBELL.

ATONEMENT--*No. IX*
To A. Campbell

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S LETTER III.
[CONTINUED.]

July 1841

Dear brother Campbell,

IT seems that my mode of expressing ideas must be very obscure, seeing I cannot be understood. I will now express them generally in your very language, which is plain and forcible. In your *Christian Baptist*, revised by D. S. Burnet, with your last corrections, I find you ably contending for the very doctrine I have advocated in this discussion, but which you seem now to oppose.

On page 511--"Then he led him (Abraham) out, and said to him, Look up now to heaven, and count the stars, if you can number them. Then he said, So shall your seed be. And Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Gen. xv. "This faith in this promise was accounted to him for righteousness. So says Moses, and so says Paul; but so does not say John Calvin, nor John Wesley. One says his system says that it was Abraham's faith in a future Messiah, which was accounted to him for righteousness; and the other says it was Abraham's obedience which made him righteous. I am not to argue the case with them." "Therefore it was accounted to

him' (i. e. his belief in this promise, that he should be the father of many nations,) for righteousness.' It brought him into a state of favor and acceptance with God.

"He that believes that God raised up the crucified, dead, and buried Jesus, and made him the Saviour of the world, believes in the same manner; i. e. rests upon the truth and power of God; and this belief of the promise of eternal life, through a crucified Saviour, is just the same kind as Abraham's faith--the object only different. And therefore all they of this faith are blessed with believing Abraham."

[[@Page:295]

Page 512--"Now the true faith has in all ages been one and the same thing in kind, if not in degree. The true faith has ever been the belief of all the revelation extant at that time. Hence Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, &c. were all justified by believing the communications made to them. So Paul teaches, Heb. xi. 1. Noah became heir of the righteousness which came through faith, by believing God's promise concerning the deluge, and Abraham by believing, So shall your seed be."

"System-makers, to form a theory in the crucible of their invention, say, that all were justified by believing the same thing. But this no man living is able to show. It is true, I contend that the ground-work of salvation by faith was either prospectively or retrospectively the sacrifice of Christ. But not a person on earth believed that the Messiah would die as a sin-offering, or rise from the dead, from Eve to Mary Magdalene. Without believing this, now-a-days, none to whom it is reported can be saved. The patriarchs had visions and anticipations of a Messiah, but so indistinct that they who spoke most clearly, Peter tells us, were not able to understand them; for, although they sought diligently what the Spirit which spoke in them could mean, they did not understand its communications. But to conclude this episode: The father of the faithful was accounted righteous through believing the promise made to him, and all his children shall be ranked with him through believing the communications made to them. Rom. iv. to the end."

These are sentiments, with one exception, which I have been endeavoring to plead in this discussion, and which I have thought you opposed. I should be glad to know that these are still your sentiments. The one exception I have made to the above extracts, is this: 'It is true, I contend, that the ground-work of salvation by faith was either prospectively or retrospectively the sacrifice of Christ.' This I view as a mere salvo of my brother to secure his orthodoxy from impeachment. How can it be made to agree with what immediately follows, I confess I cannot see. How the sacrifice of Christ could be a means of salvation, when not one from Eve to Mary Magdalene believed or understood it, I have no conception. If it was a means, it operated on the mind of God alone, and not on man. By it I suppose you mean, God was pacified,

propitiated, or made propitious, and reconciled to man, so that he could pardon the guilty and save him from sin. But of this I have more to say in its proper place.

I now proceed to review your Letter IV. In the commencement of it you glance at the points in which you think we have concurred, which points you include in nine propositions. These, with a few exceptions, I have long since received as true. The exceptions I will now point out.

Prop. 1. You say we concur in this--'That to *expiate*, and to *pacify*, and *atone for*, are scriptural ideas and expressions.' In this my brother is mistaken. I have constantly asserted that to *expiate* and *atone for*, are not scriptural expressions; they are no where found in the English Bible. Besides, I have said that 'sins atoned for,' as you express it, is not a scriptural *idea*, but an awkward expression used by some to support their system of religion.

Prop. 5. If I understand you in this proposition, I can see no [[@Page:296] concurrence of our ideas. It is the very point in which we most widely differ. See my Letter II. of review, page 158, 159.

Prop. 6. You say, 'Salvation, then, under the law, spiritual and eternal was through faith, repentance, and sacrifice, as it was from Adam unto Moses.' In this sentiment you think we concur: Did I ever intimate that spiritual and eternal salvation was ever obtained by sacrifices from Adam to Moses, or from Moses to Christ? Have I not called upon my brother for proof of this your position? We have concurred in this, that the sacrificial system under the patriarchs was substantially the same as that under the law, and that they could not give spiritual and eternal salvation to any?

On page 19 you take notice of five affirmations (as you are pleased to call them) which I have made in my previous communications to you. 1st. You say, "You intimate that errors, or as you define errors, viz. sins of ignorance, require blood; but that greater transgressions, or what are in contrast with simple errors, called sins, are forgiven without blood or sacrifice. In one sentence, that errors require blood, and that sins did not!" This last sentiment you express with a note of admiration. My brother need not wonder at it, for it is the appointment of God himself. Of the many texts to which I have already referred as proof positive on this subject, I will quote one which is decisive. Num. xv. 22-31. "And if ye have ERRED, and not observed these commandments which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses; then it shall be, if aught be committed by IGNORANCE without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the congregation shall offer one young bullock and one kid of the goats for a sin-offering. And the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and it shall be forgiven them, for it is IGNORANCE." (Mark this, my dear sir.) "And they shall bring their offering and their sin-offering before the Lord for

their IGNORANCE. And it shall be forgiven all the congregation of the children of Israel, and the stranger that sojourneth among them; seeing all the people were in IGNORANCE. And if any soul sin through IGNORANCE, then he shall bring a she-goat for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for that soul that sinneth ignorantly, when he sinneth by IGNORANCE before the Lord, to make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him. But the soul that sinneth PRESUMPTUOUSLY" [mark the contrast] "the same reproacheth the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people, because he hath despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment, that soul shall be utterly cut off, his iniquity shall be upon him"--i. e. it shall not be purged away by sacrifice. Now, my dear sir, is it not plain from this passage that errors and sins of ignorance required blood in order to be forgiven? And that sins--presumptuous sins (for so have I defined my meaning) did not admit of sacrifice, because they were unpardonable by law, such transgressors must be put to death without mercy. If such were pardoned, this pardon was not an exemption from the death denounced by law, nor was it obtained by legal sacrifice; but it was a spiritual pardon, or justification of a soul granted to believing humble penitents, who pleaded mercy. Lev. xxiv. 40, 43. If, then, I have affirmed this, is not the affirmation based on truth?

2. You say that I 'intimate, that there was a gospel preached to [[@Page:297] Abraham, by which Jews and Greeks were justified, and that it had neither blood nor sacrifice in it.' And how will my brother prove that blood or sacrifice was a part of that gospel? You will say, Because Abraham offered sacrifice. Must I conclude that because Moses sacrificed that the law was part of the gospel? Paul says, 'The law is not of faith.' If Abraham's sacrifice was part of the gospel, so must be the sacrifice of Moses, for you admit it is the same sacrificial system.

3. My third affirmation is, as you say, 'That the Jews under the law, and the Gentiles without the law, were justified by Abraham's gospel without any sacrifice, or deeds of the law'--and then you strangely ask, Do you make sacrifice one of the deeds of the law? I verily do. Does, brother Campbell deny it? He may deny what no intelligent man ever affirmed--that the sacrifice of Christ is not a deed of the Mosaic law, and he will boldly tell us, 'that not a person on earth believed that the Messiah would die as a sin-offering, or rise from the dead, from Eve to Mary Magdalene,' and that John Calvin's sentiment was wrong, who said that Abraham was justified by faith in a future Messiah. I refer to your lucid remarks quoted in the beginning of this letter.

4. In this you strangely represent me as teaching that remission in all cases, both before and since the law, is without shedding of blood. Brother Campbell, I have never taught this, I have never affirmed it, I have never been conscious of such a thought passing through my mind. To this discussion I appeal for justification from this charge. I have constantly maintained that pardonable sins of error and ignorance

were remitted through the blood of legal sacrifices, and that under the gospel we are all justified by faith in the blood of Christ. Had I affirmed that, 'Noah became heir of the righteousness, which came through faith, by believing God's promise concerning the deluge and Abraham believing, So shall thy seed be;' then there might have been some plausible ground for the charge.

On page 20 you say, 'I am sorry to see my brother Stone intimate a doubt on this subject--i. e. that the seed of the woman was Christ--the bruising his heel indicated Messiah's sufferings--the bruising of the serpent's head intimated Satan's ruin--the Lamb, sacrificed by Abel, is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.' My dear brother, it would make me sorry to cause sorrow to one whom I so highly esteem as I do you. If ever I expressed any doubt on the subject you named, I am perfectly unconscious of it, and am entirely ignorant of the time and place, when and where, such a doubt is expressed. In the belief of these things I have been firm from my earliest recollections of truth. Sorrow, then, no more for me from this cause. Rest assured you are mistaken.

Page 21--You think my opposition arises from a conviction that if you establish that sins in general were expiated by patriarchal or legal sacrifices; and especially on the principle that the victim died for, or, instead of the offerer, the whole system of old orthodoxy naturally follows. I believe I have more honesty than to oppose any doctrine, because it is old or new orthodoxy; but I have opposed some of the doctrines you advocate, from a conviction that they are not the doctrines of the Bible: I must oppose, irrespective of old orthodoxy, that [[@Page:298] all sins, but the sin of apostasy, were expiated by patriarchal or legal sacrifices, for reasons already stated in this discussion. And for the same reason I must oppose the doctrine that the victim died in the stead of the offerer. I think I have clearly proved that no victim ever suffered death at the altar, as a vicarious substitute, or in the stead of the offerer, because no person, against whom the law denounced death, was permitted to offer a sacrifice for his sin. Against pardonable transgressions, against sins of error, and of ignorance, the law did not denounce death: therefore the death of the victim was not in the stead of the offerer's death. Was the woman after child-birth worthy of death, and therefore, the death of the victim slain for her, was in the stead of her death? Was the leper--the man with a running issue, and many other similar cases, worthy of death, and therefore the death of the victim was in their stead? If *this* be the of old or new system of orthodoxy, I must reject it, although more learned, more devout, more intelligent, and more practically useful, than old or new heterodoxy.' My rule for judging is, Does the Bible teach it?

My brother thinks it, is my dislike of old orthodoxy, that I have so tenaciously adhered to the doctrine of sacrifices, which, as I think, were taught by Moses and Paul, and that I have opposed the opposite. Might I not also think that your fondness

for old orthodoxy, and your high encomiums of it, is the cause, why you so strenuously advocate its fundamental doctrines? For when once it is admitted that the victims were substitutes, and died in the stead of the guilty, then, to be consistent, we must receive the whole orthodox system as taught by the Westminster creed-makers. For, if I understand you, the man guilty of death by law, is freed from this sentence by bringing a victim which suffers death in his stead--God is now *pacified*, now *propitiated* or made *propitious*; he is now *reconciled* and *placated* to the sinner. Does it not follow that the great antitype, the Lamb of God, was a substitute, and his death was in the stead of the guilty world--that God was propitiated, made propitious, and his anger turned away--that his law's demands were satisfied--and the honors of his government sustained in his granting pardon to the guilty? Then it certainly follows that Paul's doctrine of no justification by the deeds of the law, is overthrown; for the person and his surety are one in law; if the surety pays the debt, due according to law, in the stead of the person, then is the person free from obligation, and is justified on the principle of law, not of grace; for there can be no grace, pardon, nor mercy in the justifier on this principle.

It the surety or substitute, Christ Jesus, must suffer the penalties of the law, and part of those penalties were eternal death, then must he be eternally suffering death; and if justification or pardon cannot be granted till the demands against the sinner be satisfied, it follows that it cannot forever be obtained; for it will require an eternity to suffer the demand. If he suffered temporal death its a substitute, or in the stead of those under the sentence of death, why do all die?

Are we not required to forgive one another, even as God forgives? Are we not to be imitators of him? 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.' 'If thy brother repent, forgive him.' 'A certain king would take an account of his debtors: among them was one who owed him ten thousand talents, and had nothing to [[@Page:299] pay. The debt was just, and justice demanded payment--the poor debtor acknowledged it--but humbled himself, and pleaded for mercy. The king graciously forgave him the whole debt. SO IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. Had an advocate of old orthodoxy been there, he would have taught a very different doctrine from that of the Great Teacher. He would have said, The debt is just, and therefore must be paid; pardon cannot be granted on any other terms. If the debtor cannot pay, a surety must. A generous, wealthy man, becomes his surety, and pays the full demand. Now, says the creditor, I forgive--I pardon. Does the debtor thank him? Is he under any obligation to him? Is there any thing like pardon in the case? But the debtor is now justly indebted to the surety for the full amount; and his surety must forgive as God forgives; that is, when the debt is paid. Is not the idea of pardon and favor entirely excluded from this system of old orthodoxy.

Had this been the true system taught in the Bible, is it not strange that the doctrine can never be found there? Was it taught by Christ in his sermon on the Mount? Not a hint of it. And yet said Jesus in the conclusion of it, 'Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, is like a man that built his house upon a rock.' Was it taught by Peter at Pentecost? Not a hint of it; and surely had it been true, he would not here have omitted it; yet three thousand were saved without the knowledge of it. Yet the doctrine is dubbed orthodoxy--a fundamental truth!

On page 22 my brother still contends that the patriarchs from Abel offered up sacrifice to God, through faith in the promised seed, and were pardoned in anticipation of the redemption of the transgressions to be brought in under the New Institution. Yet you acknowledge they neither understood nor believed that Messiah would ever die as a sin-offering, and rise from the dead; and yet you quote Isaiah liii. and Daniel ix. in proof--of what? That Messiah would die, and yet they neither understood nor believed that he would die as a sin-offering. I had asked, (page 23,) Is there one instance on record, from Adam to Christ, of one person being justified by (faith in) the blood of Christ? You answer, 'Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ above all the wealth of Egypt, and endured as seeing him that is invisible.' My brother surely cannot think that Christ in this text means Christ the Lord! It means the anointed people of the Lord; for so the words Messiah and Christ often signify.

Your affectionate and old brother,

B. W. STONE.

To. B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

Dear Sir--TOUCHING the extracts from the "Christian Baptist," above quoted by you, I have the pleasure to inform you that my mind has not undergone the slightest variation or shadow of a change.--When I assumed the responsibilities of a scribe, or editor of a religious periodical, my arrangements of the items of redemption on Heaven's part, and on man's part, were severally arranged under three heads:--
[[@Page:300] On Heaven's part--1st. The grace or philanthropy of God the Father. 2d. The sacrificial death of Jesus the only begotten Son of God. 3d. The descent and gift of the Holy Spirit. On Man's part--1st. Faith in the person, office, and character of Christ, with special reference to his death as a sin-offering. 2d. Repentance. 3d. Baptism. Then are we in covenant with God through the Mediator; consequently enjoy remission of sins, the consolations and sanctification of the Holy Spirit, and the

hope of eternal life. These views have only been fully stereotyped by the readings, debates, and discussions of at least one quarter of a century. I am sorry to see you express a suspicion on the most fundamental point in all that you have quoted from the "Christian Baptist," viz.--"I contend that the ground-work of salvation by faith was either perspective or retrospectively the sacrifice of Christ." Concerning this golden sentiment you kindly suspicion me as guilefully saving my reputation for orthodoxy! My course in life, indeed, exhibits a great desire for the reputation of orthodoxy, and fully warrants such a conclusion!!! No, sir, you have wholly mistaken me. While I have contended, and do contend, that the particular objects of faith of the cloud of witnesses in Hebs. xi. were as diverse as the persons named, and therefore the better served to illustrate the power and excellency of that salutary principle; I never once said or thought that *any sinner*, in any age, was ever justified before God by any faith he possessed, without the influence of the death of Christ on the throne and character of the Lawgiver of the Universe. This, during my whole editorial career, has been the polar star of all my reasonings and thoughts on the great question, *How shall a sinful man be just before God?*

But you cannot comprehend how the sacrifice of Christ could be a means of salvation, when not one from Eve to Mary Magdalene believed or understood it. Of course, then, you can never conceive how it could be the means of salvation to any one dying under five or seven years old--in infancy, from Eve to "Michael's trump shall sound;" and therefore you must have some way of saving at least one third of Adam's race without Christ at all, or else you must deny the possibility of salvation for one-third of human kind; nay, much worse than this, if all the dead of all ages were summoned to the tribunal of your views of means of salvation! Besides, you must have some way of saving the ancients, infants and adults, without the Holy Spirit, as now essential to life spiritual and divine, if the knowledge of its mode of existence or operation be an essential means of salvation. Nay, you are perplexed with still greater difficulties; for if the death of Christ be necessary to a proper faith in the divine philanthropy, as [[@Page:301] you seem to teach, then not one of all the human race, infant or adult, from the creation till the crucifixion of Christ, could have been saved at all; since you concur with me that no one during that period could possibly understand the death of the Messiah. But, my dear sir, as it is essential to animal life that there should be oxygen gas in the atmosphere, but not essential that every one believe and understand its existence, but only that he open his mouth and receive it; so was it essential to pardon in all cases that there should be a sin-offering, but not that every one should have understood the sacrificial death of the Lord Messiah before that event transpired. Hence in the extracts quoted from the "Christian Baptist" there is one that fully meets this view of the case--"True faith has ever been the belief of all the revelation extant at the time."

Your review of my fourth letter begins on the third page of what your printer has captioned a *continuation of the review of my fourth letter*. This, with some other singular typographical errors, will perplex your readers as they have perplexed me. Your remarks on the words *expiate* and *atone for* are fully met in my last, as also your singular theory of sacrifice for little offences, and no sacrifice for great offences. Please, without waiting twelve months for the review in course of your arrangement of this my 8th letter, explain to us in your next the difference between "atone for" and "to make atonement for" as a scriptural phrase; and also the difference between "expiate our sins" and "purge our sins," or "make purification for sins." This is the more necessary as I see some of our very prominent brethren, amongst whom is your able colleague and co-editor brother Thomas M. Allen, of Missouri, are occasionally tendering me some kind mementos on my essays on "Pure Speech," and "Bible Names for Bible Ideas," especially when I happen to notice any of the elect subjects of the old dispensation, as if I were pulling down the things that I had builded. It is a capital mistake. Bible names are not translators' names--Hebrew and Greek, not English nor Latin names are Bible names; and I will contend before any literary tribunal in any College in America, that "*to atone for*" is neither more nor less than "*to make atonement for*," and to "*expiate our sins*" is as biblical as to "*purge our sins*," &c. &c. I wonder if there be no sectarian feeling in selecting a few phrases on this subject as coming under such a prohibition while I can find fifty phrases in one of your letters that have no scriptural authority--i. e. on the ground assumed in reprobating *expiate*, *pacify*, *propitiate*, and *atone for* as unscriptural.

As you develop your views of the law I see in them the roots of those singular conclusions to which you have come. In defence of [[@Page:302] your second affirmation you ask, "Was the law a part of the gospel?" and then quote, "The law is not of faith," &c. There is something called "the ceremonial law"--for the name I am not tenacious; the law of types and sacrifices; "the law contained in ordinances"--which, although no part of the Christian gospel, was most certainly the gospel of the legal dispensation. The ten precepts had no forgiveness in them; but the law of sacrifice most certainly had. I see no point in your interrogatories about the law, unless you exclude both Christ and his gospel from the typical rites, and the sacrifices. And what chapter will this open for discussion!! Meanwhile, Paul being my guide, I affirm that the ceremonial or ritual of Moses was the gospel of Judaism. If you doubt, I pray you read again the whole epistle to the Hebrews.

You sustain my three first affirmations of your views, even to making sacrifice "one of the deeds of the law." Then the law was co-eval with the fall: for sacrifice is as old as Cain and Abel! The law is in your logic, therefore, a part of the gospel; for it is often commended, and in its great principles enforced, by the Apostles.

I do not exactly affirm that you represent remission, *in all cases*, without shedding of blood; but I do say, you either do this virtually, by affirming the remission of the great sins without blood; or you make animal blood, by its own efficacy, without any allusion to the blood of Christ, take away sins of ignorance, or your minor offences. And surely you, do not deny that you teach that, so far as forgiveness, with regard to another life, was bestowed on Jews and Patriarchs, it was in every case without the shedding of blood: for example, David's sin was pardoned, but not by sacrifice, direct or indirect. This I regard as your doctrine. Now if David's sin of murder and adultery was pardoned without shedding of blood, any other sin may be; and therefore I argue on your principles shedding of blood had nothing to do with the true and proper remission of sins as respects another life from Adam to Christ. I do not, then, so much wonder, as I once did, at your making the death of Christ for our faith, rather than for our sins.

If, as you say, you have proved that no victim ever suffered death at the altar, as a vicarious substitute, or in the stead of the offerer, (whence came the word *vicarious* substitute!) then I ask you for an explanation of these words--"I have given blood to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." If this be not life for life, soul for soul, what does it mean? See Lev. xvi. 11. When Paul says, "*For* a good man some would even dare to die," does he not mean to [[@Page:303] die in his stead! and so when the same Apostle says, "God commends his love to us that while yet sinners Christ died for us"--is that not in our stead? This is what you and the orthodox call "*vicarious*." I confess I believe that Christ died *for* us, in our stead. Hence we who believe in him shall never die!! Believest thou this!--?

Some two pages of your letter on orthodoxy have no bearing on the subject before us. I am not defending orthodoxy nor assailing heterodoxy. No orthodox man now-a-days would take your version of his views; but I care not for your assaults on old orthodoxy--I stand up for the Bible.

I do not wish unnecessarily to complain of your method of prosecuting this discussion. I left this matter to your superior age and your great good sense, and did not stipulate either about the order of publication in your periodical, nor upon the necessity of direct and immediate replies. Indeed, the Harbinger was the periodical contemplated in the commencement. Since that time you have revived the "Messenger," and have for months past occasionally placed me on its pages in the singular attitude of replying in one number to your letter in some preceding number; while you as frequently follow me up with a reply to some letter written three or four months before. In almost any other person I would have regarded this as an ingenious contrivance for effect; but your venerable years and high reputation for candor and guileless magnanimity elevate you far above all such suspicions.--Your letters had,

however, better be curtailed in length, as latterly they very much exceed the bounds prescribed for our communications. If I am mistaken in the relative space occupied by as both in this discussion, I shall intimate it after my compositor shall have reported the number of *m's* we had so far respectively employed. Many say it is time that we had fully discussed Isa. liii., Rom. iii., and Heb. ix.; which they think ought to suffice. But this I leave to your own mature reflection.

Very benevolently, in the hope of immortality, yours, &c.

A. C.

A T O N E M E N T--*No. X.*

August 1941

To: A Campbell

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S LETTER VI.

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 theological 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 247, 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 113, 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 the 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 118 you say, "In your second review you recur to your peculiar and favorite acceptance of the active transitive word *kaphar*, to *cover* with blood or water, and metonymically to cleanse." My peculiar acceptance! Where or when have I accepted this definition of the word? It is *not* my acceptance, 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 translators have not once translated the verb *kaphar* by *to cover*. Is it my peculiar and favorite acceptance of [[@Page:369] *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 119, 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 acceptance of the word I proved beyond fair debate in my second number. After you had read it, you expressed no surprize; but said, "I see in all you have said little or nothing from which to dissent." p. 297. Here was approbation.

Your surprize must arise from 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 surprized at my acceptance 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 when thou judgest--sanctify the Lord God in your hearts. Was this a justification of God from guilt? Was this a sanctification or cleansing of God from defilement? No. How, then, can these 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 119 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 acceptance by the verb *kafara*, to hide or conceal; so does [do] the Syriac and Chaldea, as our best [[@Page:370] 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 No. 2, pp. 291, 292. Here have I proved that the translators rendered *kaphar* to cleanse; but in no case have they rendered the word to cover, either 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 *exilaskesthai*; 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 296, 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 Genesis 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 nowhere 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 connected 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?
[[@Page:371] 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 119 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, reconciliation, &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 balance 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 blending metonymical 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 page 121 you say that 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.

B. W. STONE

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A NOTE TO B. W. STONE.

Brother Stone--I HAVE had to divide your letter, because of its unusual length. I cannot find room for more of it at present, nor for a reply; and will only say, that, seeing you do not write for victory, but for truth, I regret that you should give your communications a single squinting that way. Anyone who will turn over to my remarks on *kaphar* and *nasa* In the March number, p. 118, will see that you must have mistaken the drift of them, or that you are discussing a point on which there is no difference. You do not deny a single fact that I have stated; and yet one would imagine from the above remarks, that there is a real contradiction between us as to the manner in which our translators have rendered those terms. You also intimate that my objections against your translations of disputed words, and my complaint touching your throwing such an air of learning over the subject, equally oppugns my own efforts in the way of recommending a new version. Were it not that no one could impute to you any thing uncandid, I should have thought that you were playing off the controvertist here. I do, indeed, object to every religious controvertist turning critic on the original, and *manufacturing arguments out of his own translations*. This is at once taking the advantage of the audience or of the readers, and equivalent to a man in a rencounter getting behind a tree to escape the fire of the adversary. I will, before a tribunal or Hebrew or Greek critics, at any time engage to show that a hundred volumes of such criticisms as you have given us on the words *kaphar* and *nasa*, cannot affect the question at issue as much as one grave or acute accent over the vowel *a*. You have led the way in this field--not I. And I only say you cannot make one iota out of it. But I must dismiss the subject now.

A. CAMPBELL.

A T O N E M E N T--*No. X.*

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S LETTER VI.

September 1841

[*Continued from page 372.*]

LET 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.

[[@Page:389]

On page 120 you introduce Romans v. 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 is 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 Hebrews 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 no *direct* effect upon God to expiate or cleanse from, and make him propitious; but upon the people.

2. The rendering you have just given of the text, "He made an atonement, or reconciliation 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 preposition *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 Hebs. ix. 26, to prove your position that the reconciliation in Romans 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 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." p. 120. 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 [[@Page:390] *sin-offering*. And in Hebrews xix. 28. "He will appear the second time without sin," you read it, *without a sin-offering*. This is M'Knight's translation; and he translates the verse immediately in connexion (26) in the same way. Why did you 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." This is Macknight's translation; and he translates the verse immediately in connexion (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 Genesis 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 *hettah*, or *hettath*, *sin*, is very frequently taken for sin-offering. Exod. xxix. 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 Genesis iv. 4. See also Lev. iv. 3.; Exod. xxx. 10., &c., where the word for sin-offering is *hettath*. So also Dan. ix. 24. "To make an end of sins" means to make an end of sin-offerings. So Hosea iv. 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, and 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 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 or separation 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 prophet's figure of sins as a cloud separating between us and God. A cloud obstructs the light and heat of the natural sun from us, hut has no

effect upon the sun: 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 influence. 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 [[@Page:391] 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 120. "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, Macknight and a host of others, say, his righteousness. You alone, of all known to me, render it *justice*. Though the word *dikaioisune* is used near one hundred times in the New Testament, it is not once translated justice, but uniformly righteousness. You very often in your version translate the word *justification*, as therein is the justification of God revealed. Against this translation I have no objection. It fully includes 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 by the 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 righteousness 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, (ver. 20.) by the deeds of the law shall no flesh [[@Page:392] 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, (ver. 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 are of the faith of Abraham--they were all justified without the works of the law. ch. iv. 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 nowhere said it to my understanding.

On page 120 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 Bucks 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. [[@Page:393]

To. B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

Dear Sir--PERMIT a single reference or two more to your Hebrew. I have no where said that our translators have translated *kaphar*, or its Septuagint representative, by the English word *cover*. But I do say that the word primarily signifies *cover*. Moreover, that the English words *cover* and *coffer* are derived from it. But you make this rather a figurative meaning, than its literal and common import. Now that *kaphar* does signify *to cover*, and that it is frequently translated by words and phrases equivalent to *a cover* or *a covering*, I appeal to all our standard Hebrew Lexicons. Parkhurst gives ten acceptations of the word, and *he finds COVER in them all*. Its first meaning with him is "to cover by smearing." 2d. To annul a covenant by smearing it. 3. To dye or color over. 4. The hoar frost which covers. 5. A village or place of covering. 6. A vessel with a cover--a covered bason. 7. A covert lion. 8. To atone, to expiate, or appease--I will cover his face with the present--cover our transgressions. Psalm lxxix. 9. 9. A bribe that covereth the eyes. 10. The lid or covering of the ark. Whence, adds Parkhurst, is derived the English words *coffer* and *cover*. All other Lexicons concur substantially with Parkhurst. To *cleanse* and to *purify* are its figurative meanings; and

these happening to be its most usual scriptural acceptance, we most frequently find it, though not always, so rendered. Concerning this fact there never was any controversy between us.

I have turned up Parkhurst on the word *hettath*, Gen. iv. 7., and find no reason to change my opinion. I do not understand the Lord to say, 'Cain, if you do not well, a lamb lies at the door; it coucheth at the door of your tent: you may take and sacrifice it for an atonement, as did Abel thy brother.' But if you will take Parkhurst for authority in this, I will take him for authority to the end of the sentence: for, adds he, "Hence in *kal* and *hiph*, to offer for a sin-offering--to expiate, cleanse, or *purify by a sin-offering*, is the proper meaning of *hettath* in Ex. xxix. 30.; Lev. ix. 15.; vi. 26., &c. &c. But, as you say you expect "to write no more on this subject forever," I shall hasten to matters more intelligible and comprehensible to our readers--Romans iii. 25, 26.

I am truly sorry that you did not on this all-important passage, and on Heb. ix. 15., give us at least one essay, that we might fully understand you on passages which you admit are often quoted and much relied on by those who agree with me. Had you given to these passages only half the space occupied by outlandish terms which settle no American's mind on the subject, your readers would, no doubt, have rejoiced with me. [[@Page:394]

The view you give is briefly this:--'As from the typical mercy-seat God formerly declared his will and truth; so from Christ Jesus, the true mercy-seat, he now declares his will to the world. He declares the plan of justification without the deeds of the law;--that God will justify all who believe in Jesus, without the deeds of the Mosaic law.' This, in brief, is your interpretation of the passage. However, the reader can revert to it, and judge for himself. My objections to this interpretation are three:--1st. It misconstrues the typical mercy-seat, and converts it into a seat of intelligence. It was not an *intelligence seat*, but a *mercy-seat*. God did not "formerly declare his will and truth from the mercy-seat." His mercy sat there and dispensed blessings of forgiveness in answer to prayer and sacrifice: and when light was communicated from that place, it was in reference neither to truth nor the divine will in general, but in reference to some particular occurrence. 2d. It is not so much a revelation of the plan of salvation, as a vindication of it. Paul says he set him forth *for a demonstration of his justice*, or righteousness, [I care not which term,] in remitting sins. 3d. The reason assigned by the Apostle does not at all apply to your interpretation. His reason is, that God might be just not only in remitting sins under the gospel, but just in remitting sins committed under the law.

Allow me to explain myself fully on these three points. And, first, what was the *mercy-seat* and its design under the law? Our readers know that it is properly

called "*the propitiatory*," because "propitiation" was made upon it for the sins of the Jewish nation. In the common version it is called "*the mercy-seat*." Jerome called it "*the oracle*," because responses to special questions were sometimes given thence. Literally, however, it was the golden lid or covering of the ark of the covenant, from which were beaten out two golden cherubim, between, and upon which, the Divine Majesty was said to dwell. The golden lid, called *hilasterion*--(an adjective, neuter gender, with *epithema*, lid or cover understood,) concealed the two tables of the covenant or law of righteousness spoken from Sinai. Upon it, and before it, blood was sprinkled on the day of atonement. (Lev. xvi.) This lid or cover was, indeed, "the throne of grace" to the Jews--God was addressed as sitting between the cherubim; and while the covenant of righteousness was under that lid, it was beautifully said by David, "Justice and judgment are the basis of thy throne. Mercy and truth go before thy face." On the day of atonement the High Priest appeared there, and offered blood, which he sprinkled not merely upon, but seven times before "*the throne of God*." After which the Lord forgave and blessed the people. Now as the blood of Aaron's [[@Page:395] offering so affected the mercy-seat as to cause a blessing to flow to Israel after the flesh; so the blood of Christ, carried by himself into the true holiest of all, the archetype of the old sanctuary, so affects the throne of God in the heavens as to cause the promised blessings of the New Covenant to flow to Israel according to the Spirit. But as Jesus is himself the altar, the victim, the priest, he becomes the mercy-seat only "*through faith in his blood*." God, says Paul, has exhibited him as a *mercy-seat* through faith in his blood--the solitary example which the Bible affords of the phrase "*faith in his blood*." This makes him a mercy seat to us. Without this he is no propitiatory to anyone. Blood sprinkled upon the lid and before the lid, made that lid a mercy-seat; and to no other worshipper was it a mercy seat but to him whose faith in the call, appointment, and acceptability of the Jewish High Priest and his services, brought him to his knees.

I once said to you that "faith in his blood" was more significant than belief in Christ's person, mission, and death. It is confidence in his blood as the only and all-atoning blood that cleanseth from all sin. Jesus is, however, to all Christians, to all who repose confidence in his blood, a real "*mercy-seat*," a true "*throne of grace*." I lay the more emphasis on this, because I have met with professors, not a few, who have no more confidence in the blood of Jesus than in the blood of Stephen--they have as much faith in the one as in the other. To my mind this is a fatal mistake of the whole matter: for if it be faith in his blood that constitutes him the true mercy-seat, they have no mercy-seat who regard the blood of Stephen or of Paul as much a means of reconciliation as that of the Lord Jesus. You will, I doubt not, concur with me that it is faith in Christ's blood that makes him to any person a mercy-seat.

But I have mentioned a second objection to your interpretation of this passage. You make Jesus Christ an oracle rather than a mercy-seat. That he is the oracle of God I do most sincerely believe. But that is another figure for another object than that in the eye of the Apostle, Rom. iii. Justification through faith in Christ's blood is the subject now before the Apostle; or rather, he says, "We are justified freely by his grace *through the redemption* that is in Christ Jesus." *Redemption* in Christ Jesus! What can that mean!! Heb. ix. 15. "For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Institution, that by means of death *for the redemption of transgressions*." For the *redemption of transgressions*!! not of *transgressors*, but of *transgressions*!--redemption by means of death, by means of blood! The redemption, then, is in his blood--in his death; and hence "by grace we are justified through the redemption that is in Christ, whom God has exhibited a [[@Page:396] mercy-seat through faith in his blood, or death, for the redemption of transgressions."

The connexion, brother Stone, stereotypes the sense of this passage, and demonstrates that not as a seat of intelligence, not as an oracle, but as a mercy-seat, Jesus is contemplated by the Apostle. The reason assigned illustrates this, placing it in a very strong light--that *he might be just*. *Justice*, the justice of God, is the point of demonstration here. The justice is sustained by the redemption that is in blood--the blood of the Messiah. Justice in pardoning sin rests upon the redemption that is in his blood. The argument is, justice with God in remission rests upon *redemption of transgressions* in the blood of his Son. They measure each other. As the redemption, so is the justice. If there be a failure in the one, there is in the other. If there be not a full redemption of transgressions, there is not full justice in forgiving them. I am sorry, brother Stone, that, in your interpretation of this verse, you seem not to have remembered the antecedent verse--"*the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*." Now, to my mind, this is the very jut of the whole passage. For "that he might be just" has respect to the amplitude of the redemption respecting sins committed under two dispensations--sins committed during *the forbearance of God*, while as yet there was no real sin-offering; and sins committed since there was a real sin-offering under the gospel. Hence the distinction which is found in the third item of objections to your comment.

The third item has primary respect to the demonstration which the Apostle deduces from *the redemption* that is in the Messiah. The common version says, "To declare his righteousness" for the remission of sins, past and present. You know that "to declare his righteousness" is not the proper translation of this passage: for we have no infinitive mood governing an accusative in the original, but a substantive in the accusative governing another in the genitive--"*for a demonstration of his own righteousness*"--"that he might be just," &c. Thus, most correctly, Dr. Macknight. But this only for your benefit, not for our readers: for in all controversy, till we have a

better version agreed upon, I teach nothing that I cannot demonstrate from the common version. Now, my dear sir, let us consider the *endeixin*, the demonstration of righteousness which Paul gives.

The demonstration is found in the redemption which is in the death of Christ; not found any where else in law or gospel, in heaven or earth. Two chapters of sins are to be forgiven: sins '*passed by*,' before Christ died--during the forbearance of God; and sins committed since his death. The 'called' under the former dispensation were pardoned--i. e. those who under the law obeyed God--these were pardoned [[@Page:397] during the forbearance, while as yet there was no *redemption*, no true deliverance from the guilt of sin; and those who are now 'the called'--those who obey the gospel are pardoned through the same redemption; and thus, if there be a good reason in the redemption--that is, in the blood of Christ, why the sins of those now living should be pardoned, there was by anticipation as good reason in it why the sins committed should have been '*passed by*'⁸ and finally forgiven. Hence Paul says, in all good logic, "Whom God has set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins *that were past* through the forbearance of God--to declare also his righteousness *at the present time*, that he might be *just in justifying* him that is of the faith of Jesus," as the true Messiah.⁹

Now, I ask, what point is there in this passage (Rom. iii. 25, 26.) if you convert Jesus into an *oracle*, and represent God as showing through him that justification by faith, without the deeds of the law, is according to the law and the prophets!--Nay, do you not manifestly labor in your mind in finding a rational exposition of these words, when you have to express yourself in such marvellous words as the following?--"But, (page 392,) the objection is, how can he be just in justifying and pardoning the guilty without the deeds of the law." I wonder who ever made such an objection!! No Jew! No Greek! No American! Pardon *the guilty* WITHOUT the deeds of the law! Pardon *the*

⁸ "*Passed by*."--The word *paresin*, found here, is not found in the Greek scriptures, Old Testament or New. It ought to here rendered as Macknight has it--"*in passing by*." A similar sentence is found in Micah vi. 18.--"Who is a God like to thee, that pardoneth iniquity and *passeth by* the transgression of the remnant of thine heritage?" To "pass by" iniquity is not to punish it. Thus the sins of the ancient saints, from Abel to the days of John the Baptist, were passed by till expiated by the redemption that was in the death of Christ.

⁹ Many minor points in your letter are passed by--such as, my omitting the word *own* before justice. This I have done not from a conviction that it ought not to be there, but because it is not essential to my views, and to save unnecessary debate. Still when you notice the fact of my omitting it, I must say that it is necessarily implied in *autou* in the force of the passage; for the demonstration of justice is that *he* might be just; consequently it is for a proof of his own justice or righteousness. Take another example of minor points not replied to: Your comment on the words "*faith in his blood*," being obviously a misconception of my meaning, I passed in silence. I do not mean the belief of his blood, but confidence in his blood. Thousands believe in the blood of Christ as a means of faith and reconciliation, who have no confidence in his blood as the justifying means of their personal redemption. Now I not only believe in his death as a means of faith, or reconciliation, but I also confide in it as the essential cause of my redemption and deliverance from sin; without which God could not, with all my faith in the fact of kill death, righteously justify me. Father Stone, A this your faith in his blood? If so, we are virtually of one faith in this fundamental truth.

guilty WITH the deeds of the law, was, is, and evermore shall be, as incomprehensible as to pardon them without those deeds--a guilty man condemned by law and justified by keeping it! No greater contradiction in the universe. You therefore wisely conclude that "by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified." But how feeble your commendation of the exhibition of this justification by faith--"God declares it by, or from Jesus Christ." He simply *speaks it out by him!* So that it all ends here--'God has declared by the lips of his Son that he will justify men by faith; and this *simple affirmation* confirmed by his death, is set forth *as a propitiatory* through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of God's righteousness--that he might not only be, but appear, just in justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus.' Paul, why then did you speak of the justification by grace resting upon *the redemption* that is in Christ Jesus, and not rather upon a simple "*thus saith the Lord?*"¹⁰

But we must look more attentively into the parallel passage, Heb. ix. 15.

In the preceding verses Paul affirms that the blood of bulls and goats never took away a single sin from the conscience--that blood did, indeed, sanctify only to the purification of the flesh from legal or [[@Page:398] municipal impurities; but went no farther. Yet from this he argues, if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a burned red heifer did sanctify so far as respected *the flesh*, how much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse the conscience from dead works--that men thus sanctified might serve the living God. "And for this reason," continues he, "he has become the Mediator of a New Institution, that by means of death, for *the redemption of transgressions* that were under the first Testament", (during the oblation of the blood of animals,) "those who were under it and had been called," (obeyed the Lord according to that dispensation,) "might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance,"--though dead as to Canaan, they might through the better blood, the real sin-offering of the New Institution, obtain a portion of the eternal inheritance.

Nothing to my mind can be more evident than the following facts from these premises;--

¹⁰ Nothing in this epistle is more obvious to my mind than that Paul represents justification as an act of favor resting upon the virtue or significance of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. The justice of God in condemning and absolving sinners, as Lawgiver and Judge, occupies the first 24 verses of this chapter. Paul argues his justice [401] in both cases. He justifies him in condemning because of the wickedness of the Jew and the Greek. Then he justifies him in justifying freely through his grace because of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

Permit me farther to state that *apolutroosis* denotes the redemption of a captive from death by paying a ransom for him. Jesus, says Paul, "gave himself not merely as a *lutron*, but as an *antilutron* for all." And the Saviour himself says, (Matth. xxii. 28.) 'The Son of Man gave his life a *ransom for many*.' Here it is *lutron anti polloon*. The Greeks say, any price paid for the ransom of a captive was called *lutron*; but where life was given for life, it was usually called *antilutron*. I do not, indeed, regard the term as literally used to represent a price paid for the deliverance of a captive from slavery or death in the vulgar sense; but as a life given for the life of many.

1. The legal sacrifices only purified the flesh--never the conscience. But they did actually release the offerers from all the penalties of transgressing the legal institution, so far as the temporal rewards and punishments of the Jewish commonwealth were concerned: all this, too, for typical purposes.

2. Amongst the legal worshippers there were two classes--the really devout, and the legally devout. They equally enjoyed the benefits of the legal oblations: but the latter class enjoyed only these; whereas the former class in a believing anticipation of good things to come, confessed judgment at the altar, had their transgressions filed in blood, and obtained a stay of execution till the Lord should expiate their sins by his own death. "And for this cause," says Paul, "he is the Mediator of the New Institution, that by means of death for the redemption of those transgressions" [filed] "under the first covenant, they who, under that covenant, were truly God's people, might obtain the inheritance of the saints in light."

3. The death of Christ was *for the redemption of transgressions*; and although he died as "the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world," yet only that portion of mankind who have "faith in his blood" do actually derive pardon and life through his death. But it was as much for the redemption of transgressions past under the law, as for the redemption of transgressions under the gospel, that Christ died. Consequently there was no real pardon of real sin in the Jewish sacrificial system. "The law made nothing perfect."

4. The redemption that is through the death or blood of Jesus is necessary--that is, it is of right demanded: for to exact death, unless justice demanded it, would be to do unjustly. It was necessary, that [[@Page:399] God might be just in forgiving sin. Thus Paul to the Romans and to the Hebrews represents *redemption for sins* in the death or blood of Jesus. This redemption or deliverance is what is usually, though improperly, called "*the merits*" or "*worth*" of his death. Certainly it is the efficacy of his death; for on this redemption justice rests its plea while consenting with mercy in forgiving sin. God has, then, set forth the person and blood of his Son as a mercy-seat, that he might be truly just, and appear so before the universe, in forgiving sins committed against him as Lawgiver of all rational and moral intelligences.

If I am tedious here, brother Stone, it is because I delight to be tedious upon this basis of the basis of the whole remedial system. I pretend not to fathom the ocean, nor do I aim at comprehending the wonderful ways of the Infinite Intelligence; but when God speaks I must listen, and when he explains himself it is a sin not to endeavor to understand him. He has spoken often and through various persons on this transcendent theme. If it be orthodoxy or heterodoxy I care not; but I do believe that man is fallen--that *the wages of sin is death*--that death has passed through all generations of men because that all have sinned--that sacrifice had its origin here--that God sent man out

of Eden not clothed in silk, or cotton, or the bark of trees, but in the skins of slain beasts--that all the blood of all slain animals never took away the deep stain of the least human sin against God's moral law--that the Jewish sacrifices and all divinely ordained sacrifices were but types of the sin-offering of my Lord the King--that the New Covenant has in it a real remission of all sins because mediated by Emanuel and sealed by his own blood--that God, as King, cannot now be just in forgiving sin--having, as *lawgiver*, said, "*The soul that sinneth shall die*," but through the death of his Son. I moreover believe that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin--not our tears nor our penitence, but his blood; and that blood must be seen, believed, and acquiesced in according to God's own appointed way. Hence the command, "Believe, repent, and be baptized *for the remission of sins*."

I admire your scrupulosity about Bible terms and Bible ideas. It is a scrupulosity dear to every feeling of my heart. I venerate the man that venerates the word of God. God himself honors with special tokens of his favor the man that "trembles at his word." You know I have never been solicitous of reputation at the hands of downy and stall-fed orthodoxy. I never have courted such popular applause. Well, then, I am not to be suspected of any leaning that way. But after placing myself in every attitude favorable to an impartial consideration of all these great points, I do, while deprecating much of [[@Page:400] their unauthorized, though consecrated jargon on trinity, unity, atonement, sacrifice, &c. &c. and lamenting the frequent caricatures, rather than expositions of the true doctrine, by weak and conceited expositors, of that school; nevertheless, the true and proper divinity or godhead of my Lord Messiah, and the real sin-expiating value and efficacy of his death, and of his death alone, based upon his peerless worth and divine majesty, are the rock of my salvation--the basis of all my hopes of immortality--the very anchor of my soul amidst the shakings of the earth, the upheavings of the ocean, and all the tumults and debates of the people.

A religion not honoring God the Father of all--not relying upon the person, mission, and death of the WORD INCARNATE--not inspired, cherished, animated, and inflamed by the Holy Spirit dwelling in my soul, is a cheat, a base counterfeit, and not that athletic, strong, and invincible thing which armed the martyr's soul amidst all the terrors that earth and hell could throw around the name of the Redeemer, his cause, and people.--That this religion may be the solace of your heart, and the strength of your soul while passing through the dark valley and the deep shadows of death, is the prayer of

Yours, most benevolently,

A. CAMPBELL.

P. S. I hope to get through in one or two letters more.

A T O N E M E N T--No. X. (CONTINUED)

REVIEW OF BROTHER CAMPBELL'S LETTER VI.
[*Continued from page 372.*]

September 1841

To A. Campbell (continued)

LET 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.
[[@Page:389]

On page 120 you introduce Romans v. 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 is 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 Hebrews 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 no *direct* effect upon God to expiate or cleanse from, and make him propitious; but upon the people.

2. The rendering you have just given of the text, "He made an atonement, or reconciliation 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 preposition *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 Hebs. ix. 26, to prove your position that the reconciliation in Romans 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 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." p. 120. 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 Hebrews xix. 28. "He will appear the second time without sin," you read it, *without a sin-offering*. This is M'Knight's translation; and he translates the verse immediately in connexion (26) in the same way. Why did you 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." This is Macknight's translation; and he translates the verse immediately in connexion (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 Genesis 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 *hettah, or hettath, sin*, is very frequently taken for sin-offering. Exod. xxix. 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 Genesis iv. 4. See also Lev. iv. 3.; Exod. xxx. 10., &c., where the word for sin-offering is *hettath*. So also Dan. ix. 24. "To make an end of sins" means to make an end of sin-offerings. So Hosea iv. 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, and 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 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 or separation 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 prophet's figure of sins as a cloud separating between us and God. A cloud obstructs the light and heat of the natural sun from us, hut has no effect upon the sun: 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 influence. 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 [[@Page:391] 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 120. "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, Macknight 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 uniformly righteousness. You very often in your version translate the word *justification*, as therein is the justification of God revealed. Against this translation I have no objection. It fully includes 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 by the 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 righteousness 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, (ver. 20.) by the deeds of the law shall no flesh [[@Page:392] 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, (ver. 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 are of the faith of Abraham--they were all justified without the works of the law. ch. iv. 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 nowhere said it to my understanding.

On page 120 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 Bucks 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. [[@Page:393]

To. B. W. STONE.

BROTHER STONE:

Dear Sir--PERMIT a single reference or two more to your Hebrew. I have nowhere said that our translators have translated *kaphar*, or its Septuagint representative, by the English word *cover*. But I do say that the word primarily signifies *cover*. Moreover, that the English words *cover* and *coffer* are derived from it. But you make this rather a figurative meaning, than its literal and common import. Now that *kaphar* does signify *to cover*, and that it is frequently translated by words and phrases equivalent to *a cover* or *a covering*, I appeal to all our standard Hebrew Lexicons. Parkhurst gives ten acceptations of the word, and *he finds COVER in them all*. Its first meaning with him is "to cover by smearing." 2d. To annul a covenant by smearing it. 3. To dye or color over. 4. The hoar frost which covers. 5. A village or place of covering. 6. A vessel with a cover--a covered bason. 7. A covert lion. 8. To atone, to expiate, or appease--I will cover his face with the present--cover our transgressions. Psalm lxxix. 9. 9. A bribe that covereth the eyes. 10. The lid or covering of the ark. Whence, adds Parkhurst, is derived the English words *coffer* and *cover*. All other Lexicons concur substantially with Parkhurst. To *cleanse* and to *purify* are its figurative meanings; and these happening to be its most usual scriptural acceptation, we most frequently find it, though not always, so rendered. Concerning this fact there never was any controversy between us.

I have turned up Parkhurst on the word *hettath*, Gen. iv. 7., and find no reason to change my opinion. I do not understand the Lord to say, 'Cain, if you do not well, a lamb lies at the door; it coucheth at the door of your tent: you may take and sacrifice it for an atonement, as did Abel thy brother.' But if you will take Parkhurst for authority in this, I will take him for authority to the end of the sentence: for, adds he, "Hence in *kal* and *hiph*, to offer for a sin-offering--to expiate, cleanse, or *purify by a sin-offering*, is the proper meaning of *hettath* in Ex. xxix. 30.; Lev. ix. 15.; vi. 26., &c. &c. But, as you say you expect "to write no more on this subject forever," I shall hasten to matters more intelligible and comprehensible to our readers--Romans iii. 25, 26.

I am truly sorry that you did not on this all-important passage, and on Heb. ix. 15., give us at least one essay, that we might fully understand you on passages which you admit are often quoted and much relied on by those who agree with me. Had you given to these passages only half the space occupied by outlandish terms which settle no American's mind on the subject, your readers would, no doubt, have rejoiced with me. [[@Page:394]

The view you give is briefly this:--'As from the typical mercy-seat God formerly declared his will and truth; so from Christ Jesus, the true mercy-seat, he now declares his will to the world. He declares the plan of justification without the deeds of the law;--that God will justify all who believe in Jesus, without the deeds of the Mosaic law.' This, in brief, is your interpretation of the passage. However, the reader can revert to it, and judge for himself. My objections to this interpretation are three:--1st. It misconstrues the typical mercy-seat, and converts it into a seat of intelligence. It was not an *intelligence seat*, but a *mercy-seat*. God did not "formerly declare his will and truth from the mercy-seat." His mercy sat there and dispensed blessings of forgiveness in answer to prayer and sacrifice: and when light was communicated from that place, it was in reference neither to truth nor the divine will in general, but in reference to some particular occurrence. 2d. It is not so much a revelation of the plan of salvation, as a vindication of it. Paul says he set him forth *for a demonstration of his justice*, or righteousness, [I care not which term,] in remitting sins. 3d. The reason assigned by the Apostle does not at all apply to your interpretation. His reason is, that God might be just not only in remitting sins under the gospel, but just in remitting sins committed under the law.

Allow me to explain myself fully on these three points. And, first, what was the *mercy-seat* and its design under the law? Our readers know that it is properly called "*the propitiatory*," because "propitiation" was made upon it for the sins of the Jewish nation. In the common version it is called "*the mercy-seat*." Jerome called it "*the oracle*," because responses to special questions were sometimes given thence. Literally, however, it was the golden lid or covering of the ark of the covenant, from which were beaten out two golden cherubim, between, and upon which, the Divine Majesty was said to dwell. The golden lid, called *hilasterion*--(an adjective, neuter gender, with *epithema*, lid or cover understood,) concealed the two tables of the covenant or law of righteousness spoken from Sinai. Upon it, and before it, blood was sprinkled on the day of atonement. (Lev. xvi.) This lid or cover was, indeed, "the throne of grace" to the Jews--God was addressed as sitting between the cherubim; and while the covenant of righteousness was under that lid, it was beautifully said by David, "Justice and judgment are the basis of thy throne. Mercy and truth go before thy face." On the day of atonement the High Priest appeared there, and offered blood, which he sprinkled not merely upon, but seven times before "*the throne of God*." After which the Lord forgave and blessed the people. Now as the blood of Aaron's [[@Page:395] offering so affected the mercy-seat as to cause a blessing to flow to Israel after the flesh; so the blood of Christ, carried by himself into the true holiest of all, the archetype of the old sanctuary, so affects the throne of God in the heavens as to cause the promised blessings of the New Covenant to flow to Israel according to the Spirit. But as Jesus is himself the altar, the victim, the priest, he becomes the mercy-seat only "*through faith in his blood*." God, says Paul, has exhibited him as

a *mercy-seat* through faith in his blood--the solitary example which the Bible affords of the phrase "*faith in his blood*." This makes him a mercy seat to us. Without this he is no propitiatory to anyone. Blood sprinkled upon the lid and before the lid, made that lid a mercy-seat; and to no other worshipper was it a mercy seat but to him whose faith in the call, appointment, and acceptability of the Jewish High Priest and his services, brought him to his knees.

I once said to you that "faith in his blood" was more significant than belief in Christ's person, mission, and death. It is confidence in his blood as the only and all-atoning blood that cleanseth from all sin. Jesus is, however, to all Christians, to all who repose confidence in his blood, a real "*mercy-seat*," a true "*throne of grace*." I lay the more emphasis on this, because I have met with professors, not a few, who have no more confidence in the blood of Jesus than in the blood of Stephen--they have as much faith in the one as in the other. To my mind this is a fatal mistake of the whole matter: for if it be faith in his blood that constitutes him the true mercy-seat, they have no mercy-seat who regard the blood of Stephen or of Paul as much a means of reconciliation as that of the Lord Jesus. You will, I doubt not, concur with me that it is faith in Christ's blood that makes him to any person a mercy-seat.

But I have mentioned a second objection to your interpretation of this passage. You make Jesus Christ an oracle rather than a mercy-seat. That he is the oracle of God I do most sincerely believe. But that is another figure for another object than that in the eye of the Apostle, Rom. iii. Justification through faith in Christ's blood is the subject now before the Apostle; or rather, he says, "We are justified freely by his grace *through the redemption* that is in Christ Jesus." *Redemption* in Christ Jesus! What can that mean!! Heb. ix. 15. "For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Institution, that by means of death *for the redemption of transgressions*." For the *redemption of transgressions*!! not of *transgressors*, but of *transgressions*!--redemption by means of death, by means of blood! The redemption, then, is in his blood--in his death; and hence "by grace we are justified through the redemption that is in Christ, whom God has exhibited a [[@Page:396] mercy-seat through faith in his blood, or death, for the redemption of transgressions."

The connexion, brother Stone, stereotypes the sense of this passage, and demonstrates that not as a seat of intelligence, not as an oracle, but as a mercy-seat, Jesus is contemplated by the Apostle. The reason assigned illustrates this, placing it in a very strong light--that *he might be just*. *Justice*, the justice of God, is the point of demonstration here. The justice is sustained by the redemption that is in blood--the blood of the Messiah. Justice in pardoning sin rests upon the redemption that is in his blood. The argument is, justice with God in remission rests upon *redemption of transgressions* in the blood of his Son. They measure each other. As the redemption, so is the justice. If there be a failure in the one, there is in the other. If there be not a

full redemption of transgressions, there is not full justice in forgiving them. I am sorry, brother Stone, that, in your interpretation of this verse, you seem not to have remembered the antecedent verse--"*the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.*" Now, to my mind, this is the very jut of the whole passage. For "that he might be just" has respect to the amplitude of the redemption respecting sins committed under two dispensations--sins committed during *the forbearance of God*, while as yet there was no real sin-offering; and sins committed since there was a real sin-offering under the gospel. Hence the distinction which is found in the third item of objections to your comment.

The third item has primary respect to the demonstration which the Apostle deduces from *the redemption* that is in the Messiah. The common version says, "To declare his righteousness" for the remission of sins, past and present. You know that "to declare his righteousness" is not the proper translation of this passage: for we have no infinitive mood governing an accusative in the original, but a substantive in the accusative governing another in the genitive--"*for a demonstration of his own righteousness*"--"that he might be just," &c. Thus, most correctly, Dr. Macknight. But this only for your benefit, not for our readers: for in all controversy, till we have a better version agreed upon, I teach nothing that I cannot demonstrate from the common version. Now, my dear sir, let us consider the *endeixin*, the demonstration of righteousness which Paul gives.

The demonstration is found in the redemption which is in the death of Christ; not found any where else in law or gospel, in heaven or earth. Two chapters of sins are to be forgiven: sins '*passed by*,' before Christ died--during the forbearance of God; and sins committed since his death. The 'called' under the former dispensation were pardoned--i. e. those who under the law obeyed God--these were pardoned [[@Page:397] during the forbearance, while as yet there was no *redemption*, no true deliverance from the guilt of sin; and those who are now 'the called'--those who obey the gospel are pardoned through the same redemption; and thus, if there be a good reason in the redemption--that is, in the blood of Christ, why the sins of those now living should be pardoned, there was by anticipation as good reason in it why the sins committed should have been '*passed by*'¹¹ and finally forgiven. Hence Paul says, in all good logic, "Whom God has set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins *that were past* through the

¹¹ "*Passed by.*"--The word *parasin*, found here, is not found in the Greek scriptures, Old Testament or New. It ought to here rendered as Macknight has it--"*in passing by.*" A similar sentence is found in Micah vi. 18.--"Who is a God like to thee, that pardoneth iniquity and *passeth by* the transgression of the remnant of thine heritage?" To "pass by" iniquity is not to punish it. Thus the sins of the ancient saints, from Abel to the days of John the Baptist, were passed by till expiated by the redemption that was in the death of Christ.

forbearance of God--to declare also his righteousness *at the present time*, that he might be *just in justifying* him that is of the faith of Jesus," as the true Messiah.¹²

Now, I ask, what point is there in this passage (Rom. iii. 25, 26.) if you convert Jesus into an *oracle*, and represent God as showing through him that justification by faith, without the deeds of the law, is according to the law and the prophets!--Nay, do you not manifestly labor in your mind in finding a rational exposition of these words, when you have to express yourself in such marvellous words as the following?--"But, (page 392,) the objection is, how can he be just in justifying and pardoning the guilty without the deeds of the law." I wonder who ever made such an objection!! No Jew! No Greek! No American! Pardon *the guilty* WITHOUT the deeds of the law! Pardon *the guilty* WITH the deeds of the law, was, is, and evermore shall be, as incomprehensible as to pardon them without those deeds--a guilty man condemned by law and justified by keeping it! No greater contradiction in the universe. You therefore wisely conclude that "by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified." But how feeble your commendation of the exhibition of this justification by faith--"God declares it by, or from Jesus Christ." He simply *speaks it out by him!* So that it all ends here--'God has declared by the lips of his Son that he will justify men by faith; and this *simple affirmation* confirmed by his death, is set forth *as a propitiatory* through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of God's righteousness--that he might not only be, but appear, just in justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus.' Paul, why then did you speak of the justification by grace resting upon *the redemption* that is in Christ Jesus, and not rather upon a simple "*thus saith the Lord?*"¹³

¹² Many minor points in your letter are passed by--such as, my omitting the word *own* before justice. This I have done not from a conviction that it ought not to be there, but because it is not essential to my views, and to save unnecessary debate. Still when you notice the fact of my omitting it, I must say that it is necessarily implied in *autou* in the force of the passage; for the demonstration of justice is that *he* might be just; consequently it is for a proof of his own justice or righteousness. Take another example of minor points not replied to: Your comment on the words "*faith in his blood*," being obviously a misconception of my meaning, I passed in silence. I do not mean the belief of his blood, but confidence in his blood. Thousands believe in the blood of Christ as a means of faith and reconciliation, who have no confidence in his blood as the justifying means of their personal redemption. Now I not only believe in his death as a means of faith, or reconciliation, but I also confide in it as the essential cause of my redemption and deliverance from sin; without which God could not, with all my faith in the fact of kill death, righteously justify me. Father Stone, A this your faith in his blood? If so, we are virtually of one faith in this fundamental truth.

¹³ Nothing in this epistle is more obvious to my mind than that Paul represents justification as an act of favor resting upon the virtue or significance of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. The justice of God in condemning and absolving sinners, as Lawgiver and Judge, occupies the first 24 verses of this chapter. Paul argues his justice [401] in both cases. He justifies him in condemning because of the wickedness of the Jew and the Greek. Then he justifies him in justifying freely through his grace because of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

Permit me farther to state that *apolutroosis* denotes the redemption of a captive from death by paying a ransom for him. Jesus, says Paul, "gave himself not merely as a *lutron*, but as an *antilutron* for all." And the Saviour himself says, (Matth. xxii. 28.) 'The Son of Man gave his life a *ransom for many*.' Here it is *lutron anti polloon*. The Greeks say, any price paid for the ransom of a captive was called *lutron*; but where life was given for life, it was usually

But we must look more attentively into the parallel passage, Heb. ix. 15.

In the preceding verses Paul affirms that the blood of bulls and goats never took away a single sin from the conscience--that blood did, indeed, sanctify only to the purification of the flesh from legal or [[@Page:398] municipal impurities; but went no farther. Yet from this he argues, if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a burned red heifer did sanctify so far as respected *the flesh*, how much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse the conscience from dead works--that men thus sanctified might serve the living God. "And for this reason," continues he, "he has become the Mediator of a New Institution, that by means of death, for *the redemption of transgressions* that were under the first Testament", (during the oblation of the blood of animals,) "those who were under it and had been called," (obeyed the Lord according to that dispensation,) "might receive the promise of the eternal inheritance,"--though dead as to Canaan, they might through the better blood, the real sin-offering of the New Institution, obtain a portion of the eternal inheritance.

Nothing to my mind can be more evident than the following facts from these premises;--

1. The legal sacrifices only purified the flesh--never the conscience. But they did actually release the offerers from all the penalties of transgressing the legal institution, so far as the temporal rewards and punishments of the Jewish commonwealth were concerned: all this, too, for typical purposes.

2. Amongst the legal worshippers there were two classes--the really devout, and the legally devout. They equally enjoyed the benefits of the legal oblations: but the latter class enjoyed only these; whereas the former class in a believing anticipation of good things to come, confessed judgment at the altar, had their transgressions filed in blood, and obtained a stay of execution till the Lord should expiate their sins by his own death. "And for this cause," says Paul, "he is the Mediator of the New Institution, that by means of death for the redemption of those transgressions" [filed] "under the first covenant, they who, under that covenant, were truly God's people, might obtain the inheritance of the saints in light."

3. The death of Christ was *for the redemption of transgressions*; and although he died as "the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world," yet only that portion of mankind who have "faith in his blood" do actually derive pardon and life through his death. But it was as much for the redemption of transgressions past under the law, as for the redemption of transgressions under the gospel, that Christ died. Consequently

called *antilitron*. I do not, indeed, regard the term as literally used to represent a price paid for the deliverance of a captive from slavery or death in the vulgar sense; but as a life given for the life of many.

there was no real pardon of real sin in the Jewish sacrificial system. "The law made nothing perfect."

4. The redemption that is through the death or blood of Jesus is necessary--that is, it is of right demanded: for to exact death, unless justice demanded it, would be to do unjustly. It was necessary, that [[@Page:399] God might be just in forgiving sin. Thus Paul to the Romans and to the Hebrews represents *redemption for sins* in the death or blood of Jesus. This redemption or deliverance is what is usually, though improperly, called "*the merits*" or "worth" of his death. Certainly it is the efficacy of his death; for on this redemption justice rests its plea while consenting with mercy in forgiving sin. God has, then, set forth the person and blood of his Son as a mercy-seat, that he might be truly just, and appear so before the universe, in forgiving sins committed against him as Lawgiver of all rational and moral intelligences.

If I am tedious here, brother Stone, it is because I delight to be tedious upon this basis of the basis of the whole remedial system. I pretend not to fathom the ocean, nor do I aim at comprehending the wonderful ways of the Infinite Intelligence; but when God speaks I must listen, and when he explains himself it is a sin not to endeavor to understand him. He has spoken often and through various persons on this transcendent theme. If it be orthodoxy or heterodoxy I care not; but I do believe that man is fallen--that *the wages of sin is death*--that death has passed through all generations of men because that all have sinned--that sacrifice had its origin here--that God sent man out of Eden not clothed in silk, or cotton, or the bark of trees, but in the skins of slain beasts--that all the blood of all slain animals never took away the deep stain of the least human sin against God's moral law--that the Jewish sacrifices and all divinely ordained sacrifices were but types of the sin-offering of my Lord the King--that the New Covenant has in it a real remission of all sins because mediated by Emanuel and sealed by his own blood--that God, as King, cannot now be just in forgiving sin--having, as *lawgiver*, said, "*The soul that sinneth shall die*," but through the death of his Son. I moreover believe that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin--not our tears nor our penitence, but his blood; and that blood must be seen, believed, and acquiesced in according to God's own appointed way. Hence the command, "Believe, repent, and be baptized *for the remission of sins*."

I admire your scrupulosity about Bible terms and Bible ideas. It is a scrupulosity dear to every feeling of my heart. I venerate the man that venerates the word of God. God himself honors with special tokens of his favor the man that "trembles at his word." You know I have never been solicitous of reputation at the hands of downy and stall-fed orthodoxy. I never have courted such popular applause. Well, then, I am not to be suspected of any leaning that way. But after placing myself in every attitude favorable to an impartial consideration of all these great points, I do, while deprecating much of [[@Page:400] their unauthorized, though consecrated jargon on

trinity, unity, atonement, sacrifice, &c. &c. and lamenting the frequent caricatures, rather than expositions of the true doctrine, by weak and conceited expositors, of that school; nevertheless, the true and proper divinity or godhead of my Lord Messiah, and the real sin-expiating value and efficacy of his death, and of his death alone, based upon his peerless worth and divine majesty, are the rock of my salvation--the basis of all my hopes of immortality--the very anchor of my soul amidst the shakings of the earth, the upheavings of the ocean, and all the tumults and debates of the people.

A religion not honoring God the Father of all--not relying upon the person, mission, and death of the WORD INCARNATE--not inspired, cherished, animated, and inflamed by the Holy Spirit dwelling in my soul, is a cheat, a base counterfeit, and not that athletic, strong, and invincible thing which armed the martyr's soul amidst all the terrors that earth and hell could throw around the name of the Redeemer, his cause, and people.--That this religion may be the solace of your heart, and the strength of your soul while passing through the dark valley and the deep shadows of death, is the prayer of

Yours, most benevolently,

A. CAMPBELL.

P. S. I hope to get through in one or two letters more.

A.C.

Two Notes

FROM
THE
MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.
NEW SERIES.

VOL. V.

BETHANY, VA. NOVEMBER, 1841.

No. XI.

NOTE TO MY PATRONS.

By B. W. Stone

[[@Page: 537]] I STATED in my last number that I should give a synopsis of the doctrine contained in the discussion between brother Campbell and myself, and advise brother Campbell to do the same; and print no more in our periodicals on this subject. From the letter of brother Campbell, just printed, no other principle than what has already been discussed in our letters, is brought to view. I am perfectly willing to rest the whole of our discussion with our readers; and if they have received any profit from it, let God have the glory. We have written honestly, I hope; and if we have in any thing erred, (and who but His Infallibility is exempt from error?) we hope it will not be imputed to us for sin.

I verily believe that in the manner our late letters are written, we might continue to write all our lives without any profit to ourselves or to our readers. We should involve every subject of theology. By long observation and experience I have found that when men have exhausted their sum of knowledge in debate, they supply that want with cynical remarks, which, produce strife and angry contention. Brother Campbell and myself have not advanced thus far; but we are men, subject to like passions. I am confident we love each other as cordially now, as we did when we commenced this discussion. I speak confidently of myself. We love the same God and Saviour as fervently as ever, and delight to advance his cause, and to hear of its advance on the earth.

I have declined giving a synopsis of my views, as stated in our discussion; because I view it unnecessary. I do not expect to write more on this subject in the Christian Messenger. Brother Campbell must take his own course. But it is hoped he also will cease. If he should think it proper to continue his letters, I may reply in an extra Messenger hereafter; but not at the expense of my patrons. My days are nearly numbered, and I wish to spend the remnant of them in preparing myself and others for eternity. My path through life has been rough and thorny; yet have I been cheered with the hope of immortality. I am now on the bank of Jordan, awaiting the voice of our great High Priest, to move forward to the heavenly Canaan. Amen!

B. W. STONE.

NOTE

By Alexander Campbell

SINCE the above was written I have had the painful intelligence that Elder Stone has been stricken with the palsy, and is not likely to recover. From recent accounts, indeed, it is probable that ere now he has passed the Jordan and gone to rest. Under all the circumstances I conceive it inexpedient to prosecute the subject farther at present. The discussion, on my part, was undertaken with a reference to two points: The first, the transcendent importance of the question itself--*For what did Christ die?* The second, a very general misconception and consequent misrepresentation of our views of it. I did, I confess, expect that brother Stone would have, more fully and satisfactorily relieved himself and the cause of reformation from the imputation of some of our opponents on the subject of Unitarianism in its sectarian acceptation. In this respect, though measurably disappointed, I am persuaded it will not be without advantage to the cause of reformation that so much has been written on the subject in the way of discussion--with one, too, who had spent so many years in debates and discussions on that or some kindred branch of the same subject.

All admit the excellency of the character of Elder Stone, however they may regard him as muddy and confused on some aspects of that all-important question. For my own part, I much desired, that, as he had ceased from all preaching and teaching of his former speculations on this and other questions for which the commencement of his career some forty years ago was distinguished, he would also in writing have given a permanent and full exposition of those points more in harmony with the developments and objects of the current reformation. Some of our readers have thought he has done so, while others are of a contrary opinion. For my own part, I can, and do make great allowance for early and long established habits of thinking and speaking on all religious questions; and therefore, regarding brother Stone as confiding in the sacrifice and death of Christ as indispensable to salvation, although by no means acquiescing in some of his views and interpretation of the meaning and designs of the Messiah's death, I can bear with a difference of opinion on a subject so vital, which many would regard as an insuperable obstacle to Christian communion.

Men may and do hold the *Head*, Christ, and his death and mediation as indispensable to salvation, who nevertheless have very inadequate conceptions of some of the aspects of these transcendent subjects. And as we are not saved by the strength and comprehension of our views, but through obeying from the heart the apostolic mould of doctrine, more stress ought to be laid upon moral excellence than [538] upon abstract orthodoxy; especially when all the great facts and documents of Christianity are cordially believed and cherished. Our bond of union

is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body, one spirit, one hope, one God and Father of all. And as many as walk by this rule peace be on them and mercy, and upon the whole Israel of God!

A. C.