

Religious

BIBLE SOCIETY, MISSIONARY, AND SABBATH SCHOOL ADVOCATE.

E. McLEOD, EDIT.

VOL. III.—NO. 43.

ST. JOHN, NEW BRUNSWICK.

That God in all things may be glorified

Intelligencer,

TERMS.—ONE DOLLAR A YEAR, IN ADVANCE

through Jesus Christ.—PETER.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1856.

WHOLE NO. 147

Religious Intelligencer.

The Blood and Pardon.

The apostle is writing to the Christians in the heathen—says that *without shedding blood there is no remission*. Hebrews vi. 22. In this statement he was speaking of the blood of inferior sacrifices; but he speaks of that in its symbolic relation to “the blood of Jesus Christ,” the Son of God, which “cleanseth us from all sin.” The truth that without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins under the ceremonial system, is used by him to demonstrate the necessity of the shedding of blood in the crucifixion of Emmanuel as the Lamb of God who bore the sin of the world. It is of inestimable moment to cling closely to the word of eternal truth on such a subject as this. We may, therefore, leave our readers as considerate in both as a matter of fact, and as one of doctrine, and also in its bearings on human experience. Guided by the Bible, we are compelled to regard it as a matter of unquestionable truth, that without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin. A remission through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justice of him which believeth in Jesus.” Rom. iii. 25, 26. Here is the blood shed on Calvary, and here too, on the high authority of the Eternal Spirit, is the reason, why sin could not be remitted without being shed. God could not be just and the *justifier* of those who believe in Jesus, unless their faith could be faith in his blood. Mark it well, not faith in his sympathy, but “in his blood” itself. In this context could their faith be such that God might be just, and justify them in connection with it. Is it the doctrine of the Divine Justice then that is *sophomically taught* in this manner of fact, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin.” As the Judge of all the earth, seated on his supreme judgment-seat and justifying those who believe in Jesus, that he may be just in doing so, he requires the shed blood of his only-begotten Son, as that of Him who appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself? We are thus led without any circuit to the bearing of this momentous matter on the experience of humanity. It is an unquestionable truth that man becomes, sooner or later, like the object of his worship. If his god is a creation of inflexible justice, the more earnestly the man will seek that god, the more, certainly and speedily will all that may be in him of such an attribute die away, and the more surely also will all such element of character be prevalent from ever forming in his mortal nature. We are aware that those who seek to divert attention from the blood of Christ as shed for sin, speak in the strongest terms of God’s justice; but surely we must be guided by what we already know. The patriarch not only offered what he had at hand, in his approach to God, but he offered that kind of sacrifice which Abel offered, and which was “most excellent” than that of Cain. Gen. viii. 20. Taking the two facts together, we are immediately convinced of the truth of Paul’s assertion. We next light on Abraham. When the father of all men that believe was commanded to offer up his beloved son, he rightly understood the command to be *to slay his blood*; and when the ram caught in the thicket relieved him of the necessity of that tremendous deed, it was provided as a victim whose life’s blood was to be shed instead of that of the young man. When we go back again to the “more excellent sacrifice” of Abel, as compared with that of Cain, and taking along with it that of Noah and that of Abraham, we can see the force of the apostle’s words, that, “as a matter of divine honesty,” without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.” Leaving the sacrifice of Abelism, we come next to Moses, and that vast and most instructive system of ceremonial to which the Apostle is writing in the Hebrews, refers. It is utterly impossible to study this system, or even to read over the account of it which we have in the Scriptures, without seeing that, under the law, almost all things were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there was no remission of sin.” Make of it what we may, it is an indisputable matter of fact. We may, then, at once come to Christ, and to his *over-emphatic words* to Nicodemus. “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” This lifting up, as applicable to Jesus, is clearly explained; when we regard to his own use of the same phrase, it is evident that he did this signifying what death he should die.

The question naturally arises—Why must he thus “lifted up?” He replies “that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have eternal life.” But another question arises, now, as it is essential to their having eternal life by faith, that he should be lifted up? And the reply is evident from the Saviour’s language. All the faith they could ever have exercised would never have given them life, had he not been lifted up to us according to men. “Without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins;” and consequently no amount of belief could have been of any avail, had he offered as sacrifice as which they might believe as a preparation for sin. “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, that he might appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself upon the high priest entered into the holy place every year with blood of others; for unto them that look for him shall still appear the second man without any substance.” Heb. ix. 24-28. Such then, is the great matter of fact. Let us consider it for a time as a matter of doctrine. What does this great matter of fact teach us? To be brief as pos-

sible, we must seize on the main thought which it presents to our minds. The truth that men had sinned and were perishing, and the other truth that Jehovah infinitely pitied and sympathized with man, while he identified himself with man, are not necessarily connected with the fact before us. We can easily conceive of God’s infinite pity regarding the guilty, and also of his infinite purity abhorring evil, without its being true that apart from his infinite purity there is no remission of sin.” Paul teaches us the true doctrine here involved, when he says of Jesus: “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiatory sacrifice through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justice of him which believeth in Jesus.” Rom. iii. 25, 26. Here is the blood shed on Calvary, and here too, on the high authority of the Eternal Spirit, is the reason, why sin could not be remitted without being shed. God could not be just and the *justifier* of those who believe in Jesus, unless their faith could be faith in his blood. Mark it well, not faith in his sympathy, but “in his blood” itself. In this context could their faith be such that God might be just, and justify them in connection with it. Is it the doctrine of the Divine Justice then that is *sophomically taught* in this manner of fact, that “without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin.” As the Judge of all the earth, seated on his supreme judgment-seat and justifying those who believe in Jesus, that he may be just in doing so, he requires the shed blood of his only-begotten Son, as that of Him who appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself? We are thus led without any circuit to the bearing of this momentous matter on the experience of humanity. It is an unquestionable truth that man becomes, sooner or later, like the object of his worship. If his god is a creation of inflexible justice, the more earnestly the man will seek that god, the more, certainly and speedily will all that may be in him of such an attribute die away, and the more surely also will all such element of character be prevalent from ever forming in his mortal nature. We are aware that those who seek to divert attention from the blood of Christ as shed for sin, speak in the strongest terms of God’s justice; but surely we must be guided by what we already know. The patriarch not only offered what he had at hand, in his approach to God, but he offered that kind of sacrifice which Abel offered, and which was “most excellent” than that of Cain. Gen. viii. 20. Taking the two facts together, we are immediately convinced of the truth of Paul’s assertion. We next light on Abraham. When the father of all men that believe was commanded to offer up his beloved son, he rightly understood the command to be *to slay his blood*; and when the ram caught in the thicket relieved him of the necessity of that tremendous deed, it was provided as a victim whose life’s blood was to be shed instead of that of the young man. When we go back again to the “more excellent sacrifice” of Abel, as compared with that of Cain, and that vast and most instructive system of ceremonial to which the Apostle is writing in the Hebrews, refers. It is utterly impossible to study this system, or even to read over the account of it which we have in the Scriptures, without seeing that, under the law, almost all things were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there was no remission of sin.” Make of it what we may, it is an indisputable matter of fact. We may, then, at once come to Christ, and to his *over-emphatic words* to Nicodemus. “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” This lifting up, as applicable to Jesus, is clearly explained; when we regard to his own use of the same phrase, it is evident that he did this signifying what death he should die.

A Word to New Converts.

Do young converts depart from Gospel simplicity and purity?—lose, their first love—become worldly-minded, proud, selfish—return to the beggarly elements—bring darkness,lessness, and wretchedness into their souls? Is there danger of this sad, grievous downfall? Every step fraught with danger. Where then is safety—hope permanent?

None but God—the God of Israel. No safety save is going on—pressing on to higher attainments—aiming constantly and perseveringly for the mark of the prize of the high calling in Christ Jesus.

It is an awful, fearful, ruinous mistake, to suppose a Christian can stand still in religion. New converts, especially, should be instructed to go on from strength to strength, shining brighter and brighter till the perfect day,—impressed deeply, faithfully, continuously, the importance of having Christ dwell in the heart by faith—of being rooted and grounded in love—of comprehending with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of this great salvation—and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that they may be filled with all the fullness of God. Let this doctrine of holiness be nucleated and enforced, in the very outset of the Christian course. The young convert should be urged on, by every motive and consideration, to present his body a living, or continual sacrifice—holy, acceptable unto God as a reasonable service. The lairs of the flock must be carried in the bosom of nursing fathers and nursing mothers.

In every protracted effort for the salvation of souls, there should be two revivals at the same time—a revival of conversion or justification, and a revival of holiness or sanctification. The very moment the new-born soul enters the promised land, he should put on the whole armour of God, be fully equipped for the battle field and rest not day nor night till every Canaanite in the land is driven out, extirpated entirely.

One of the subtlest, most ruinous and fatal mistakes the Israelites ever made on entering the promised land, was in omitting to destroy the wicked Canaanites, root and branch, as God had commanded. They suffered them to live—and soon they became thorns in their side, and finally proved their downfall. This example of warning, God in mercy has placed before our eyes,—a beacon, high as heaven. Ministers, will you heed it? Young Christians, will you? Exaltate every Committee—the last and least remains of old Adam and his deeds.

Daily many learned men, of different nations, varied long and oftentimes from thirty to forty curious cases, stayed around his

intelligence and clarity. “Rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks.”—*1 Thess. v. 16-18.*

We make the following extract from a memoir of Dr. Bond, published in the Christian Advocate:

“That the number of those taken away in the different captivities had been much overestimated, only the principal people having been made captive as hostages, with the men of war, and others most available as slaves; that the main body of the ten tribes, was taken away by the Assyrians, but were left in their ancient possessions, when they became again partially subjected to the kings of Judah; that the tribes that can be supposed to have been really removed were the Reubenites, the Gadites, with the half tribe of Manasseh, and that of Naphtali, who, being placed on the east of Jordan, and on the north, were most exposed to the attacks of the enemy; that the greatest part of those who had been taken away by Babylon, or their descendants, and the descendants of those taken away by the Assyrians, returned to their ancient land; that while in Babylonians, Assyria, and other countries of their conquerors, they could not be supposed to have lived apart by their tribes, so that in the space of two hundred years and upward, those taken away must have lost almost every distinction of tribes, and thus have become prepared to form part of that restored nation which took the name of the Jews from the principal tribe among them; that the tribe of Judah having been the most numerous, and their city of Jerusalem the centre round which the Israelites congregated, it follows, as a natural consequence, that their name would become the prevailing one; that the amalgamation or union into one people of all the Israelites was in accordance with the predictions of the prophets; that the remnant of the Israelites left in Babylon and Assyria, though smaller in number than that portion which was restored to their ancient possessions, might yet have increased to an immense multitude in the six hundred years which elapsed between the first restoration and the time of Josephus but that the remnant left beyond the Euphrates cannot properly be considered to have been the representatives of the ten tribes, much less the entire body of the ten tribes; that in the time of Josephus all distinctions of the other tribes having become lost, except those of Judah and Benjamin, he erroneously supposed they were the only tribes that had returned, and that the other ten tribes still remained beyond the Euphrates; that in any case the dream of Esdras respecting the ten tribes of having taken counsel among themselves, and gone into a further country, where never mankind dwelt, was a mere dream or vision, as it in reality professes to have been.”

Being on a visit to his father, he was deeply grieved to find the church, which he had left in a state of prosperous activity, languishing, akeenath and weak. His thoughts were much occupied with the subject, and of course, it was the master of earnest and frequent prayer. In this state of mind, one morning he was walking over the fields to a neighboring house, when suddenly he seemed to be in a room where a number of people were assembled, apparently for worship. The room he recognised, as an apartment in the house of a neighbor, where a prayer-meeting was to be held on the evening of that day. Had he stood in the midst of it, he could not have been more conscious of the scene. There was nothing of the dim, or shadowy, or dreamy about it. He recognized the people, noticed where they sat and stood, remarked his father near the table, at which a preacher was rising to give out a hymn, and near the middle of the congregation he saw a man named C., for whose salvation he felt considerable anxiety, standing by his son beside him. While gazing with astonishment upon the scene, he heard the words, “Go and tell C. that he has an off’r of salvation for the last time.”

Naturally supposing that the too great concentration of mind upon one subject had induced some hallucination of the senses, Dr. Bond fell down on his knees, and besought God to preserve his reason. The scene, however, continued; it would not disappear or change in any of its particulars. In vain he struggled to dispel it, the voice yet repeated, with indubitable distinctness, “Go and tell C. that he has an off’r of salvation for the last time.” How would he dare to deliver so awful a message! For a great length of time he struggled for deliverance from what he still considered an illusion. At length an ex-
-pedit occurred to him, which he adopted. He had never been in the room in which he was apparently present, when it was used for a public religious meeting. He, of course, did not know how it was commonly prepared for such occasions. He therefore met with great care the particulars of the scene. He saw where the little table for the preacher, the benches and the chairs for the people, were placed. He noticed his acquaintances, and where they sat and stood, and when he was satisfied that he had possessed himself perfectly of these details, he said, “I will go to this meeting, and if I find all things there to correspond with what I now see, it shall be as a sign from the Lord, and I will deliver the message.” Immediately the scene vanished, and he was alone in the green fields.

With a spirit indescribably agitated, he returned home, where he found ladies, who required him to escort them a long distance, and it was somewhat past the hour fixed for the meeting, when he reached the awful place. During the day he had freely indulged the hope, that on his entrance into the room, his trouble would disappear. He thought he had been the subject of an illusion, the fruit of an excited brain, and that a want of correspondence, immediately to be detected, between the real scene and the one presented to his disordered fancy, would at once satisfy him as to the morbid character of his morning vision, and release him from the obligation of delivering the terrible message, with which he was continually charged. When he opened the door, however, he saw again, in all its minuteness of detail, the morning scene. He vainly searched the room for a variant particular. There sat his father in the designated place. The preacher at the table was rising to give out the hymn. In the midst of the room stood C., with his son beside him. Everything demanded that the message should be delivered.

With a spirit indescribably agitated, he returned home, where he found ladies, who required him to escort them a long distance, and it was somewhat past the hour fixed for the meeting, when he reached the awful place. During the day he had freely indulged the hope, that on his entrance into the room, his trouble would disappear. He thought he had been the subject of an illusion, the fruit of an excited brain, and that a want of correspondence, immediately to be detected, between the real scene and the one presented to his disordered fancy, would at once satisfy him as to the morbid character of his morning vision, and release him from the obligation of delivering the terrible message, with which he was continually charged. When he opened the door, however, he saw again, in all its minuteness of detail, the morning scene. He vainly searched the room for a variant particular. There sat his father in the designated place. The preacher at the table was rising to give out the hymn. In the midst of the room stood C., with his son beside him. Everything demanded that the message should be delivered.

After the preliminary exercises, he rose and stated the circumstances as we have related them, and then going to C., he laid his hand upon him, and repeated the words he had heard. The effect was admirable. C. and his son fell down together and called upon God. An awful solemnity rested upon all present. Many cried for mercy, and from that time began a revival which spread far and wide; the fruits of which are yet seen, after many days.

The Lost Tribes of Israel.

Scholars have indulged in wild speculations touching the fate of the ten tribes of Israel, who were first led into captivity by the king of Assyria. They have been supposed by some to be identical with the Abyssinians of Africa, or the Indians of America, and traces of them have been recognized, so it

the scoffs of his countrymen, and with the obloquy which they cast upon him, that he returned, and with an axe hacked her in pieces.

And not only are they miserable in this life, but in death. A Hindoo of a thoughtful, reflecting turn of mind, but devoted to idolatry, lay on his death-bed. “As he saw himself about to plunge into that boundless unknown, he cried out, “What will become of me?” “O,” said a Brahmin, who stood by, “you will inhabit another body.” “And where,” said he, “shall I go then?” “Into another.” “And where then?” “into another, and so on, through thousands of millions.” Darting across this whole period, as though it were an instant, he cried, “Where shall I go then?” And paganism could not answer. And he died agonizing, under the inquiry, “Where shall I go last of all?”

Another Hindoo lay on his death-bed; he, however, had seen a religious Tract, and had read it. It had led him to religious teachers, and to Christ. His friend, hearing of his sickness, came to see him, and found him in the last stage of disease; and as he bore up his languishing head, watching to see him breathe his last, the dying man broke out in ecstasy, “Sing, brother, sing.” “What?” said he, “shall I sing?” “Salvation,” said he; “salvation, by the death of Jesus”—and winged his way to bow with ransomed millions before the throne.

Persecution at Florence.

A Protestant recently converted to that faith died at Florence a few weeks since, after having long resisted the importunities of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration, showed the same firmness. After his decease, the parish refused to bury the remains. The widow having been summoned before the Chancellor, was interrogated respecting the conversion of his physician, of his cure, to whom the physicians had denounced him, and of several priests. He persisted in saying that he acknowledged but one Saviour, and but one Sovereign Pontiff and head of the church, Jesus Christ. He also persisted in refusing the sacraments. His wife, equally Protestant, who was urgently solicited to persuade him to consent to their administration