

REVIEW OF HALL ON THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

We will now notice our author's "positive testimony" in favour of the position that the Day of Judgment is at future, beyond death, and at the resurrection of the dead."

1. The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained. Acts 17:30, 31.

This, as before remarked, refers to the *gospel day*, or christian dispensation. But our author thinks it cannot thus refer, because the christian dispensation, he allows, was then in progress," and the apostle says "will judge," not "is judging." The gentleman's objection will disappear when he is recollected that although the gospel had been preached for a number of years, and the church was then in its incipient state, still the Son of Man had not yet come in the *glory of his Father*—that the kingdom was not yet fully established—the judgment seat set up,—in fine, that "that man whom he hath ordained" had not yet entered upon his reign, with power and great glory—Mr. Hall takes it for granted all the way along, that the christian dispensation, of gospel age, commenced on the day of Pentecost—as though this was an admitted fact. I utterly deny the whole of it.—

Neither the coming of the Son of Man, the commencement of the christian dispensation, nor of the *kingdom*, took place on that day. The New dispensation could not commence till the Old was taken out of the way; and this was not done till Jerusalem was destroyed and an end put to the Temple, and the Temple-service. And as regard to the *kingdom*, Christ, in speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, as recorded by Luke, says: "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the *kingdom of God is nigh at hand*."—Luke 21:31. So the "*kingdom*" was not to come or commence till these things" came to pass, among which was the destruction of Jerusalem. I protest against this way of taking things for granted which need proof, and which, by the bye, no man can prove! Further remarks on this passage are hardly necessary.

The word "judge" here evidently means *rule or govern*; and admitting now that the christian dispensation had commenced and that Christ had entered upon his reign and commenced judging or governing the world when Paul uttered the text, still the Athenians were ignorant of the fact; the kingdom and the jurisdiction, or influence of the Son of Man had not yet reached them, and Paul might, therefore, with all propriety, command them to repent, telling them that God "hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness." The judgment so far as they were concerned, was still future—although with some it may have already commenced. I make these remarks to show that on either supposition the gentleman's objection is of no consequence.

In speaking of what Universalists say about the word "day" in regard to Adam, he said "In the *day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die"—he says, "We admit the premises—that God made use of the word *day* as Adam, etc.: but we deny the conclusion, that Adam actually died the day he partook of the interdicted tree." When God *lied*, and the serpent told the truth—that's all!

2. For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that which he hath done, whether it be good or bad.—2 Cor. 5:10.

"This," he says, "cannot have reference to the christian dispensation, for Paul speaks in the future tense.—'We must all appear before the judgment seat,' &c. The remarks on the preceding passage will apply here. The 'judgment seat' was not yet set up, consequently the apostle speaks of appearing before it, in the future tense. Let us apply the criticism here which the gentleman used in reference to the 15th of 1 Cor., and see what we can make of it. To whom is the apostle speaking? 'Ah! it is brethren Paul addressing; and now we can understand what he means by the pronoun *we*,' it personates *all men, christians, or the saints of all ages and every clime*," therefore, as Paul says "WE must

all appear," &c. he only means that "*christians, the saints of all climes*," must appear before the judgment seat of Christ! So all us that are not christians nor saints have nothing to do with this "judgment!" Good!

But the correct reading of this passage, leaving out the *supplied words*, shows that the receiving is to be *when it is now*—and not in the immortal state. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things in *now* according to that he hath done." Says Mr. Hall, "the things in *body*—i. e. all—in a lump!" ("things in *body* means things in a lump! Well, that beats me! Things in a lump!! I have no more to say."

3. And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled.—Acts 24:25.

All that is necessary to say on this text is, that Felix was a very unrighteous, intemperate and wicked man, living with another man's wife at the time; and Paul preached to him of *righteousness, temperance (or continence) and of a judgment to come*, no doubt assuring him that although a Roman Governor, a day of judgment would surely overtake him, and that, too, while it was *now*. Felix trembled! It's not very likely that Felix would have trembled at the idea of a judgment several thousand years off, and in eternity at that! He was a heathen, and such an idea would have been more likely to have excited his mockery than his fear, as did the doctrine of the resurrection when Paul preached it to the Athenians.

To be Continued.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

Sir,—

Many rejoice at the appearance in this Province of your 'Messenger and Advocate': as ushering in a rational system of theology. The incongruous and wretched theories of the endless misery doctrines, vibrate before the consistence of Truth as exhibited in the attributes and perfections of Deity, and the corresponding announcements of Revelation.—The antagonistic elements—the irrational theories and presumptions of the common priest-craft Theology—inure its ultimate dissolution. It participates more of the qualities of the ancient pagan system than that of the genuine orthodox Theology and Christianity of Jesus: and ere long, on this continent, at least, it will have to seek shelter in rural, obscure and solitary places, like its pagan predecessor of old, in the Roman Empire.

Conceptions of the truth illuminate the human mind; and for this purpose, and because it is the Truth, it is of vast importance to be known for the guidance and rational enjoyment of mind calculated to progress *ad infinitum* in its acquisition and in the glory of its enjoyment. The media of attaining to the knowledge of Truth are various. Written and oral discussions for the use of the public, when well conducted, are of obvious efficiency. Your late public discussion upon human destiny, with a certain Mr. Oliphant, has attracted the special attention of your readers. They deem it reasonable to expect a good account of this affair in your columns at your earliest convenience. Preliminary arrangements being requisite for public debates of this kind, it would seem therefore expedient to organize and provide some funds for the just equation of the responsibilities involved. Did our friends about Niagara consider this matter with reference to your first public discussion alluded to, as held at Jordan on the 21st, 22d and 23rd of February last?

I remain, yours,

ALETHEIA.

London, May 1, 1849.

Niagara District, April 27, 1849.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL MESSENGER, Dear Sir,

In the March No. of the *Witness of Truth* I find two pieces written concerning the late Debate at Jordan, between you and Mr. Oliphant; one by Mr. Oliphant, editor of the *Witness*, the other by "A Hearer"—both having one object in view, viz: to convince their readers that in this debate, Universalists fell to the ground, under the masterly arguments of Mr. Oliphant. It may not be amiss to state, that I am not a Universalist, nor a Disciple, although I have been a reader of the *Witness*, since its commencement. I have heretofore cherished every friendly feeling towards the *Witness*, notwithstanding myself and the church to which I belong, differ in opinion in many respects from

the doctrines it teaches—but with all I like to see fairness and candor, and particularly from the teachers in Israel. In my opinion those two pieces referred to, are unfair, unchristianlike and ungentlemanlike, and thinking that Mr. Lavell and Mr. Oliphant, exchange papers, both may have the benefit of my opinions. Mr. Oliphant assigns us reasons why he has completely girdled Universalism, as follows viz:—

1st. Those, at whose invitation, he appeared on the ground, are no-wise inclined to express regret that the debate had taken place. 2nd. A number of friends and acquaintances approve rather than censure. 3rd. He has received by reason of the debate, various requests through parties either neutral or leaning to the opposition, to visit places where Universalism prevails. 4th. He says it has been creditably reported that more than one or two, who were previously either standing upon the balance, or wholly committed to the system of Universal Salvation, were induced to consider their position and to decide in favor of the apostolic gospel. He then adds in conclusion, "we cherish no unkind feelings towards Universalists personally, but assuredly we view the system as the most baseless, factious and unsupportable of all systems which fancy imagines or delusion sanctions. Were we to propose to ourselves the hardest task, in the whole range of difficult enterprise, we should gather around us the assertions, the devices and sophistical shifts of Universalism and hence engage to prove that the Bible teaches all men's ultimate salvation. To prove that the Pope is the successor of Peter, or that the Pope is Peter, would be as children's play in comparison," &c., after having duly examined Mr. Oliphant's olive branch and tomahawk, I wish to ask a few plain questions: In what places where Universalism prevails, have you been invited to visit,—and by whom—who are the persons converted to your faith, would you not rather undertake to meet Mr. Lavell, in a debate and prove that the Pope is not Peter, than to engage to prove that a part of mankind will be endlessly miserable, and are there not many other things in the whole range of "difficult enterprise" that would be a harder task for you, than it would be for Universalists to prove endless happiness for all mankind, really it does seem to me, that if you give us your true sentiments, it would be child's play for you to upset Universalism and prove that nine tenths of the human family or more, will go down into the pit, and suffer beyond description, throughout the countless ages of eternity. Recollect, sir, you are but a mortal, and recollect that in the opinion of millions, and of myself, that it would be just as hard for you to prove that all mankind must be immersed for remission of sins, in order to be saved, and that the followers of Mr. Campbell, are alone the children of promise, as it would be to prove the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, let Mr. Oliphant give us some of his proof texts, let him show how he defeated Mr. Lavell, and then allow others to judge—for my own part I have heard various opinions respecting the debate: some of other churches who were present during the whole debate have told me that it was their opinion that the discussion would tend, in their opinion to confirm them who stood upon the balance, that Universalism was true, others were surprised to learn that such strong arguments, could be produced to prove the ultimate happiness of all men, others say it was a tie, and in short, as far as my knowledge extended the public opinion is, that Mr. Oliphant, who is believed to be a good man, lost ground, and I am credibly informed that some of his own members are quite dissatisfied.

Next in order appears a piece written by "A Hearer." If ever a mountain was heard to roar, to give birth to a man, here we have it.—The "Hearer" has laboured to put a number of fine words together to prove nothing; let this "hearer" inform us what he means and who he refers to when he states this: "I caution a certain gentleman against presenting his notes of the debate, &c., &c." So far as I have been able to learn, it would not be well for "hearer's" cause, if correct notes of the debate were published. The most that can be said of this "hearer" is that he has made quite a number of statements, and takes it for granted that the public will believe him to be some infallible Pope, and thus credit all he has said, without any evidence to support him. In order that this "hearer" may at once see and feel the folly of his remarks—I will adopt his mode of argument and see what I can prove "Mr. Hearer.—The wolf of which your speak is a 'Disciple' and the lion a Universalist. Mr. Oliphant's heavy artillery of which you speak were but small puppets; your death to Universalism was annihilation to Campbellism. The epiphany you give for the 'lower order of Universalists,' is twisted from its design. I fear all understood it to suit your own case and situation, since the debate 'many of your ducks are turning to be chickens.' You have a zeal, but not according to knowledge—you have 'soft soled shoes' Mr. Oliphant as much, that I am surprised he would make you both appear ludicrous by giving your letter a place in his paper—this mode of argument would be folly on my part, but still I think it precisely the plan you have adopted viz: giving statements for arguments. In conclusion, I would say, that the general opinion throughout the District, is that the Universalist had decidedly the advantage against tentatively. I would direct Mr. Oliphant's attention to the *Golden Rule*, 'as you would &c.

ORTHODOX.

Rev. David Leavitt has removed from Belleville C. W., to Bloomfield C. W. to which place he desires that all letters attended for him be addressed.

FESTIVALS.

There have been several Festivals connected with our Societies in Boston and vicinity, within a short time. There has been one in Br. Cook's Society, South Boston; one in Cambridgeport, where Br. Eaton has just been settled; one in Chelsea, and one in Lynn. They have all been well attended, and yielded large sums of money which have been appropriated for the benefit of the poor and the aid of Sabbath Schools.

ANOTHER NEW MEETING HOUSE.

A new meeting house is shortly to be dedicated at Columbus, Ohio. Br. Doolittle, in a letter to the editor of the "Star," gives a very encouraging account of the condition and prospects of our cause in that place. A Fair and Festival were recently held for the purpose of raising funds to aid in completing the church, which yielded the very handsome sum of three hundred and fifty dollars.

REMOVALS.

Br. H. R. Walworth, late of North Yarmouth, has received and accepted an invitation to take the pastoral charge of the society in East Thomaston, Me. We are pleased to learn that Br. W. has been very successful in his late engagement, and that he is enabled to enter upon his new location under very flattering auspices.

We understand that Rev. R. Breare has resigned the charge of the Universalist Society in Marblehead.

Br. Varnum Lincoln, has received and accepted an invitation to take the pastoral charge of the Society in West Townsend, Mass.

Br. E. A. Eaton has removed from Newburyport to Cambridge port Mass., and desires to be addressed accordingly.

Br. J. S. Lee, has removed to Lebanon, N. Y., and desires all communications intended for him, to be directed accordingly.

The parable of the Offending Hand, on the last page of this paper, will be continued in our next number.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

Those who have not paid the amount of their Subscription for the *Messenger*, will confer a very great favor on the Publisher by doing so without delay. We are much in need of it.

PREACHING APPOINTMENTS.

LONDON—May 6th, at 11 o'clock A. M. at 4 P. M.

WESTMINSTER—May 8th, at 7 in the Evening in the Brick School-house.

DORCHESTER—May 9th, at 7 in the Evening.

TOWN-LINE—May 10, at 7 in the Evening, in the New School-house.

RICHMOND—May 13, at 10½ A. M.

TEMPERANCEVILLE—May 13, at 3 P. M.

ALYMER—May 13, at 7 P. M.

LOUTH—May 20, at 10½ A. M., in the School-house, near Dishy's Tavern.

SMITHVILLE—May 20, at 3 P. M.

BEANVILLE—May 20, at 7 P. M.

ST. JOHN'S—May 20, at 7 P. M. The friends will make arrangements, give Notice, &c.

JORDAN—May 27, at such time as the friends may appoint.

BERLIN—June 3, Preaching twice during the day, at such hours as the friends may appoint.

GALT—June 4, at 7 o'clock P. M.

MUDON-HOLLOW—June 5, at 7 o'clock P. M. Subject.—The character of the opposition to Universalism.

ST. MARY'S, BLANCHARD—June 6th, at 7 o'clock P. M. Will the friends in that region, make the necessary arrangements, give notice, &c.

LONDON—June 10th, at 11 A. M., and 4 P. M.