

REVIEW OF HALL ON THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

Continued from No. 5.

4. But say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment.—Matt. 12 : 36.

Most assuredly, the "day of judgment" here spoken of, was then "future." Nobody doubts this! But is that any reason why it is still future? The "day of judgment" of any person or people, is the time the judgment is executed. Many "days of judgment" have passed; and the probability is, that many are still future. But should there be ten thousand judgments future, that is no reason that any of them are in eternity! Not a particle.

5. For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.—Heb. 10: 27. But after thy hard and impenitent heart, treasurest up to thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his works.—Rom. 2 : 5, 6.

What has been said on the preceding passages will apply to these. All that is here threatened has, no doubt, long since taken place; at any rate, there is not the slightest evidence in the world for believing that they refer to the future—much less to the eternal world!

6. His sixth "argument" is founded on the passages in 2 Pet. 2, and in Jude, which speak of the judgment of "the angels that sinned," and "which kept not their first estate;" but as he thinks that "not men," but "a higher order of intelligences" are intended here, I will pass his "argument" with the single remark, that all he says may be true, and yet the "judgment" there spoken of not extend "beyond the resurrection of the dead."

6. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.—Hebrews 9: 28, 29.

The entire force of what our author says on this text rests upon the supposition that the word "die" refers to the literal death of mankind. What he says about the adjective "this," being referred to the "appointment," is all gammon. I know of no Universalist who says so—and I presume he knows none! Without stopping to notice all that the gentleman says, I remark, that if the *dying* in the text, refers to the literal death of mankind, then I admit that there is a judgment beyond death. But that the word has such a reference, I most unquestionably deny! By the noun *men*—or rather the phrase *the men*. (*tois anthropois*.) is undoubtedly intended *the men*, or *high priests*, under the Law. This is evident from the context; and also from the passage itself.—Just as it was "appointed unto *these men* to die"—SO Christ died, "to bear the sins of many." How did Christ die? He died as an OFFERING, a SACRIFICE, to bear the sins of the people. SO did the *men* die, to whom the apostle alludes.—Do all men die as sacrifices—as offerings for sin? You will find on examination that the whole subject of the apostle is the contrast between the two covenants—the Law and the Gospel;—between Christ, the high priest of the new Covenant, and Aaron and his successors, the high-priests under the Law. Between the death, typical, of the priests, which was exhibited in

their sacrifices or offerings for sin, and the death of Christ, as an offering "for the sins of the many, or of the multitude." It was appointed unto *these men*—the priests under the Law, to die *once a year*; that is, by proxy, as in their sacrifices, "for without the shedding of blood there is no remission;" they went thus into the holy of holies once a year, offered their sacrifices, died typically—all typifying Christ's death—after which they returned to the waiting multitude without, and pronounced the judgment—the *krisis*—which resulted in their justification. Mr. Hall objects to the word *justification*. But does he not know that the word *judgment*, or *krisis*, may as properly denote justification as condemnation? Are not men judged in our courts daily, and as often acquitted, or justified, as condemned? But suppose the word means condemnation, or damnation, and suppose Mr. Hall's view of the passage be correct; then it should read—it is appointed unto all men everywhere to die, and after this the damnation! This will hardly suit the gentleman.

No rational interpretation, we affirm, can be given to this passage, aside from the one adopted by Universalists; this view agrees with the whole chapter, and the whole subject of the apostle, as any one may see by examining; it also agrees with the passage itself, while no other view will: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment or justification—SO Christ was once offered to bear the sins of the many; and unto them that look for him, shall he appear the second time, without sin, (offering) unto salvation, or justification." Just as the high priest returned from the holy of holies, and "appeared to them that were looking for him," the multitude waiting without, and pronounced the *krisis*—the justification—so "to them that looked for him" was Christ to "appear," not as a sin offering, but "unto salvation." The contrast, you perceive, is kept up throughout. The very next verse still confirms this view—"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the things themselves, can never with those sacrifices, which THEY offered, year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect." Which *who* offered? They, the high-priests—the very *tois anthropois*, unto whom it was "appointed to die every year. Let any one read the 9th and 10th chapters of Heb. and he will readily see that this is the true doctrine of the text:

But our author makes a "dive into the Greek," just about here. Let us attend to what he says: In order to show that *tois anthropois*, means "all men every where," he refers to Acts—"The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where, to repent," where he says "that same knotty little word, *tois anthropois*," occurs in the original. He leaves the impression that the phrase, "all men every where," is translated from the phrase "*tois anthropois*;" and adds, "We hope Universalists will now be satisfied, and that we shall hear no more of their learned blustering about '*tois anthropois*,' and the Jewish high priests." Vain hope, truly! Universalists be satisfied indeed! with such a fabrication! They will expose it, as it deserves, and hold up its author to the just ridicule and indignation of every candid

and honorable mind! *Tois anthropois*, is not the phrase translated "all men every where" in Acts 17 : 30—neither is it so translated in any work under heaven—Mr. Hall's alone excepted! The phrase in Acts is *tois the, anthropois men, pasi all, pantachou* everywhere—literally "all the men everywhere." The words *pasi* and *pantachou*, which mean *all* and *everywhere* do not occur in Heb. 9: 27! Was ever such high-handed impudence and dishonesty exhibited before, in a professedly religious book? Shame, I say, on the man that can deal thus treacherously with the truth, in order to deceive the people and gain his ends! And shame on the man that can have any confidence in such a man! And shame, too, on the cause which has to be sustained by such efforts!

From the Universalist Miscellany.

TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD.—BELIEF AND UNBELIEF.

BY REV. T. B. THAYER.

Proposition 1. The soul is from God: All true religion is from God: Therefore true religion is always in harmony with the nature and wants of the soul—and whatever religion is not, is false.

Proposition 2. Truth, seen and felt to be truth must be believed, whether openly acknowledged or not. Therefore there is no need for promises of reward on the one hand, nor for threats of punishment on the other, as an inducement for believing the truth.

Proposition 3. Falsehood, known to be falsehood, cannot be believed, whatever pretence may be set up to the contrary. No hope of good, no fear of evil, can get faith for it. These may beget an outward conformity, or an inward effort and struggle to believe—but at bottom there is no faith, but perpetual unrest and conflict.—The soul and the falsehood will not unite. There is no affinity.

If these propositions are true, then all religion which is true, is fitted to sanctify and ennoble the soul, to give it freedom and development, and aid it in its progress onward and upward to greater and greater knowledge, purity and spiritual strength. Whatsoever religions, doctrines, creeds, do not aim at or tend to this, but the contrary, are, therefore, obviously false, whether Pagan or Christian in name.

This is a position whose importance cannot be overstated. If a religion or doctrine is manifestly at war with the higher nature of man, in constant conflict with the noblest sympathies and affections of the human heart; this seems proof enough that it is either wholly false, or adulterated with a large alloy of error. And the very fact that this strife exists between the soul and the creed, is a sufficient argument for a reconsideration of the whole question—for a *de novo* thorough inquiry into the authority of the doctrine, and the grounds of belief in it.

No matter how long the religion or doctrine has been believed; or how many wise and good men have believed it; or how many saints have lived and died in it; no matter in what church or in what book the doctrine is found, or supposed to be found. The faith of others is not your affair or mine. What is it to me who have acknowledged this religion, whether wise or ignorant, good or bad men? They cannot believe for me, nor feel for me.—

And what is it how long it has been believed, whether twenty centuries or two years? Though the first, it is no argument for its truth. It does not reconcile the radical and essential difference between and all that I feel to be good, and pure, and divine within me. Here is the chief difficulty. This religious doctrine or creed is not fitted to my better nature. Its teachings are in sharp conflict with my love, my benevolence, my prayers, and that makes me worthy of my own respect and of the confidence and affection of those about me. I cannot believe it because the church has believed it for never so many ages; or because it is the creed of so many wise and good men from the beginning until now; or because it is supposed to be, or really is, written in a certain book. My faith is my own affair; and it must be based on my own knowledge, or on my own reasoning and investigation; and to be securely established, must answer to the best attributes and holiest desires of my soul.

This is a point deserving the attention of all believers of every nation, and religion, and sect. The same Being who made us, gave us also a religion, as guide and comforter. He cannot contradict himself. If he has spoken one language in the nature of man, in the faculties, aspirations and affections of the soul, he will not speak another and contradictory in that religion which he has given as the companion, teacher and helper of the soul. If both are of God, then both are in chord, and respond to each other, vibrate in unison like octavo notes. On the other hand, if the religion or doctrine is at discord with the soul, they cannot both be of God for God is not the author of confusion.—But the soul is of God. The conclusion is plain.

This, then, furnishes a universal and unerring standard by which all doctrines and religions may be tried. If a doctrine be offered for our belief which wars against the soul, against its dignity, its benevolence, its noblest sympathies and loftiest aims: a doctrine which if received, will make it mean and abject, indifferent to the suffering of others, selfish and unloving; let us reject it unhesitatingly, though all manner of authorities be adduced to prove it divine and true. If we are told it is in the Bible, even if we think it is, let us begin the inquiry anew, and review the proofs step by step. We may be mistaken. At all events, one of two things is certain, either the doctrine is not in the Bible, or the Bible is not of God—for, as we have said, God does not contradict himself, nor war with the soul, of which he is the Father.

But again: Our second and third propositions show the folly and uselessness of attempting to coax or frighten the soul into belief or unbelief of truth on the one hand, or of falsehood on the other.

This is not only impossible, but with true religion unnecessary. I cannot believe, after investigation and with knowledge, what I will, but what I must. What is false to me I cannot believe, though I be saved for it; and what is true to me I must believe, though I be damned for it. Hence the foolishness of all rewards and promises, of all threats and terrors, to produce faith or prevent it. As though I could believe my right hand to be my left.