

POETRY.

THE ENTIRE WORLD.

BY THE REV. GEORGE ROGERS.

There's a region above,  
Free from sin and temptation,  
And a mansion of love,  
For each child of creation.  
Then dismiss all thy fears,  
Weary pilgrim of sorrow—  
Though thy sun set in tears,  
'T will rise brighter to-morrow.

There our toils shall be done,  
And free grace be our story;  
God himself is its sun  
And its unsetting glory:  
In that world of delight,  
Spring shall never be ended;  
Nor shall shadows nor night  
With its brightness be blotted.

There shall friends no more part,  
Nor shall farewells be spoken;  
There'll be balm for every heart  
That with anguish was broken.  
From affliction set free,  
And from God we're to sever;  
We His glory shall see,  
And enjoy Him forever.

What is Universalism?

As our opposers are continually seeking to make new issues, and to misrepresent our real views, we are compelled, year after year, to reiterate our distinctive doctrinal views, in forms of expression purposely varied, so as to meet the distorted statements of our enemies.

Be it understood, then, once for all, that Universalism is, the doctrine of "the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouths of all his holy prophets since the world began." In other words, we believe in the promise God made to Abraham and his descendants, that "in him and his seed, (Jesus Christ), God will bless all nations, families and kindreds of the earth"—that this blessing consists, as declared by the apostle Peter to the Jews, "in turning away every one of you from his iniquities;" or, as says Paul to the Galatians, "the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel [this very promise] to Abraham." In other words still we believe that "God will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth"—that this purpose of God being "the mystery of his will, which he hath purposed in himself" (and not in the faith or works of his creatures) he will ultimately and certainly "gather together (or rehead) all things in one, even in Christ, whether they be things in heaven or in earth;" and in view of this certain fulfillment of his purpose, and the present salvation of all believers, by faith in its fulfillment, God is styled "the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe," and Jesus is called "the Saviour of the world," and "the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the whole world." Hence in believing in the plain, full and explicit declarations contained in the above passages of Holy Writ, we conceive we are giving glory to God and his Son—that were we to deny them, wholly or partly, and to assert that a part of mankind would finally remain endlessly sinful and miserable, we should, just so far, "deny the Lord that bought us," and the atonement through his blood.

Universalism, then, in its plainest and simplest form—in the form in which it is universally received and most certainly believed by all Universalists—is nothing more and nothing less than this clear, rational and scriptural sentiment—that God is the Father of all spirits—that "the chief end," (the end sure to be attained,) for which he created any spirit in his own image and likeness, is, that it might "glorify God and enjoy him forever"—that in accordance with that purpose and his own parental affection, he sent Jesus to be the Saviour of the world, "gave all things into his hands," and "gave him power over all flesh that he might give eternal life to as many as the Father hath given him"—that Jesus in accomplishing his mission,

"tasted death for every man," became "the head of every man," "will draw all men unto him," until "he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied," having "put down all rule, authority and power," and delivered up the kingdom of universal spiritual empire unto God the Father, and "because himself subject unto the Father, that God may be all in all."

If a still simpler form of words is wanted Universalism is the doctrine of the *salvation from sin* and consequent suffering of every moral being in the universe of God, and its consequent and complete blessedness and holiness in an immortal existence by the atonement and mediation of Jesus Christ.

In this great, important and distinctive sentiment, all Universalists are agreed, as they are agreed in receiving the Bible as a revelation of God's will and purpose, and a guide in faith and practice. But on minor and unessential points of church government, and religious forms and ceremonies, they differ as widely from each other as do their opposers—with this important difference, however. Universalists the most opposite to each other in opinion on minor points of doctrine, generally maintain "the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace," and live in mutual toleration, harmony and love with each other. But Partialists differing in but a few shades of opinion, or in a singular form of ceremony, split up into opposing sects and factions, and worry, bite, slander, abuse and devour each other. The candid Christian can judge for himself which conduct is most in accordance with the spirit of God, and the precepts and examples of Jesus!

The most uncandid, unfair, and false charges have been made against us, during a few years past, on this very ground of our differences in minor points of faith, by our opposers. We have some brethren who do, and some who do not, believe that the Christian Sabbath is of Divine origin; or that any set day or seasons, or any forms and ceremonies observed or practiced in the Christian church, are now of binding force or obligation. Well—a dishonest opposer, knowing these facts, goes to those who are ignorant of Universalism, and appealing to their prejudices in favor of Sunday and of what are termed Christian ordinances, says, "Universalists are opposed to the observance of the Christian Sabbath and of Christian ordinances;" and give for proof a few garbled (or brief and incomplete) extracts from the writings of those Universalists who are on that side of those questions, just as if all Universalists held those opinions, and as if no one could be a Universalist who kept the Sabbath, and had been baptised, and partook of the eucharistic bread and wine!!! How ungenerous such a course—how unfair to us and to those whom he deceives by his falsehood!

Or, taking for granted what he can not prove, that his peculiar views of the atonement are the Bible views—that the apostles taught that Jesus came to reconcile God to man, (when they most emphatically and uniformly declare that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," and that he made the atonement to God (when they always teach that "we have received the atonement")—calling his views, and his views only, the doctrine of the atonement, and knowing that some Universalists do, and that many do not, hold those views, he appeals to the prejudices of the public, and says, "Universalists reject them!"—just as if all Universalists denied his views of the subject; and as if no person could be a Universalist who believed that Christ died to reconcile God to man, by making the atonement to God!!! Is not such a course very dishonest in itself—is it not very unjust to us, and to those whom this lying spirit would deceive? It is a fact that the Bible nowhere teaches the doctrine of atonement which represents God as being reconciled to man by the Saviour, or the Saviour as making the atonement to God. Look, and see, and be convinced for yourselves! It is also a fact, that Rolly, Winchester, Murry and many others of our early writers, and a few of our denomination now, do believe in even that

view of the atonement; so that the charge against the entire denomination, is still false and unfair.

A few of our writers, and preachers, and laymen, (at the head of whom is that most amiable and worthy man, Rev. Walter Balfour, of Charlestown, Mass.), deny that man, in this state of existence, is an immortal being. They all believe in the future existence as a state of immortality—that the portion of man which Christians generally believe to be immortal now, will be raised from the dead, and will be then made immortal in the resurrection. But carefully avoiding all mention of this latter portion of these brethren's views our slanderers come out and unqualifiedly charge these brethren with denying the immortality of the soul, as if they denied that it ever would exist again after death!—and further to injure us and deceive their readers, these unfair accusers proceed to quote extracts from Br. Balfour's and other writings, which separate from the contexts, will tend to rivet the false accusation on the public mind! And this is not all their deception and wickedness. They not only charge a few Universalists with denying the immortality of the soul, but they say "Universalists deny" it; as if this was the doctrine of the whole denomination—as if every Universalist in God's universe held to that sentiment—and as if no one could be a Universalist who believed in the soul's immortality! What wholesale slanderers these men must be! And then, to add hypocrisy to their abominable falsehoods against us, they affect great horror at our alleged heresy—just as if bearing false witness and hypocrisy was a less sin in the sight of God than an honest error of opinion. They are careful, also, never to inform their deceived readers and hearers, that Martin Luther, the great Reformer, and William Law, the very pious author of the "Call to the Unconverted," were disbelievers, also, in the present or innate immortality of the soul. Yet such was a fact—if to disbelieve this point is a damnable and horrible error, then let Luther, Law and Dr. Priestly, and hundreds of others eminent and pious divines of other denominations, share the blame with Br. Balfour and others.

We do not intend to argue the question of the truth or falsity of the opinions with which these opposers charge all Universalists. That is not our present business. We only aim to inform you what Universalism is—to state clearly and fully, that every one may understand, what that point of doctrine is, a belief of which constitutes a person a Universalist in theory. And that no one may be misled, we have also pointed out the fact, that many who hold that great and distinguished doctrine, differ widely from each other on other points of religious doctrine and ceremonies. And to disabuse some who have been grossly deceived and deeply prejudiced against us by uncandid and lying opposers, we have given a few samples of the mean slanders with which they have misrepresented our denomination under the mantle of seeming fairness and abundance of proof. We designate Rev. Mr. Hill's sermon in particular, as an instance of this dishonorable warfare. It is being widely circulated by the Methodists; many of whom, we are persuaded, will be heartily ashamed of circulating it when they learn what a dirty article they have been handling. How applicable to Revs. E. F. Hatfield, Matthew Hale Smith, and M. Hill, are the indignant words of the apostle—"O full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil and enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" My God have mercy on them, and purify their depraved souls, and enlighten their minds, and convert them to the peace and blessedness and salvation of that faith which they now so dishonestly and vainly attempt to overturn!—U. S. Universal Register.

I. KINGS xviii: 21.—Men who profess to believe in God, and to reject the claims of Baal, have a thousand excuses and apologies for neglecting to manifest their faith by their works.

This man is a merchant, and knows that

a profession of the popular dogmas of the day, will secure him custom, so he bows down at the shrine of Baal, though he believes him to be no more than an idol. That man is a Physician, and he knows that a profession of faith will get him patients, so he professes with his mouth, what he does not believe in his heart. Another man is a politician, and he waits votes. He thinks, if he speaks what he thinks, it may injure him, and so he becomes all things, to all men, will bow at the altars of God or Baal, as happens to be most convenient. Another man, still, says he has a great show of charity; he believes indeed in Universalism, but he is no bigot, and in the excess of his charity, he forgets to be honest; he gives his means and his influence, to support doctrines, which he says he knows to be false, he says he believes in Universalism, and yet, from week to week, and from Sabbath to Sabbath, he sits under the preaching of the man who denounces Universalism, as the vilest of heresies, and gives all his influence against it, of course he is no bigot, and wishes to be charitable!! He may be no bigot, but he certainly is not far from being a hypocrite. In the political world, if a man should profess to agree with one party, and yet do all he could to advance the interests of the other he would be scouted from both. And yet in religion, men will fawn around the painted hypocrite of this sort, and urge him to go to this church or that, well knowing that the man is belying his conscience, and therefore, sinning against God. These things ought not so to be. We call on you as honest men and women, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve. If the Lord be God, then follow him; out if Baal, then follow him!"

I. D. W.

JUDAS.

"And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself." Matt. xxvii: 5.

"and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." Acts i: 18.

I approach these passages without any reference to the final destiny of Judas, but merely to reconcile the two passages, and give their true meaning. Wakefield renders these passages—"Then he threw down the pieces of money in the temple, and withdrew; and after his departure was choked with anguish." "Now this man bought a field with the reward of this iniquity; and afterwards fell flat down and burst, so that all his bowels gushed out." He refers to his "Internal Evidences of the Christian Religion," and his "Silva Critica," for his remarks, establishing this as the true translation.

Dr. Campbell, of the Presbyterian church, renders the passage in Matthew, "After which having thrown down the money in the temple, he went away and strangled himself." In his notes on the passage, the Doctor remarks—"The Greek word plainly denotes strangling; but does not say how, by hanging or otherwise.—It is quite a different term that is used in those places where hanging is mentioned. It may be rendered, was strangled or was suffocated. I have, in the above version, followed the Syriac. The common translation follows the Vulgate, which says, 'laqueo se suspendit.'" Wahl—"was choked with grief."

"I mistake not, there are two or three cases on medical record where excessive grief has produced 'strangulation' and bursting asunder in the midst." Shakespeare seems to have been aware of this strangling power of grief, in delineating the hysterical passion of poor Lear. And, if memory deceives me not, one of the kings of France died with a complaint similar to the choking with grief, and bursting asunder, which seems to have ended the guilty life of Judas.

The whole account appears to have been thus:—After casting down the money in utter despair of effecting his master's escape from death, he went out, and his grief choked him so that his strength failed him, he tottered, and fell down flat, on headlong, on his face, when, filled by the