

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
											✓

THE GOSPEL MESSENGER,

OR UNIVERSALIST ADVOCATE.

[“AND THE ANGEL SAID UNTO THEM, FEAR NOT, FOR BEHOLD! I BRING YOU GOOD TIDINGS OF GREAT JOY WHICH SHALL BE UNTO ALL PEOPLE.”—Luko 2: 10.]

VOL. 1.

LONDON, CANADA WEST; MAY, 1849.

NO. 5.

SCRIPTURE TERMS EXPRESSING DURATION.

Statement of Facts, showing that the fact of the application of the words *eternal*, *everlasting*, &c., to punishment, is, no proof of the doctrine of endless punishment.

1. The words *everlasting*, *forever*, and *ever*, in the Old Testament, are translated from the Hebrew *olim*.—Taylor, Parkhurst, Stuart, and indeed all ancient writers, admit that the word *olim*, does not of itself, signify an endless duration. In other words, that this is not the radical meaning of the word. Hence, they define it to signify ‘a duration which is concealed;’ ‘time hidden from man, whether definite or indefinite; whether past or future.’

2. These words in the New Testament, are translated from the Greek word *aión* and *aiónios*. The authorities referred to above, admit that these words are frequently used to express a limited period of time: and also, that in their Scripture usage, they are synonymous with that term.

3. Although the authorities just referred to, contend that *aión* and *aiónios* are sometimes used to express endless duration, yet of this there is no proof. And although they assert that *olim* is sometimes used to signify endless duration, yet of this there is no proof; and, besides, even they themselves admit that it signifies this, not from the proper force of the word, but when the sense of the place requires it; as God and his attributes. But, following they are correct in this, (and in our opinion it is a point of but very little importance,) then it will follow that the extent of duration expressed by these terms, must be determined by the nature of the thing to which they are applied. And unless it can be shown that punishment is absolutely endless in its nature, the fact of the application of these terms to punishment, does not prove the endless duration of that punishment.

4. It is beyond all dispute, that these words are frequently, and in a great variety of ways, used in the Scriptures, both of the Old and the New Testament, to signify limited duration. Out of six hundred and fifty-two occurrences of *olim*, and its corresponding words in the Old Testament, it is susceptible of the clearest demonstration, that in six hundred instances it expresses only limited duration.

5. Our translators have rendered *olim*, and its corresponding words, by nearly thirty different words and phrases; most of them signifying duration, but varying as to its extent, from three days to endless duration.

6. It is an indisputable fact that the words *olim* and *aión*, are used in the Scriptures in the plural number. Now, had the inspired writers understood these words to express endless duration, there would have been no necessity of their using them in the plural number; but on the

contrary, such use of them would be highly improper.

7. These words are not only used in the plural number, but words are added to extend their signification. The literal rendering of Exodus xv: 26, is, ‘the Lord shall reign from *aión* to *aión* and farther.’ Dan. xii: 3. ‘And they that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars through the *aións* and farther.—Mic. iv. 5. ‘And we will walk in the name of Jehovah our God, through the *aión* and beyond it.’ Now if the word *aión* signifies *eternity*, then we should be under the necessity of reading these passages thus, ‘The Lord shall reign from *eternity* to *eternity* and farther.’ ‘And they that turn many to righteousness, shall shine as the stars through the *eternity*, and farther.’ ‘And we will walk in the name of Jehovah our God, through the *eternity* and beyond it.’ Now to speak of a period of time beyond eternity, or to speak of one eternity succeeding another eternity, is absurd. Hence, we conclude the Scripture writers did not understand these words to signify endless duration.

8. If we understand *aión* to express endless duration, then we shall read in the Bible of *eternities*, of the *beginning of eternity*, of the *end of eternity*, and of *this eternity*, and the *eternity to come*. Eph. ii: 7. ‘That in the *aións* (eternities) to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace.’ Col. i: 26. ‘Even the mystery which hath been hid from *aións* (eternities) and from generations.’ Eph. iii: 9. ‘And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the *aión* (eternity) hath been hid in God.’ Titus i: 2. ‘In hope of eternal life, which God that can not lie promised before the *aión* (eternity) began.’ Acts i: 21. ‘Which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the *aión* (eternity) hath been hid in God.’ Titus i: 2. ‘In hope of eternal life, which God that can not lie promised before the *aión* (eternity) began.’ Matt. xxiv: 2. ‘Tell us when shall these things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the *aión*.’ (eternity.) Matt. xxviii: 20. ‘Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the *aión*.’ (eternity.) Heb. ix: 26. ‘But now once in the end of the *aión* (eternity), hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.’ 1 Cor. x: 11. ‘And they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the *aións* (eternities) have come.’ Matt. xii: 32. ‘But whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this *aión* (eternity), nor in the *aión* (eternity) to come.’ Eph. i: 21. For above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this *aión* (eternity), but also in that to come.’

9. It is a matter of some doubt, whether these words do of themselves primarily

signify duration at all; and whether, when they are used for this purpose, they are not used in an accommodated sense. Dr. Clowes says on this subject, ‘there has been at least one writer (Rev. Mr. Goodwin, in the Christian Examiner, published in Boston) who has with great learning and judgment examined these words, and who has come to the conclusion that *olim*, and its equivalent *aión*, mean spirit; and *aiónios*, means spiritual; and that these words never have necessarily the meaning of duration. Without admitting or rejecting the correctness of this sentiment, we must declare that our Saviour has so carefully defined eternal life, as consisting in ‘the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ as sent by him’—and as being that which is here enjoyed, before the resurrection—as something in short, which is exclusive of that life which shall be enjoyed in the future world, that we feel ourselves compelled to admit, that in the teachings of our Saviour, the term *aiónios*, rendered *eternal*, in the phrase *eternal life*, refers much more to the character of that life, than to its duration. The only question is, whether the terms *olim*, *aión* and *aiónios*, have not in other parts of Scripture a corresponding meaning.’

10. If we understand these terms to be expressive of endless duration, we put an unanswerable argument into the hands of the Jews. It is an incontrovertible fact, that these terms are applied to God’s ancient covenant with the Jew; to the statutes of Moses, and to the priesthood of Aaron. With what propriety, then, may the Jews contend, that all these were designed to be of perpetual continuance; and that Jesus must have been an impostor; inasmuch, as one ostensible object which he had in view, was, to abrogate the institutions of Moses and bring the legal covenant to a close.

11. But, we also set the Bible at variance with itself. We have seen that these terms are applied to the ordinances of Moses, and yet in Heb. viii: 13, and ix: 10, we are expressly told, that the old covenant and the Mosaic ordinances are done away. We have seen that these terms are applied to the Aaronic priesthood, and yet in Hebrews, 7th chapter, we are told that that priesthood is abolished. These terms are also applied a number of times to the kingdom of Christ, and yet in 1 Cor. xv: 24, we are told that this kingdom shall come to an end. ‘Then cometh the end, when he (Christ) shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father: when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.’

12. Although these terms are applied to the punishment of persons twelve times in the Bible, yet in not one single instance are they applied to punishment after death, or in a future state of existence. We have examined every passage, particularly

and carefully; and have not been able to find, even one, which has any reference to a future world. Now this is an important fact. How can it be supposed now, that the Scripture writers believed in a future state of unending punishment, and understood these terms as expressive of endless duration, and yet should not in a single instance, apply these terms to that punishment? This is an absurdity so glaring, that it must not be overlooked.—The Bible abounds with exhortations to, and warnings, and threats, and denunciations against the wicked, yet no where between its lids do we find the terms *olim*, *aión*, and *aiónios* applied to any punishment whatever in another world. This fact upon the minds of the candid, will have, and upon the minds of all, ought to have great weight.

13. It is also a fact that a great majority of the Scripture writers have not applied these terms to punishment, i. e., the punishment of persons at all. And of those who have they have done so only in a very few instances. Job, David, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Malachi, are the only Old Testament writers who apply these terms to punishment; and they, each only once. Jesus Christ applied the terms in question to punishment only twice; Paul, twice; Peter, once; Jude, once; and supposing John to have been the author of the Book of Revelations, he, once. Now, can it be believed that Moses, Joshua, Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Solomon, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Naham, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah, could have believed in the doctrine of future endless punishment; and that these terms were expressive of endless duration; and yet, that in all their denunciations against the wicked, they should never apply these terms to punishment of any kind, either in this world or another? The man who can believe this, must have a mind not regulated by evidence in making up his opinions. Such an one, is prepared to believe almost anything.

We will now notice some objections.—It is said that ‘these terms must express endless duration, because they are applied to God.’ If the objector means by this, that because a term expressive of duration is applied to God, therefore it expresses endless duration in all cases, we have shown this to be contrary to fact. For we have seen that the terms in question, are applied to God, and yet are applied to things which have had, and to things which are to have, an end. If he means by it, that because a term expressive of duration is applied to God, therefore, that term is of itself expressive of endless duration, this also, is contrary to fact. For we have shown that the term *olim* is applied to God, and yet that eternity is not the radical meaning of the word; and that if it expresses endless duration when applied to

God, it is not from the natural force of the word but because the Being to whom it is applied, is endless in his nature. We say a *great* man, and the *great* God; but when we apply the word *great* to man, we do not mean that he is as *great* as God.—We say a *good* man, and the *good* God; but we do not mean, that the man is as good as God. So, also, we say of a man, he is an *everlasting* talker: and of God, he is *everlastingly* good; but we do not mean, that the man will continue to talk as long as God is good. We say, too, of a child, he is *eternally* in mischief; and of God, he is the *eternal* God; but we do not mean, that the child will continue to do mischief, as long as God exists.

2. It has been said that '*aionios*, when it stands alone, signifies endless duration.' *Aionios* is an adjective. It must therefore, be connected with some noun, either expressed or understood, which it qualifies. Adjectives never make or add qualities to nouns; but simply express qualities which are inherent in the noun itself. Neither can an adjective express any more than the noun to which it is prefixed; or from which it is derived. Indeed, it is often the case, that nouns express more than can be expressed by adjectives. For instance, we say of a man he is *lovely*; by this we mean that he is possessed of some lovely qualities; but if we say the man is *love*, we express by this, that love is the inherent principle of his very nature. When we say God is *lovely*, we do not express as much, as when we say God is *love*.—For God might be lovely, and yet *love* not be the essence of his nature; but when we say he is *love*, we express by it, that *love* is the central sun of all his excellences: that it is the sum and substance—the all and in all, and the very essence of his nature. Now, as the adjective *aionios* is derived from the noun *aion*, hence, it can express no more than *aion*.

3. But it is said that 'these terms must express endless duration when applied to punishment, inasmuch, as in some texts where they are thus applied, the punishment spoken of is, in the same text, contrasted with *eternal life*.' There are but two instances of this in the Bible; one in Dan. xii : 2, and one in Mat. xxv : 46. It by no means follows, that because everlasting punishment is contrasted with eternal life, therefore, the punishment spoken of is equal in duration with the life spoken of, even allowing the life to be of endless duration. Before this can be admitted, it must first be proved that punishment is as enduring in its nature as life. But we have shown that the word rendered punishment in Mat. xxv : 46, signifies chastisement, or correction, for the benefit of the punished. Now, to speak of endless correction, is a contradiction in terms. Hence, the fact of the application of the term *aionios* to punishment, does not prove that punishment is endless, for two reasons. First, because *aionios* to punishment, does not of itself express endless duration; and, second, because the punishment to which it is applied, is limited in its nature.—Again, these terms are applied to different things in the Bible, and in the same passages; when all must acknowledge that one is limited and the other endless. Hab. iii : 6. 'And the *everlasting* mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are *everlasting*.' See also Rom. xvi : 25, 26. 'According to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept se-

cret since the *aionions* began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the *aionion* God.' If the objection we are considering, is of any force, it proves that the hills and mountains will endure as long as God exists; and that the ages of the world are as ancient and as enduring as God. Whereas, Paul in the text from Romans, speaks expressly of a time when these ages began. What has been said is sufficient to overthrow the objection under consideration; but there is one fact which of itself is sufficient to silence this objection forever. In our remarks on Dan. xii : 2, and Mat. xxv : 46, we have shown that the everlasting or eternal life there spoken of, is not the life of the resurrection world; but is that life which is imparted to the believer in Jesus, and which may be enjoyed in this state of existence. We have shown that Christ himself defines this life to consist in the 'knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent;' and that he speaks of his followers as being already in the possession of eternal life. Now, in the face of this testimony, who dare assert that eternal life consists in endless beatitude in a future state of existence? Surely no one who heeds the instructions and the testimony of the great Founder of Christianity, Jesus Christ. As, therefore, the eternal life spoken of in Mat. xxv : 46, was confined to this world, so also the everlasting punishment. As the one was limited, so also the other.

4. Again, it is said, that 'in our exposition of those texts where these terms are applied to punishment, we have applied nearly all of them to the Jews; and it is unreasonable to suppose, that nearly all that is said in the Bible about everlasting punishment, was spoken in reference to that people.' The objector must be careful how he brings his reason against facts. We know that Universalists have been accused of making a kind of scape-goat of the Jewish people, and of making them bear all the sins of mankind, and all the punishment. But have we not appealed to the context, and the connection of these passages, to prove the correctness of our opinions? If it is a fact, then, that most of these texts relate to the awful doom which came on the Jewish nation, and which they are suffering to this day, it is a fact for which we are not responsible.—And if any one is disposed to cavil on this ground, he must cavil with the Bible, not with us. If the objector thinks this opinion is erroneous, he had better be trying to prove it so, than to be finding fault.

5. It is also said, that 'if these terms do not express endless duration, then we have no proof of the endless existence of God.' But do not the Scriptures teach that God is self-existent? And is not his endless existence a self-evident fact? Suppose that no word whatever expressive of duration was ever applied to him; would this make any difference in regard to his duration? Or suppose that all words, of every language under heaven, expressive of duration, were applied to him, and applied to him times without number; would this make his endless existence any more certain? Is God dependent on the meaning of a word for his endless existence? If so, then we may well fear that he will come to nought. But no rational man will pretend this. If, then, God is ever-enduring in his very nature, it is a matter of no con-

sequence whether any word expressive of duration is ever applied to him or not; and if such words are applied to him, it is immaterial whether they express endless duration or not.

6. Once more. It is said, that 'if these words do not express endless duration, then we have no proof of the endless existence and happiness of mankind in a future world.' If no other terms were used to express the duration of man's existence and happiness in the resurrection world, there might be some force in this; but such is not the fact. There are several words applied to life and happiness in the Scriptures, which are never applied to punishment; and these words are unequivocal in expressing endless duration.—These words are *amianton*, *aphtharton*, and *akatalutos*; rendered endless, undefiled, incorruptible, and immortal. In 2 Cor. iv : 7, we read, 'For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal (aionion) weight of glory.' The word *and* in this passage was supplied by the translators, and weakens the force of the passage. Leaving that word out, we here read of a glory exceeding aionion or eternal. The original is even more full than this. The literal rendering would be, 'a glory exceeding eternal to an excess.'—In Heb. vii : 17, we read of an *endless life*; but we no where in the Bible read of endless death; of endless misery, woe or pain; nor of endless punishment; nor of an endless hell. In 1 Peter i : 4, we read of 'an inheritance *incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away*.' In Isa. xxxv : 8, and 1 Cor. xv : 54, we are told that '*death shall be swallowed up in victory*.' And in 2 Cor. v : 4, we read of *mortality* being '*swallowed up in life*.' In 2 Tim. i : 10, we read [of '*life and immortality* being brought to light by Jesus Christ;'] but we no where read of *immortal death* and *endless pain* being brought to light by Jesus Christ, or any other person mentioned in the Bible. In 2 Cor. xv : 22, we are told that 'as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' Now, just as certain as Christ will endlessly exist, just so certain is it that all mankind will exist endlessly. For they are to be made alive *in him*. In 1 Cor. xv : 51, 52, we are told that all mankind will be changed from '*mortal to immortality*;' and in verse 54, we are informed that '*this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal immortality*.' These passages prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the endless existence of mankind is taught in the Bible irrespective of the application of *olix*, *aion*, and *aionios* to that existence.

Such are all the objections to our views of these terms. Whether they are insuperable or not, the reader can judge for himself.

THE NEW BIRTH.

There are multitudes of Christian Professors in the world who yearn for the joys of faith in God as the Universal Father, Friend and Savior; but alas! they are debarred this high privilege! They are right in their feelings, they are influenced in their doings by the spirit of gospel love—but they have been taught to view the doctrine of Universalism with abhorrence.

Such persons frequently have said to us, "You do not believe in the doctrine of the new birth; and this is an essential

point in Christianity."

We answer, Who told you that we do not believe in the doctrine of the new birth? You certainly have not so been informed by either our preachers or writers—for our books and papers maintain this doctrine as a fundamental, and our pulpits have ever insisted on it as a chief item in the Christian system.

It is very likely that we do not understand the new birth precisely as others do; but our brethren have no greater right to insist that *their* views should be *our* standard, than we should have to insist that *our* views should be *theirs*. If you are willing to consider what we have to say on this subject, read—and think!

"Cease to do evil—learn to do well," was a prominent injunction under the dispensation of the Law; and the same end is contemplated by the economy of the Gospel. "The grace of God, which bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in *this present world*." Hence, Jesus "gave himself for us, that he might *redeem us from all iniquity*, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Titus ii ; 20-14.

The doctrine of the New Birth, as may clearly be shown, is resolved into practical conformity to the heavenly law. *Righteousness of life* is the end to be attained, and this is to be wrought by *purifying the heart*, and this, again, by *enlightening the understanding*. He who is in error, is to be made acquainted with the truth as it is in Jesus; he who is swayed by evil feelings and motives, is to be brought under the influence of the love of God; and he who is wandering in the dark mazes of sin, is to be introduced to the path of the just, which shineth more and more, even unto the perfect day.

Let me simplify these ideas, and present them very distinctly in a brief space—as follows:

1st. The *head* is to be instructed—that is, the mind is to be enlightened by the truth. Hence it is written, "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, he is born of God*," 1 John v. 1. But if such an one went no farther than this, he would have merely a *head-religion*.

2d. The *heart* is to be purified—that is, the feelings are to be influenced by the right spirit. Thus it is written, "*Love is of God, and every one that loveth he is born of God*," 1 John iv. 7. This brings the addition of a *heart-religion*.

3d. The *life* is to be reformed—that is, the character is to be established in virtue, as proved by *deeds*. Accordingly we are informed, "*every one that doeth righteousness he is born of God*," 1 John ii. 29. This completes the new birth, and is comprehended in a *life-religion*.

1. "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*," v John v. 1. This was the simple and only article of faith enjoined by the primitive teachers of Christianity, whether the persons addressed were Jews or Gentiles. "We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God," John vi. 69, was Peter's profession in behalf of himself and brethren, "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ," Acts ii. 36, was his testimony to the Jews. "I believe that Jesus Christ is

the Son of God," Acts viii, 27. was the acknowledgment of the Ethiopian.

Dr. Lightfoot, and other eminent authorities, inform us, that to be new-born, and to be made a new-creature, were expressions used by the ancient Jews, signifying merely a change of religion. "One of their sayings was, "If any man become a proselyte, [namely, from Paganism to Judaism,] he is like a child new-born." And, of Abraham, when he renounced idolatry and was chosen of God, they said "He was made a new creature."

This phraseology was doubtless familiar to Nicodemus; and hence Jesus said to him, "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" John iii. 10. He was not ignorant of the meaning of the new birth, and he would not have been astonished if it had been spoken of concerning a proselyte from heathenism; but he was so unsuspecting that it could rightly be applied to the conversion of Jews, that he did not understand our Saviour's meaning. "Ye must be born again." Ye Jews are indeed the descendants of Abraham by the birth of the body; but "ye must be born again;" ye must believe in me as the Christ, ye must be converted from Judaism by faith in the Messiah, or "ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It was a very simple condition, there being but a single article of faith; "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God."

II. We must not suppose, however, that nothing further was required of the proselyte or disciple. The conviction or faith of the mind (connected with a public profession) that "Jesus is the Christ," entitled such an one to admission to the outward kingdom of heaven, or visible church—for that the phrase, "kingdom of heaven," frequently means nothing more than an organized society, is very clear. Thus:

The kingdom of heaven is likened to a net cast into the sea, gathering of every kind, Matt. xiii. 47; also to ten virgins, five wise and five foolish, xxv. 1. The violent took this kingdom by force, and it therefore suffered violence, xi. 11, the Pharisees shut it up against men, neither entering themselves, nor suffering others to enter, xxiii. 13. Those who broke the commandments and taught others to do so, were in that kingdom, and were called least therein, v. 19.

These and many similar passages, plainly speak of the kingdom of heaven and kingdom of God as a merely outward economy or visible church, into which every one was admitted as a proselyte on a profession of faith in Jesus as the Christ. And all such were declared to be born of God, in the sense already given of that phrase.

But besides the outward or visible kingdom referred to, we read of an inward kingdom. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," Rom. xiv. 17. "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God . . . and such were some of you—but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified," 1 Cor. vi. 9-11. Sinful persons might be in the kingdom of heaven, as an outward or visible church; but not until they were purified inwardly, could they inherit the spiritual kingdom, which pertains to "the inner man."

We here discover that a more abstract

faith in Jesus as the Christ, may be only a head-religion. Faith is to become an active principle, working by love in "the hidden man of the heart." Gal. v. 6; Acts xv. 9; 1 Peter iii. 4; Rom. v. 3.—Hence it is written, "Beloved, let us love one another—for love is of God; and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God," 1 John iv. 7. Accordingly, all the commandments are comprehended in love to God supremely; and love to mankind universally.

III. But there is still another step.—The faith of the head and the love of the heart are to be manifested in THE LIFE.—Accordingly it is written, "If ye know that he is righteous, know ye that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him," 1 John ii. 29. And this testimony completes the proof of the statement, that the scriptural doctrine of the new birth is resolved into practical conformity to the heavenly law.

The intimate association of faith in Christ and love of man, is thus spoken of in the Scriptures: "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God." John i. 12, 13. See also 1 Peter i. 22, 23.

The result of this association of faith and love—the morality of the new birth—is mentioned in Eph. iv. 22-24,

In this scriptural exposition of the matter in hand, nothing supernatural is implied—and nothing that involves the idea of a change of nature. The process is natural and comprehensible. The understanding is first to be convinced, by an appeal to the evidences of truth, that Jesus is the Christ—and whosoever thus believes is born of God. Not all the excellencies of the Savior's character are immediately perceived: but the new-born child of the kingdom is enjoined to grow in grace and in knowledge, until his heart is filled with the love of God and man. Then he is born from above in a new and living sense; and it becomes his meat and drink to do the will of God. Not by its stature, nor the symmetry of its branches, nor the verdure of its leaves, nor the beauty and fragrance of its blossoms, is the tree to be known—but by its fruits. And the faith of the head, and the love of the heart, can best be testified by RIGHTEOUSNESS OF LIFE.

Finally: The mediatorial kingdom is not to be delivered up to the Father until all things shall be subordinated to Christ; and then God shall be all in all, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28. And we are certified that God hath highly exalted the Messiah, to the end that every knee should bow to him, and that every tongue should confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, Phil. ii. 9-11. This implied universal faith in Christ, is associated with that universal righteousness which can only be wrought by the principle of love: "Every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear—surely shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength," Isa. xiv. 22-24.

Conformably, the primitive believers could say, "Of his own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures," James i. 18. They were "the first fruits unto God and the Lamb," Rev. xiv. 4.—The first fruits are a sample of the harvest.

Accordingly, the believers who enjoyed the first fruits of the spirit, testified that not themselves only, but "the creature, [THE WHOLE rational CREATION] itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Rom. viii. 21.—They waited for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the universal body of humanity, verse 23; and the holy spirit of promise which the believers possessed, was an earnest or pledge of their inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, Eph. i. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 6; Heb. ii. 9; 1 John ii. 2—not the believers only—but the harvest also, THE WHOLE WORLD.

From this essay the reader will learn, that Universalists believe in a change of heart, as well as of head and life; and that they differ mainly from other Christians, in maintaining that this change is rational and comprehensible, and that, in the Lord's own time, it will be wrought in every soul of the family of man. A. C. T.

WHO IS A UNIVERSALIST?

That thousands takes to themselves the name, who are not entitled to it, can not be denied. For, is that man a Universalist, who is in the constant practice of defrauding and cheating his neighbours, and of trampling upon the rights and privileges of others? No. He has not yet the principles of our holy faith fixed in his heart—he has not yet learned the way of life everlasting—he has not been spiritually renewed in the inner man, nor blessed with the glorious influences of a full and perfect knowledge of Heaven's truth! No—he is not a Universalist!

Is that man a Universalist, whose mouth is continually filled with oaths and cursing, who is in the habit, daily, of taking the name of God in vain? No. He is yet without the kingdom. He is as far from Universalism as earth from heaven—salvation has not yet come unto his house. No—he is not a Universalist!

Is that man a Universalist, who manifests no engagedness in behalf of the cause—who feels no interest in its welfare, and is not zealously engaged in the propagation and defence of the doctrine of free and universal salvation? No. The depths of his soul have not yet been lit up with the glories of Universalism—its spirit and sanctifying power have not yet entered into his heart. He has scarcely entered the vestibule of the glorious temple! No—he is not a Universalist!

That man, and that man only, is a Universalist, who refrains from evil practices and vicious habits—whose mind is filled with high and holy impulses to action, and in whose daily walk is preserved a corresponding likeness between his profession and practice. That man is a Universalist who is continually alive to his duty—who is ever found at his post, like a tried and faithful soldier of the Cross, and whose determination is, to fight the good fight, and keep the faith!

A. C. T.

THE MYSTERY EXPLODED.

Our readers will recollect that we noticed, a few weeks since, a very mysterious account, which appeared in the "Advocate and Journal," of a converted Universalist preacher, who after having been twelve years in the ministry, is about to ascend the world with certain developments concerning Universalists that will rival those made by the notorious M. H. Smith. It now appears that this mysterious individual is no less a personage than one Rev. W. S. Clark, who having fallen into bad repute in our denomination, was dis-fellowshipped by the Maine convention, a year or two since. He subsequently joined the Campbellites, with whom it is presumed he stills is as he found it convenient, and has now turned Methodist. From the war meeting that he has associated, we presume that he will need no other recommendation to their favor, than a willingness to abuse Universalists in a most unscrupulous and unprincipled manner. Yet, the enemies of our blessed faith must be

reduced to great straits for means to oppose our sentiments, when they consent to use such weapons in carrying on their warfare. We deem it highly complimentary, that they can find nothing better to bring against us. While the hearts of all good men earnestly desire that our doctrine may be true, and even the enemies of our faith are obliged to pray for it, we have little to fear from the malice and envy of those who hate us only because of our faithfulness in braving them to discipline for their transgressions.—N. Y. Christian Messenger.

UNSAFE DOCTRINE FOR A FUNERAL OCCASION.

It is conceded by all denominations, that the Gospel is safe to preach on all occasions; and that it is particularly adapted to the house of mourning. Jesus, our great Master, took special care to bind up the broken hearted, and comfort those who mourned; and we should defame his doctrine to say that it was not directly calculated to accomplish the same objects.

But dare the advocates of a partial salvation make an honest application of their faith on a funeral occasion? We think not. No discreet man among them ventures, so far as our knowledge extends, to carry it out into legitimate results. And why?—Because it would, in most cases, shock the moral sense of all his hearers.

Let us illustrate a little. A woman, the mother of a large family of children, and the loved of an extensive circle of friends, dies. She never experienced religion, or joined a Church—and although amiable in the common exception of the word, was not a fit subject of the kingdom of glory—orthodoxy being judge. A Methodist or Presbyterian preacher is called to attend the funeral. And now, what can he say in her favor? What must he say, if he speaks the sentiments of his creed? He must say there is no hope for her. Having never been converted—having never experienced religion in the technical sense, she has gone to hell. But he will not affirm this, except he be an imprudent, inexperienced young man, for the reason that it would fill the minds of his hearers with horror. He will probably say that she leaves her in the hands of a just God. True, he must leave her there, but that just God will certainly send her to the pit of endless despair, if his sentiments are correct; this legitimate result he is careful to keep to himself for the cause above stated.

If all such preachers were to apply their faith, as they ought, if true, on all funeral occasions, they would soon be left without hearers. They know this very well; and hence they are careful to conceal its dark features, and leave the destiny of those in reference to whom they speak with general remarks of a consolatory character.

Those assembled to mingle their tears and sympathies with bereaved friends would be startled at the mention of endless misery, as the fate of the deceased, whatever might be their fate. They could not bear it if ever so orthodox. Every good feeling of their souls would rise up in rebellion against it—and the spontaneous cry would be, "That theme is unwieldy to this place and occasion!" But why unsuited if true? Here is a question for others beside Universalists to answer; and it deserves careful consideration does not lead to the conclusion that the peace-giving and heart-cheering Gospel of Christ is utterly at variance with endless death, we shall be deceived.—See on the West.

HYPOCRISY?—OR NOT?

Near the close of Mr. Hobson's last Lecture against Universalism, after using Dr. Rice's illustration of the "disagreeing Doctors," 99 to 1, or 999 to 1, the Lecturer thus expressed himself: "I avow, that if I believed in Universalism, I would never tell it, even to my wife, or to my child."

On hearing these words,—for I did hear them,—the question irresistibly forced itself into my mind, How do you know, Sir, that you are not a Universalist, only you see fit to conceal and deny your real sentiments? What guarantee can we have that you say, or disbelieve anything that you oppose? By what means can we know whether you are now an honest man, or a hypocrite, if, as you avow, you would not acknowledge your faith in Universalism, even if you were convinced of the truth of that doctrine? "I pause for a reply."—N. Y.

REVIEW OF HALL'S UNIVERSALISM AGAINST ITSELF.

THE GRAND CONSUMPTION: 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.—Rev. 5: 13. (No 43—p. 127.)

It seems very evident from this language, that the Revelator was permitted to look through the long vista of coming ages and to catch a view of the glorious results of the Messiah's reign; of that time when all shall be redeemed, purified and made holy and immortal—when the "whole creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." The language here is the strongest and most comprehensive that can possibly be used; and is what the learned call a *periphrasis*, peculiar to the Hebrew writers, denoting the entire universe of intelligent beings. To say that it does not comprehend the entire family of man, is to say what is at once a violation of both reason and common sense! It may mean more, but it cannot mean less. And though it should mean more than the entire family of man, we cannot go so far as to make it embrace the inanimate and the brute creation; for this would do violence to the passage. It represents beings of intelligence—beings that worship "Him that sitteth upon the throne, and the Lamb"—and last, though not least, it represents beings in a state of happiness. They are INTELLIGENT, OBDIENT, AND HAPPY.

Says Professor Stuart, in his letters to Channing, in speaking of Phillip, 2: 10, 11. "Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the Universe; (*ta pan, or ta panta.*) What can be meant by things in heaven, i. e. beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant? What other worship can heaven render?" Again, speaking of this very passage in Rev., he says: "If this be not SPIRITUAL WORSHIP, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine!"—pp. 100—103, third edition. Thus then, according to this learned and orthodox Professor, the worship here must be spiritual and divine; and none surely but intelligent creatures can render such worship. Let us now hear what Mr. Hall has to say.

This proves too much for Universalism, for every creature will embrace all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fish of the sea, and creeping things; and hence, if this proves salvation in heaven to any, it proves the salvation of all the horses, cows and sheep, in the universe, for they are all creatures.—p. 127.

How very forgetful, or inconsistent, is our author! But a little while before, when speaking of the 6th of Romans, as we have just seen, he maintained that the word creature only meant infants—now he thinks it means all the horses, cows, sheep, beasts, fish, fowls, and creeping things! It is the same original word here (*Ktisis*) as in Rom. 8th, that is rendered creature; and as the reader is aware, in that place our pious author thought, in his "humble judgment," that it meant the infant creation! What a wonderful man is this Mr. Hall.

But allow me to ask, can horses, cows, sheep, &c., render spiritual and divine worship? And is it reasonable to suppose that they would be classed along with intelligent and purified beings—angels and men—as saying 'blessing and honor, and glory, and power be unto the Lamb?'—this vast number of beings, be they what they may, were all worshipping God at the same time—in the same way—and singing the same song of praise unto Him. Does this include "brute beasts?" But hear our author again.

But Peter speaks of some men who had become as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed. (2 Pet. 2: 12.) therefore it is unreasonable that they should praise God, and hence they will be excluded from the number of the saved, upon the same principle that you would exclude a crocodile or hyena. This is Universalism against itself, No. 1.—p. 128.

Oh mercy, reader! Only think of that! This is Universalism against itself, No 1! Only think! Some men will be excluded from the number of the saved, on the same principle that you would exclude a crocodile or hyena! "Who is prepared for such things!"

But suppose these men, who had become as brute beasts, in some sense or other—but had not become brute beasts—suppose they should be raised from the dead, pure, holy, and immortal, as Paul teaches that all men will be, and should be "like the angels of God in heaven,"—"children of God, being children of the resurrection," as the Savior taught the Sadducees; would they then be "excluded from the number of the saved, as you would exclude a crocodile or hyena?" Or would they not more likely, be found among the innumerable number which John saw in prophetic vision, praising God and the Lamb? This is Universalism in favor of itself, No. 1.

But will Universalists tell us that this is all to take place in eternity, beyond the resurrection, and that then there will be no beasts, fowls, fish nor creeping things in existence: and therefore that every creature in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, and in the sea, can praise God, without such creatures being included? We reply, that if it refer to the state beyond the resurrection, then the wicked will also be destroyed, and will neither be in heaven, on the earth, under the earth, nor in the sea, and consequently will not be among the number that John heard praising God.—ib.

My dear sir, who told you that the wicked will "also be destroyed" beyond the resurrection state? Paul believed there would be "a resurrection of the dead—both of the just and of the unjust;" and he said that "as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ shall all be made alive"—that "this mortal must put on immortality!" Can immortal spirits be destroyed? Can the children of the resurrection die any more? O, sir, you must be mistaken.

But it may be asked; does the bible any where teach that the brute creation can praise God? We will see. "Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons, and all deeps, fire and hail, snow and vapors, stormy wind, fulfilling his word; mountains and hills, fruitful trees, and all cedars, and all cattle, creeping things, and flying fowls—let them praise the name of the Lord.—Ps. 148.

There is no doubt in the world, but every thing that God has made, praises

him—whether "brute beast," or inanimate object; cattle, creeping things, flying fowls, mountains and hills, fire, hail and snow, vapors and stormy winds; but how do they do it? By "fulfilling his word"—by answering the purpose for which he formed them, and by declaring his wisdom and goodness—his "power and Godhead." But the worship which John heard was quite different. He heard them saying, blessing, and honor, and glory and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. This is "spiritual and divine" worship, and can only be performed by INTELLIGENT CREATURES. Quite a difference, Mr. Hall,—and you will excuse me for saying this looks very much like a failure.

But if every creature, is to be confined to human beings, it cannot be proved to mean one in ten thousand. Paul testifies to the Colossians, that the gospel had been "preached to every creature under heaven, whereof, I, Paul am made a minister," (Col. 1: 23.) This embraced only those who lived at that age of the world; and not those myriads who had lived before, and who have lived since. Thus we can, with all safety to our cause, admit that "every creature" in Rev. 6: 13, applies exclusively to rational beings, and yet myriads may never praise God.—p. 127.

Alas for our author now! He could not have made a more fatal admission!—But before noticing his admission, let us pay some attention to the fact of Paul's preaching the gospel "to every creature under heaven," Paul only meant those "creatures" living at that age of the world; and according to the definition of "every creature" assumed by our author in the outset, Paul must have preached the gospel to "all the horses, cows, and sheep living at that age of the world"—"for" said he, "every creature will embrace all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fish of the sea, and creeping things." Did Paul mean that the gospel had been preached to all these animals, as well as to human beings?—that is, to those living at that age of the world? Suppose by "every creature under heaven," Paul meant intelligent beings, may we not safely conclude, "and upon the same principle," that when the Revelator heard every creature in heaven, on the earth, (or under heaven,) under the earth, and such as are in the sea, saying blessing and honor and power and glory be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever—that he meant intelligent creatures also? I put this question to the good sense of the reader. "What is meant by "every creature" in Mark 16: 15—where the Savior said to his disciples "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature?" Did he mean all the horses, cows and sheep, fowls, fishes, and creeping things? Or did he mean all intelligent creatures, "in the world," or "on the earth?" I leave this to the good sense of the reader, also.

But it will be recollected that not long ago, our author thought every creature meant every infant! Did Paul mean that the gospel had been preached to every infant under heaven? I only allude to these things to show how fickle minded our author is;—or what is equally as bad—how very forgetful he is! Great men, and authors, should be a little more careful—such discrepancies do not look very

well in a book! Let us now turn to the gentleman's admission contained in the last quotation.

You perceive that he admits by every creature in Col. 1: 28, is meant "those living at that age of the world;" and thinks he can, "with all safety, admit that 'every creature' in Rev. 5: 13, applies exclusively to rational beings." Will he see with what "safety" he can do this. I agree with him that Paul only meant "those who lived at that age of the world; and not those myriads who had lived before and who have lived since. But how reads the language of the Revelator? "And every creature which is IN HEAVEN;—and (every creature which is) ON THE EARTH:—and (every creature which is) UNDER the earth; and (every creature which is) IN THE SEA—and ALL THAT IS IN THEM—heard I saying, Blessing and honor," &c. Does not this language "embrace those myriads who had lived before, and who have lived since?" He does not merely say "every creature;"—nor yet "every creature in heaven;"—but "every creature in heaven—on the earth—under the earth, and in the sea; and all that is in THEM!" How could language be more complete—more universal and comprehensive? It is unnecessary to dwell any longer on this point. The gentleman's own admission has ruined him! He has, with his own hands, formed a rope with which to hang himself! "Let him hang, then, like Haman, upon the gallows he erected for Mordecai!" But it would not have been the same had he not made this admission; for the language is so plain, palpable and comprehensive, and so evidently embraces all who ever have lived, who now live, and ever will live—that all attempts, however ingenious, to make it mean any thing less, must prove fruitless and unavailing.

The first worship which John saw—Ch. 4: 9-11—was offered by the "four living creatures" and the "four and twenty elders." They worshipped the Father only—they "fell down before him that sat on the throne"—for the Lamb had not yet been seen. When the Lamb took the book—Ch. 5: 6, 9—to open the knowledge of it unto men, then the "four living creatures," and the "four and twenty elders," fell down before him, and rendered the prayers and praises of the saints, who had been "redeemed unto God out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. But a sublimer scene was soon to follow:—All the hosts of heaven next joined in the worship;—verse 11—angels whose number was "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands," said with a loud voice, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," &c. But the scene brightens. The Revelator's mind is carried forward to the time when the Lamb should prevail everywhere—to the final triumph of the Redeemer, when every heart shall be sanctified, and every tongue attuned to praise. He now sees the RESURRECTION OF ALL THINGS! Sublime sight! Most glorious consummation! How shall he describe it! In the grandest, sublimest, and most comprehensive periphrasis to be found in the whole Bible, he breaks forth: "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!"—Well might Professor Stuart say this meant THE UNIVERSE—THE WHOLE; and Dr. George Campbell, that it included THE WHOLE RATIONAL CREATION. J. M. J.

QUENCH NOT THE SPIRIT.

The spirit of the Lord, which bears witness with the spirits of all true Christians that they are born of God, is likened to a fire; and it is this spiritual fire that we are forbidden to quench. On the contrary, we are enjoined to cherish it as the purifying agency of God in the soul of man. Its office is to burn up every thing unholy—to consume all evil passions, such as anger, wrath, malice—and to assimilate the creature to the Creator in all holy affections and desires.

It is through faith in Christ, and by the baptism of his love, that this divine spirit is attained and enjoyed. Hence it was predicted of him that he should be "like a refiner's fire... And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.—Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years." Malachi 3:2, 4.

He whose vocation it is to smelt the precious ores, and purify them from dross, sits and watches with interest the process of refining; and he knows that the process is complete so soon as he sees his own face reflected in the flowing metal. And he who, in a figure, sits as a refiner of the soul from all its earth-born impurities, knows that the work of his mission is complete, so soon as he beholds his own image in the regenerated spirits of his redeemed. Accordingly, it is written, that "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his," Romans 8:9. We are all his, in the sense of proprietorship—for "he is heir of all things," Hebrews 1:2, and "Lord of all," Acts 10:36; but if we have not his spirit, we are not his in character—that is, we are not like him.

And what is it to be like Christ? It is to possess the same holy principle of love for every soul of our race—to love even our enemies—to be the friend of publicans and sinners. To be like Christ is to cherish the same spirit of sympathy for all suffering humanity—to rejoice with them who rejoice, and to weep with them who weep.

We discover this heavenly spirit in all the labors of Christian people to improve the condition of the ignorant and erring, the poor and wretched, the widow and orphan, the unbelieving and sinful. And these labors originate in the same benign disposition which prompts ardent supplication to the throne of grace, in behalf of the nations and tribes and individuals of the earth, who are still in darkness and wo.—Surely, nothing less than the spirit of our divine Redeemer could embrace such large and joyful blessings as these.

It is this "spirit which maketh intercession for us with groanings, or yearnings, which cannot be uttered." After we have used all forms of language in our power, there are holy aspirations in the believing

heart which have not been expressed.—And this, too, not simply in reference to ourselves, nor to the benedictions of which we personally feel the need—for this would be mere selfishness; but in reference to all others of the human race, whatever may be their circumstances or character.

Thus it was with the pious old colored woman, who, after uttering many fervent petitions to the throne of grace, summed up her soul's deep desire in the comprehensive supplication—"O Lord! let there be a full heaven and an empty hell!"

Can there be any doubt that Christ saw his own image in the soul of that disciple? Can there be a doubt that her prayer was prompted by the spirit of the Messiah, or that her utterance of deep emotion was an offering in righteousness? And if Christ's image was stamped on her soul—if this supplication was but the breathing of Christ's own spirit—what right has any one to doubt the universal triumphs of the love of God? If she, with all her earthly imperfection still cleaving to her, would realize her own prayer, if she only had the power, will not that prayer be answered and fulfilled by him who prompted its utterance?

—An incident occurred some years ago, in the central part of New York, which may serve to illustrate this point:

The neighbors were divided in their religious faith, but preserved the unity of love in all their intercourse. Universalists and those who opposed Universalism, were ever ready to unite in any plan of benevolence or work of charity.

An Indian, ruined by ardent spirits, resided in the vicinity. He had not been seen for a few days; and one evening several of the neighbors went to the cabin, in which he resided alone, for the purpose of re-urging him to abandon strong drink. When they entered, they saw him lying in the fire, dead, partly consumed. He had doubtless fallen into the flames while drunk. Forthwith, a Methodist and a Presbyterian, who entered in advance of a Universalist, took hold of the body and drew it out of the fire.

So soon as the shock of the awful scene subsided, one of the believers in endless misery said to the Universalist, "What do you believe will become of the soul of this drunken Indian?"

"I will answer your question by asking another," said the Universalist. "Do you believe God will be less merciful to his living soul, than you have been to his dead body?"

—The question was certainly a fair one—but it was not answered. How could it be answered? The dead body, at the worst, would have been reduced to insensible ashes—yet it was promptly pulled out of the fire. The living soul—who can count the agonizing pangs of even a thousand years of torture! Will God be less merciful to this, than you professors of his religion were to that?

It is nothing to the purpose, to say that the justice of God must not be violated for the gratification of his mercy—for we hold to no opposition among the attributes of God. But even allowing that the years of suffering entailed by intemperance, was not a full punishment for the offence of the Indian—and also, supposing that the horrible death he died would not fill up the measure of his judgment,—surely

something short of eternity would make up any deficiency. It would seem that even the malignity of a devil would not demand unending torment, on any plea whatever.

—Another incident is worthy of record. It occurred at Auburn, N. Y., in which beautiful village there is both a Theological Seminary of high repute, and a State Penitentiary.

"On the night of the 23d of October, 1828, the citizens were aroused from their slumbers by the ringing of bells and the cry of fire! It was soon ascertained that a log building in the north yard of the prison, occupied as a paint-shop, and at the time filled with combustible materials, was in flames. Its contiguity to the north wing of the prison, (in which the convicts were all confined in separate cells,) and the fearful progress the flames had already made, seemed to justify the apprehension that the whole of the pile would be laid in ruins.

"The north side of that part of the prison-building in which the convicts were confined, was already enveloped in a sheet of fire. The scene was awful beyond description! But what added most to the interest of the event, was the situation of the convicts. Nearly six hundred of them were locked up in separate cells, within ten feet of the wall which at the moment was wrapped in flames.

"The citizens rushed toward the shop to aid in suppressing the raging element; and the first sounds that fell upon their ears were the cries and shrieks and prayers of the miserable beings incarcerated within the walls.

"As these cries and shrieks reached the multitude of citizens, there seemed to be but one desire, and that desire was expressed in the imperative ejaculation—*Let out the prisoners! Let out the prisoners!*"

"The prison-doors were opened, and every heart rejoiced in the liberation of the captives. And even some of the convicts, had as they were, exposed their own lives, in aiding their companions in misery."

—Can there be any doubt as to the character of the spirit which cried, *Let out the prisoners!* Was it depravity of heart that uttered this demand? Was it not rather the spirit of Him who "can have compassion on the ignorant, and on those who are out of the way?"

It is not to be supposed that the Professors and pupils in the Theological Seminary, close by, were unmoved and silent spectators of the scene described.—Doubtless they mingled with the citizens, and co-operated in all endeavors to stay the devouring element; and when these attempts became hopeless, I will venture to affirm that the voices of those pious divines were heard in the demand of humanity, *Let out the prisoners!*

Why should it be otherwise? They were men, having the feelings of men; they were Christians, and the spirit of Christ could not ask less than the liberation of the captives under such awful circumstances.

—But how will it be with those pious divines, in the immortal world, if their creed be true? Surely, they will retain the same holy spirit *there*, that they manifested in Auburn; and when they hear the shrieks and groans of millions of captives, weltering in liquid fire, will they not rise

in the sublime majesty of a humanity glorified, and cry, *LET OUT THE PRISONERS!*

An objector, however, may inquire, "Would you have all judgments cancelled so that the sinner shall be wholly unpunished?"

Certainly not. The word of the Lord abides, that "he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong he hath done, and there is no respect of persons," Col. 3:25. But because we discard the notion of endless punishment, does it follow that we hold to no punishment whatever? Surely you can conceive of a position which avoids both these extremes. You can conceive of a punishment which, while it is just, is also merciful; and wherever and whenever such punishment is administered, its infliction does not contravene the Christian spirit.

And herein is discovered the doctrinal bearing of the incident above narrated.—God certainly has not affixed any such penalty to His law, as must incur the disapprobation of every pious soul. Fiends of darkness might exult in the infliction of endless torment: men, hardened to the highest degree, or savages of the lowest grade, might possibly look on with indifference; but the angels and saints of God's presence would shudder at the awful spectacle, and instinctively demand the deliverance of the sufferers.

And is not this an unanswerable objection to the truth of the doctrine of endless torment?

—It may perhaps be said that we shall have no such feelings of sympathy in the future life, as we now possess—but that we shall be changed.

Alas! how changed! Even so we might be changed in the present life. But in such a change we should be divested of all Christian peculiarities. The spirit of the Lord would be quenched in the soul, and we should be degraded to a level with mere barbarians.

O no, my friends. The change from mortal to immortal, is a change for the better; and the rejoicing of the immortal life will have for its principal element, the deliverance of the whole rational creation from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God Rom. 8:18-21.

A. C. T.

ANSWERED ACCORDING TO SCRIPTURE RULES.

We were very forcibly reminded of the rule that is to be found in the writings of Solomon, for answering a certain unkindly description of persons, upon reading the following, which appeared in a late number of the "Star in the West." The editor of the "Western Baptist Review," in noticing the case of a skeptic converted to Universalism, says:

"Now what could this man loose, according to Universalism by remaining a skeptic? Or what does he gain, according to the principles of the same system, by renouncing his skepticism? Will some Universalist mathematician, skilled in the rule of 'Profit and Loss,' work out this 'sum'—*Western Baptist Review.*"

To what a Br. Guley, in most fitting terms, responds as follows:

"Simple as these questions appear to the well informed Christian, we feel disposed to answer them, in the hope of the Rev. Mr. Walker, who penned them.

The man loses the hopes, prospects and blessings of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, which are more valuable in this world than all the treasures of the earth, Mr. Walker being judge. Without these he must remain all his life-time subject to bondage through fear of death.

He gains the knowledge of God which is eternal life. He gains life, Christian liberty, light, love truth and all the excellencies connected with the word of God. He gains that peace which the world can neither give nor take away. He gains joy unspeakable and full of glory. He

vains through faith, a prospect of a world's endless happiness, where the whole family of man shall finally gather, purified from the corruptions and defilements of sin, to enjoy the smiles and blessings of God forever.

"Having plainly answered the gentleman's questions, we shall take the liberty to ask a few in turn.

"Mr. Walker is a Calvinistic Baptist. What could a man lose by leaving his creed and adopting skepticism? It could not alter his immortal destiny, for the number of the elect is so certain and definite that it can neither be increased nor diminished. It would of course, be better for a man to believe that death is an eternal sleep, than to believe that he may be lost eternally, and that many of his dearest kindred and friends will wa! forever in hell! Better for him to remain in ignorance than suffer all the doubts connected with such an unrighteous theory.

A sceptic could gain nothing according to Calvinism, by embracing that, except the fear that hath torment. He could not gain peace of mind, nor heaven, for his eternal destiny was decided before the world began, without any foresight of faith or good works. Nothing good could be secured, nothing desirable could be gained, by leaving skepticism for the Baptist creed. It he thinks otherwise, let him try his hand at figures and see if he can produce a different result.

"One fact is certain: Universalism is desirable to all good beings, and gives peace and rest; and another fact is equally evident: Endless misery, when believed and realized, makes men melancholy, and even mad! Of what use is it then, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men?"

REV. ROBERT TOWNLY.

This gentleman was educated in the University of Dublin, at which he graduated in 1841, where he took high classical honors. The same year he was ordained a minister in the Episcopal Church, and after holding two or three appointments he was settled as minister of St. Matthew's Church, Liverpool, England. He continued his connection with the Episcopal Church about four years, when he left it, in consequence of a change in his religious belief. Not long after, he embraced the doctrine of Universal Salvation. He came to this country about two months since, with strong letters of recommendation from the Rev. Mr. Thom, of Liverpool, with whom he has been intimate for 4 or 5 years. He is a man of good mind, excellent attainments, and superior pulpit talents. He has preached 2 sermons for Br. Skinner, in the Orchard-street Church, with which the people were greatly pleased. He has gone to Charlestown, Mass., to spend two Sabbaths. He is a great acquisition to our cause, and will be one of our most useful and efficient ministers.—*N. Y. Christian Messenger.*

CONVERSION OF A BAPTIST MINISTER!!

Light Shining in North America!!!

Br. GURLEY:—With pleasure I now take pen in hand to inform you that Rev. Henry Swanson, of Fort-Run, Green Co., N. C., has renounced the doctrine of endless misery, and avowed his belief in the cheering doctrine of a world's salvation.

Mr. Swanson has been a Calvinistic Baptist clergyman for the last 25 years, and is a man of much wealth—talent, popularity and influence.—For the last year his mind has been much exercised on the subject of man's destiny beyond the grave, and the result is, his conviction of the Bible fact, that "God will have ALL MEN to be saved."—1 Tim. 2: 4 —[*Star in the West.*]

THE LATE DISCUSSION AT JORDAN, C. W.

We give below some of the arguments brought forward by us in support of the first proposition, which reads thus: "Do the Scriptures teach the final Holiness and Happiness of all Mankind?"

Feb. 21, 10 o'clock, A. M.

Mr. Lavell having the affirmative, was called forward by the principle Moderator to open the debate, and commenced by saying that "the proposition before us was one in which all are deeply interested, "Do the Scriptures teach the final Holiness and Happiness of all Mankind?"—Neither one of us believes any will be saved in their wickedness, but from their wickedness. He (Mr. Oliphant) believes in the final holiness and happiness of a part of mankind. I believe in the final holiness and happiness of all mankind; and here we join issue. Mr. Lavell then proceeded to his first proof-text: Matt. 22: chap. from the 23d to the 32nd verse inclusive. The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say there is no resur-

rection, and asked him, saying; Master, Moses said, if a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren; (Sadducees, who were unbelievers,) and the first when he had married a wife, died; and having no issue, left his wife unto his brother. Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seven, and last of all the woman died also. Therefore, in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.' Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.—For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living." The parallel passage in Luke 20, chapter, was introduced and reads as follows: "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more, for they are EQUAL unto the angels; and are the children of God, BEING the children of the resurrection. Now, that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for ALL LIVE UNTO HIM." Our Saviour did not merely answer the question of the Sadducees and then stop; but proceeded, 1st, To show that there was a resurrection of the dead. 2nd, To inform his hearers what would be the condition of those raised, 1st, "they should not die any more." 2nd, They should be "EQUAL unto the angels." 3d, They should be the "children of God." 4th, They ALL should "live unto God." Mr. Lavell called the particular attention of Mr. Oliphant here, that two distinct facts are predicated of the raised, 1st, They should not marry. 2d, They should not "die any more" because of their equality with the angels of God. Hence we are justified in saying those raised will not sin or suffer, or marry, or die any more;—carnality will not exist in the resurrection state, because of their equality with angels. There is no way of escaping from this conclusion other than to say that "angels in heaven" sin and suffer!

Mr. Lavell wished to call the attention of Mr. Oliphant to the words "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead." How many does he think will obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead? Is it not a prominent doctrine of the New Testament, and universally acknowledged by all Christians, that all the dead shall be raised. Paul declared this fact in his first letter to the Corinthians: "As in Adam ALL die, EVEN SO, in Christ shall ALL be made alive." And again, (Acts 24: 15) "And have hope towards God, which they themselves also show, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead BOTH of the JUST and the UNJUST." Hope is a conjunction of expectation and desire, and Paul being a christian did not hope that any

would be raised unjust; for that would have been a most unchristian hope indeed. Does my friend hope that any will be raised unjust? If his hope is as extensive as Paul's was, then he must certainly believe that ALL will be "accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead." he must have hope towards God, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." The fact is, he must admit that all are worthy, in order to prove the 2nd proposition (endless punishment), or else prove it without the resurrection from the dead. The Scriptures I affirm, teach the resurrection of all mankind into a state of immortality, by the same process and the same power; and the fact is triumphantly established by Luke's own teaching, that all will be "accounted worthy," and will be "equal unto the angels,"—the children of God being the children of the resurrection—for none are to "obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead," but those that are "accounted worthy," and as all are to "obtain" them, or be raised from the dead, all, as a matter of course, will be "accounted worthy." That this proof text triumphantly sustains the proposition cannot but be evident to all who will give it a fair examination. If after the resurrection the greater part of mankind are to be endlessly miserable why did not our Saviour say so when treating of the resurrection?—the very time we should expect to hear of it. Why did He never say so? On the contrary he tells us that "in the resurrection" mankind shall be "equal unto the angels"—"the children of God BEING the children of the resurrection"—that they shall not "die any more," and that all shall "live unto God." These are glorious announcements—well worthy of that Gospel which brings good tidings of great joy which shall be unto all people.

2nd PROOF TEXT.—Mr. Lavell introduced 1 Cor., chap. 15, as his second proof text. It appears from this chapter, that some among the Corinthians (even the brethren), denied the resurrection altogether. The Apostle in order to establish this important doctrine in the mind of his readers, goes into a lengthened account of its extent and its effects upon its subjects. 1st, With reference to its extent, the Apostle says: "For as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ shall all be made alive." 2nd, As to its effect we learn, As those who are raised in Christ, we are justified in saying that they will be raised free from sin, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2-Cor. 5: 17. The phrase "in Christ," is used about forty times in Scripture, and always applied to those who are justified from sin! 2nd, Paul declares that "as we have borne the image of the earthy (and all bear the image of the earthy) we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." 3d, "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory." 4th, "It is sown in weakness it is raised in power." 5th, "It is sown in corruption it is raised in incorruption." 6th, We shall all be changed, (yes, even some of his Corinthian brethren whom Paul told to "awake to righteousness and sin not, for some have not the knowledge of God, I speak this to your shame") that is "the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed." (What becomes of the partialist phrase "no change after death," if Paul

tells the truth which shall we believe? We go for Paul and the Bible!—our Partialist friends may go for whom they please, with all their home-made Scriptures. So much for the extent and effects of the resurrection; the former is universal, the latter, glorious, sublime, holy.

Mr. Lavell proceeded to notice some of the results and triumphs of his reign of kingdom. 1st, He is to conquer death. "Death is swallowed up in victory." This agrees with the words of our Saviour when speaking of the resurrection, and those who are raised. "Neither can they die any more." 2d, He is to put down all authority and power, (that is opposing rule, authority and power) excepting the devil and his power, whatever they may be. "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil—Heb. 2: 14. "For this purpose, (will it fail?) was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John, 3: 3d, "The last enemy shall be destroyed—death?" The devil and all his works, the grave sin, and all enemies shall be destroyed—death being the last enemy shall be destroyed." What will hinder the holiness and happiness of all mankind, if all the enemies are destroyed? Can friends of Oliphant tell? 4th, All things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son ALSO himself, be subjected or subdued unto him that put all things under him, that God may be ALL IN ALL!" After all have been subject unto Christ, then Christ is subject, does not convey here any idea of misery, but of happiness. The word also doth bar the popular cavil that some are subdued in one way and others in some other way. All must be happy for they will be subdued to the mild and peaceful reign of Jesus Christ.

On the 26th verse, Dr. Clarke says "Death can only be destroyed by a general resurrection; if there be no general resurrection, it is most evident death will retain his empire. Therefore the fact that death shall be destroyed, assures us of the fact that there shall be a general resurrection; and this is proof also that after the resurrection there shall be no more death." "Death is swallowed up in victory." Hence the Apostle exclaims, "O death where is thy sting?" And immediately he adds, "The sting of death is sin!"—What more, my friends, could be said! All that bear the image of the earthy, are to bear the image of the heavenly. All are to be made alive in Christ—not come up out of Christ, but all who go down to the grave in Adam, come up, or are made alive in Christ. All are to be raised in power! GLORY!! and INCORRUPTION!!!

In these proof texts there is the most perfect harmony. Over the whole there res a flood of light and truth, that can never be removed; and though the heavens and the earth may pass away, not one jot or one tittle of God's word shall pass away until all be fulfilled; until the ransomed millions of the race of man shall unite in one general anthem of praise; until "Every creature which is in Heaven and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and ALL THAT ARE IN THEM (are) heard saying, Blessing and honour and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne and unto the Lamb forever and ever

REVIEW OF HALL ON THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

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

1. The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where 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 it 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, the 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 he hath done 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 you 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 while he 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 he hath done 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 he is 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 correspondent announcements of Revelation.—The antagonistic elements—the irrational theories and presumptions of the common priest-craft Theology insure 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, 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 a man a mountain was heard to brag, 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 you 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 epigram you give for the "lower order of Universalists," is twisted from its design, for all understood it to suit your own case and situation, since the debate "many of your necks are turning to be ducks." You have a zeal, but not according to knowledge—you have "soft soled" 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 argumentatively. I would direct Mr. Oliphant's attention to the Golden Rule, "as you would be done to."

Rev. David Leavitt has removed from Belleville C. W., to Bloomfield C. W. to which place he desires that all letters intended 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 has 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 was 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. Brainerd 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. 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 10 1/2 A. M.
- TEMPERANCEVILLE—May 13, at 3 P. M.
- ALYMER—May 13, at 7 P. M.
- LOUTH—May 20, at 10 1/2 A. M., in the School-house, near Dishy's Tavern.
- SOUTHVILLE—May 20, at 3 P. M.
- BEANSVILLE—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.

PARABLE OF THE OFFENDING HAND.

"And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."—(Mark ix. 43-48)

Q. Who uttered this parable?
A. It was uttered by Jesus Christ.
Q. To whom was it addressed?
A. To his disciples, who alone were with him at the time, in a house at Capernaum.
Q. What was the Saviour's object in speaking these words?
A. To warn his followers of the necessity of casting aside every personal habit or gratification, that could prove an obstacle to their giving themselves up wholly to the service of their Master.
Q. Why should it not be proper to understand the language of the parable in a literal sense?
A. Because it would be attributing to Jesus the doctrine that some will enter upon the spiritual existence of another life, deprived of a hand, a foot or an eye—than which nothing could be more unscriptural or absurd.
Q. How, then, should we view the language of this parable?
A. As highly figurative.
Q. Why did the Redeemer employ such singular figures, as the cutting off the hand, and plucking out the eye?
A. It was to impress his disciples the more deeply with the truths he desired to communicate.
Q. What did the Saviour mean when he called upon his disciples to cut off an offending hand, and pluck out an offending eye?
A. By these bodily organs, he represents darling sin; and his meaning was, that however much his disciples might be tempted to any improper habit or any indulgence of a sinful character, they should break away from it entirely—although the sacrifice were like the cutting off a hand, or plucking out an eye.
Q. Do bad habits frequently become deeply seated?
A. They do; and so much so, that to destroy their power, is like cutting off the hand or foot of the body.
Q. What is Archbishop Nowcome's opinion of the phraseology under consideration?
A. He says, "This is a strong eastern manner of expressing that seductions to sin, and particularly stumbling-blocks in the way of openly professing the gospel at that season, should be avoided at all events."
Q. What do you understand by the words "enter into life," as used in this parable?
A. I do not understand them as referring to an entrance upon the immortal state of happiness, in a future world, for the reason already expressed, that it is absurd to suppose that any will enter there, deprived of an eye or a foot. But in the use of this phrase, I understand the Saviour as signifying an entrance into the belief of his gospel.
Q. Have you any Scripture evidence of the correctness of this construction?
A. There are several passages where the word "life" is evidently used in this manner.
Q. Can you quote them?
A. Upon a certain occasion Jesus said, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."—(John vi. 63) At another time he exclaimed, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life."—John v. 24.
Q. Is there other testimony of like character?
A. There is. Jesus declared, "This is the eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."—John xvii. 3. The Apostle John also uses similar language: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren: he that loveth not his brother abideth in death."—1 John iv. 14.
Q. What do we learn from these passages?
A. We learn that the phrases "eternal life," "everlasting life," "passed from death unto life," are used to represent an adoption of the doctrine proclaimed by Jesus Christ; and that hence, there is the utmost propriety in giving the same meaning to the similar phrase in the parable before us.
Q. How should we understand the words "enter into the kingdom of God," as used in the latter part of the parable?
A. In the same manner as the phrase "enter into life," already explained. The terms are perfectly synonymous, as may be seen by comparing verses 43 and 47.
Q. Is this term, "kingdom of heaven," "kingdom of God," used in other places to represent the spiritual, or gospel kingdom, which Jesus established on the earth?
A. It is. "From that time Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."—Matt. iv. 17. On a certain occasion Jesus, addressing the Jews, said, "The kingdom of God is come to you."—Matt. xii. 28. At another time, he exclaimed, "Behold the kingdom of God is within you."—Luke xvi. 21. Other passages of like character might be quoted. See Matt. iii. 2; x. 7.
Q. What does Dr Adam Clark say upon this phrase?

A. He says, the kingdom of heaven, "and the kingdom of God, mean the same thing, viz., the dispensation of infinite mercy, and manifestation of eternal truth by Jesus Christ."
Q. What farther does he say on the subject?
A. He makes the following inquiries and answers: "But why is it called a kingdom? Because it has laws—all the moral precepts of the gospel: subjects, all who believe in Jesus Christ; and its king, the Sovereign of heaven and earth. But why is it called the kingdom of heaven? Because God designed that his kingdom of grace here, should resemble the kingdom of glory above."

SECTARIAN EDUCATION FOR THE WEST.

A plan was devised, some years ago, to collect, prepare and send teachers to the Western States. A society has been organized for that purpose, with ex-Governor Slade, of Vermont, a run-down politician, at its head. It assumed the imposing title of a society for 'National Popular Education.'
In accordance with the plan, Gov. S. went through the East and lectured in all the principal towns upon the wants of the West, the vast influence that portion of our country is destined to exert the value of education, &c. &c., all of which was made very plausible, and money was easily raised to pay his salary, and carry out the objects of the society. Young women were induced to offer themselves for teachers, and such as were prepared were dispatched to their places of destination, to the number of one hundred and ten, their expenses and wages being paid by the Society. Those who were not fitted, were sent to school to gain the necessary qualifications. A Committee for that purpose has been established at Hartford, Ct., which is composed of three ladies appointed by the board, who receive and decide upon the qualifications of applicants, and give the necessary instructions, preparatory to their departure for the field of labor in the New States.
Now all this appears very well, very laudable to our poor neighbours "out West." It shows a kind and watchful concern on the part of those acting in it. Who will not favor such a humane project for the enlightenment of the valley of the Mississippi? Who will say a word against such a stupendous scheme of philanthropy? "National Popular Education!" What can appeal in stronger terms to the heads, and hearts, and pockets of Americans? We are proud of our Schools—our Common Schools. We glory in the general diffusion of knowledge. It is the strength of our Republic.
But somehow, from jealousy or otherwise, we have come to feel a sort of insidious distrust of all movements kept exclusively within the control of the church. We cannot tell why, but, from the first, we have had suspicions that there was something back which was not made apparent—some object ulterior to 'popular education' at the bottom of this movement. And we have several times had too strong confirmation of all we had suspected, and more. We have our opinion in the outset, that there was a snake in the grass, that sectarianism was cooling itself about this movement, and preparing to strike its venom where least expected. We know it was denied and the main object insisted on. But we had known of him who was at the head. An intriguing politician rarely makes an honest man or a sincere Christian. It has been proved, at different times, that ladies of the most thorough education and irreproachable character who are known to be first rate teachers, have been rejected, for reason not given: while those of far inferior qualifications were accepted. After a while it was found that these rejections were in cases where they did not give in their adherence to 'orthodox' doctrines, or were not members of 'Evangelical' churches. Cases of this kind have been made public. But to set the matter at rest, we ask attention to the following paragraph, from the 'Pioneer' of William Slade, dated Cleveland, Ohio, Jan. 22, 1843:
"The Board has sent out teachers, indiscriminately, from the Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Episcopal denominations, from all which it expects contributions will continue to be made. We desire to make any practical, Union movement.
That is what we call the snake! Kind, of impudence, not to say impudence we ever heard of under the fair pretences of 'National Popular Education'! What the American people tolerate, is a sort of Jesuitism—the selection and training of young women to go forth in the name of 'popular education' to indoctrinate the ignorant and young States in the peculiar dogmas of certain churches! Will the people in these States consent to such arrogant interference with the culture of their children? Will they submit to such disguises, such gross deception? Will they suffer schools to be established in the name of 'popular education' while the agents to be sent forth in religious views? It is hoped they have too much self-respect, too great a love for honesty and frankness, to submit to such base imposition.
What is this but the adoption of the plan of Ignatius Loyola, in a modified form? It has been the glory of our "National Popular Education" that it is unsectarian. The law of many States forbid all interference in matters of religious faith. We know not how it is in the New States, but presume that the matter is properly guarded. If these teachers go out and set up "Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational" schools, according to the name of the sect from which they are taken, we will not object. They have a right to do so. But we beg of them not to call it "National Popular Education." Call it Sectarian Education, Eran-

gelical, Orthodox, any thing but National and Popular. Those terms have been appropriated to a better use. Let not the public be deceived by the abuse of them. Our Western editors should inquire into this matter, and speak out in reference to it. They will soon learn whether things are called by their right names or not; and the people will know how to act.—N. C. Christian Messenger.

UNITARIANISM AND UNIVERSALISM.

Thinking our readers might be curious to know what view is taken by our Unitarian friends of the tremendous sensation produced among the Partialist sects by the recent movement in Boston, in relation to the censure and installation of Rev. T. S. King, we copy the following from the "Christian Enquirer":
"A wonderful amount of solicitude manifests itself in all the Unitarian religious papers concerning the friendly relations of the Unitarians and Universalists, more particularly as it has been evinced in the settlement of the Rev. Mr. King at Hollis-street. A very lively anxiety is felt least the Unitarians should be doing themselves some injury by anything like union with the Universalists. They are called upon, in a very pathetic manner, to remember their scholarship, refinement and purity of manners, as if Unitarianism had ever been just what George the Third—that most pious and intelligent judge of such matters—thought the Church of England to be the only religion for a gentleman! But the fact is, that Unitarians have an old-fashioned fable, daily growing upon them—a desire to be true to their own principles; and having seen that under the spirit of the times they have been wrong in allowing themselves to treat the Universalists a little as the orthodox have treated them, they are now anxious to place themselves right with that large and uninteresting body of Christians. Agreeing in almost all points, and daily approximating in those upon which they have heretofore differed, without the least compromise on either side of fidelity or independent researches and conclusions in matters of faith, neither denomination had thought it worth while to resist the union coming from substantial agreement in doctrine and easiness of spirit. The orthodox are for the most part just as ignorant of the spirit of the Universalist body, as they once were of the spirit of the Unitarians. The origin of Universalism may have been as bad as the correspondent of the 'Independent' states it to be. It was the protest of common minds against orthodox asceticism and bigotry, and irrationality of faith; and of course much coarseness, much skepticism, much unscholarlike criticism, much virulent and poor controversy, characterized its early career. Yet it had vigor and substantial truth in its protest, and showed itself 'mighty in the Scriptures.' Its growth has been like that of many an American youth of mean origin, whose luscious 'moss and strong blood added to the culture of the common school, have finally borne him far ahead of competitors of gentle breeding, but of over-refined and effeminate mental habits and moral culture. We look with the greatest interest and the liveliest hope upon the Universalists. That they are everywhere spoken against is only an additional reason for rejoicing in any form of union with them, which has truth, charity, brotherly love, and sincere piety for its basis. Now is not the time—when the orthodox papers are so generally signaling their arrogant spirit and systematic narrowness, by direct and insinuated expressions of contempt and hatred for Universalism—for us to draw any lines between the Unitarian and the Universalist opinions. We agree in so much more than we differ, that we ask it as a favor of orthodox to include us in all the odium, exclusion and execration, it heaps on our brethren of the Universalist faith. We would rather suffer with the friends of religious liberty and Christian charity than be glorified with the supporters of an impudently bigoted and self-complacent orthodoxy."

TRIUMPHANT AND HAPPY DEATH.

DIED, at Frankfort, Herkimer Co., N. Y., on the evening of the 7th ult., of Consumption, Miss Mary Jane Holmes, aged 25 years.
In the death of this young lady the community suffers the loss of one of its most useful members, the Universalist society is deprived of one of its brightest ornaments, while the faith of a world's salvation receives the highest encomium that could be bestowed upon it, by the peace, the joy and the triumph it imparted to the dying youth, as she was about to take her leave of the earth and all its attractions. She was the sister of Wm. B. Holmes, Esq., a young and enterprising lawyer of the same place, who died of the same disease some three years since, and whose death was noticed at the time. Miss Holmes had been a believer in the doctrine of Universal Salvation for several years, and always distinguished for the deep sympathies, the broad charities, and the expansive benevolence of her heart. She deeply sympathized with all that were afflicted, and could never withhold assistance from any whom it was in her power to aid.
Consumption, that insidious destroyer, had marked her as its prey long before she could be made to believe that any serious disease was upon her. We saw her several times during her decline and sickness, and conversed with her freely on the subject of her approaching dissolution. At first (sometime, we believe in November) she seemed unwilling to believe she should never recover and enjoy good health again. We did not conceal from her our belief that she had

but a short time to remain here. But the thought of death seemed painful to her. Not that she feared to die, as she said, for she was not afraid of death, nor of any thing beyond it. But to do so young, with life just opening before her, with all its charms and attractions—to leave this beautiful world and all its splendors, and to go down in the still, cold grave—it was a sad, a melancholy thought, and it could permit it, she would gladly recover. But when the hectic flush upon the cheek, and the cold night sweat, and the distressing cough, and the labored and painful respiration, told her, from day to day and from week to week, that the sands of life were fast ebbing away, and that health could never again be hers in this world, she turned her thoughts more entirely to God and her hopes more constantly to another world. She sought communion with her Father in Heaven, and he gave her that peace of God that passeth all understanding. "As we called to see her from time to time, and as death approached nearer and nearer, we were happy to find her more and more resigned, stronger and stronger in faith, as the body grew weaker towards its dissolution. The last time we saw her living was the Sabbath before her death. She was then waiting for her change, and anxious for the hour to come when her emancipated soul, freed from its clay tabernacle, shall soar to mansions in the skies. She said she seemed to see her departed brother, sister and kindred in heaven, waiting for her arrival with outstretched arms, to welcome her home, and she longed to go to her rest. She said she should never see him again in this world, but she should in another. She desired I would preach her funeral sermon, and had selected the text from which I should preach it, viz: Rom. xii. 32, 33. "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all. O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out." On the evening of her death, while her kindred and friends around her dying pillow were weeping for her early exit, she told them not to weep and take on thus, for she was happy, and soon to be far happier. She did not wish a tear shed nor a sigh heaved for her. She desired rather that they should rejoice that her sufferings were over, and she was going to rest forever.

Some three or four clergymen, Methodists, Baptists, &c. called on her during her sickness, and strove but in vain, to shake her confidence in the glorious doctrine in which she believed and found so much consolation. But her steadfast soul knew no fear; and they were satisfied that whether her faith was right or not, they had not the power of altering or shaking it, or disturbing the calm serenity of soul with which she approached the spirit world. Her mother is a strong and zealous Baptist, but seeing the strong faith and happy death of her daughter, she could not doubt but what she died a Christian, and is happy in the land of glory.

"Where she shall bathe her weary soul
In seas of heavenly rest,
And not a wave of trouble roll
Across her peaceful breast."

DENOMINATIONAL BOOKS.

Any of the following Universalist Books may be had by applying to any minister of the denomination in the Province.
Paige's Commentary, 5 0
Ballou's 2d Inquiry, 5 0
Roger's Memoranda, 5 0
Roger's Pro & Con, 5 0
Universalist Book of Reference, 5 0
Causes of Infidelity Removed, 2 0
Streeter's Hymns, 3 1
Ancient History of Universalism, 5 0
Brown's Review of the Life and Writings of M. H. Smith, 3 9
Whittemore's Notes on the Parables, 3 9
Ballou's do do, 3 1
The Bible a Universalist Book, 3 9
Ballou's Treatise on Atonement, 3 1
Orthodoxy as it is, 2 6
Ballou on Future Retribution, 2 6
The Balance, 1 10
The Crown of Thorns, by E. H. Chapin, 1 10
Ely and Thomas' Discussion, 2 6
Williamson's Exposition of Universalism, 2 6
Sawyer's Review of Hatfield, 2 6
Endless Punishment, 2 6
Williamson's Argument for Christianity, 2 6
Universalist's Guide, 5 0
Rose of Sharon for 1852, 10 0
Universalist Companion, with an Almanac and Register, containing the Statistics of the Denomination, 0 7

THE GOSPEL MESSENGER, OR, UNIVERSALIST ADVOCATE, Published Monthly, at LONDON, C. W.

TERMS—One Dollar a year—payable in advance. J. R. LAVELL, EDITOR & PROPRIETOR.

All Communications concerning the paper, must be directed to J. R. LAVELL, Editor, London, Canada West., and if sent by Mail, post paid.

Printed by D. M. GUNN, St. Thomas, C. W., May, 1852.