

of the whole subject. First of all as to the Charge, that his "words convey a general notion of ultimate salvation for all," he says, "I am not a Universalist. I have deliberately rejected the theory of Universalism, knowing what it is." But then he adds, "I should as much refuse an Article, which dogmatised in favor of that theory, as one that dogmatised in favor of the opposite." And again, having quoted the words: "By this will we be sanctified, through the offering of the body of Christ, once for all;" he asks, "Dare you make it a positive article of faith, that God's will, being what the Scripture says it is, shall not finally triumph? Nevertheless, there is such a darkness over the whole question, of the possible resistance of the human will, that I must be silent, and tremble and adore."

With regard to the Greek word which in Matt. xxv. 46., and also in Rom. vi. 22, 23., is translated both "everlasting" and "eternal" he greatly prefers the latter rendering. He says, "it does not suggest perpetual progress, but fixedness and completeness . . . and seems to have been divinely contrived to raise us out of our Time notions—to suggest the idea of One who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, to express those spiritual and heavenly things which are subject to no change or succession." He also produces a number of passages, such as 1 John v. 11-13., in which "eternal life" is represented as being already possessed by believers, and objects that according to the views of his opponents, "All these passages refer to the *future* state of the Blessed." He likewise repudiates the idea that it is "the great end of God's revelation to tell men of future bliss or future woe." In another place he says, "I am sure any one of our older and greater divines would have told you, that we do not want that kind of security for the bliss of heaven which we want for earthly possessions. No saint in heaven has that bliss in fee; he never wishes so to have it. It is the misery of the fallen creature that he seeks to keep his treasures upon this tenure. The redeemed creature holds his by continual dependence on a Righteous, Loving being. While he trusts in God he has no fear that any good will be taken from him. Were he to lose his trust, he must lose all good, because he would be separated from the Source of good."

We have been careful to give the Author's views almost entirely in his own words, as his writings have always seemed to us exceedingly obscure, some of them, we confess, unintelligible. We suppose, however, we may regard him as occupying a position of neutrality with respect to the duration of the punishment of the wicked, and as holding with respect to the blessedness of the righteous that its unending duration is not matter of direct divine revelation—that the term "eternal," as applied to it, refers to its relation to God; but, not being a time word, does not predicate of it endless continuance. We are not sure whether he would say that the Immortality of the Soul itself, is revealed. For we do not remember that that doctrine in the abstract, is stated in Scripture. Eternal life, i. e. blessedness, and eternal punishment are revealed; and each of these, as ordinarily understood, implies everlasting existence. But if "eternal" do not refer to duration, then