

God, it is not from the natural force of the word but because the Being to whom it is applied, is endless in his nature. We say a *great* man, and the *great* God; but when we apply the word *great* to man, we do not mean that he is as *great* as God.—We say a *good* man, and the *good* God; but we do not mean, that the man is as good as God. So, also, we say of a man, he is an *everlasting* talker: and of God, he is *everlastingly* good; but we do not mean, that the man will continue to talk as long as God is good. We say, too, of a child, he is *eternally* in mischief; and of God, he is the *eternal* God; but we do not mean, that the child will continue to do mischief, as long as God exists.

2. It has been said that '*aionios*, when it stands alone, signifies endless duration.' *Aionios* is an adjective. It must therefore, be connected with some noun, either expressed or understood, which it qualifies. Adjectives never make or add qualities to nouns; but simply express qualities which are inherent in the noun itself. Neither can an adjective express any more than the noun to which it is prefixed; or from which it is derived. Indeed, it is often the case, that nouns express more than can be expressed by adjectives. For instance, we say of a man he is *lovely*; by this we mean that he is possessed of some lovely qualities; but if we say the man is *love*, we express by this, that love is the inherent principle of his very nature. When we say God is *lovely*, we do not express as much, as when we say God is *love*.—For God might be lovely, and yet *love* not be the essence of his nature; but when we say he is *love*, we express by it, that *love* is the central sun of all his excellences: that it is the sum and substance—the all and in all, and the very essence of his nature. Now, as the adjective *aionios* is derived from the noun *aion*, hence, it can express no more than *aion*.

3. But it is said that 'these terms must express endless duration when applied to punishment, inasmuch, as in some texts where they are thus applied, the punishment spoken of is, in the same text, contrasted with *eternal life*.' There are but two instances of this in the Bible; one in Dan. xii : 2, and one in Mat. xxv : 46. It by no means follows, that because everlasting punishment is contrasted with eternal life, therefore, the punishment spoken of is equal in duration with the life spoken of, even allowing the life to be of endless duration. Before this can be admitted, it must first be proved that punishment is as enduring in its nature as life. But we have shown that the word rendered punishment in Mat. xxv : 46, signifies chastisement, or correction, for the benefit of the punished. Now, to speak of endless correction, is a contradiction in terms. Hence, the fact of the application of the term *aionios* to punishment, does not prove that punishment is endless, for two reasons. First, because *aionios* to punishment, does not of itself express endless duration; and, second, because the punishment to which it is applied, is limited in its nature.—Again, these terms are applied to different things in the Bible, and in the same passages; when all must acknowledge that one is limited and the other endless. Hab. iii : 6. 'And the *everlasting* mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are *everlasting*.' See also Rom. xvi : 25, 26. 'According to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept se-

cret since the *aionions* began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the *aionion* God.' If the objection we are considering, is of any force, it proves that the hills and mountains will endure as long as God exists; and that the ages of the world are as ancient and as enduring as God. Whereas, Paul in the text from Romans, speaks expressly of a time when these ages began. What has been said is sufficient to overthrow the objection under consideration; but there is one fact which of itself is sufficient to silence this objection forever. In our remarks on Dan. xii : 2, and Mat. xxv : 46, we have shown that the everlasting or eternal life there spoken of, is not the life of the resurrection world; but is that life which is imparted to the believer in Jesus, and which may be enjoyed in this state of existence. We have shown that Christ himself defines this life to consist in the 'knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent;' and that he speaks of his followers as being already in the possession of eternal life. Now, in the face of this testimony, who dare assert that eternal life consists in endless beatitude in a future state of existence? Surely no one who heeds the instructions and the testimony of the great Founder of Christianity, Jesus Christ. As, therefore, the eternal life spoken of in Mat. xxv : 46, was confined to this world, so also the everlasting punishment. As the one was limited, so also the other.

4. Again, it is said, that 'in our exposition of those texts where these terms are applied to punishment, we have applied nearly all of them to the Jews; and it is unreasonable to suppose, that nearly all that is said in the Bible about everlasting punishment, was spoken in reference to that people.' The objector must be careful how he brings his reason against facts. We know that Universalists have been accused of making a kind of scape-goat of the Jewish people, and of making them bear all the sins of mankind, and all the punishment. But have we not appealed to the context, and the connection of these passages, to prove the correctness of our opinions? If it is a fact, then, that most of these texts relate to the awful doom which came on the Jewish nation, and which they are suffering to this day, it is a fact for which we are not responsible.—And if any one is disposed to cavil on this ground, he must cavil with the Bible, not with us. If the objector thinks this opinion is erroneous, he had better be trying to prove it so, than to be finding fault.

5. It is also said, that 'if these terms do not express endless duration, then we have no proof of the endless existence of God.' But do not the Scriptures teach that God is self-existent? And is not his endless existence a self-evident fact? Suppose that no word whatever expressive of duration was ever applied to him; would this make any difference in regard to his duration? Or suppose that all words, of every language under heaven, expressive of duration, were applied to him, and applied to him times without number; would this make his endless existence any more certain? Is God dependent on the meaning of a word for his endless existence? If so, then we may well fear that he will come to nought. But no rational man will pretend this. If, then, God is ever-enduring in his very nature, it is a matter of no con-

sequence whether any word expressive of duration is ever applied to him or not; and if such words are applied to him, it is immaterial whether they express endless duration or not.

6. Once more. It is said, that 'if these words do not express endless duration, then we have no proof of the endless existence and happiness of mankind in a future world.' If no other terms were used to express the duration of man's existence and happiness in the resurrection world, there might be some force in this; but such is not the fact. There are several words applied to life and happiness in the Scriptures, which are never applied to punishment; and these words are unequivocal in expressing endless duration.—These words are *amianton*, *aphtharton*, and *akatalutos*; rendered endless, undefiled, incorruptible, and immortal. In 2 Cor. iv : 7, we read, 'For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal (aionion) weight of glory.' The word *and* in this passage was supplied by the translators, and weakens the force of the passage. Leaving that word out, we here read of a glory exceeding aionion or eternal. The original is even more full than this. The literal rendering would be, 'a glory exceeding eternal to an excess.'—In Heb. vii : 17, we read of an *endless life*; but we no where in the Bible read of endless death; of endless misery, woe or pain; nor of endless punishment; nor of an endless hell. In 1 Peter i : 4, we read of 'an inheritance *incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away*.' In Isa. xxv : 8, and 1 Cor. xv : 54, we are told that '*death shall be swallowed up in victory*.' And in 2 Cor. v : 4, we read of *mortality* being '*swallowed up in life*.' In 2 Tim. i : 10, we read [of '*life and immortality* being brought to light by Jesus Christ;'] but we no where read of *immortal death* and *endless pain* being brought to light by Jesus Christ, or any other person mentioned in the Bible. In 2 Cor. xv : 22, we are told that 'as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' Now, just as certain as Christ will endlessly exist, just so certain is it that all mankind will exist endlessly. For they are to be made alive *in him*. In 1 Cor. xv : 51, 52, we are told that all mankind will be changed from '*mortal to immortality*;' and in verse 54, we are informed that '*this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality*.' These passages prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the endless existence of mankind is taught in the Bible irrespective of the application of *olix*, *aion*, and *aionios* to that existence.

Such are all the objections to our views of these terms. Whether they are insuperable or not, the reader can judge for himself.

THE NEW BIRTH.

There are multitudes of Christian Professors in the world who yearn for the joys of faith in God as the Universal Father, Friend and Savior; but alas! they are debarred this high privilege! They are right in their feelings, they are influenced in their doings by the spirit of gospel love—but they have been taught to view the doctrine of Universalism with abhorrence.

Such persons frequently have said to us, "You do not believe in the doctrine of the new birth; and this is an essential

point in Christianity."

We answer, Who told you that we do not believe in the doctrine of the new birth? You certainly have not so been informed by either our preachers or writers—for our books and papers maintain this doctrine as a fundamental, and our pulpits have ever insisted on it as a chief item in the Christian system.

It is very likely that we do not understand the new birth precisely as others do; but our brethren have no greater right to insist that *their* views should be *our* standard, than we should have to insist that *our* views should be *theirs*. If you are willing to consider what we have to say on this subject, read—and think!

"Cease to do evil—learn to do well," was a prominent injunction under the dispensation of the Law; and the same end is contemplated by the economy of the Gospel. "The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in *this present world*." Hence, Jesus "gave himself for us, that he might *redeem us from all iniquity*, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus ii ; 20-14.

The doctrine of the New Birth, as may clearly be shown, is resolved into practical conformity to the heavenly law. *Righteousness of life* is the end to be attained, and this is to be wrought by *purifying the heart*, and this, again, by *enlightening the understanding*. He who is in error, is to be made acquainted with the truth as it is in Jesus; he who is swayed by evil feelings and motives, is to be brought under the influence of the love of God; and he who is wandering in the dark mazes of sin, is to be introduced to the path of the just, which shineth more and more, even unto the perfect day.

Let me simplify these ideas, and present them very distinctly in a brief space—as follows:

1st. The *head* is to be instructed—that is, the mind is to be enlightened by the truth. Hence it is written, "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*," 1 John v. 1. But if such an one went no farther than this, he would have merely a *head-religion*.

2d. The *heart* is to be purified—that is, the feelings are to be influenced by the right spirit. Thus it is written, "*Love is of God, and every one that loveth is born of God*," 1 John iv. 7. This brings the addition of a *heart-religion*.

3d. The *life* is to be reformed—that is, the character is to be established in virtue, as proved by *deeds*. Accordingly we are informed, "*every one that doeth righteousness is born of God*," 1 John ii. 29. This completes the new birth, and is comprehended in a *life-religion*.

1. "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*," v John v. 1. This was the simple and only article of faith enjoined by the primitive teachers of Christianity, whether the persons addressed were Jews or Gentiles. "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," John vi. 69, was Peter's profession in behalf of himself and brethren, "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts ii. 36, was his testimony to the Jews. "I believe that Jesus Christ is