

himself broadly open to severe ridicule. And it is very evident he is fully aware of this. We want no better evidence of the fact than the following, which occurs at the close of his exposition. "The whole fraternity of Universalists, with all their powers of mysticism and twistism, are challenged to refute this exposition. They cannot do it; and they dare not try it! Reader, recollect this." This is precisely the kind of earnest-work with which Mr. Hall strengthens his weak places in his arguments, all through his book. We have come to regard such kind of things as an advertisement that there is something rotten in Denmark—that the heap of filth contains something suspicious, or contraband in the custom-house of truth, beneath the surface! In this instance, such, in fact, is the case. You shall see, reader, what it is that Universalists dare not try to refute—and which they cannot refute if they do try. Here it follows:

"*Ktisis*, rendered creation, does, in my humble judgment, signify the infant creation, or that part of the human family who never arrive at the age of accountability, and who are never in the scriptures styled either christians or sinners."

And this is what Universalism cannot refute, and dare not try to refute! Nay, verily—the thing refutes itself! Nevertheless, it is possible that some person may be so purblind with error, that they may wish to see a bona fide refutation. Well, then, here it follows:

1. Infant, or infants, is not a correct rendering of the term *creature*, as used in the text; because the creature is represented, verse 19, as waiting with earnest expectation for the manifestation of the sons of God. Thus: "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for manifestation of the sons of God." Are infants exercised with an earnest expectation for the manifestation of the sons of God? Do they know any thing about the gospel, the christian hope, or the destiny of the sons of God?

2. The "whole creation (*ktisis*) is represented as groaning and travailling in pain for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of our body. Is this true of infants? Have they any knowledge of future redemption, and adoption, and deliverance into the glorious liberty of the children of God?

3. The word *ktisis* (creature) is never once rendered infants in the whole Bible; and we presume not in any book or manuscript under heaven. Hence, there is not one particle of authority for such an exposition of the term, in existence. *Brephos* is the Greek word for infant—why was not that used if such was the apostle's meaning? Did the spirit of God intend to deceive, by using a term which never had the meaning Mr. Hall ascribes to it in any Greek author that ever existed?

4. Mr. Hall frequently tries the soundness of an interpretation, by trying its adoption elsewhere. We presume, therefore, he will not complain if we test him on his own ground. This same word *ktisis*, or *ktisee*, occurs in Mark xvi 15 which reads thus: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," or, as Mr. Hall renders it: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every infant!" It occurs also in 1 Pet. ii. 13, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man." Or, as it should be rendered, every human creature; Or, as Mr. Hall would render it—submit yourselves to every infant! Once more: The word occurs in Rev. v. 13.—"And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever!" Substitute infant for creature and the absurdity will be complete.

The commentators are against Mr. Hall's error. "By the creature we here understand not as some do, the Gentile world, and their expectation of Christ and the gospel; but the company of sensible creatures. There is an impurity a deformity, and infirmity, which the creature has contracted by the fall of man. The creature that is thus burdened, shall at the time of the redemption of all things, be delivered from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." *Com. in loco.*

ANOTATIONS BY MATTHEW H. POOL.—"This word is used four times, in the and the three following verses. By the creature or creation, is meant ALL MANKIND, both Jews and Gentiles." *Com. in loco.*

We have not Macknight at hand, but his comment is essentially the same as the above. See Macknight on the Epistles.

"Thus easily do we dispose of the profound lucubrations of Alexander Hall. Perhaps he is still convinced Universalists 'dare not try to do it!' We would just inform Mr. Hall, it is not necessary to try—[a]ny thing can be done without trying!

Let us see now if he succeeds any better in his attempts to refute Universalism

Objc. 1. "Universalists contend that the Greek word *ktisis*, here translated 'creature,' and 'creation,' signifies the whole human family. This we deny, and we proceed in the first place to disprove it. The language which the apostle makes use of, forever excludes the idea that the whole creation means the entire posterity of Adam. This is clear without an argument, if we simply look at the language. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, and not only they but ourselves also, i. e. not only the whole creation, but ourselves also, showing most conclusively that ourselves was no part of this whole creation of which he was speaking. If this be not so, then there is no meaning in language."

Ans. It is not so; and still there is meaning in language. Hear the apostle: "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John, ii. 2. If Mr. Hall's criticism is just, then we may say in reference to this text, that "ours only" shows most conclusively that ours was no part of the whole world of which the apostle was speaking! But we know that such is not the fact, and therefore the criticism is not just.

If we dared perpetrate a paraphrase after the signal failure of the great Mr. Hall, it would be something like the following: "For we know that the whole creation (i. e. intelligent creation) groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also which have the first fruits of the spirit [the fact that we have the first fruits of the spirit does not prevent our groaning for the final deliverance in common with those who have it, not—even we are not excluded.] even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, (i. e. "manifestation," *Bush*.) to wit, the redemption of our body." [i. e. "the body to which we belong."] Thus the text is construed agreeably to the laws of language; by which a part may be spoken of as distinguished from the whole by some peculiar quality, but nevertheless, belonging to the whole.

Objc. 2. "Let them [i. e. Universalists] put their fingers upon the text of scripture, where *ktisis* means the entire posterity of Adam, or else forever hold their peace."

Ans. Very easily done: For example, see the texts under examination. Also Rev. v. 12, *ktisma*. Also Col. 1, 15, *ktiseos*: 23, *ktisei*, and also many others. Of the latter quotation, Clarke says it is "a Hebraism for the whole human race." Now let Mr. Hall, "forever hold his peace."

Objc. 3. "But Universalists may say, that *ktisis* cannot mean infants; and that it has not this meaning once in the whole Bible. But here, as in other cases, Universalism contradicts itself in one sentence. They first tell us that *ktisis* means the whole human family without exception, and then turn right round, and say it cannot signify infants. Singular indeed! Are not infants a part of the whole human family? Most certainly: and hence Universalists are compelled to admit that the creation means all we contend it does; for they say it means all that and more too."

Ans. Does Mr. Hall suppose his readers are all a graceless set of idiots? or does he mean to insult them by burlesques on reason and common sense? It must be one or the other, or something equally as bad; for that Mr. Hall should honestly suppose his objection is anything more than a flimsy attempt at a dishonest deception, is not conceivable.

The sum of the objection is this: 1. Universalists say *ktisis* means the whole human family. 2. Infants are a part of the human family. 3. Therefore, infants are the whole human family!

O tempora! O mores! And, reader, Mr. Hall winds up this ebullition of diluted silliness with the following windy grandiloquence:—"Whenever they (Universalists) tell you that *ktisis* means the whole human family, just admit that it means that part of the human family, who die in infancy, and deny us meaning any more; and that instant Universalism is brought to a dead set. They cannot bludge a peg!"

On this we have but one remark to make. It is said that some tribes of Indians deify natural objects. Mr. Hall's deification is only prevented

by his having been born in a Christian community! Such, at least, is our opinion!

We have thus exploded Mr. Hall's view of the text, and successfully, as we believe, removed the obstacles which he has attempted to throw in the way of the Universalist view. One word more of an affirmative character, and we have done.

We have seen that Henry, Macknight, and Pool; define the term *creature* to signify the rational creation; and that this definition is sustained by scripture usage. Our most testimony we will now introduce, and we trust that, on this point, the reader will deem it conclusive: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures." (*Klimaton*.) James 1. 18. This renders the fact undeniable, that those who were the first-fruits, or those who had "the first-fruits of the spirit," are to be included with the whole creation that groans and travaileth in pain; namely, "the entire company of God's sensible creatures!"

The next fact of importance is, that God's creation of rational creatures are to have a eternal deliverance—delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God; that is, they are to be constituted children of God in the highest sense by "being children of the resurrection." Luke xx. 36—And that this glorious liberty excludes the idea of sin and suffering, is too apparent to require proof.

O the great and precious treasures of the gospel of Christ! Hail, great and precious promises—hail glorious hopes of immortal bliss! The creation that now groans in the bondage of corruption, shall not always groan. The day of deliverance draweth nigh. The great drama that has been performing upon the vast theatre of the world is coming to a close; and soon we shall hear

"The dwellers on the rocks, and in the vale, Shout to each other; and the mountain tops From distant mountains catch the sounding joy, Till nation after nation taught the strain, Earth rolls the rapturous hosannah round!"

We close this section with a quotation from the Rev. John Wesley:

"Have we not got farther ground for thankfulness, yea, and strong consolation, in the blessed hope which God hath given us, that the time as at hand, when righteousness shall be as universal as unrighteousness is now? Allowing that the whole creation now groaneth together, under the man of sin; our comfort is, it will not always groan. God will arise and maintain his own cause, and the whole creation shall be delivered from both MORAL and NATURAL corruption.—Sin, and its consequences, pain, shall be no more, holiness and happiness shall cover the earth.—Then shall all the ends of the world see the salvation of our God. And the whole RACE OF MANKIND shall KNOW, and LOVE, and SERVE God, and reign with him forever and ever!" Wesley's Sermon's vol. 5, page 156 Some editions, vol. 2, page 67.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GOSPEL MESSENGER.

Your last number contained the obituary of Mrs. Louisa T., stating that the last moments of the departed "were cheered by bright hopes of a brighter and happier life beyond the grave." This Sir, is true. No one, who knew the deceased, and will exercise candor, has any reason to doubt the truth of this statement. Mrs. T. was a firm believer in the ultimate holiness, and consequent happiness, of all created intelligences. To her, the Gospel was, indeed, "good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people."

Our departed friend was educated in the faith of the Covenant, yet, she yielded not a blind assent, because, her early impressions were Universalist. She had apparently tried the spirit of the doctrine, whether it was of God, and having convinced herself, that it accorded with the character of "Our Father," as we are directed to pray, and who is represented as a Being of infinite love, she saw no reason to doubt its truth, and it proved, through the grace of God, the support and consolation of many hours of bitter sorrow and severe bodily affliction. Possessing similar views respecting the Character of God, and the mission of Jesus Christ; the writer of this was accustomed to converse unreservedly upon religious subjects, with Mrs. T. Some of her remarks may interest your readers. Justice to the memory of the deceased, and a due regard for truth, compel me to state that these remarks were

not intended for publication at the time they were made. In this writing from memory, I may possibly fail in using language sufficiently expressive. Her own words will be given as near as possible. The subject is of too serious a nature to admit the exercise of the imagination. About one month before her decease, the writer attended her during a night, while the family obtained necessary repose as she was so far reduced that she could not be left unattended; this is mentioned to show that she then considered herself upon the very verge of the grave, and consequently her words must have been intended to express her thoughts.

While relating to me some of the events of her past life, I asked if she had ever doubted the final salvation of all; and if she thought her sentiments would remain unchanged in the hour of death. She replied to my first question in this manner.—"Why should I doubt? If I do not believe that all will be saved, I cannot believe in the salvation of any." To my second, she made this reply: "I have been reduced to such extreme weakness that I could not raise my hand, or speak, my physicians gave up all hope, and my friends wept over me as one dying; yet the thought of death had no terrors—I was willing to go; and if fears respecting my future destiny were all, I should die happy. I have no fears, yet the thought of leaving my family are sometimes painful." The conversation turned upon the singular diversity of religious sentiments existing, and the varied forms of worship extant among Christians. "How strange," said she, "that people (and even teachers, as they profess to be of the religion of Jesus,) will persist in representing Our Father, in the light of a cruel tyrant, rather than in the Scriptural light of a Being of unlimited goodness, whose tender mercies are over all his works." Upon my saying that reason, if rightly exercised must lead us to proper views of the goodness of God, toward his creatures, I was interrupted with "not reason alone; but look at the promises, has he not said that he will wipe away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of his people will he take away from off all the earth, for the Lord God hath spoken it.—Isaiah, 25, 8; and also, "Who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth.—1 Tim. 2, 4. And have we not, [the oath of God, sworn by himself, for there is none greater."

"Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return. That unto me, every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear. Surely shall say in the Lord, have I righteousness and strength." Isaiah 45, 22, 24.

Again, on the Thursday previous to her death which occurred on Monday, Jan. 1st, her faith in God and unwavering attachment to the doctrine of impartial grace, were most touchingly and triumphantly displayed. She had been so weak during the night previous that we dared not converse beyond ascertaining her wants; in the afternoon, however, she seemed easier, and the opportunity was improved. As Mrs. T. was not expected to survive during the next day, and as I purposed leaving the village for at least two days, I had no reasonable hope of again meeting her in this life, and approached her bedside to bid her her adieu, until by the will of the Father we should meet in the spirit land. Never while consciousness remains can the memory of the scene that followed, be effaced from my mind. Upon asking if she was still relying upon the promises, she replied, "Oh! yes!" Well then, said I, farewell! and if you never meet again on earth, may we meet at the Mercy seat of the Most High, adding, I feel assured that we shall. "So do I," So do I, I feel perfectly assured that we shall." was part of her reply, the remainder was lost in tears, and as we both supposed, a last embrace.—And once again we met, but she was too far gone to converse, yet from the patience with which she bore her sufferings and the smile of hope which occasionally lighted up her countenance, I feel convinced that she remained unchanged to the last. Is not this a most cheering refutation of the absurd objection, that "Universalism will do to live but not to die by." The Angel of Death folded his wings around her, yet the darkness of despair fell not upon her spirit. Amid the gloom of the valley of the shadow, there shone the gladdening ray of Love, boundless, illimitable Love. Mrs. D.

Smithville, February 1, 1849.